H1 – GENERAL IMPACTS

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
PLANNING & DESIGN PHASE										
TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT	***Direct impacts:*** Inadequate planning for the transportation of turbine parts and specialist construction equipment to the site by long and/or slow-moving vehicles could cause traffic congestion, especially if temporary road closures are required.	DIRECT	REGIONAL	SHORT TERM	PROBABLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• Project planning must include a plan for traffic control that will be implemented, especially during the construction phase of the development. Consultation with the local Road Traffic Unit in this regard must be done early in the planning phase. The necessary road traffic permits must be obtained for transporting parts, containers, materials and construction equipment to the site. Also refer to recommendations in the Traffic Impact Assessment.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be high should the moving of wind turbines parts for the neighbouring MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster all happen on the same timelines.	CUMULATIVE	REGIONAL	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH-**		**MODERATE -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to transport of turbine parts.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
	Direct impacts: The integrity of existing road infrastructure such as bridges and barriers may be compromised by the heavy vehicle traffic delivering components to the site.	DIRECT	REGIONAL	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SLIGHT	EASY	**LOW -**	• Careful planning of the routes taken by heavy vehicles must highlight areas of road that may need to be upgraded in order to accommodate these vehicles. Once identified, these areas must be upgraded if necessary.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be moderate should the moving of wind turbines parts for the neighbouring MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster all happen on the same timelines.	CUMULATIVE	REGIONAL	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to transport of turbine parts.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
STORAGE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES	***Direct impacts:*** Inappropriate planning for the storage of hazardous substances such as diesel, paint, pesticides, etc, tools and equipment used on site could lead to surface and ground water pollution e.g. due to oil leaks, spillage of diesel etc. In addition, these hazardous substances could be washed off into nearby drainage lines. The mixing of concrete on site could result in ground water contamination from compounds in the cement. In addition, a large number of concrete mixing stations on site could increase the presence of impermeable areas which in turn could increase rates of run-off and thereby increase the risk of localized flooding, soil erosion, silting, gully formation, etc.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• All hazardous substances such as paints, diesel and cement must be stored in a bunded area with an impermeable surface beneath them. • Concrete mixing must be conducted at a single location which must be centrally located, where practical. This mixing must take place on an impermeable surface, and dried waste cement must be disposed of with building rubble.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be high should the storage of hazardous good be non-compliant for the neighbouring MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster. However, they are being proposed by the same developer and risk mitigation measures and management process will be aligned in all EMPrs.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to hazardous waste as the site does not currently experience issues related to hazardous substances.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
ENVIRONMENTAL LEGAL AND POLICY COMPLIANCE	***Direct impacts:*** Failure to adhere to existing policies and legal obligations could lead to the project conflicting with local, provincial and national policies, guidelines and legislation. This could result in lack of institutional support for the project, overall project failure and undue disturbance to the natural environment.	DIRECT	REGIONAL NATIONAL	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	*EASY*	**HIGH -**	• Ensure that all relevant legislation and policy is consulted and further ensure that the project is compliant with such legislation and policy. • These must include (but not restricted to): ▪ Local and District Spatial Development Frameworks ▪ Local Municipal bylaws • In addition, planning for the construction and operation of the proposed energy facility must consider available best practice guidelines.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be high as there are a range of renewable energy facilities proposed within the greater area. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	REGIONAL NATIONAL	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	*MODERATE*	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative could result in landowners looking at other avenues of potential income which would need to comply with environmental law and policy.	NO-GO	REGIONAL NATIONAL	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	*EASY*	**LOW -**		**LOW -**
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND EROSION	***Direct impacts:*** The introduction of roads and impermeable areas could increase rates of run-off and therefore the risk of localised flooding.	INDIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• Structures must be located at least 32m away from identified drainage lines. • A Stormwater Management Plan must be designed and implemented to ensure maximum water seepage at the source of water flow. • The plan must also include management mitigation measures for water pollution, wastewater management and the management of surface erosion e.g. by considering the applicability of contouring, etc. • An Erosion Management Plan must be designed and implemented to ensure minimal impact.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be moderate as there are a range of activities, including roads, which contribute to erosion at localised levels. However, these activities are not prevalent in the area.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	*MODERATE*	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would still present a level of stormwater runoff and erosion due to current farming activities and existing impermeable surfaces.	NO-GO	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	*DIFFICULT*	**LOW -**		**LOW -**
MANAGEMENT OF GENERAL WASTE	***Direct impacts:*** Inappropriate planning for management and disposal of waste e.g. storage disposal could result in surface and ground water contamination.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	*EASY*	**HIGH -**	• A Waste Management Plan for handling on site waste must be developed and implement. • An appropriate area where waste can be stored before disposal must be designed. General Waste must be disposed of at a registered landfill site.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters construction timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the two WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to general waste as the site does not currently experience issues regarding waste.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
SCHEDULING OF CONSTRUCTION	***Direct impacts:*** Construction scheduling that does not take into account the seasonal requirements of the aquatic environment, e.g. allowing for unimpeded flood events, could lead to short-term (and potentially long-term) impacts such as excessive sediment mobilization, etc.	INDIRECT	REGIONAL	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	▲ Wherever possible, construction activities must be undertaken during the driest part of the year to minimize downstream sedimentation due to excavation, etc. ▲ When not possible, suitable stream diversions structures must be used to ensure that rivers/streams are not negatively impacted by construction activity.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters be constructed at the same time. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	REGIONAL	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to construction scheduling as no other construction, that we are aware of, is planned on site.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
CONSTRUCTION PHASE										
NUISANCE DUST	***Direct impacts:*** Dust is likely to be a potential nuisance due to the construction activities.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	PROBABLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	▲ Fugitive/nuisance dust must be reduced by implementing one of or a combination of the following: ▪ Damping down of un-surfaced and un-vegetated areas; ▪ Retention of vegetation where possible; ▪ Excavations and other clearing activities must only be done during agreed working times and permitting weather conditions to avoid drifting of sand and dust into neighbouring areas; ▪ A speed limit of 40km/h must not be exceeded on dirt roads; ▲ Any complaints or claims emanating from the lack of dust control must be attended to immediately by the Contractor.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters be constructed during the same period. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to construction nuisance dust as no other construction activities that we are aware of, are planned on site.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
FIRE	***Direct impacts:*** Risk of runaway fires from construction activities related to having people on site, such as cooking, smoking or burning of vegetation might lead to the burning of surrounding vegetation.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	MODERATE	**HIGH -**	▲ There must be no burning of construction waste or other waste and debris onsite. ▲ Cooking and burning of vegetation must not be permitted on site. ▲ Smoking on site must be confined to a designated area in the vicinity of the site office which must be equipped with the necessary fire extinguishers. ▲ A Fire Management Plan must be developed and implemented.	**MODERATE -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster be constructed during the same period. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	MODERATE	**HIGH -**		**MODERATE -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would still retain a fire risk as fires are a natural occurrence.	NO-GO	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	MODERATE	**HIGH -**		**MODERATE -**

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	***Direct impacts:*** Sediment is likely to be created during construction. This could be washed off into the nearby drainage line e.g. during the excavation of foundations, the laying of access roads within the site, digging of cable runs and soil stripping and stockpiling to create foundations and temporary areas of hard-standing, such as the construction camp.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**MODERATE -**	• The recommendations of the Stormwater Management Plan must be implemented to avoid soil erosion and siltation of drainage line. • The recommendations of the Erosion Management Plan must be implemented to reduce the risk of soil erosion.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster be constructed during the same period. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	MODERATE	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would still present a level of stormwater runoff and erosion due to current farming activities and existing impermeable surfaces.	NO-GO	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	LOW	MODERATE	**LOW -**		**LOW -**
DEGRADATION OF DRAINAGE LINES FROM EARTHWORKS	***Direct impacts:*** Unplanned construction activities or earthworks that occur close to onsite drainage lines could cause adverse impacts such as soil erosion, siltation, and blockage of the drainage line.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	MODERATE	**HIGH -**	• There must be no earthworks, apart from roadworks inclusive of culverts, within 32m of the drainage lines to avoid contamination of water sources.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be high as there are a range of activities, including roads, substations, overhead lines and neighbouring WEFs which could contribute to the degradation of drainage lines at localised levels if not properly managed during construction. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	MODERATE	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would have no impact as there are currently no earthworks activities on site that we are aware of.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
MANAGEMENT OF GENERAL WASTE	***Direct impacts:*** Littering by construction workers could cause surface and ground water pollution.	INDIRECT	STUDY AREA	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• A Waste Management Plan, incorporating recycling and waste minimisation, must be implemented. The Waste Management Plan must be explained to all employees as part of the environmental induction training.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters construction timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	STUDY AREA	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to general waste as the site does not currently experience issues regarding waste.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES	***Direct impacts:*** Onsite maintenance of construction vehicles/machinery and equipment could result in oil, diesel and other hazardous chemicals contaminating surface and ground water. Surface and ground water pollution could arise from the spillage or leaking of diesel, lubricants and cement during construction activities.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**MODERATE -**	• The storage of fuels and hazardous materials must be located away from sensitive water resources. • All hazardous substances (e.g. diesel, oil drums, etc.) must be stored in a bunded area. • The recommendations of the Stormwater Management Plan and the Waste Management Plan must be implemented during construction.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact would be nill as no other new activities, which include the use of hazardous substances are planned for this site (localised impact).	CUMULATIVE	**NO IMPACT**							
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to hazardous waste as the site does not currently experience issues related to hazardous substances.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
MANAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION WASTE	***Direct impacts:*** Waste from construction activities e.g. excess concrete and cement mixture, empty paint containers, oil containers, etc., could cause pollution of ground and surface water when they come into contact with run-off water.	DIRECT	STUDY AREA	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**MODERATE -**	• A Waste Management Plan for the project must be developed and implemented in the construction phase. • All waste must be disposed of at an appropriately licensed landfill site. • All construction materials must be stored in a central and secure location with controlled access with an appropriate impermeable surface. • The recommendations of the Stormwater Management Plan must be implemented to mitigate the impacts of run-off water on pollution.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster construction timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	STUDY AREA	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to construction waste as the site does not currently have any construction activities taking place.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
WATER QUALITY	***Direct impacts:*** Wet concrete is highly alkaline. This could result in flash kills of macroinvertebrates and fish species in the vicinity. Soil erosion will decrease the quality of the aquatic habitat downstream of the construction activities by silting over exposed rocks and decreasing the clarity and oxygen saturation of the water. Soil erosion will decrease the quality of the aquatic habitat downstream of the construction activities by silting over exposed rocks and decreasing the clarity and oxygen saturation of the water.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	PROBABLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• There must be no concrete mixing within 32m of any watercourse. • The concrete batching plant must be clearly demarcated, and no sprawl must be tolerated.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF cluster construction timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to concrete contamination of watercourses as the site does not currently have any construction activities taking place.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
INFILLING/ EXCAVATION IN A WATERCOURSE	***Direct impacts:*** Excavated material stockpiles may increase sediment loads in watercourses during rainfall events. Materials used for the infilling of watercourses in order to construct water crossings may not be compatible with the surrounding bed/banks, etc., which could change the characteristics of the watercourse.	INDIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• Stockpiled excavated material must not be stored within 32m of a watercourse. • Stockpile areas must be suitably bunded to prevent waterborne erosion of exposed soils where there is a likelihood that the soils will be washed into a watercourse. • Materials used for infilling must be suitably stabilized to ensure that scour and erosion of the existing bed/banks is exacerbated.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters construction timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to excavated stockpiles as the site does not currently have any construction activities taking place.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
DISPOSAL OF SPOIL MATERIAL	***Direct impacts:*** Incorrect disposal of subsoil/spoil material could result in significant loss of a useful resource.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	MEDIUM TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	• Subsoil cannot be disposed of onsite without the appropriate Waste License in terms of the NEMA: Waste Act. • Spoil could be used to rehabilitate open borrow pits or erosion features. • Disposal of spoil material to a registered landfill must be the last option. • No spoil stockpiles will be allowed to remain onsite once construction activities have ceased.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEFWEF cluster construction timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	MEDIUM TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE-**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to disposal of spoil materials as the site does not currently have any construction activities taking place.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
OPERATIONAL PHASE										
AIR QUALITY CLIMATE CHANGE	***Direct impacts:*** The electricity generated by the development will displace some of that produced by fossil fuel-based forms of electricity generation. The scheme, over its lifetime, will therefore avoid the production of a significant amount of CO_2, SO_2 and NO_2 that would otherwise be emitted to the atmosphere.	DIRECT	NATIONAL	LONG TERM	DEFINITE	BENEFICIAL	EASY	**HIGH +**	• Enhance this impact by promoting the use of renewable energy locally.	**HIGH +**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be high as the area has a number of renewable energy facilities proposed, inclusive of the WEF cluster comprising MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF.	CUMULATIVE	NATIONAL	LONG TERM	DEFINITE	BENEFICIAL	EASY	**HIGH +**		**HIGH +**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in a low negative impact as local power would not be offset by additional renewable energy.	NO-GO	NATIONAL	LONG TERM	UNLIKELY	SLIGHT	EASY	**LOW -**		**LOW -**

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
ARCHITECTURE OF ANCILLARY INFRASTRUCTURE	***Direct impacts:*** Control buildings, toilet facilities and other ancillary infrastructure could cause negative visual intrusion if allowed to fall into disrepair and not maintained properly.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	PROBABLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	All project structures and buildings must be well maintained.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters operational timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to architecture of ancillary infrastructure.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
HAZARDOUS CHEMICAL STORAGE	***Direct impacts:*** Inappropriate storage of chemical, herbicides, diesel and other hazardous substances on site could result in soil and water contamination and pose a high accident danger risk.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**	All hazardous substances must be stored in appropriately bunded locations during the operations.	**MODERATE -**
	Cumulative impacts: impact, on a localised scale, would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters operational timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	SEVERE	EASY	**HIGH -**		**MODERATE -**
	No-go alternative would result in no impact related to hazardous waste as the site does not currently experience issues related to hazardous substances.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
INCREASED STORMWATER RUN-OFF	***Direct impacts:*** Failure to maintain the stormwater system could increase the risk of surface water damage to the landscape and vegetation from increased rates of run-off and therefore the risk of localised flooding and increased sheet erosion downstream due to the presence of roads and impermeable areas of hard standing.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	Recommendations of the Stormwater Management Plan and Erosion Management Plan must be implemented during operations.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be high should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters operational timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would still present a level of stormwater runoff and erosion due to current farming activities and existing impermeable surfaces.	NO-GO	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	LOW	MODERATE	**LOW -**		**LOW -**
WASTE MANAGEMENT	***Direct impacts:*** could be littering by maintenance workers and security personnel on site.	DIRECT	STUDY AREA	MEDIUM TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	A Waste Management Plan, incorporating recycling and waste minimisation, must be implemented. The Waste Management Plan must be implemented throughout the operational phase.	**LOW -**

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters operational timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	STUDY AREA	MEDIUM TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	MODERATE -		LOW -
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to general waste as the site does not currently experience issues regarding waste.	NO-GO	NO IMPACT							
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE										
POLLUTION	***Direct impacts:*** Littering by construction workers could cause surface and ground water pollution.	DIRECT	STUDY AREA	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	MODERATE -	• Littering must be avoided, and litter bins must be made available at various strategic points on site. • Refuse from the decommissioning of the site must be collected on a regular basis and deposited at an appropriate landfill.	LOW -
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters decommissioning timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	STUDY AREA	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	MODERATE -		LOW -
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to general waste as the site does not currently experience issues regarding waste.	NO-GO	NO IMPACT							
	Direct impacts: Onsite maintenance of construction vehicles/machinery and equipment could result in oil, diesel and other hazardous chemicals contaminating surface and ground water. Surface and ground water pollution could arise from the spillage or leaking of diesel, lubricants, etc. during decommissioning.	DIRECT	STUDY AREA	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	MODERATE -	• The storage of fuels and hazardous materials must not be permitted near sensitive water resources. All hazardous substances (e.g. diesel, oil drums, etc.) to be stored in a bunded area.	LOW -
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters decommissioning timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	STUDY AREA	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	MODERATE -		LOW -
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to hazardous waste as the site does not currently experience issues related to hazardous substances.	NO-GO	NO IMPACT							
DUST	***Direct impacts:*** Dust is likely to be a potential nuisance due to the decommissioning activities.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	PROBABLE	MODERATE	EASY	MODERATE -	• Management of fugitive/nuisance dust could be implemented through the following: ▪ Damping down of un-surfaced and un-vegetated areas;	LOW -

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/ANTICIPATED	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters decommissioning timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE-**	▪ Retention of vegetation where possible; Demolitions and other clearing activities must only be done during agreed working times and permitting weather conditions to avoid drifting of sand and dust into neighbouring areas; ▪ A speed limit of 40km/h must not be exceeded on dirt roads. Any complaints or claims emanating from the lack of dust control must be attended to immediately by the Contractor.	**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to decommissioning nuisance dust as no other decommissioning activities should be taking place on the site, that we are aware of.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
TRAFFIC & TRANSPORT	***Direct impacts:*** A high number of heavy vehicle movements will occur during the decommissioning phase. This may have a detrimental effect on sensitive receptors.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**MODERATE -**	Construction vehicles and machinery must make use of existing infrastructure such as roads as far as possible to minimise disturbance on the receiving environment during decommissioning.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters decommissioning timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to traffic and transport as no other decommissioning activities should be taking place on the site, that we are aware of.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
SOIL EROSION	***Direct impacts:*** After the removal of all wind turbine related structures, the disturbed soils could become exposed, unstable and prone to erosion.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**	After the removal of all wind turbine-related structures during decommissioning, the disturbed soils must be re-vegetated to avoid unnecessary soil erosion. This must be based on the Revegetation Plan and the Erosion Management Plan.	**LOW -**
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters decommissioning timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	SHORT TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	EASY	**MODERATE -**		**LOW -**
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact related to soil erosion as a result of turbine removal as no other WEFs are planned on this site.	NO-GO	**NO IMPACT**							
LAND-USE	***Direct impacts:*** Land previously unavailable for certain types of land use will now be available for those uses.	DIRECT	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	**LOW +**	No mitigation necessary.	**LOW +**

ISSUE	DESCRIPTION OF IMPACT	NATURE OF IMPACT	SPATIAL SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE	CERTAINTY SCALE	SEVERITY / BENEFICIAL	REVERSABILITY/MITIGATI	SIGNIFICANCE PRE-MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE POST-MITIGATION
	Cumulative impacts: Cumulative impact, on a localised scale, would be moderate should the MNWP WEF and MNWP 2 WEF clusters decommissioning timelines overlap. However, it is important to note that the 2 WEFs and their associated infrastructure are proposed by the same developer and the EMPrs will be prepared to the same standard.	CUMULATIVE	LOCALISED	LONG TERM	POSSIBLE	MODERATE	MODERATE	LOW +		LOW +
	No-go alternative: No-go alternative would result in no impact as the site will return to what it was used for before, i.e. the current status quo.	NO-GO	NO IMPACT							