

Annexure B: Issues and Response Table

Issue Raised	By Whom and When	Response Given by Project Team
General		
At what uranium price is the project considered feasible?	Epson Hoebebe – Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	The price is important, however, this also depends on the mining cost and exchange rate. The mining cost would be dependent on the size of the pit and the uranium grade.
Is the Z20 ore-body part of Swakop Uranium?	Cisel– Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	No, it is not. The Z20 resource/Uranium deposit is entirely within the Rössing mining licence area. This uranium deposit is however an extension of the Uranium deposit that is also found in the Swakop Uranium Mining License (i.e. Husab Mine).
In December there will be a meeting through the Chamber Of Mines where projects like the proposed mining of the Z20 Uranium deposit can be presented.	Erasmus Shivolo – MME Meeting 26/10/2012	Noted.
The application for Environmental Clearance Certificate must be submitted to MET, not MME	Erasmus Shivolo– MME Meeting 26/10/2012	Noted. The application forms were submitted to Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) during a meeting with them. The copies of the Background Information Document (BID) and applications forms were however also provided to Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME) for information.
The proposed pit is shown as bordering the current mining license area. Will Rössing be applying for an expansion of their ML area?	Jade McClune – Media Meeting 23/10/2012	No, there will be no extension of the mining license, mining would happen solely within the current Mining License area.
What is the total estimated cost for the project and what are the expected employment figures?	Floris Steenkamp– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Total estimated cost for the conveyor is US\$ 150 million. The total project costs still need to be determined. Current employment is 1600 full time employees and 400 to 500 contractors. During the peak of the construction phase there would be approximately 2500 (temporary) employees. The number of permanent employees still needs to be determined.
Does the uranium price affect the plans for this project?	Adam Hartman– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Yes, the uranium price (amongst others) does affect the project. Rössing Uranium is confident that it will rise again, given the demand of a non-fossil fuel based electricity source.
Through the SEMP, there should be greater cooperation between the various mines and proposed projects. This does not appear to be	Rod Braby– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012	Comment noted. Rössing Uranium acknowledges that it is important for the mines to be willing to talk and negotiate. It should be noted that there is still no-one in a Strategic

happening.		Environmental Management Plan co-ordinating role to bring the various parties together. There is a liaison with the EMWUC, and there is cooperation in regards to the Husab infrastructure.
When dealing with the general public, be sure to explain the engineering terms in simpler language.	Selma Uushini– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012	Comment noted.
What is the expected pit depth and will backfilling be considered?	Marcia Stanton – Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012	Backfilling is not a financially viable option, given the open pit mining method for granite based ore. Backfilling for strip mining would be feasible.
What is the expected depth of the pit?	Denise Neels – MUN Meeting 24/10/2012	The exploration drilling and other studies first need to be completed. However, current indications are estimated at approximately 300 m.
What is the projected size of the Z20 pit?	Erwin Leuschner– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	The pit would be 1 km long, 600 m wide and 300 m deep. However, drilling is still on-going and the size may change.
Why is there only a half-circle pit shown in the images?	Marcia Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012	The impact assessment addresses the maximum impact scenario. This scenario would foresee a pit which would be developed beyond the boundary in order to reach ore at depth. Note that this might not be feasible for other reasons but would allow the assessment of a worst case scenario from the environmental perspective.
Will the study disclose the information regarding the pit boundary?	Marcia Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012	Yes, that information regarding the maximum expansion scenario will be available. Rainer to comment. Will we show this on a map – we need to provide a reference to the report.
Will the option of dumping the waste rock on the neighbour's ML (away from the river) be considered?	Werner Ewald– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012	Purely from the environmental perspective several alternatives are being considered, including this one. The various options will be assessed as part of the Z20 assessment phase of the process. However, these alternatives might not be feasible for other reasons but would allow the assessment of various environmental alternatives.
On page 5 of the Background Information Document is a table with potential environment issues. The arrows indicated on the table do not differentiate between positive and negative impacts. Please distinguish what is positive and what is negative.	Ben Truter – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The potential impacts associated with the infrastructure corridor were assessed as part of the Scoping Process. Refer to Section 8 of the Scoping Report for the findings of the various specialist studies. This section provides detail regarding the significance of the potential impacts and also distinguishes whether it is

		positive or negative.
It is rather mysterious that on the one hand Namibia receives international awards for good management of the natural environment and its biodiversity and on the other hand government allows uranium mining in the protected Namib Naukluft Park. The reason to proclaim a National Park is to protect the natural environment and not to spoil it.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	Comment noted.
Page 3 on the Background Information Document: The satellite photo shows the Z20 uranium deposit partly outside the Project Area of the Mine License Area. Please explain.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The Z20 deposit and the Husab deposits are part of the same geological formations. The deposit extends beyond the Rössing mining boundary.
BID Page 5: Quote: “A number of potential positive and negative impacts on the socio-economic and biophysical environment, which could result from the proposed project, have been identified.” Job creation and income for government through taxes and royalties will rightly be identified as positive socio-economic impacts. However, Earthlife is interested to learn about identified positive impacts on the biophysical environment.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The “positive impacts” identified relate to the socio economic environment and not the biophysical environment. The potential impacts associated with the infrastructure corridor were assessed as part of the Scoping Process. Refer to Section 8 of the Scoping Report for the findings of the various specialist studies. This section provides detail regarding the significance of the potential impacts and also distinguishes whether it is positive or negative. The potential socio-economic and biophysical impacts associated with the other mining related project components will be assessed as part of the next phase of the process.
A full study on the impacts on wildlife must be incorporated, including the impact of waste and contamination of park resources (including the health of wildlife).	Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012	A biodiversity impact assessment was conducted for the infrastructure corridor as part of the Scoping Phase. The findings from the impacts assessment is presented in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report. The impacts on biodiversity relating to the other project components (i.e. mining of the Z20 ore body and associated activities) will be conducted as part of the next phase of the Social and Environmental Impact Assessment

A study looking at the long term impact beyond the life of mine must be incorporated including cumulative impacts of all mining and exploration activity in the area.

A full study must be conducted to determine potential worst case scenario impacts (disaster) as part of the various studies and cumulative impacts. A scientific analysis of the types of disasters that could occur and the potential cumulative disasters must be incorporated into the EIA, including cumulative impacts of all mining and exploration activity in the area. The EMP must be based on the science of the EIA in all aspects, including the disaster contingency components.

Studies on the Worst Case Scenario (Disasters) must look into the future, beyond life of mine. For example, what will happen when Rössing leaves and cannot continue its current dewatering program? That waste will enter the underground water unhindered and there is no plan currently on what to do with this beyond life of mine.

The Namibian Government and the people are not fully informed as to the potential release of hazardous waste and they are not prepared to handle this issue when the company leaves. This is unacceptable and no additional site can be added without a plan for the waste and the virtually guaranteed contamination beyond

(SEIA).

The SEIA will include all project phases including decommissioning and closure. Potential impacts will be cumulatively assessed by including existing activities and infrastructure. The strategic environmental assessment (SEA) for the Central Namib Uranium Rush cumulatively assessed impacts from current mines and future (proposed) mines and expansions. The relevant recommendations and findings from the SEA and Strategic Environmental Management Plan will be used by the project team to guide the SEIA.

Disaster impacts cannot be determined and will not be assessed as part of the SEIA.

However, disaster management and recovery plans are in place at the current operation and will be put in place for the proposed new operations.

A closure management plan is in place for the current operation and a plan will be developed for the new projects. Financial provisions are being put in place on an ongoing basis to make provision for those aspects which require longer term management once the company has closed.

<p>the life of the mine.</p> <p>A scientific analysis on the long term impact of the components that will not be rehabilitated (waste sites, pit, infrastructure, other facilities, etc.) must be incorporated- this study must look beyond the life of mine and the EMP must incorporate issues that require long term planning and funds.</p> <p>A full analysis of the impact (on the environment and people) of additional requirements of water and electricity by the mine must be analysed.</p> <p>All studies must be conducted from on-site research and in situ studies.</p>		<p>The SEIA will include all project phases (including decommissioning and closure). Closure objectives will be included in the SEIA. However, detailed closure planning form part of the Mine Closure Planning process and the development of the mine Closure Plan.</p> <p>Noted. The specialist studies include various methodologies as presented in each specialist report. These include amongst others field work.</p>
<p>Extended mining and infrastructure across the Khan River valley, i.e. conveyor, access road, fuel pipeline, crushing plant a.s.o requires</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blasts and hauls which bring more uranium rock to surface, • More disposal of waste rocks and new disposal sites • More natural land transferred to processing area including open pits • More tailing dam pollution of aquifer groundwater <p>(Note: Geohydrology contamination by chemically processed uranium compounds which are not naturally water soluble)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More destroyed and polluted nature which we inherit to future generations <p>(Note: Temptations and promises of the uranium mining industry never meet the demands of a growing jobless work force. Even without strikes that influence an</p>	<p>Bernd Seefeldt – Comments received via fax 31/10/2012</p>	<p>These aspects will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA which will address the mining related aspects. Refer to Section 10 of the Scoping Report for the terms of reference for future studies.</p>

economy negatively, as in RSA now, normally economic crisis cause retrenchment anytime and bring whole families into ruin. Strikes are always to be foreseen in countries with low job creation and high population growth. Does Namibia like to become mine/mineworker dependent country like RSA?)

Cancer and fatal cases due to ionizing radiation in the region increases. Biodiversity decreases. Surface water of flowing rivers contaminate sand pits of building industry, and brings uranium into the houses which then become a permanent radiation source for the inhabitants.

(Note: Constant monitoring by the state's radiological officials must be established now)

Air quality decreases and poisons when strong winds blow uranium salts/particles over the whole Namib.

(Note: desert storms carry the fine dust over hundreds of km and pollute the desert surface)

High influx of job seekers to the coast makes living conditions of illegal settlers' worse, whom have been present since the uranium industry came to the region, and are a permanent source of many unlawful activities.

In conclusion we are busy to sell our nature which we are commissioned to preserve. No job once terminated, and no money or revenue income can give us back our health and life. The uranium industry is a threat to us all.

Do we have to witness at first a catastrophic nuclear power station disaster at the east coast of the USA, before we turn away from uranium as an energy source? Solar and wind power is a safe, environmentally friendly, sustainable, reliable alternative to nuclear power and uranium exploration as well.

How far is Z20 from Husab	John Mootseng – MUN meeting 24/10/2012	The Z20 ore body is an extension of the Husab ore body which is very close. The Swakop Uranium Mining License is located directly south west of the Z20 area. The Husab Mine belongs to Swakop Uranium.
What is the expected life of mine? (Current and future).	Denise Neels - MUN meeting 24/10/2012	The current life of mine plan of the Rössing mine foresees closure in 2023. The future life of mine depends on exploration results, the uranium price, etc. and cannot be confirmed at this point in time.
Why was the project kept secret for so long?	Charles Cleghorn – Open Day 24/10/2012	The feasibility study of the proposed project is currently being conducted. The exploration drilling results of the Z20 area only became available quite recently after a second phase of drilling in this area. These drilling results are positive but need to be confirmed with closer spaced drilling. Mine planning and environmental studies will be conducted in parallel because they are interdependent.
SEA recommendations are different than what is planned, what will be done about this?	Sandra Müller– Open Day 24/10/2012	The relevant recommendations and findings from the SEA and Strategic Environmental Management Plan were used by the project team to guide the assessment of the impacts associated with the infrastructure corridor. Some relevant/key recommendations from the SEA (i.e. the fact that infrastructure corridors should be used rather than each mine having their own infrastructure) were considered in the Scoping Report. Refer to sections 2.3.16 and 11 in the Scoping Report.
Rössing will have a greater demand on water and electricity. Shortage of both is experienced already under current conditions. Where does the electricity come from?	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	There will be a 50% increase from the current Rössing usage. A second transformer has been included in the project design. Electricity will continue to be supplied by NamPower.
How will the power demand be met?	Adam Hartman– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	
What impact will this project have on national power grid? And what will it do to the affordability of power?	Denise Neels– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012	Rössing currently utilizes 7% of the nation's electricity which will increase to 9% if the project is implemented. There will be a 50% increase in power supply to Rössing due to the proposed project. It will be necessary to talk to NamPower on details regarding national demand.
Are any challenges foreseen at this stage to the national power demand?	Florida Husselmann– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012	Part of the reason for the SEIA process is to determine the social and environmental impacts as well as identifying appropriate mitigation measures. In the case of the road, it
What mitigation measures will be in place regarding the access road?	Aunie Gebhard– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012	

		will not always be possible to fill and cutting will be necessary.
<p>Rössing is already aware from earlier discussions, of the majority of the environmental issues and concerns raised by Swakop Uranium in connection with the proposed linear infrastructure across the Khan River and onto the Khan/Swakop River watershed. They are reiterated in the comments and suggested additional investigations provided below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind Speeds. Given the proposed height of the conveyor supporting structure, the speed at which the conveyor will travel (~16 km per hour) and the propensity for strong winds in the area, has the effect of the wind on the structure been definitely assessed given the paucity of reliable weather data for the Khan Mine valley? In other words, is there a possibility for the conveyor and its diesel fuel line to be damaged by excessive wind speeds? (Or develop resonant vibration at a particular, not necessarily high, wind velocity, <i>a la</i> Tacoma Narrows Bridge in the USA). Surely wind data should be collected at several points in the Khan River valley and at the design height of 120 m, for at least a year to inform both the design, and to select an optimal conveyor corridor. • Air Quality. Dust containing radioactive material will certainly be blown off the ore being conveyed. Detailed modelling studies of the effects of dust, particularly the radioactive material blown from a height, must be 	Swakop Uranium – Comments received via email 1/11/2012	<p>Wind speed measurements in the area have been recorded for most of the time that Rössing is in operation. The highest wind speeds were measured at 120km/h on 21 July 1989. The design of the conveyor and associated structures is based on a design wind speed of 150km/h. Similar installations have withstood hurricane force wind speeds of 265km/h with immediate start up after conditions had normalised.</p> <p>Doppelmayr have made over 30,000 installations of various rope systems including rope conveyors. The design always takes into account any possible issues with harmonic resonance due to wind of moving loads. There has never been a problem in this respect on any installation. As there is no vibration or resonance, the diesel line will be the same as if installed on the ground on a pipe rack, so there will not be any issues or potential for diesel line damage due to wind.</p> <p>The dust and radiological impacts associated with the conveyor system were assessed as part of the scoping phase. The findings from these studies are presented in sections 9.2 and 9.3 of the Scoping Report.</p>

examined as the affected area may be quite large. (Wet crushing can be done, but difficult: refer to the experiences at the recent installation at De Beers Elizabeth Bay Mine)

- What is considered the most effective means of reducing dust off the conveyor and could any palliative affect the operation of the conveyor belt: i.e. can there be build-up of congealed material on the belt? If water is used, it is likely that droplets of dust containing radioactive material could drop into the area below the structure and cause soil and surface water pollution.

- Public exposure to radiation. Are baseline public exposure pathways to radioactivity to be undertaken over a full year as is best practice?

Swakop Uranium has made every effort to minimise its footprint on the relatively sensitive surface and biodiversity on the watershed between the Khan and Swakop Rivers, and to purposely avoid several areas identified as being sensitive habitat for protected plant and reptile species. Rössing's proposed infrastructure appears to cross these areas.

Following a scientific field study, the preferred habitat for the vulnerable lizard has been identified. The proposed road and pipeline

Please refer to the design phase section of the Social and Environmental Management Plan (SEMP) in Annexure D. The conveyor is equipped with corrugated side walls to contain material. Special covers surrounding the material transporting part of the conveyor will be installed. Further optimisation is possible by shaping these covers in an aerodynamic form which creates a pressure regime inside the covered belt which would keep material inside.

A belt turning device is the standard way of this transport system to prevent losing material from the unloaded belt. Belt cleaning is not required as in a conventional conveyor as the ore carrying side is always face up. If a belt scraper were needed (highly unlikely and not recommended) it would be installed immediately prior to the belt turning device.

Refer to section 9.3 for the evaluation of public exposure by incremental dose.

The final routing of infrastructure will still be optimised taken the results of the impact study into account.

route appears to impact on this habitat and could result in the isolated populations being cut off from populations in the Khan valley. The protected plant species has also been mapped and its ideal habitat occurs in the watershed area where the infrastructure is proposed.

- Because of the possibly restricted and threatened ranges of these species, it is suggested that careful route selection work is undertaken, following more detailed work on the bio-diversity along the infrastructure routes.

The Husab mine SEIA “Sensitivity of collective habitats” plan marked the potential road and pipeline route from the Khan River to the mine site as a “no go” area in that its biodiversity and sensitivity were considered high. A valley further to the east is also marked as very sensitive.

Has the route selection process taken into consideration the known sensitivity of the bio-diversity in the area as well as technical and financial considerations?

Z20 and the planned infrastructure are situated within the Namib Naukluft National Park south of the Khan River. Tourism and conservation issues need to also be addressed.

- The noise generated by the elevated conveyor will be heard over a larger area of the Khan River valley. The potential effects on camping/tourism sites in the Khan River should be investigated.
- How will the public and wildlife be protected from rocks falling from the conveyor? Are safety measures to be

A biodiversity impact assessment was conducted as part of the Scoping Phase of this process. The findings from this study are presented in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report.

Previous studies conducted by Swakop Uranium were referred to as part of this investigation.

Route selection was based on practical considerations using valley alternatives. Shortening the route as much as possible to minimise impact and designing for fill rather than cutting into rock by blasting was an additional objective. The biodiversity impacts have been assessed in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report..

A noise impact assessment was conducted as part of the Scoping Phase of this process (Annexure C3 to the Scoping Report). The findings from this study are presented in Section 9.6 of the Scoping Report.

Please see design phase section of the SEMP Annexure D. A catching device will be installed underneath the

installed on the ground under the conveyor, such as fencing or barricades? Could this affect the passage of animals and people through the area?		conveyor to prevent material from falling below. Once the conveyor load has reached critical areas any material will have stabilised sufficiently on the way from the loading end of the system.
Technical		
Can the existing plant manage the additional load?	Ismael Keister– Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	That is why additional changes/modification to the plant, are proposed as part of this project.
Is the heap leach process the same as at Trekkopje?	Eric Tjitana– Arandis Public Meeting 23/20/2012	The basic principal of irrigating a heap of ore and collecting the leach solution is the same. The chemical process is different and an alkaline leach compared to an acid leach which is applied at Trekkopje.
Will blasting take place?	Ismael Keister– Arandis Public Meeting 23/20/2012	Currently there will just be drilling, blasting would only start during road construction, assuming the project goes ahead. Blasting will also be used as part of the mining of the Z20 pit.
Size of TSF? And what changes will there be?	Erasmus Shivolo– MME Meeting 26/10/2012	The footprint of the TSF will be about 600ha. The new tailings facility will be a high density facility requiring less water and allow better recycling of valuable process chemicals.
What is the anticipated grade of the Z20 resource?	Erwin Leuschner– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Comparable to the currently mined grade of 350ppm of the Rössing open pit.
What is the expected capacity of the proposed acid plant?	Adam Hartman– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	The approved, but not yet constructed, acid plant is 1200t/day, which is proposed to be changed to 2000t/day.
Will the tailings storage facility (TSF) replace the old facility, or will they run concurrently?	Rod Braby– MET/ERC Meeting 24/12/2012	The proposed heap leach plant would be constructed on the current tailings dam. The ripios disposal area previously approved would be shifted to the south on the Dome to allow positioning of the new TSF on the northern part of the Dome. Refer to Section 5.2.5 of the Scoping Report for a description of the proposed changes to the TSF, etc.
Are you in the process of acquiring a Clearance Certificate for tailings deposition?	Ben Truter – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	Tailings has been deposited in the existing TSF since the start of operations at Rössing Uranium. Various changes to the TSF and increases have been approved during the previous SEIA process. A Clearance certificate has therefore been obtained for the current tailings deposition and TSF operations.

		<p>Changes to the present Tailings Storage Facility and the establishment of a new High Density TSF on the Rössing Dome as a result of the proposed mining of the Z20 ore deposit is however proposed as part of this project and an environmental clearance is sought for this.</p>
<p>Although the new tailings facility is proposed to be high density, all options of the best type of tailings facility for health must be analysed. A wetter tailings facility has the additional issue of waste seepage into underground water but a drier tailing facility has the additional issue of waste release into the air. Both options must be analysed from an environmental and health perspective and options should be given to stakeholders that are not based on the cost to the company foremost, but the best options for the health and environment.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts of waste from the old and new waste sites must be incorporated.</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>Both environmental aspects of water and air emissions need to be managed. The high density tailings will not be a dry product and would be deposited as a slurry, like the existing tailings. The material will be continuously covered to prevent wind erosion. The combination of a number of seepage control options would be applied to control groundwater seepage. The assessment for the current TSF is included in Section 5.1 and the new TSF will be assessed in the following phase of the study. Air and water quality studies will include both facilities and the cumulative impact will be assessed.</p>
<p>What are the technical considerations being incorporated into the design of the Z20 pit and support infrastructure? Does Rössing take into account the close proximity of the proposed Z20 pit to Zone 1 pit of the Husab mine?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having pits in very close proximity, managed and operated by two companies poses potential risks, for example, to slope stability and safety; • How will interaction between the two operations, especially during blasting, take place? The two mining operations will be within each other's blasting evacuation radius; 	<p>Swakop Uranium – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>No, at this stage the proximity of the Zone 1 ore body has not been taken into account. Through the following stages of project design once exploration drilling has been completed by mid 2013, Swakop Uranium will be consulted in order to ensure that the two mines will not influence each other in a negative way.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Blasting evacuation radii should not extend beyond mining license boundaries to ensure safety outside the areas of responsibility. Work Rössing needs to carry out in its ML should not be influenced by neighbouring operations. However, should this be inevitable, close cooperation between the companies should take place to manage the</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a geotechnical assessment of the impact of mining Z20 adjacent to Zone 1 been undertaken and how have these considerations been incorporated into the Z20 pit design? • There may be potential impact (sterilization) on the Z20 resource due to mining activities at Husab. <p>Swakop Uranium also wishes to get more detail on the proposed location of all required infrastructure, including the temporary ore stockpiles, waste rock dump, mine offices, fuel depots etc.</p> <p>The Husab double revenue pit footprint must also be considered during site layout planning.</p> <p>How will the proposed Z20 operating methodology affect Swakop Uranium's operations and how will operations at Zone 1 affect operations at Z20?</p> <p>Swakop Uranium assumes that, by virtue of having already obtained a mining license and that construction of the mine is about to commence, Rössing will have to take into consideration all the Husab mine designs, layouts, infrastructure, operating methodologies, etc. and that any adjustment or change that maybe required, will be done on Rössing's designs.</p> <p>Swakop Uranium would be interested to know</p>		<p>issues.</p> <p>No, geotechnical information is still being gathered by the ongoing exploration program. The geotechnical impacts on the Z20 pit will be assessed once sufficient information is available.</p> <p>In case there are impacts expected on the economic viability of resources within the Rössing ML, these need to be discussed with Rössing before the Husab plans are finalised. Any plans potentially having an impact in areas of Rössing's responsibility need to be approved by Rössing.</p> <p>All information will be made available as the design of the mining operation and required infrastructure is being finalised.</p> <p>Yes, it will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The operating methodology of the Zone 1 operation is not available to Rössing. However, once Z20 project planning reaches advanced stages, information should be exchanged to coordinate planning.</p> <p>Once relevant information on Husab's mine designs, layouts, infrastructure, operating methodologies, etc, has been received it will be possible to identify whether there are issues which need to be planned in cooperation so to guarantee safe and unhindered operations in the respective mining license areas. Rössing's mining licence was issued in 1976 and renewed in 2004.</p> <p>The timing of development of the ore body is dependent on</p>
--	--	---

<p>the estimated time-frame for the development of Z20, given the early stage level of evaluation of the Z20 ore body at this time. This information would clearly influence the operating methodologies of each mine.</p> <p>We also suggest that Swakop Uranium and Rössing Uranium should collaborate closely on site layout and mining issues.</p>		<p>economic factors and the final assessment of the exploration results and in comparison to the feasibility of other opportunities within Rössing's ML.</p> <p>This is agreed as outlined in the responses above.</p>
<p>What are the anticipated changes to the acid plant? And will there be any changes to the rail transfer area?</p>	<p>Florida Husselmann – Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>The approved plan has an acid plant producing 1200 tonnes per day; to accommodate the processing of both ore-bodies we are requesting an adjustment to 2000 tonnes per day. There will be no change to the rail transfer.</p>
<p>Why is the ore-body called Z20?</p>	<p>Magdalena Goliath– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>Initial exploration of the area was in 1976, where geologists gave the areas names according to anomaly type. Z20 falls within the Z-anomaly, and is number 20 of 27 such areas.</p>
<p>What is the grade of the Z20 ore-body?</p>	<p>Florida Husselmann– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>The grade, at this stage, seems to be similar or comparable to the current SJ pit (approximately 350ppm), but this number is subject to change as further drilling results come in.</p>
<p>How does it differ from the current capacity?</p>	<p>Denise Neels– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The RopeCon is designed with an hourly capacity of 2,700 tph based on 8,000 operating hours per year which equates to 18 Mtpa.</p>
<p>Proposed TSF is “stronger” than the existing facility, how will this impact Arandis?</p>	<p>Anton Cloete– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The main difference is that it is dryer, as result contains less water and moisture; the chemical composition of the material are the same to the current tailings.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with the changes to the TSF will be assessed as part of the SEIA process in the next phase.</p>
<p>Where exactly will the TSF move to? Is there not a water line in this area?</p>	<p>Denise Neels– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The location of the TSF is indicated in Section 5.2.5 of the Scoping Report (in the vicinity of the geological dome feature). There is no water line in the area.</p>
<p>What is ripios and will more acid be used in the processing?</p>	<p>Denise Neels – MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>Ripios are the same as tailings with the major difference that it is much coarser grained, very similar to pebbles, but again a very similar chemical composition than the current tailings.</p> <p>Yes, an acid plant producing 1200 tonnes per day has</p>

		been approved (not yet constructed); to accommodate the processing of both ore-bodies an adjustment to 2000 tonnes per day is required.
Will ripios still be used for roads? Some issues have been reported regarding skin irritation.	Shaun Peters - MUN Meeting 24/10/2012	Ripios can be used for roads as with the current practice of tailings sand and ripios from the HL demo plant.
Technical – Linear Infrastructure		
How big/long will the bridge over the Khan be? How many cubic meters will be excavated?	Marvellous Garoeb– Arandis Public Meeting 23/20/2012	120m long, with 22 pillars planted in the river-bed. The excavation details are not yet available, as final designs are not yet complete.
Is the RopeCon system cost-effective as compared to a regular conveyor?	Ismael Keister– Arandis Public Meeting 23/20/2012	Lower power usage and constant monitoring, makes maintenance easier as the parts come to you. The entire operating cost for the system will be lower.
Will there be any soil pollution as a result of the diesel pipeline?	Adreas Elro– Arandis Public Meeting 23/20/2012	The diesel line will have various safety features as part of the design, including a pipe sleeve; flow, pressure and temperature monitoring; and shut off valves.
Ensure that there is no diesel leakage into the surrounding environment.	Manie Le Roux– P&W Meeting 27/10/2012	
An Accessory works permit needs to be applied for before the construction of works can begin.	Erasmus Shivolo– MME Meeting 26/10/2012	Yes, this will be done.
The associated infrastructure is outside of the ML area, within the Swakop Uranium accessory works area.	Erasmus Shivolo– MME Meeting 26/10/2012	Yes, the final routing would have to be agreed with Swakop Uranium in order to allow both operations to work unhindered.
What route/road will be used during the construction phase of the conveyor?	Manie Le Roux– P&W Meeting 27/10/2012	The conveyor and pylons will be erected by means of a helicopter. The pylon foundations will however require some work on the ground and road access to some locations will be required. The potential biodiversity impacts relating to these activities were assessed as part of the Scoping Phase and the findings are presented in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report.
Regarding the power line and water pipeline, which route will be utilised? And they should be kept within the same corridor.	Manie Le Roux– P&W Meeting 27/10/2012	The positions of the water- and power lines are indicated in Section 5.2.2 in the Scoping Report. The power line will initially follow the conveyor alignment and then further on run next to the water pipeline and the proposed new road alignment.
Will traffic to the Z20 mine also travel from the south (C28 and Welwitschia plains)?	Manie Le Roux – P&W Meeting 27/10/2012	Some of the heavy vehicles (haul trucks, etc.) will initially be transported via this south. The proposed new road will

		only cater for personnel, equipment and parts.
Will the bridge be for public use, or only for private use by Rössing?	Guido Van Langenhove – MAWF Meeting 25/10/2012	The bridge will only be used by Rössing.
DWAF will not prevent the bridge from being built if it is only being used by Rössing as a private access. If it is built by Rössing then Rössing need to ensure that is safe. If the road and bridge can be used by the public then Rössing need to consider liability in terms of providing a safe road.	Guido Van Langenhove – MAWF Meeting 25/10/2012	Noted. The team will certainly look at the aspect of liability during the course of the study and it is something that Rössing will also consider.
The conveyor system will be a Namibian first, how long will it take to construct and will local contractors be used?	Floris Steenkamp– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Total construction takes 18 to 24 months. Civil work will be done locally and local businesses will have the opportunity to tender.
Where will the fill material sourced for the access road?	Floris Steenkamp– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Waste stripping of the pit produces large amounts of inert material that can be utilized for filling. The details, however, still need to be confirmed.
Will mining commence prior to construction of the infrastructure?	Floris Steenkamp– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Given the project requirements, many activities will be conducted in parallel, including initial stripping and infrastructure construction. All of the project components however first needs to be approved (i.e. environmental clearance) by MET (DEA) before any construction activities will commence.
Will local contractors be included in the construction of the access road?	Floris Steenkamp– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Yes, local contractors will be able to tender for the project.
Is there a Husab-Rössing partnership in the works to share infrastructure etc.? As it now stands, there will be 2 bridges across the Khan River, servicing the same area.	Erwin Leuschner– Media Meeting 23/10/2012	Reducing infrastructure requirements providing access into the same area would be a preferred alternative. Should it be decided to go ahead with the Z20 project, sharing of infrastructure will be considered.
According to the SEA and SEMP which we have conducted, infrastructure corridors should be used rather than every mine having their own infrastructure criss-crossing the desert. Is there any mention of co-operation with Husab, which must be considered. In today's newspaper a report says that there will be even 2 bridges over the Khan River. This is unacceptable and unnecessary.	Gabi Schneider – fax received 18/10/12	<p>The relevant recommendations and findings from the SEA and Strategic Environmental Management Plan were used by the project team to guide the assessment of the impacts associated with the infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>Some relevant/key recommendations from the SEA (i.e. the fact that infrastructure corridors should be used rather than each mine having their own infrastructure) were considered in the Scoping Report. Refer to Table 57 in the Scoping Report.</p>

<p>Will a roof be included with the conveyor? Also, has there been work done on bird collisions and fatalities regarding the conveyor?</p>	<p>Mark Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>Various covers are designed/available for the RopeCon conveyor technology These issues were assessed as part of the air quality and biodiversity impact assessments. The findings from these studies are presented in Section 9 of the Scoping Report.</p>
<p>Will there be support structures in the river bed for the conveyor?</p>	<p>Mark Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>There will be no towers within the riverbed. There will be no visible infrastructure within the riverbed apart from the overhead conveyor.</p>
<p>Will the conveyor system be removed after mining?</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>No decision can be taken yet, again it depends on whether stakeholders perceive beneficial at the time and the financial costs associated with continued operation and maintenance. But removal will be included in the closure plan and funds.</p>
<p>Is the road to be going up the “old Railway valley” or another one?</p>	<p>Hartmut Oscar Fahrbach – Comment received via email 20/10/2012</p>	<p>No, the Road will follow an existing track that starts at Rössing Uranium Mine from where it would continue on an existing gravel track to the south of the tailings dam. The alignment would then cut across a relatively flat dry river bed area with rock outcrops until it turns southwards following a sandy gorge with rocky slopes to the Khan River. Refer to Section 5.2.2.2 of the Scoping Report.</p>
<p>To Earthlife’s knowledge, a road and other service infrastructure across the Khan River is planned by Swakop Uranium for the Husab project. Is it really necessary to build twice infrastructure facilities within a relatively short distance in such an ecologically sensitive area? Is it not possible linking interests in order to preserve our fragile natural system? Recommendations by the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) and the follow-up Strategic Environment Management Plan should be taken seriously and negative impacts are avoided as much as possible.</p>	<p>Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	<p>Reducing infrastructure requirements into a similar area is an objective that should be followed as much as possible. Should it be decided to go ahead with the project, avenues to utilise already existing infrastructure will be explored.</p> <p>The potential impacts relating to the proposed linear infrastructure were assessed as part of the Scoping phase (Refer to Section 9 of the Scoping Report). These assessments were conducted cumulatively by including existing activities and infrastructure and where relevant also considering the (approved) linear infrastructure across the Khan River that is planned by Swakop Uranium.</p> <p>The strategic environmental assessment (SEA) for the Central Namib Uranium Rush cumulatively assessed impacts from current mines and future (proposed) mines and expansions. The relevant recommendations and findings from the SEA and Strategic Environmental</p>

		<p>Management Plan were used by the project team to guide the assessment of the impacts associated with the infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>Also reference was made to some relevant/key recommendations from the SEA. Refer to Table 57 in the Scoping Report.</p>
<p>Options to make the infrastructure corridor smaller must be explored. Currently the suggested corridor footprint is quite an extensive area (in terms of the size of the total area impacted). Options to minimise the extensive footprint must be explored from an environmental perspective as an option which stakeholders can look at and comment on. Although other corridor options may not be ideal for the company due to cost, it is necessary from an environmental perspective to explore all options that will have a lesser impact on the environment. As the stakeholders, we should be able to view the most environmentally friendly option.</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>Although the total area of the infrastructure corridor appears large (2700ha) since it is bounded by the combined road, waterline and powerline route on the western side and the conveyor route on the eastern side, the combined footprint of ground disturbance is significantly smaller (20ha for the road and 0.1ha for the conveyor)</p> <p>Information on the alternatives considered is included in Section 6 of the report.</p>
<p>The BID document describes three sets of infrastructure routes: firstly, the power line route, secondly, the road and pipeline route and, thirdly, the conveyor route. At the public meeting held on the 24th October 2012, the three sets of infrastructure were shown in a “corridor” that is almost a kilometre wide in places, primarily because the terrain over which they have to traverse, cannot contain them all in a single, narrower corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have alternative access routes been investigated, in particular, from the north east of the Z20 deposit? • Has the proposed conveyor structure been designed for the wind conditions prevalent in the area? 	<p>Swakop Uranium – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>All infrastructure including road, power and water lines are following the same route. The conveyor follows a different route and has insignificant footprint. Both mark the outer boundaries of the corridor.</p> <p>The Valencia road and a road through the Zhonghe EPL have been considered. Road alternatives considered can be found in section 6.2 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Yes, the design wind speed has been based on long term weather records including extreme events and safety factors. Refer to the Air quality specialist study (Annexure</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a conveyor of this magnitude ever been constructed elsewhere in the world? It could potentially be the largest unit ever built and this presents potential risks to its operation and the environment. • What is the pipeline volume of diesel that Rössing proposes pumping across the Khan River on the conveyor structure? Will this be a continuous feed? 		<p>C2 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The SEIA does not consider operational risks unless related to environmental aspects. The assessment of potential environmental impacts is found in section 9 of the scoping report.</p> <p>The fill volume is 54 000 litres for the total length of the pipe. The potential maximum drain volume is the volume between two of the longest spans, which is above the Khan river and 522m long. The volume over this distance is 2100 litres. The feed will not be continuous and utilise fuel storage on the Z20 side. The final design of the pumping system will be based on a detailed risk assessment.</p>
<p>From the available information, it is evident that the currently planned infrastructure has to cross the northernmost section of Swakop Uranium's Mining Licence area in order to access the Z20 deposit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swakop Uranium believes that Rössing Uranium should investigate alternative routes that do not cross its mining licence area. Swakop Uranium's double revenue footprint and any future site infrastructure requirements must be conserved. The proposed conveyor, diesel and water pipelines, power lines and road on Swakop Uranium's mining licence area are situated within the blast evacuation radius of pit Zone 1. • Have these route options been finalised? Or is there engineering work that must still be done to determine if 	<p>Swakop Uranium – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Routes will still be optimised and should any environmental</p>

<p>the proposed routes are fit for purpose and which may lead to a change in the proposed route(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed infrastructure routes across the mining licence area and their associated footprints must be discussed with Swakop Uranium in order to ensure that Husab's mining infrastructure is not compromised. For example, where would the ore stockpile for the conveyor be situated, and how much ground does it need? • In what proximity to Husab's power line will the proposed Z20 power line be? 		<p>or operational problems be identified, the routes will be adapted. Refer to Section 6 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>The stockpile area would be situated within Rössing's ML.</p> <p>Once the detailed information on power lines in the Husab operational areas is available the routing of the Rössing power line can be finalised.</p>
<p>Diesel spill from conveyor structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What volume is lost before it's noticed? (I.e. what is the total pipeline volume?) • Environmental damage that this could cause to the area over which the conveyor is routed, especially the Khan River and downstream areas? • Can this damage be cleaned up effectively? <p>Dust from conveyor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the public health risks, potential damage to vegetation? • Is there a way in which this dust fall-out could be cleaned up effectively? • Transportation of radioactive dust downstream in rain/flood events? 	<p>Swakop Uranium – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>No diesel will be lost during potential leaks. The diesel line will have various safety features as part of the design, including a pipe sleeve; flow, pressure and temperature monitoring; and shut off valves. These features are described in the design phase section of the SEMP, Annexure D.</p> <p>The dust and radiological as well as surface water impacts associated with the conveyor system were assessed as part of the scoping phase. The findings from these studies are presented in Section 9 of the Scoping Report.</p>

<p>Wind causes conveyor structure to collapse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much ore would be lost and can it be effectively reclaimed? • What potential damage to the environment could this cause? • What is the effect of possible belt failure? 		<p>It is highly unlikely that the conveyor structure will collapse unless hurricane force winds will be experienced over the Namib.</p> <p>Any belt failure will be gradual and not sudden or instantaneous. In these cases, belt sections will be replaced as and when required. If there were to be a sudden belt failure, the conveyor would stop immediately. As the conveyor is supported on wheels at 5-6 m intervals, the only possible area where any material can be lost from the belt is in this 5-6 m section. The remainder of the belt will continue to be supported off the rope on its wheels so there is no chance of material falling from any section other than the section of 5-6 m which suffered the failure. Any material falling from the belt will be caught on the under pan at the river crossing area. Any other section the material will be collected by the maintenance crew when they re-splice the belt. There are no other effects from belt failure. Belt repair will take a matter of 36 hours to move the belt to the end station and re-splice (vulcanising time allowed is 24 hours as per any other conveyor belt).</p>
<p>Will conveyor speed not impact on processing?</p>	<p>Denise Neels– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>No, a stockpile will have sufficient surge capacity.</p>
<p>How long will it take to transport material from Z20 to the processing plant?</p>	<p>Denise Neels– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>40-50 minutes</p>
<p>What is the difference in grades between the Z20 and current mine?</p>	<p>Anton Cloete– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>Grade is somewhat higher based on current drilling data but can degrade or improve based on infill drilling.</p>
<p>How will the maintenance of the idlers of the conveyor system be carried out? What is the purpose of the inspection trolley?</p>	<p>Anton Cloete– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The difference between the conventional conveyors and this technology is that with this RopeCon system, the turning parts which require maintenance move and come to the terminal whereas the idlers are stationary.</p> <p>The inspection trolley will only be used for inspections and for example to remove foreign objects (i.e. piece of windblown plastic, etc. from the system).</p>
<p>Saw newspaper ad and wants to know what will the impacts be? UV may cause fuel pipe damage. Water is a limited resources, desalinated water should be used.</p>	<p>Ulrich Peter– Public Open Day 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The diesel line will have various safety features as part of the design, including a pipe sleeve; flow, pressure and temperature monitoring; and shut off valves. These features are described in the design phase section of the</p>

		<p>SEMP.</p> <p>Rössing has committed to using desalinated water for all present and future water demands. As soon as desalinated water is available Rössing will take all water demand from this source to change water sources from aquifers to desalination as soon as possible.</p>
<p>RopeCon: is ground disturbance avoided? Is it safe, especially given the height of the structure?</p>	<p>Calvin Sisaman– Public Open Day 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The conveyor and pylons will be erected by means of a helicopter. The foundation will however require some work on the ground and access to these locations will be required. Significantly fewer disturbances will be caused by the RopeCon system compared to conventional conveyors.</p> <p>The potential biodiversity impacts relating to these activities were assessed as part of the Scoping Phase and the findings are presented in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report.</p>
<p>What is the RopeCon wind stability and wind resistance? Regarding the tailings, will it be lined and how will it be disposed of?</p>	<p>Gustav Obermair– Public Open Day 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The design wind speed is 150km/h compared to measured windspeeds of up to 120km/h. Similar systems withstand hurricane wind forces.</p> <p>The new high density TSF will not be lined because the combination of a number of natural and engineered geohydrological features will prevent seepage or deflect it to the open pit. This will be assessed during the next phase of the study. Disposal will be by slurry deposition.</p>
<p>Air Quality</p>		
<p>With the lower moisture content of the high density TSF, there will be an increase in dust, what are the mitigating measures for this?</p>	<p>Selma Uushini– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The high density tailings are not completely dry, but over time it will dry. As part of the ongoing operations of the HD TSF the completed deposition areas will be covered with ripios in order to prevent dust erosion.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with the high density tailings facility will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA and further mitigation measures will be provided.</p>
<p>What type of cover will there be, regarding material transported on the conveyor? What will be the dust impacts?</p>	<p>Denise Neels – MUN meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>Various covers are designed/available for the RopeCon conveyor technology. The impacts on air quality (i.e. dust) were assessed and is presented (together with mitigation</p>

		measures) in Section 9.2 of the Scoping Report.
The use of Dust-a-Side instead of a conventional tarred road might be a more economic option.	Pierre Brittz – Public Open Day 24/10/2012	Noted.
Concerned about the acid plant, as the old plant created “smog” across the sky, which moved across to Arandis. What mitigation measures will be in place to prevent this?	Ismael Keister– Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	The technology has improved and must adhere to more stringent international standards and regulations. The potential cumulative impacts (i.e. gaseous emissions) associated with the proposed changes to the process plant, including the acid plant, will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA process. This will include mitigation measures to prevent exposure to air pollutants.
Radiation		
A full analysis of the full life cycle of the waste must be analysed and disclosed. Cumulative impacts of potential contamination of the current site and the additional site must be analysed. Since underground water has already shown contamination (the reason for the dewatering program), it is critical to look at the additional impact of additional waste in the form of tailings and the waste rock dump. Impacts of the additional new sites must be analysed on their own and cumulative impacts of current and the additional sites combined must be analysed in order to assess the full impact of waste. Impacts on the environment (including the health of wildlife) as well as people must be assessed.	Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012	The potential groundwater impacts associated with the Waste Rock dumps, tailings, etc.) will be assessed as part of the next phase of the assessment. Refer to 10.2.7 of the Scoping Report.
You might be aware that on Earthlife’s request the Commission for Independent Research and Information on Radioactivity (CRIIRAD) in 2011 took samples of sediment, soil and water in the vicinity of the current Rössing Uranium Mine. Although the results of these samples still have to be compared with monitoring data gathered over a long period by Rössing and Water Affairs, the preliminary findings show uranium-238 contamination of underground water (as well as soil and sediment)	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	Rössing has a comprehensive Radiation Management Plan which is approved by the Atomic Energy and Radiation Protection Regulator. This plan specifies all the controls, measures and monitoring programs employed to ensure a safe working environment, and public and environmental safety. The comparison of groundwater and water from dewatering wells with international standards for drinking water is misleading because people are not impacted by consuming any of that water. The natural characteristics of

<p>downstream the Rössing Uranium Mine in the Khan and Swakop River alluvium. This raises the question of the origin of uranium-238 contamination. The current waste rock dump is very near the Khan River. CRIIRAD's measurements reveal high radioactivity of some rocks which may contribute to uranium-238 contamination.</p> <p>On request we gladly send you CRIIRAD's preliminary report.</p>		<p>desert ground water often render the latter not fit for consumption.</p> <p>A comparison of radiation levels at the waste rock dumps with stated background (presumably in Swakop) is misleading because the waste rock dumps are not inhabited and hence this external radiation does not impact people.</p>
<p>Earthlife strongly recommends additional independent analysis of soil and underground water of this specific area and transparent consultation before any further activities are carried out. All uranium related operations may increase contamination which, as you know, may haunt future generation for 100 000 years because of the long half-life of certain radio-nuclides released during the mining process as e.g. thorium-230 with a half-life of 75 000 years.</p>	<p>Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	<p>The potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project (taking the existing situation into consideration) will be assessed as part of the assessment phase of this SEIA and further public participation will follow in this phase. The radiological dose assessment will identify and model the associated radiation risk.</p>
<p>Please elaborate on the tailings. Earthlife understands that the current tailings dam of Rössing has no lining and is thus predisposed to underground leakage. In fact, CRIIRAD detected radium-226 contamination as far as 2 km distance from the tailings dam which indicates contamination from the tailings dam.</p>	<p>Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	<p>The current and proposed changes to the TSF is presented in Section 5 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>The potential cumulative impacts associated with the proposed changes to the TSF will be assessed as part of the assessment phase of this SEIA.</p>
<p>Socio-Economic</p>		
<p>What issues were raised by stakeholders?</p>	<p>Erasmus Shivolo– MME Meeting 26/10/2012</p>	<p>All issues raised by Stakeholders are captured as part of this Issues and Response Report.</p>
<p>It is the view of SMEs Compete, based on the track record of Rössing Uranium Ltd and on our knowledge of the modus operandi of the mine that all due care and attention will be</p>	<p>Danny Meyer – Comments received via email 13/10/2012</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>taken by the firm as it expands its operations in the vicinity of Arandis. It has done so in the past and we have no cause or reason to believe that this proposed expansion will be tackled by Rössing Uranium Ltd, differently. Furthermore, Rössing Uranium Ltd is embarking on a Social and Environmental Impact Assessment (SEIA) in a structured and responsible manner. This we find commendable.</p> <p>We are confident that the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) and its respective ministries, regulatory departments and institutions, will closely monitor and evaluate every stage of the proposed mining expansion programme of Rössing Uranium Ltd.</p> <p>In summary, as a social entrepreneurship entity that routinely provides business growth support (wealth and job creation) to Arandis based small and medium enterprises (SMEs), SMEs Compete believes the proposed development by Rössing Uranium Ltd will benefit the town's local economy. Resultantly it might even create new business opportunities for local emerging, novice and established entrepreneurs.</p>		
<p>How will Rössing deal with the increasing demand of social infrastructure, e.g. housing, schooling, medical care etc. in an already stressed situation.</p>	<p>Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	<p>The cumulative Socio economic impacts as a result of the proposed project will be assessed in the next phase of the process.</p>
<p>The social impacts must also be considered. There should be more benefits than only job creation.</p>	<p>Ismael Kasuto– MUN meeting 24/10/2012</p>	
<p>A full socio-economic impact must be analysed. The increased demand for housing, education, healthcare, medical care must be analysed and a plan should be in place to help alleviate this situation. In addition, negative</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	

impacts on the social structure must be fully assessed.		
Is there going to be an increase of the number of people employed on the mine?	Florida Husselmann– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012	During the peak of the construction phase there will be approximately 2500 (temporary) employees.
What will be the additional workforce requirements?	Denise Neels – MUN meeting 24/10/2012	The number of permanent employees still needs to be determined.
As these (construction) workers are temporary, where will they be accommodated?	Florida Husselmann– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012	10 sites have been identified, 3 or 4 which are in Arandis. However, nothing has been decided yet and will depend upon the location of the construction activities. Consultation with Arandis will take place before the site selection is finalised.
During the public meetings it would be important to manage the expectations of the people expecting jobs. We don't want people flooding into Arandis, looking for jobs that are not available, especially temporary jobs. There is already a housing shortage in Arandis and we do not want to have informal settlements.	Florida Husselmann– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012	Comment noted.
What are the odds that local people (Arandis residents) will be employed during this project?	Magdalena Goliath– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012	Rössing currently has an employment desk and standard recruitment process which will be followed.
If approved, what is there for the community to benefit? There should be more benefits to the whole community, apart from work.	Fillip Kandenge– MUN meeting 24/10/2012	Noted. This issue relates more to Rössing's Corporate Social Responsibility and is not specifically relating to a stand-alone project.
Social aspects relating to the community are important.	John Mootseng– MUN meeting 24/10/2012	Noted.
Does Rossing support the orphans of Arandis? And they say they care for Arandis, so why is there no office in Arandis?	Elvis Kazehukua – Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	The comment will be forwarded to the Rössing Foundation.
Water		
The availability of water to the mine is the main issue. Rössing must get a firm commitment from NamWater in terms of water provision and the operation of their plant. Rössing cannot take water away from other users.	Guido Van Langenhove – MAWF Meeting 25/10/2012	Rössing has committed to using desalinated water for all present and future water demands. As soon as desalinated water is available Rössing will take all water demand from this source to change water sources from aquifers to desalination as soon as possible. Surface water will be investigated and the aspect of surface water runoff from the waste rock dump (WRD) will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA.

<p>The waste rock dump is shown having a downwards gradient and borders on the Khan River. Will there be run-off or seepage into the river and what will be done to mitigate this?</p>	<p>Jade McClune– Media Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>The WRD location still needs to be confirmed and assessed in detail. The potential surface water impacts from the WRDs will be assessed as part of the SEIA process in the next phase of the study.</p>
<p>There will be an increase in water demand, what is the expected increase? And where will the water come from, the Omdel Aquifer or desalinated water?</p>	<p>Adam Hartman– Media Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>Usage will increase from about 4 million m³ per annum to about 6 to 8 million m³ per annum.</p>
<p>Could you please indicate what impact the mining and processing of the new ore body will have on Rössing's water demand?</p>	<p>NP du Plessis – Comments received via email 22/10/2012</p>	<p>Rössing has committed to using desalinated water for all present and future water demands. As soon as desalinated water is available Rössing will take all water demand from this source to change water sources from aquifers to desalination as soon as possible.</p>
<p>Rössing will have a greater demand on water and electricity. Shortage of both is experienced already under current conditions. Where does the water come from?</p>	<p>Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	
<p>With reference to the Uranium Rush SEA/Strategic Environmental Management Plan, all water for mining activities should be coming from desalinated sources. A bigger (national) problem is the over-abstraction of groundwater resources.</p>	<p>Rod Braby – MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is the water supply issue so insignificant in the document • What is the projected water demand for this development • Will Rössing be responsible to distribute the water to and for this development to the Z20 site or will NamWater be requested to engage in this system. 	<p>Venter Willem – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	
<p>There is a shortage of water in the country, where will water come from and what quantity is needed?</p>	<p>Denise Neels– MUN Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	
<p>Where will the water for the proposed project come from?</p>	<p>Florida Husselmann– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	
<p>75% of water samples taken in the area have been found to exceed World Health Organization standards (15 mg/l) for radiation</p>	<p>Jade McClune– Media Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>Yes, some monitoring boreholes have already been drilled, but the monitoring is done by the Department of Water Affairs (DWAF), not Rössing. Also, brackish desert water</p>

<p>levels. The SEA recommends that the mines within the area conduct borehole monitoring. Has this started? And what will be the effect of these high numbers on the local communities and what mitigation measures are being taken?</p>		<p>is naturally occurring within this area and high levels of all constituents including uranium are expected. The natural evapotranspiration from river vegetation results in increasing salt contents as one moves downstream in the river. Water for consumption is not drawn from the Khan or Swakop Rivers and drinking water standards are applicable to drinking water sources. Information can be obtained through the DWAF.</p>
<p>What are the measures to protect against seepage for the TSF?</p>	<p>Selma Uushini– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The catchment and drainage areas have been de-lined and it has been found that the water from seepage can be trapped and intercepted before it reaches any sensitive areas. Surface water run-off will be trapped in a dam. The alluvial system will be managed with cut-off trenches and pumping with a submersible pump within the valley. There is a geological fault, where the pit will be established, resulting in deflection of water flow away from the Khan into the open pit cone of depression. The phase 4 mining plan considers mining into the water passway completely intercepting any potential flow.</p>
<p>Tailings are contaminated with the processing chemicals, and this will just be allowed to seep into the ground?</p>	<p>Selma Uushini– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>Yes, it will be allowed to seep into the ground, but it will be recaptured close to the tailings facility at source. A combination of four natural and engineering intercepting features will prevent seepage to move beyond the present open pit: a surface water collection dam, alluvial cut off trenches in the main sand filled drainage channel, the SJ fault and and Amphibole schist horizon deflecting fracture flow to the open pit, and the phase 4 mining push back through the main flow path physically separating the TSF from the Khan River.</p> <p>Note that there will also be less water to seep into the ground as the tailings has a lower moisture content.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with the proposed changes to the TSF will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA.</p>
<p>Is there going to be a seepage monitoring system to be put in place to monitor seepage from the new High Density Tailings Storage on the Rössing Dome?</p>	<p>Ben Truter – Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	<p>Yes, the current monitoring systems will be extended to cover alluvial and fractured rock aquifers. The current monitoring network already covers the upstream and downstream environments of Dome Gorge and the Khan River.</p>

What is the impact on acid-mine drainage on receiving envelope	Ben Truter – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	This will be assessed as part of next phase of the SEIA assessing mining, waste rock and tailings disposal
Where is the proposed acid plant going to be and what will the impact be on groundwater?	Ben Truter – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The location of the acid plant is presented in Section 5 of the Scoping Report. As part of the acid plant design all spillage collection areas will be connect to the existing plant spillage collection systems. The potential cumulative groundwater impacts associated with the proposed changes to the process plant will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA.
Will the conveyor run across the river? What will happen if there is material wasted within the river - spillage? (Or if the belt is cut?)	Festus Shikongo – MUN Meeting 24/10/2012	<p>The belt being cut is almost impossible, also the emptied side of the belt is always facing upwards. There are cross sections every few meters and any possible cut will have a small impact. The lower belt will also catch possible spillage from the top belt in such an unlikely event.</p> <p>Also, a screen will be placed below the belt where the Khan River is crossed and other critical areas.</p> <p>Potential impacts on surface water quality from the unlikely event of spillages were assessed as part of the Scoping process and the findings from this study presented in Section 9.7 of the Scoping Report.</p>
Visual & Noise Impacts		
A full visual and noise analysis must be conducted and its impact on people, (including tourists, workers, and residents) and wildlife must be incorporated.	Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012	<p>Visual-; noise-; and biodiversity impact assessments were conducted for the infrastructure corridor as part of the Scoping Phase. (Refer to Section 9 of the Scoping Report for the findings of these specialists studies. The full specialist studies are attached as Annexure C)</p> <p>Visual-; noise-; and biodiversity impact assessments will also be conducted to determine the significance of potential impacts relating to all the other project components. Refer to Section 10 of the Scoping Report for the terms of reference of these specialists studies.</p>
Where will the high density TSF be located? Will it be visible?	Epson Hoebeg– Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	<p>On the Rössing Dome, on the far side, away from the B2 road and Arandis, with a mountain screening the view.</p> <p>A visual impact assessment will however be conducted as</p>

		part of the assessment phase of the SEIA that will take the proposal changes to the TSF and new high density TSF into consideration.
At what decibel level does one need ear-plugs? (In relation to those working around the conveyor)	Ismael Keister– Arandis Public Meeting 23/10/2012	At approximately 80 db(A). The RopeCon Conveyor systems generally create noise of 55 db(A) – measures at a distance of 1 meter from the belt. The potential noise impact relating to the infrastructure corridor (including the conveyor) was assessed as part of the Scoping phase. The findings from this study are presented in Section 9.5 of the Scoping Report.
Safety and Security		
The current waste rock dump is neither confined nor designated by warning signs. People entering the area may be exposed to radiation not being aware of the danger. What are the safety plans for the new waste rock dump?	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The safety and security measures relating to the proposed new waste rock dumps and other infrastructure relating to the mining of the Z20 uranium deposit will be included in the next phase of the SEIA. Any areas which pose potential danger to people will be appropriately barricaded and signposted.
Biodiversity		
The National Park is being “raped” as a result of all these activities taking place within its boundaries. More cohesion needed.	Rod Braby– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012	Comment noted. The project team will consider the Strategic Environmental Management Plan and apply it within SEIA. Refer to Section 11.3 of the Scoping Report.
It is important to include the Parks and Wildlife personnel at the Ganab Station within this SEIA process, since they do the monitoring in the Namib Naukluft Park.	Rod Braby– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012	Comment noted. A separate meeting was conducted with MET (DPW) in Windhoek. Local representatives were invited to the consultations.
Something of potential concern in the proposed development area would be the presence of the endemic & range restricted Husab Sand Lizard (<i>Pedioplanis husabensis</i>) in the area - mainly found on grey/white geology.	Peter Cunningham – Comments received via email 14/10/2012	A biodiversity impact assessment relating to the infrastructure corridor was conducted as part of the Scoping phase of this process. Refer to the findings of the impact assessment in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report. The potential impacts on biodiversity as a result of the activities associated with the other project components (mining development and waste disposal) will be assessed as part of the next phase of the SEIA process.
Are you aware of the Landscape Level Assessment (LLA) study recently done by some local and foreign researchers on the	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	Yes reference was made to the LLA as part of the biodiversity impact assessment.

<p>Vulnerability of Central Namib by Mining, highlighting the loss of endemic biodiversity in the area of mining which includes the Z20 site?</p>		
<p>There is a concern that the Z20 uranium deposit is partially outside of the Mining Licence Area and the project area in fact enters more of the Park. Please do a full study on the full impact of the entire proposed area on Park resources inclusive of those areas not in the Mining Licence. Please understand that inter alia, the environment, anything of scientific value and all wildlife (including plants and animals) are protected in a Park. It is critical to mention that in terms of the Nature Conservation Ordinance, mining in a Park undermines much of the law meant to protect the environment. This is of exceptional concern, as the purpose of a park is for the preservation and protection of wild animal life, wild plant life and anything of any scientific interest for the benefit and enjoyment of inhabitants of Namibia.</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>A biodiversity impact assessment will be conducted for the Z20 mining and the associated activities – as part of the the next phase of the SEIA process. Evaluation of alternatives will be included in the study.</p>
<p>What is the expected length of the access road?</p>	<p>Patrick Haushona – Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>Approximately 14km</p>
<p>What about the Welwitschias in the area? Will they be protected?</p>	<p>Aunie Gebhard– Arandis Town Council Meeting 23/10/2012</p>	<p>A biodiversity impact assessment relating to the mining of the Z20 uranium deposit and the associated activities will be conducted as part of the next phase of the SEIA process.</p> <p>The drilling team has seen 4 plants on the slopes, thus far. Whereas the Welwitschia Plain has over 50,000 plants, and this is located on the other side of the of the Welwitschia Plains, away from the Z20 prospect.</p>
<p>What will be the impact on animals in the area?</p>	<p>Fillip Kandenge – MUN meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>The potential impacts on biodiversity (relating to the infrastructure corridor) were assessed as part of the Scoping phase. The findings of this assessment is included in Section 9.4 of the Scoping Report.</p>

Tourism		
Is the old railway embankment going to be impacted through this project?	Joachim Lenssen– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012	No, it won't be impacted. It falls outside of the mining lease and accessory works area.
Will there be any impact on the Khan Mine valley area?	Joachim Lenssen– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012	No, it also falls outside of the ML area.
Mine Closure Planning and Rehabilitation		
Within the report it should indicate how much funds have been set aside for rehabilitation.	Selma Uushini– MET/ERC Meeting 24/10/2012	A closure strategy will be developed for the project and cost estimates appropriate for the level of feasibility studies will be done. Funds will be build up over time once the project commences.
What will happen with the Z20 project if the uranium price does not recover? Please elaborate on the restoration management plans in such a situation.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The project will not commence unless the economic conditions are feasible to start.
We want to see a proper management plan for restoration during construction, mining and after mining activities.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The rehabilitation plans will be included in the closure section of the SEMP for the project components.
We want to know how much money will be set aside for restoration and who will administer these funds.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	The closure cost calculations will determine the money to be set aside. Funds will be administered by the Rössing Environmental Rehabilitation Trust Fund.
SEIA Process		
Our rivers are a national pride and as such all Namibians should be properly informed about such drastic impacts like a road and other service infrastructure across the Khan River. Public meetings should be held not only in Arandis and Swakopmund but also in Windhoek and other towns. All citizens should have a chance to make an informed input.	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) – Comments received via email 31/10/2012	Attendance at the local meetings was poor indicating a low level of interest of the stakeholders. During previous SEIA processes it was found that very few people in Windhoek attend the public meetings and it was decided not to conduct a public meeting in Windhoek for this present process. Various meeting were however conducted with relevant authorities in Windhoek. During the next phase of the project, more focus group meetings could be arranged in Windhoek as and when required.
When will the draft ESIA be available for	Earthlife Namibia (Bertchen Kohrs) –	The draft Scoping Report (including the assessment of

<p>public input?</p>	<p>Comments received via email 31/10/2012</p>	<p>impacts associated with the infrastructure corridor), is available for review from the 16th of November until 14 December 2012.</p> <p>The draft SEIA Report, that will provide the assessment findings relating to the other project components (i.e. Mining of the Z20 ore body; Disposal of Z20 waste rock; Amendment of the existing Acid Plant Environmental Clearance; Processing plant modifications; Changes to the present Tailings Storage Facility (TSF); and Establishment of a new High Density TSF on the Rössing Dome) will be available for review towards April/May 2013.</p>
<p>Why is the infrastructure not included within the EIA phase, only in the scoping phase?</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<p>During the initiation/screening phase exiting information was studied by the SEIA team in detail. (i.e. previous SEIAs in the area, Rössing monitoring results, information provided by supplier of the conveyor, etc.). The SEIA Team determined that the infrastructure corridor can be subject to an assessment presented in the Scoping report , taking the following into consideration:</p>
<p>There are some concerns regarding this, as the public will only have the opportunity to comment on the infrastructure during the scoping. According to law, a full EIA process must be conducted with regards to accessory works</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton– Swakopmund Public Meeting 24/10/2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential social and environmental impacts relating to this type of activity (linear infrastructure) is well understood; • the receiving socio-economic and biophysical environment have been studied and contextualised in detail; and • Additional input/assessment studies from environmental specialists have been identified and the detailed assessments will be included in the Scoping Report. These will be supplemented (where required) by input from I&APs during the public participation process.
<p>The infrastructure corridor, as part of the Accessory Works, is legally required to be incorporated into the full EIA. All components of a project must be incorporated together in one EIA. The Minerals Act makes it very clear that an EIA must be done for an entire project and all mining operations which include the accessory works of the operation [section 50(i) and section 1(1) of the Minerals Act- see definition of “mining” and “accessory works” as well as section 3.1 of the EIA Regulations Annexure on Listed Activities].</p> <p>In addition, the various components of a project must be assessed together in one EIA</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>However, the final decision regarding the proposed project and the process being followed rests with DEA and the Environmental Commissioner.</p> <p>All the components of the project have been included in</p>

in order to consider all potentially significant effects including the physical, biological, social, economic, cultural and cumulative impacts [EIA Regulations 15(2) (c) and 15(2) (h)(aa)].

the Scoping report and the “description of the environment that may be affected by the activity” is provided for the entire project area (EIA Regulations 15(2)(c)). Refer to Section 4 of the Scoping Report . Also, the “manner in which the various aspects of the environment may be affected by the proposed activity” was identified (refer to Section 9 of the Scoping Report).

However, sufficient detail regarding the “existing environment” within the footprint of the linear infrastructure was available and supported with additional fieldwork during the Scoping phase. The Z20 area, however, needs to be studied and assessed in more detail during the next phase of the SEIA.

During the next phase of the SEIA the “environment that may be affected” relating to the Z20 area will be studied in more detail.

With reference to the EIA Regulations 15(2)(h)(aa), the assessment of the potential impacts associated with the linear infrastructure was conducted cumulatively by including existing activities and infrastructure and where relevant also considering the (approved) linear infrastructure across the Khan River that is planned by Swakop Uranium.

During the next phase of the SEIA process, all other project components will also be assessed in a cumulative

		<p>manner, including existing activities and infrastructure. The findings from the assessment relating to the infrastructure corridor (associated with the Z20 mining) will also be included as part of the next phase to ensure the entire project is assessed cumulatively.</p>
<p>Accessory Works are defined under section 1 of the Minerals Act to also include all power lines, water pipelines, etc. required for the purpose of mining operations or connected with such operations. A full analysis of the full route of all water pipelines, power lines, etc. from their source to the mining operation is thus required as part of the EIA process. Only analysing these within the Mining Licence Area is insufficient, as section 1 of the Minerals Act does not limit “accessory works” to the mining licence area. Full cumulative impacts of the entire footprint of all pipelines and power lines must also be incorporated into the full EIA.</p>	<p>Marcia Stanton – Comments received via email 1/11/2012</p>	<p>All accessory works will be assessed in all affected areas.</p>