

	Date	Note Number			
Zitholele Consulting	11/11/2018	NGHES_17_04_01			
Attention: Mathys Vooslo					
Address: Building 1, Maxwell Office Park,					
Magwa Crescent West c/o Allandale Road &					
Maxwell Drive, Waterfall City, Midrand. PO	Project Number: GHES_17_04				
Box 6002 Halfway House 1685, South Africa					
<b>T:</b> +27 11 207 2073 <b>C:</b>	Addendum to the "Continuous ash				
<b>F:</b> +27 86 674 6121	disposal facility at Kendal Power				
		dwater numerical			
Email:	model				
	for Source Pat	hway Receptor study"			

The present addendum to the "Continuous ash disposal facility at Kendal Power Station Groundwater numerical model for Source Pathway Receptor study" report (GHES\_17\_04\_02Final) focuses on the assessment of the impacts to the groundwater resulting from the proposed Class D liner which was finally recommended in the "Source-Pathway-Receptor study for the Kendal Power Station existing Ash Disposal Facility" report (17126-46-Rep-001-SPR Kendal PS).

The methodologies (categories and ranking criteria) used for the quantification of the impacts per alternative sites have been provided by Zitholele. A matrix (Excel spreadsheet) was developed by Zitholele using given categories and ranking criteria, and has been availed to GHES.

# Impacts assessments

## Construction phase

The risk impacts that result in the groundwater quality deterioration is probable and the significance is rated low. With a strict application of the proposed mitigation measures, the significance of the residual impacts risk at the construction phase can be reduced to "very low".

## **Operation phase**

Prior to mitigation, the risk impacts that result in the groundwater quality deterioration is possible. The significance of the risk impacts that result in the groundwater quality deterioration, is rated low. The strict application of the



proposed mitigation measure, the significance of residual impacts risk during the operation phase will be kept at "low".

## Closure phase

The risk impacts that result in the groundwater quality deterioration is probable and the significance is rated low. With a strict application of the proposed mitigation measures, the significance of the residual impacts risk at the closure phase can be reduced to "very low".

### GROUNDWATER IMPACT ASSESSMENT 2018

Impact	Unmitigated / Residual Impact	Direction of Impact	Degree of Certainty	Magnitude (before mitigation)	Magnitude (after mitigation)	Spatial	Temporal	Probability	Significance Rating (Impact Risk)
Phase: Construction Phase Contamination of groundwater resource, due to construction activities (wastes, hydrocarbon spills)	Impact (Unmitigated)	Negative	Probable	3	2	2	3	3	1,6
				MOD	LOW	Site	Med	<u>Could</u>	LOW
	Residual Impact (Mitigated)	Negative	Possible	2	1	1	3	2	0,8
				LOW	VLOW	Iso	Med	<u>Unlike</u>	VLOW
Phase: Operational Phase	Impact	Negative	Probable	3	3	3	3	3	1,8
Contamination of groundwater	(Unmitigated)			MOD	MOD	Loc	Med	<u>Could</u>	LOW
resource, due to	Residual Impact N (Mitigated)	Negative	Probable	2	1	1	3	3	1,2
seepage and leachate infiltration (leakage of the liner system) from ash dam, contaminated water trenches and pollution control dam.				LOW	VLOW	Iso	<u>Med</u>	<u>Could</u>	LOW
Phase: Closure Phase	Impact (Unmitigated)		egative <b>Probable</b>	3	3	3	3	3	1,8
Contamination of groundwater				MOD	MOD	Loc	Med	<u>Could</u>	LOW
resource, due to seepage and leachate infiltration (leakage of the liner system) from ash dam, contaminated water trenches and pollution control dam, and from closure activities			ative <b>Probable</b>	2	1	1	3	2	0,8
	Residual Impact (Mitigated)	Negative		LOW	VLOW	Iso	<u>Med</u>	<u>Unlike</u>	VLOW

DP AHOKPOSSI

D.P. A HOUPOPPI