

## 8 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

In order to ensure uniformity, a standard impact assessment methodology has been utilised so that a wide range of impacts can be compared. The impact assessment methodology makes provision for the assessment of impacts against the following criteria:

- Significance;
- Spatial scale;
- Temporal scale;
- Probability; and
- Degree of certainty.

A combined quantitative and qualitative methodology was used to describe impacts for each of the aforementioned assessment criteria. A summary of each of the qualitative descriptors along with the equivalent quantitative rating scale for each of the aforementioned criteria is given in Table 24.

**TABLE 24: QUANTITATIVE RATING AND EQUIVALENT DESCRIPTORS FOR THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA.**

RATING	SIGNIFICANCE	EXTENT SCALE	TEMPORAL SCALE
1	VERY LOW	<i>Isolated route / proposed route</i>	<u>Incidental</u>
2	LOW	<i>Study area</i>	<u>Short-term</u>
3	MODERATE	<i>Local</i>	<u>Medium-term</u>
4	HIGH	<i>Regional / Provincial</i>	<u>Long-term</u>
5	VERY HIGH	<i>Global / National</i>	<u>Permanent</u>

A more detailed description of each of the assessment criteria is given in the following sections.

### 8.1 Significance Assessment

Significance rating (importance) of the associated impacts embraces the notion of extent and magnitude, but does not always clearly define these since their importance in the rating scale is very relative. For example, the magnitude (i.e. the size) of area affected by atmospheric pollution may be extremely large (1000 km<sup>2</sup>) but the significance of this effect is dependent on the concentration or level of pollution. If the concentration is great, the significance of the impact would be HIGH or VERY HIGH, but if it is diluted it would be VERY LOW or LOW. Similarly, if 60 ha of a grassland type are destroyed the impact would be VERY HIGH if only 100 ha of that grassland type were known. The impact would be VERY LOW if the grassland type was common. A more detailed description of the impact significance rating scale is given in Table 25 below.

TABLE 25: DESCRIPTION OF THE SIGNIFICANCE RATING SCALE.

RATING		DESCRIPTION
5	VERY HIGH	Of the highest order possible within the bounds of impacts which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts: there is no possible mitigation and/or remedial activity which could offset the impact. In the case of beneficial impacts, there is no real alternative to achieving this benefit.
4	HIGH	Impact is of substantial order within the bounds of impacts, which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts: mitigation and/or remedial activity is feasible but difficult, expensive, time-consuming or some combination of these. In the case of beneficial impacts, other means of achieving this benefit are feasible but they are more difficult, expensive, time-consuming or some combination of these.
3	MODERATE	Impact is real but not substantial in relation to other impacts, which might take effect within the bounds of those which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts: mitigation and/or remedial activity are both feasible and fairly easily possible. In the case of beneficial impacts: other means of achieving this benefit are about equal in time, cost, effort, etc.
2	LOW	Impact is of a low order and therefore likely to have little real effect. In the case of adverse impacts: mitigation and/or remedial activity is either easily achieved or little will be required, or both. In the case of beneficial impacts, alternative means for achieving this benefit are likely to be easier, cheaper, more effective, less time consuming, or some combination of these.
1	VERY LOW	Impact is negligible within the bounds of impacts which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts, almost no mitigation and/or remedial activity is needed, and any minor steps which might be needed are easy, cheap, and simple. In the case of beneficial impacts, alternative means are almost all likely to be better, in one or a number of ways, than this means of achieving the benefit. Three additional categories must also be used where relevant. They are in addition to the category represented on the scale, and if used, will replace the scale.
0	NO IMPACT	There is no impact at all - not even a very low impact on a party or system.

## 8.2 Spatial Scale

The spatial scale refers to the extent of the impact i.e. will the impact be felt at the local, regional, or global scale. The spatial assessment scale is described in more detail in Table 26.

TABLE 26: DESCRIPTION OF THE SIGNIFICANCE RATING SCALE.

RATING		DESCRIPTION
5	Global/National	The maximum extent of any impact.
4	Regional/Provincial	The spatial scale is moderate within the bounds of impacts possible, and will be felt at a regional scale (District Municipality to Provincial Level).
3	Local	The impact will affect an area up to 5 km from the proposed route corridor.

RATING		DESCRIPTION
2	Study Area	The impact will affect a route corridor not exceeding the Boundary of the corridor.
1	Isolated Sites / proposed site	The impact will affect an area no bigger than the route site.

### 8.3 Duration Scale

In order to accurately describe the impact it is necessary to understand the duration and persistence of an impact in the environment. The temporal scale is rated according to criteria set out in Table 27.

TABLE 27: DESCRIPTION OF THE TEMPORAL RATING SCALE.

RATING		DESCRIPTION
1	Incidental	The impact will be limited to isolated incidences that are expected to occur very sporadically.
2	Short-term	The environmental impact identified will operate for the duration of the construction phase or a period of less than 5 years, whichever is the greater.
3	Medium term	The environmental impact identified will operate for the duration of life of the line.
4	Long term	The environmental impact identified will operate beyond the life of operation.
5	Permanent	The environmental impact will be permanent.

### 8.4 Degree of Probability

Probability or likelihood of an impact occurring will be described as shown in Table 28 below.

TABLE 28: DESCRIPTION OF THE DEGREE OF PROBABILITY OF AN IMPACT ACCRUING.

RATING	DESCRIPTION
1	Practically impossible
2	Unlikely
3	Could happen
4	Very Likely
5	It's going to happen / has occurred

**8.5 Degree of Certainty**

As with all studies it is not possible to be 100% certain of all facts, and for this reason a standard “degree of certainty” scale is used as discussed in Table 29. The level of detail for specialist studies is determined according to the degree of certainty required for decision-making. The impacts are discussed in terms of affected parties or environmental components.

**TABLE 29: DESCRIPTION OF THE DEGREE OF CERTAINTY RATING SCALE.**

<b>RATING</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
Definite	More than 90% sure of a particular fact.
Probable	Between 70 and 90% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring.
Possible	Between 40 and 70% sure of a particular fact or of the likelihood of an impact occurring.
Unsure	Less than 40% sure of a particular fact or the likelihood of an impact occurring.
Can't know	The consultant believes an assessment is not possible even with additional research.

**8.6 Quantitative Description of Impacts**

To allow for impacts to be described in a quantitative manner in addition to the qualitative description given above, a rating scale of between 1 and 5 was used for each of the assessment criteria. Thus the total value of the impact is described as the function of significance, spatial and temporal scale as described below:

<b><i>Impact Risk = (SIGNIFICANCE + Spatial + Temporal) X Probability</i></b>	
3	5

An example of how this rating scale is applied is shown below:

**TABLE 30: EXAMPLE OF RATING SCALE.**

<b>IMPACT</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>SPATIAL SCALE</b>	<b>TEMPORAL SCALE</b>	<b>PROBABILITY</b>	<b>RATING</b>
	LOW	<i>Local</i>	<u>Medium Term</u>	<u>Could Happen</u>	
Impact to air	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b><u>3</u></b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.6</b>

**Note:** The significance, spatial and temporal scales are added to give a total of 8, that is divided by 3 to give a criteria rating of 2,67. The probability (3) is divided by 5 to give a probability rating of 0,6. The criteria rating of 2,67 is then multiplied by the probability rating (0,6) to give the final rating of 1,6.

The impact risk is classified according to 5 classes as described in the table below.

TABLE 31: IMPACT RISK CLASSES.

RATING	IMPACT CLASS	DESCRIPTION
0.1 – 1.0	<b>1</b>	<b>Very Low</b>
1.1 – 2.0	<b>2</b>	<b>Low</b>
2.1 – 3.0	<b>3</b>	<b>Moderate</b>
3.1 – 4.0	<b>4</b>	<b>High</b>
4.1 – 5.0	<b>5</b>	<b>Very High</b>

Therefore with reference to the example used for air quality above, an impact rating of 1.6 will fall in the Impact Class 2, which will be considered to be a low impact.

### 8.7 Notation of Impacts

In order to make the report easier to read the following notation format is used to highlight the various components of the assessment:

Significance or magnitude- **IN CAPITALS**

Duration – in underline

Probability – *in italics and underlined.*

Degree of certainty - **in bold**

Spatial Scale – *in italics*