




**KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY)
LTD**

**Proposed Development of the Klipkraal
Wind Energy Facility (WEF) 1 and
Associated Infrastructure near
Fraserburg in the Northern Cape
Province**

**Final Environmental Impact Assessment
Report**

Issue Date: 16 March 2023
Revision no.: 1.0
Project No. 16891
DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2202

Date:	16 March 2023
Document Title:	Proposed Development of the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 and Associated Infrastructure near Fraserburg in the Northern Province: Final Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR)
Revision Number:	1.0
Author:	Luvanya Naidoo (EAP) SACNASP Reg No. 126107 EAPASA Reg No. 2019/1404
Checked by:	Michelle Nevette Cert.Nat.Sci Rev No. 120356 EAPASA Reg No. 2019/1560
Approved by:	Michelle Nevette Cert.Nat.Sci Rev No. 120356 EAPASA Reg No. 2019/1560
Signature:	
Client:	Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (PTY) Ltd

Confidentiality Statement

© SiVEST SA (Pty) Ltd
All rights reserved

Copyright is vested in SiVEST SA (Pty) Ltd in terms of the Copyright Act (Act 98 of 1978). This report is strictly confidential and is to be used exclusively by the recipient.

Under no circumstances should this report or information contained therein be distributed, reprinted, reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, without the written consent of SiVEST SA (Pty) Ltd.

KEY PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The application site assessed during the scoping phase (which incorporates the farm portions / properties listed above) is approximately 1362 hectares (ha) in extent. At this stage it is anticipated that the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 will comprise up to sixty (60) wind turbines with a maximum total energy generation capacity of up to approximately 300 MWac. In summary, the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 development will include the following components:

Wind Turbines:

- Approximately 60 turbines, between 5MWac and 8MWac, with a maximum export capacity of up to approximately 300MWac. This will be subject to allowable limits in terms of the Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Procurement Programme (REIPPPP) or any other program.
- The final number of turbines and layout of the wind farm will, however, be dependent on the outcome of the Specialist Studies in the EIA phase of the project;
- Each wind turbine will have a maximum hub height of up to approximately 200m;
- Each wind turbine will have a maximum rotor diameter of up to approximately 200m;
- Permanent compacted hardstanding areas / platforms (also known as crane pads) of approximately 100m x 100m (total footprint of approx. 10 000m²) per wind turbine during construction and for on-going maintenance purposes for the lifetime of the proposed wind farm projects. This will however depend on the physical size of the wind turbine;
- Each wind turbine will consist of a foundation (i.e. foundation rings) which may vary in depth, from approximately 3m and up to 10m or greater, depending on the physical size of each wind turbine. It should be noted that the foundation can be up to as much as approximately 700m³;

Electrical Transformers:

- Electrical transformers will be constructed near the foot of each respective wind turbine in order to step up the voltage to 66kV.
- The typical footprint of the electrical transformers is up to approximately 10m x 10m, but can be up to 20m x 20m at certain locations;

Step-up / Collector Substations:

- One 11-66/132-400kV step-up / collector substation, each occupying an area of up to approximately 2ha,
- The proposed substation will include an Eskom portion and an Independent Power Producer (IPP) portion, hence the substation has been included in this EIA and in the grid connection infrastructure BA (separate application - substations, switching stations and power lines) to allow for handover to Eskom.
- Following construction, the substation will be owned and managed by Eskom. The current applicant will retain control of the medium voltage components (i.e. 33kV components) of the substation, while the high voltage components (i.e. 400kV components) of the substation will likely be ceded to Eskom shortly after the completion of construction;

Main Transmission Substations (MTS):

- One (1) new 132/400kV Main Transmission Substation (MTS) is being proposed, occupying an area of up to approximately 120ha.
- The proposed MTS will include an Eskom portion and an IPP portion.
- Following construction, the substation will be owned and managed by Eskom. The current applicant will retain control of the 132-400kV and lower voltage components of each MTS, while the 132/400kV voltage components of the MTS will likely be ceded to Eskom shortly after the completion of construction;

Electrical Infrastructure:

- The wind turbines will be connected to the proposed substation via medium voltage (i.e. 33kV) cables.
- These cables will be buried along access roads wherever technically feasible, however, the cables can also be overhead (if required);
- Each WEF will then connect to the MTS via an up to 400kV powerline.

Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS):

- One (1) Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will be constructed for the wind farm and will be located next to the 33-66/132-400kV step-up / collector substations which form part of the respective wind farms, or in between the wind turbines.
- It is anticipated that the type of technology will be either Lithium Ion or Sodium-Sulphur (or as determined prior to construction).
- These batteries are not considered hazardous goods as they will be storing 'energy'.
- The size, storage capacity and type of technology will be determined / confirmed prior to construction. This information will be provided to I&AP's prior to the commencement of construction.

Roads:

- Internal roads with a temporary width of up to approximately 15m will provide access to the location of each wind turbine. These roads will be rehabilitated back to 8m once construction has been completed.
- Existing site roads will be used wherever possible, although new site roads will be constructed where necessary.
- Existing site roads may also be upgraded using temporary concrete stones in order to accommodate for the heavy loads.
- Turns will have a radius of up to 50m for abnormal loads (especially turbine blades) to access the various wind turbine positions.

Site Access:

- The proposed wind farm application site will be accessed via existing gravel roads from the R353 Regional Route;

Temporary Staging Areas:

- A temporary staging area will be required for the wind farm and will be located both at the foot of each wind turbine and at the storage facility (i.e. turbine development area) to allow for working requirements.
- One (1) temporary staging area per wind turbine / range of wind turbines will be required.
- Temporary staging areas will cover an area of up to approximately 100m x 100m (10 000m² / 1ha) each;

Temporary Construction Camps:

- One (1) temporary construction camp will be required during the construction phase for the wind farm.
- This area will be used as a permanent maintenance area during the operational phase.
- The combined Temporary Construction Camp / Permanent Maintenance Area will cover an area of up to approximately 2.25ha.
- A cement batching plant as well as a chemical storage area will fall within the Temporary Construction Camp and Permanent Maintenance Area.
- The Temporary Construction Camp and Permanent Maintenance Area will be strategically placed within the proposed wind farm site and will avoid all high sensitivity and/or 'no-go' areas;

Offices, Accommodation, a Visitors' Centre and Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Buildings:

- An office (including ablution facilities), accommodation (including ablution facilities), a Visitors' Centre and an Operation & Maintenance (O&M) building will be required and will occupy areas of up to approximately 100m x 100m (i.e. 1ha).
- Each wind farm (i.e. each phase) will have its own O&M building and Office, however, the Accommodation and Visitors' Centre will be centralised locations which will be shared between certain wind farm projects (i.e. shared between certain phases which will be confirmed at a later stage);

Septic Tank and Soak-Away Systems:

- The proposed wind farm will consist of a septic tank and soak-away system.
- This will be required for construction as well as long term use.
- The septic tank and soak-away system will be placed 100m or more from water resource (which includes boreholes);

Fencing:

- Fencing will be required and will surround the wind farm.
- The maximum height of the fencing as well as the area which the fencing will cover will be confirmed during the detailed design phase, prior to construction commencing.
- Fences will however be constructed according to specifications recommended by the Ecologist and Avifauna specialist (and as per the EMPr);

Temporary Infrastructure to Obtain Water from Available Local Sources:

- Temporary infrastructure to obtain water from available local sources will be required. Water may also be obtained from onsite boreholes and from the town of Fraserburg.
- New or existing boreholes, including a potential temporary above ground pipeline (approximately 50cm in diameter) for each wind farm, to feed water to the sites are being proposed.
- Water will potentially be stored in temporary water storage tanks.
- The necessary approvals from the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) will be applied for separately (should this be required); and

Temporary Containers:

- Temporary containers of up to approximately 80m³ will be required for the storage of fuel on-site during the construction phase of the wind farm.
- The chemical storage area will fall within the Temporary Construction Camp and permanent Maintenance Area.

Component	Description / Dimensions
Location of site (centre point)	32° 4'51.11"S 21° 46'1.91"E
Application site area	1362 ha
Total Klipkraal WEF area	Approximately 6507ha
Turbine development area	Turbine Foundation Area = 45m*32m*60 turbines = 8.6 Ha
SG codes	C02600000000040900000 C02600000000044700003 C02600000000044700001
Export capacity	Up to 300MWac
Proposed technology	Wind turbines and associated infrastructure
Hub height from ground	Up to 200 m
Rotor diameter	Up to 200 m
Substation Area	Approximately 2 ha
O&M building area	Approximately 1 ha
Temporary staging area	Up to 1 ha
Permanent laydown area	To be determined based on final layout
Temporary site camp	Up to 2.25ha
Hard stand areas	700m ³ per turbine
Width of internal access roads	Approximately 15 m
Length of internal access roads	To be confirmed during the detailed design phase
Site Access	The Klipkraal WEF 1 development access point is from Road DR02312, bisecting the northern quadrant of the Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409. Road DR02312 is classified as a Class R4 in the RCAM Classification – Rural Collector Road with an

Component	Description / Dimensions
	average road reserve width of 20m, a gravel surface of ±6m wide, and an average speed of 80 km/h. The Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409 has one (1) existing access point emanating from Road DR02312 at Km 82.51. The access point is located on Road DR02312 within the first 10 m as the road enters the farm, travelling west to east.
Proximity to grid connection	Approximately 70km from application site
Height of fencing (for substation)	To be confirmed during the detailed design phase, Eskom specifications.
Type of fencing (for substation)	To be confirmed during the detailed design phase, Eskom specifications.

COORDINATES

KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: APPLICATION SITE		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 2' 31.740" S	21° 45' 13.504" E
2	32° 3' 21.633" S	21° 45' 26.419" E
3	32° 3' 54.892" S	21° 46' 20.466" E
4	32° 4' 54.566" S	21° 44' 52.199" E
5	32° 5' 55.486" S	21° 44' 39.559" E
6	32° 5' 43.813" S	21° 45' 36.500" E
7	32° 5' 42.999" S	21° 46' 2.836" E
8	32° 5' 45.977" S	21° 46' 35.192" E
9	32° 5' 48.890" S	21° 46' 51.068" E
10	32° 5' 50.353" S	21° 47' 2.594" E
11	32° 5' 5.545" S	21° 46' 54.549" E
12	32° 4' 15.073" S	21° 47' 6.391" E
13	32° 3' 24.744" S	21° 46' 8.190" E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
14	32° 4'51.11"S	21°46'1.91"E

KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: SUBSTATION		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 4'27.83"S	21°46'59.66"E
2	32° 4'28.43"S	21°47'3.43"E
3	32° 4'33.91"S	21°47'2.21"E
4	32° 4'33.52"S	21°46'58.26"E

COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
5	32° 4'31.09"S	21°47'0.87"E
KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: BESS		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 4'27.49"S	21°46'57.32"E
2	32° 4'27.92"S	21°46'59.54"E
3	32° 4'33.41"S	21°46'58.35"E
4	32° 4'33.14"S	21°46'56.26"E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
5	32° 4'30.70"S	21°46'57.87"E
KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: OFFICES AND BUILDINGS		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 4'38.85"S	21°46'52.98"E
2	32° 4'39.70"S	21°47'0.83"E
3	32° 4'55.41"S	21°46'57.51"E
4	32° 4'54.86"S	21°46'49.24"E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
5	32° 4'47.30"S	21°46'55.13"E

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY (WEF) 1

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd (The Applicant) is proposing to construct the wind energy facility (WEF), namely the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 and associated infrastructure approximately 30 km south east of Fraserburg in the Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality, in the Northern Cape. **(Figure 1) (DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2202)**. The overall objective of the proposed development is to generate electricity by means of renewable energy technologies capturing wind energy to feed into the national grid. The proposed development will have a maximum total generation capacity of up to 300 megawatt (MWac).

SiVEST Environmental Division has subsequently been appointed as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed construction and operation of the Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated infrastructure. The proposed development requires an (Environmental Authorisation (EA) from the National Department Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE). However, the provincial authority (i.e. the Northern Cape Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs, Rural Development and Land Reform) will also be consulted. The EIA for the proposed development will be conducted in terms of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) promulgated in terms of Chapter 5 of the NEMA. In terms of these regulations, a full EIA process is required for the proposed development. All relevant legislation and guidelines will be consulted during the EIA process and will be complied with at all times.

Four additional WEF's are concurrently being considered on the properties and adjacent properties and are assessed by way of separate impact assessment processes contained in the 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (GN No. R982, as amended) for listed activities contained within Listing Notices 1, 2 and 3 (GN R983, R984 and R985, as amended). These projects are known as Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 2 **(DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2203)**, Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 3 **(DFFE Reference Number: TBA)**, Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 4 **(DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2204)** and Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 5 **(DFFE Reference Number: TBA)**.

In order to evacuate the energy generated by the WEF's to supplement the national grid, Aura Development Company (Pty) Ltd is proposing one grid connection which will be assessed in a separate BAR **(DFFE Reference Number: To be Allocated)**:

The respective WEF and grid connection infrastructure developments will require separate Environmental Authorisations (EAs) and are subject to separate Environmental Impact Assessment

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

Prepared by:



Project No. 16891
Description Proposed Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1
Revision No. 1.0

Date: March 2023

Page vii

(EIA) and Basic Assessment (BA) processes respectively. The proposed grid connection infrastructure developments will be handed over to Eskom once constructed (Eskom grid connection works). The substations will include an Eskom portion (switching station) and an Independent Power Producer (IPP) portion (facility substation) hence the facility substations will be included in the respective WEF EIAs and the Eskom switching stations in the respective associated grid connection infrastructure BA in order to allow for handover to Eskom.

APPLICABILITY OF NEMA EIA REGULATIONS, 2014 (AS AMENDED IN 2017)

The following activities are applied for:

Activity No(s):	Relevant Basic Assessment Activities as set out in Listing Notice 1 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended
11 (i)	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 11: The development of facilities or infrastructure for the transmission and distribution of electricity— (i) outside urban areas or industrial complexes with a capacity of more than 33 but less than 275 kilovolts.
12 (ii) (a) (c)	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 12: The development of: ii) infrastructure or structures with a physical footprint of 100 square metres or more; where such development occurs- (a) within a watercourse; (c) if no development setback exists, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse.
19	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 19: The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from a watercourse;
28 (ii)	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 28: Residential, mixed, retail, commercial, industrial or institutional developments where such land was used for agriculture, game farming, equestrian purposes or afforestation on or after 01 April 1998 and where such development: (ii) will occur outside an urban area, where the total land to be developed is bigger than 1 hectare;
48 (i) (a) (c)	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 48: The expansion of-i) infrastructure or structures where the physical footprint is expanded by 100 square metres or more; where such expansion occurs— (a) within a watercourse; (c) if no development setback exists, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse;
56 (ii)	GN R. 327 Item 56: The widening of a road by more than 6 metres, or the lengthening of a road by more than 1 kilometre (ii) where no reserve exists, where the existing road is wider than 8 metres –
Activity No(s):	Relevant Scoping and EIA Activities as set out in Listing Notice 2 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended

1	GN R. 325 (as amended) Item 1: The development of facilities or infrastructure for the generation of electricity from a renewable resource where the electricity output is 20 megawatts or more,
15	GN R. 325 (as amended) Item 15: The clearance of an area of 20 hectares or more of indigenous vegetation, excluding where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for — (i) the undertaking of a linear activity; or (ii) maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan.
Activity No(s):	Relevant Basic Assessment Activities as set out in Listing Notice 3 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended
4 (g) (ii) (ee)	GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 4: The development of a road wider than 4 metres with a reserve less than 13,5 metres. g. Northern Cape ii. Outside urban areas; (ee) Critical biodiversity areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans.
12 (g) (ii)	GN R. 985 (as amended) Item 12: The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan. g. Northern Cape ii. Within critical biodiversity areas identified in bioregional plans;
14 (ii) (a) (c) (g) (ii) (ff)	GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 14: The development of— (ii) infrastructure or structures with a physical footprint of 10 square metres or more; where such development occurs— (a) within a watercourse; (b) in front of a development setback; or (c) if no development setback has been adopted, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse; excluding the development of infrastructure or structures within existing ports or harbours that will not increase the development footprint of the port or harbour. g. Northern Cape i. Outside urban areas: (ff) Critical biodiversity areas or ecosystem service areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans;
18 (g) (ii) (ii)	GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 18: The widening of a road by more than 4 meters, or the lengthening of a road by more than 1 kilometer- g. Northern Cape ii. Outside urban areas: (ii) Areas within a watercourse or wetland; or within 100m from the edge of a watercourse or wetland.
23 ii (a) (c) (g) (ii) (ee)	GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 23: The expansion of—

	<p>ii) infrastructure or structures where the physical footprint is expanded by 10 square metres or more; where such expansion occurs—</p> <p>(a) within a watercourse;</p> <p>(b) in front of a development setback adopted in the prescribed manner; or</p> <p>(c) if no development setback has been adopted, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse;</p> <p>excluding the expansion of infrastructure or structures within existing ports or harbours that will not increase the development footprint of the port or harbour.</p> <p>g. Northern Cape</p> <p>ii. Outside urban areas:</p> <p>(ee) Critical biodiversity areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans;</p>
--	--

DETAILS OF ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

No site alternatives have been considered during the EIA process for the proposed development. The placement of wind energy facilities is dependent on the factors discussed in Section 13, all of which are favourable at the proposed site location. A met mast was installed on the project site and the proposed site has been deemed suitable in terms of wind resource. The proposed project site has topography which is suitable for the development of a WEF.

Site layout alternatives will not be comparatively assessed, but rather a single layout will be refined as additional information becomes available throughout the EIA process (e.g., specialist input, additional site surveys, and ongoing stakeholder engagement). All constraints identified by the respective specialists are being considered and the layout is being refined to avoid all no-go areas.

The development area presented in the Scoping Report has been selected as a practicable option for the Klipkraal WEF 1 considering technical preference and constraints, as well as initial No-Go layers informed by the relevant specialist during the initial screening studies.

The no-go alternative will result in the current status quo being maintained as far as the avifauna, bats, ecological and the aquatic systems are concerned. The no-go option would therefore eliminate any additional impact on the ecological integrity of the proposed development site. The no-go option would also mean that the social environment is not affected as the status quo remains. This also means that all the positive aspects associated with the project would not materialise. Consequently, there would be no job creation, no revenue streams into the local economy and municipal coffers, and a lost opportunity to enhance the National Grid with a renewable source of energy.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS UNDERTAKEN FOR THE EIA PHASE

The following has been undertaken during the EIA Phase (as per the approved Final Scoping and Plan of Study):

- The DEIR underwent a 30-day comment and review period that ran from the 9th of February 2023 until the 11th of March 2023, (excluding public holidays).

- The I&AP database was updated and includes all affected landowners, adjacent landowners, occupiers of affected and adjacent land, other I&APs, key stakeholders (such as OoS) and other surrounding project developers. The I&AP database is included in Appendix 5.
- Issuing of the notifications was circulated to all I&APs on the 9th of February 2023 as part of the Draft EIA Report (proof included in Appendix 5).
- Reminder notifications of the closing of the DEIR comment period were sent out on the 23rd of February 2023 in order to ensure that comments and/or concerns were received from the OoS and/or registered I&APs.
- All comments received from I&APs and the responses thereto has been included in this final EIA Report, which has been submitted to DFFE.
- A Comments and Responses Report has been updated and included in the EIA Report, which records the date that issues were raised, a summary of each issue, and the response of the team to address the issue. The Final EIA report with all comments included has been submitted to DFFE for review and approval.
- All I&APs have been notified via email, sms or fax of the submission of the Final EIA Report to DFFE.
- All I&APs will be notified via email, sms or fax after having received written notice from DFFE on the final decision on the application. These notifications will include the process required to lodge an appeal, as well as the prescribed timeframes in which documentation should be submitted.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED KLIPKRAAL WEF 1

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
PLANNING		
Heritage		
Unidentified heritage resources - Due to the size of the area assessed, there's a possibility of encountering heritage features in un-surveyed areas does exist.	Medium	Low
Paleontological Resources - Damage, disturbance, destruction or sealing-in of legally-protected, scientifically valuable fossil heritage at or beneath the ground surface within the road footprint, mainly due to ground clearance and excavations	Very High	Medium
CONSTRUCTION		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic feature because of inadequate stormwater management..	Medium	Low
Hydrology - Impact to the hydrological characteristics of the aquatic feature due to changes in the catchment.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of the leakages from the portable chemical toilets that will be used during construction.	Low	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from plant and equipment.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leaking petrochemical storage facilities.	Medium	Low
Hydrology - Impact to the flow of water in the watercourses that will be crossed by infrastructure.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Impacts on broad-scale ecological processes as a result of construction phase activities, including disturbance and habitat loss.	Medium	Low
Impacts on ecosystem services within FEPA Priority Subcatchments as a result of construction phase activities, including disturbance and soil erosion.	Medium	Low
Agricultural – compliance statement – none identified		
Avifaunal		
Displacement due to disturbance associated with the construction of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	Medium	Low
Displacement due to habitat transformation associated with the construction of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	Low	Low
Bat		
Loss of foraging habitat by clearing of vegetation.	Low	Low
Roost destruction during earthworks.	Low	Low
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		
Noise	Low	Low
Increase in crime	Low	Low
Increase risk of HIV infections	High	Medium
An influx of construction workers	Low	Low
Hazard exposure	Low	Low
Quality of the living environment - Disruption of daily living patterns	Low	Low
Quality of the living environment - Disruption to social and community infrastructure	Low	Low
Economic - Job creation and skills development	Medium	Medium
Economic - Socio-economic stimulation	Medium	Medium
Heritage		
Unidentified heritage resources - Due to the size of the area assessed, there's a possibility of encountering heritage features in un-surveyed areas does exist.	Medium	Low
Paleontological Resources - Damage, disturbance, destruction or sealing-in of legally-protected, scientifically valuable fossil heritage at or beneath the ground surface within the road footprint, mainly due to ground clearance and excavations	Very High	Medium
Noise		
Noise pollution due to construction activities (equipment and vehicle noise)	Low	Low
Visual		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Medium	Low
Traffic		
Increase in traffic	Medium	Low
Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Medium	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
Increase in Road Maintenance	Low	Low
Additional Abnormal Loads	Low	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
New / Larger Access points	Low	Low
OPERATIONAL		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Hydrology - Impact to the hydrological characteristics of the aquatic feature due to changes in the catchment	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of inadequate stormwater management	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leakages from vehicles and plant moving on the site	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from petrochemical storage areas within the site.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leakages from the sanitation infrastructure servicing the operations.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Impacts on broad-scale ecological processes as a result of operational phase activities, including disturbance turbine noise.	Low	Low
Impacts on ecosystem services within FEPA Priority Subcatchments as a result of operational phase activities, including disturbance and soil erosion.	Low	Low
Potential impact on Karoo Dwarf Tortoises at the site during operation due to operational activities (vehicles/disturbance) as well as predation by crows.	Medium	Low
Agricultural - compliance statement – none identified		
Avifaunal		
Mortality of priority species due to collisions with the wind turbines.	Medium	Low
Mortality of priority species due to electrocutions on the overhead sections of the internal 33kV cables.	Medium	Low
Mortality due to collisions with the overhead sections of the internal 33kV cables.	Medium	Low
Bat		
Bat mortalities during foraging.	High	Medium
Bat mortalities during migration.	High	Medium
Increased bat mortalities due to light attraction and habitat creation.	High	Low
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Shadow flicker WEF only	Low	Low
Electromagnetic field and RF interference	Low	Low
Hazard exposure	Low	Low
Quality of living environment – Transformation of sense of place	Medium	Low
Economic - Job creation and skills development	Medium	Medium
Economic - Socio-economic stimulation	Medium	Medium
Heritage – none identified		
Heritage (Palaeontology) – none identified		
Noise		
Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components. (Day time)	Low	Low
Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components. (Night time)	Low	Low
Visual		
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on landscape receptors	Medium	Low
Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Medium	Medium
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on landscape receptors	Medium	Medium
Traffic		
Increase in traffic	Low	Low
Increase of incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Low	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
Increase in road maintenance	Low	Low
Additional abnormal loads	Low	Low
New / Larger access points	Low	Low
DECOMMISSIONING		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of the leakages from the portable chemical toilets that will be used during decommissioning. Reduction in and/or loss of species of conservation concern (i.e. rare, threatened/endangered species).	Low	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from plant and equipment.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leaking petrochemical storage facilities.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Impacts on Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of decommissioning phase activities, including vehicle collisions, disturbance.	Low	Low
Agricultural – none identified		
Avifaunal		
Displacement due to disturbance associated with the dismantling of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	Low	Low
Bat – none identified		
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Economic – Job loss	Medium	Medium
Heritage – none identified		
Heritage (Palaeontology) – none identified		
Noise		
Noise pollution due to construction activities (equipment and vehicle noise)	Low	Low
Visual		
Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Low	Low
Traffic		
Increase in Traffic	Medium	Low
Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Medium	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
Increase in Road Maintenance	Low	Low
Additional Abnormal Loads	Low	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
New / Larger Access points	Low	Low
CUMULATIVE		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Hydrology - Impact to the hydrological regime of the aquatic features.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality of the aquatic features as a result of inadequate stormwater management.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Cumulative impacts on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of habitat loss, disturbance and increased predation and poaching.	Low	Low
Agricultural – compliance statement - none identified		
Avifaunal		
Mortality due to collisions with the wind turbines Displacement due to disturbance during construction and operation of the wind farm Displacement due to habitat change and loss at the wind farm Mortality due to electrocution on the electrical infrastructure	Low	Low
Bat		
Bat mortalities during foraging	High	Medium
Bat mortalities during migration	High	Medium
Increased bat mortalities due to light attraction and habitat creation.	High	Low
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Noise	Low	Mitigation can only be considered implemented through a readiness action plan at a regional level and will be driven on a provincial and municipal basis; underpinned by national government, private sector and public support
Shadow Flicker	Low	
Blade glint	Low	
Risk of HIV and AIDS	High	
Sense of place	High	
Service supplies and infrastructure	Low	
Job creation and skills development	Very high	
Socio-economic stimulation	Medium	
Heritage – None identified		
Noise		
Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components of all three Pofadder WEFs.	Low	Low
Visual		
The introduction of a WEF into a landscape that is devoid of any such similar structures	Medium	Medium
Traffic		
Increase in Traffic	Medium	Medium
Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Medium	Medium
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Medium	Low
Increase in Road Maintenance	Low	Low
Additional Abnormal Loads	Medium	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Medium	Low
New / Larger Access points	Low	Low

SPECIALIST STUDIES

The following specialist studies have been undertaken for the project and their main findings and recommendations are included below:

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
Aquatic / Freshwater	The Klipkraal WEF phase 1 has a small footprint spread over a large area, allowing for the retention of a much of the natural system so that the system should remain	The assessment report makes a recommendation for the implementation of a 40m buffer around any watercourse and a buffer of 100m from any of the ephemeral

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>largely unaffected. A variety of aquatic features, mostly ephemeral in nature were observed within the study area and were mapped and buffered as necessary for their protection and handed over as constraints to inform the design of the project layout.</p> <p>The field assessment of the property has identified a number of additional artificial and natural aquatic features. The three aquatic features identified in the NFEPA Database were found to be farm dams and therefore artificial in nature, while a number of natural Depression wetlands (or pans) were identified within the study area. The Depression wetlands are ephemeral in nature with water accumulating in these features during rainfall events. No water flows out of these features with the primary water loss being as a result of evaporation.</p> <p>A number of seasonal watercourses were also identified within the study area. These watercourses predominantly form unnamed tributaries of the Damfontainspruit and drains towards this feature (to the east). These watercourses are very seasonal in nature and will only have flow during heavy rainfall events. Years might pass between flow events in these watercourses.</p> <p>The impact assessment was conducted in consideration of the provision of these buffers providing for management and mitigation for potential impacts.</p> <p>The final layout (revised by the screening and pre-application scoping phase inputs) has, to a large degree, avoided any sensitive aquatic features and associated buffer areas, significantly reducing the potential overall impact and risk to aquatic resources on the study site. The assessment of the potential impacts associated with the project were completed where avoidance of aquatic features was not possible, or the nature of the activities involve a potential risk to aquatic features even at great distance. Overall, it is expected that the impact on the aquatic environment would be Low Negative.</p>	<p>wetlands that have been identified as well as any of the farm dams on the property.</p> <p>Adherence to these buffers as prescribed further limits the potential impact on the aquatic environment of the study site.</p> <p>Where watercourses must be crossed by access roads or cable infrastructure, the design of these crossings must make provision for adequate hydraulic sizing to prevent any damming on the upstream side of these structures. Furthermore, the functionality of these structures must be monitored to ensure that they are kept fully functional.</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
Terrestrial Ecology	<p>The Klipkraal 1 WEF is mapped as falling primarily within the Eastern Upper Karoo and Western Upper Karoo vegetation types. However, the site verification and field assessment confirmed the presence of Upper Karoo Hardeveld and Southern Karoo Riviere within the site as well. All of these vegetation types have only been impacted to a limited extent by transformation, and are classified as Least Threatened.</p> <p>In terms of fauna, there are several listed fauna which occur in the area and which would potentially be impacted by the development. Of greatest concern would be the Riverine Rabbit and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise, neither of which were observed within the Klipkraal 1 site but are known from the immediate area. There are no areas of habitat within the site that are considered highly suitable for this species and the extent of habitat loss for this species within the site would be minimal. There are confirmed areas of Karoo Dwarf Tortoise within the site that have been classified in the sensitivity mapping as high or very high sensitivity and in response to this mapping the developer has ensured that there are no turbines in these areas. Consequently, there would be a low impact on this species as a result of habitat loss.</p> <p>There are no CBAs within the development footprint, with the result that an impact on CBAs and ESAs as a result of the development is considered unlikely. There are however some areas of FEPA Subcatchment along the western boundary of the site that would be impacted to some degree by the development as there are two turbines located within this area. The overall footprint within the FEPA Subcatchment would be less than 2ha and is not considered significant. A number of avoidance and mitigation measures have however been recommended which would reduce impacts on the FEPA Subcatchments to a low level.</p>	<p>The major sensitive features of the site including Riverine Rabbit habitat and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat have been mapped as high or very high sensitivity and would not be impacted by turbine footprint areas. Some impact to these areas from limited amounts of overhead cabling or turbine access roads are considered acceptable.</p> <p>There are no CBAs within the development footprint, with the result that an impact on CBAs and ESAs as a result of the development is considered unlikely. There are however some areas of FEPA Subcatchment along the western boundary of the site that would be impacted to some degree by the development as there are two turbines located within this area. The overall footprint within the FEPA Subcatchment would be less than 2ha and is not considered significant. A number of avoidance and mitigation measures have however been recommended which would reduce impacts on the FEPA Subcatchments to a low level.</p>
Agricultural	None of the land is classified as cropland, agricultural sensitivity is purely a function of land capability. The land capability of the site on the screening tool is predominantly 4 to 5,	The recommended mitigation measures are implementation of an effective system of storm water run-off control; maintenance of

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>but varies from 2 to 6. The small scale differences in the modelled land capability across the project area are not very accurate or significant at this scale and are more a function of how the data is generated by modelling, than actual meaningful differences in agricultural potential on the ground. Values of 2 to 5 translate to a low agricultural sensitivity and values of 6 translate to a medium agricultural sensitivity, although there is little real difference between low and medium agricultural sensitivity on the ground.</p> <p>The climate data (low rainfall of approximately 168 to 179 mm per annum and high evaporation of approximately 1,320 to 1,360 mm per annum) (Schulze, 2009) proves the area to be very arid, and therefore of limited land capability.</p> <p>The land capability value is in keeping with the climate limitations that make the site totally unsuitable for dryland crop production.</p>	<p>vegetation cover; and stripping, stockpiling and re-spreading of topsoil.</p>
Avifauna	<p>The proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 will have several potential impacts on priority avifauna. These impacts are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displacement of priority species due to disturbance linked to construction activities in the construction phase - The impact is rated as medium but could be mitigated to low levels. • Displacement due to habitat transformation in the construction phase - The impact is rated as low both pre- and post-mitigation. • Collision mortality caused by the wind turbines in the operational phase - The impact is rated as medium pre-mitigation and low post-mitigation. • Electrocutation on the 33kV MV overhead lines (if any) in the operational phase - The impact is rated as medium pre-mitigation and low post-mitigation. • Collisions with the 33 kV MV overhead lines (if any) in the operational phase - The impact is rated as medium pre-mitigation and low post-mitigation. 	<p><u>High sensitivity no-turbine buffer</u></p> <p>Included in this category are areas within 200m of pans and earth dams, and 150m from all major drainage lines. Surface water in this arid habitat is crucially important for priority avifauna, including several Red Data species such as Martial Eagle, Lanner Falcon, Black Stork, Blue Crane and Verreaux's Eagle, and many non-priority species, including several waterbirds. Drainage lines when flowing attract waterbirds on occasion, as do the large pools that remain in the channel after the flow has stopped. Wind turbines that are placed near these sources of surface water pose a collision risk to birds using the water for drinking and bathing, and drainage lines, when flowing, are natural flight paths for birds.</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Displacement of priority species due to disturbance linked to dismantling activities in the decommissioning phase. 	
Bat	Information from literature as well as available bat activity data from site confirms that seven bat species occur on the site and another three species are likely to occur. Of this total of ten species, six have a Medium – High or High likelihood to be negatively impacted by wind energy due to their foraging and behavioural patterns.	<p>Buffers have been placed around key habitat features as per best practice resulting in the identification of several No-Go areas for turbine placement.</p> <p>Bat fatality must be monitored for a minimum of two years from commencement of operation and estimated fatality levels compared to the thresholds set for the project. If these thresholds are exceeded, an adaptive management plan for bats must be developed which will outline the use of curtailment and/or acoustic deterrents to reduce fatality to below threshold levels.</p>
Social	<p>It is evident that the cumulative impacts associated with changes to the social environment of the region are more significant than those attached to any one project.</p> <p>The initiative to address these cumulative impacts lies at a far higher level than at an individual project level. In this regard conclusions are drawn to the findings of this assessment conducted for the proposed Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 which indicates that during the construction and the operational phase of the proposed development, various employment opportunities, with different levels of skills will be created. In addition this will create local business opportunities benefitting the socio-economic development of the local community of Fraserburg.</p>	The proposed project and associated infrastructure will create a number of potential socio-economic opportunities and benefits and is unlikely to result in permanent damaging social impacts. From a social perspective it is concluded that the project is acceptable subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation and enhancement measures and management actions identified for the project. Considering the findings of the report and potential for mitigation it is the reasoned opinion of the specialist that the project can be authorised from a social perspective.
Heritage	<p>The fieldwork conducted in 2021 within the Klipkraal WEF 1 study area identified two (2) heritage resources that were classified as structures (incl. historical farmstead).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 stone ruin farmstead (K-10) was rated as having medium heritage significance. 1 stone shepherds shelter (K-09) was rated as having low heritage significance. <p>The pre-construction and construction phase of the proposed WEF will entail extensive</p>	<p>The calculated impact confirms the impact of the new Klipkraal WEF 1 will be reduced with the implementation of the mitigation measures. This finding in addition to the implementation of a chance finds procedure, as part of the EMPr, will mitigate possible impacts on unidentified heritage resources. The following mitigation measures will be required if associated infrastructure does encroach upon the identified heritage sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30m buffer zone around historical structures

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>surface clearance as well as excavations into the superficial sediment cover and underlying bedrock (e.g., for widened or new access roads, wind turbine foundations, hardstanding areas, on-site substation, underground cables, construction laydown area, O&M building and BESS).</p> <p>Construction of the facility may adversely affect potential archaeological and fossil heritage within the development footprint by damaging, destroying, disturbing or permanently sealing-in fossils preserved at or beneath the surface of the ground that are then no longer available for scientific research or other public good.</p> <p>The possible pre-construction impacts calculated on the tangible cultural heritage resources is overall VERY HIGH to MODERATE NEGATIVE rating but with the implementation of the recommended buffers and management guidelines will be reduced to a MEDIUM - LOW NEGATIVE impact.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is essential that a walk down survey of the final footprint of the new Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated grid connection infrastructure be conducted. • A management plan for the heritage resources then needs to be compiled and approved for implementation during construction and operations.
Heritage (Palaeontology)	<p>The Palaeontological Impact assessment (PIA) conducted by Butler (2022) determined that the Jurassic Dolerite underlies a small portion of the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 while the rest of the footprint is underlain by the Adelaide Subgroup (Beaufort Group). The PalaeoMap of the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Jurassic Dolerite is Zero as it is igneous in origin and thus unfossiliferous while that of the Adelaide Subgroup is Very High (Almond and Pether, 2009; Almond et al., 2013). Large areas of the development on the PalaeoMap are underlain by white, indicating that these areas have not been allocated so a specific Palaeontological Sensitivity. The updated Geology (Council of Geosciences, Pretoria); refines the geology of the 1983 Geological Map and indicates that the north-eastern portion is underlain by Jurassic dolerite, the most significant portion of the development is underlain by the Middleton Formation with the south western portion underlain by the Balfour Formation. Both the Middleton and Balfour Formations</p>	<p>It is recommended that a Palaeontological Walkdown of the development is conducted prior to the commencement of construction.</p> <p>The appointed Palaeontologist will also have to include a Chance Find Protocol for the Klipkraal WEF 1 development and training of accountable supervisory personnel by a qualified palaeontologist in the recognition of fossil heritage is necessary.</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>forms part of Adelaide Subgroup (Beaufort Group).</p> <p>In the last few decades extensive research and collecting have been conducted by palaeontologists in this part of the basin and the Fraserburg area was found to be highly fossiliferous. A two day-site-specific field survey of the development footprint was conducted on foot 24-26 September 2021. Various fossiliferous sites, where fossils were found to be well-preserved, has been identified in the development footprint.</p>	
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a short-term increase in noise in the vicinity of the site during the construction phase. • The area surrounding the construction sites will be affected for short periods of time in all directions, should numerous construction equipment be used simultaneously. • The day time SANS 10103:2008 noise limit of 45dB(A) will not be exceeded at any of the noise sensitive areas. • The night-time outdoor guideline noise rating limit of 35dB(A) will not be exceeded at any of the noise sensitive areas, except at two noise sensitive areas (NSA 2 and NSA 8) when the windspeed is above 10m/s. There will most likely be wind noise masking at this windspeed that will mitigate the impact. On site monitoring at these two noise sensitive areas is recommended during the operational phase. Mitigation measures to be considered if the noise impact exceeds the 35dB(A) night noise rating limit, include running the turbines in low power mode at certain wind speeds at night. It is unlikely that the indoor limit will be exceeded as the residents' buildings will attenuate some sound. • The cumulative impacts will not exceed the day time SANS 10103:2008 noise limit of 45dB(A). • The cumulative impacts will exceed the night time SANS 10103:2008 noise limit of 35dB(A) at NSA 2 and NSA 8. There will most likely be wind noise masking at 	<p>Due to the potential low noise impacts associated with the construction and operational phases of the proposed project, it is recommended the project receive Environmental Authorisation, from a noise impact perspective.</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>this windspeed that will mitigate the effect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction phase and operational phase will have a low noise impact on the noise sensitive receptors. 	
Visual	<p>The project will exert a negative influence on the visual environment. This is largely due to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high visibility of the wind turbines which can be 180-200m high (300 to tip of the blade), within the study area. the high visibility of construction and operation activity within the low growing, uniform open Karoo veld of uniform visual pattern; the low VAC of the area due to the low and uniform visual pattern of vegetation which does not allow for the project to be visually accommodated within the landscape as a result of the high visual contrast and absent screening; the scale of the project in a rural setting; the introduction of an extensive project within a rural setting that will be brightly lit by security lighting including red flashing aviation warning/hazard lights on the top of the turbines throughout the night. <p>However, due to the low relative visual quality of the area the overall significance of the visual impact is regarded as Moderate.</p>	<p>Based on the field observations and the studies herein and with the implementation of the mitigation measures, it is the Visual Specialist's opinion the visual impact of the wind farm layout does not present a potential fatal flaw provided that the recommended mitigation measures are implemented.</p>
Traffic	<p>The development is in close proximity to an existing road network with minor upgrades proposed on the gravel roads between Fraserburg and the development. The current access point on Road DR2312 has an insufficient sight distance of 240 m; therefore, we propose the access position be moved towards the east at Km 89.55. Before work commences, external road upgrades require approval and a wayleave application from the Northern Cape Department of Public Works & Roads (NCdr&pw).</p> <p>The construction / balance of plant phase of this development will typically generate the highest number of additional vehicles.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures to be included in the construction phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure staff transport is done in the 'Off Peak' period and by bus to reduce impact in the peak periods. Stagger material, component, and abnormal loads deliveries. Adequate road signage on all external roads carrying development traffic according to the South African Road Traffic Sign Manual (SARTSM). Reduction in the speed of vehicles. Adequate enforcement of the law. Implementation of pedestrian safety initiatives.

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>However, it will be temporary, and impacts are considered nominal.</p> <p>Abnormal loads have been presumed from the Port of Saldanha through Moorreesburg, Wolseley and Worcester towards Matjiesfontein on the N001 Freeway. The section from Matjiesfontein to Fraserburg would require passing over the Theekloofpas and could pose problems for the transportation of rotor blades. Our recommendation is to route through Sutherland with minor deviations in places; however, a more comprehensive route analysis will be required before construction better to understand the required works and the potential risks.</p> <p>Several mitigation measures are proposed to accommodate the development and reduce the impact on the surrounding road network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular maintenance of farm fences & access cattle grids. • Construction of gravel roads in terms of Technical Recommendations for Highways (TRH20). • Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department; and • Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. <p>It is the traffic specialist opinion that the Klipkraal WEF 1 will have a nominal impact on the existing traffic network. The project is therefore deemed acceptable from a transportation perspective, provided the recommendations and mitigation measures in this report are implemented. Hence, Environmental Authorisations (EAs) should be granted for the EIA applications.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd is proposing to develop, construct and operate the Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated infrastructure, on a site located approximately 30 km South East of Fraserburg within the Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality and the Namakwa District Municipality in the Northern Cape Province.

The overall objective of the proposed development is to generate much needed electricity by means of renewable energy technologies capturing wind energy to feed into the national grid. The use of renewable energy to provide power to South Africa is supported at international, national, provincial and local level. Given South Africa's need for additional electricity generation and the need to decrease the country's dependency on coal-based power, renewable energy has been identified as a national priority, with wind energy identified as one of the readily available, technically viable and commercially cost-effective sources of renewable energy.

Taking into consideration the findings of the EIA process for the proposed development and the fact that specialist recommendations have been used to inform the project design and layout of the facility, it is the opinion of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) that the majority of the negative impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project can be mitigated to acceptable levels. While there are potential negative environmental impacts associated with the proposed development, the extent of the positive benefits associated with the implementation of the project in terms of renewable energy supply and positive local and regional economic impact are considered to outweigh the negative impacts.

After consideration of the findings presented in the EIR and based on the preferred layout presented within this report, it is the reasoned opinion of the EAP that the proposed Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 is acceptable and Environmental Authorisation could be granted.

The Klipkraal WEF 1 will assist by converting wind energy into electricity, thereby releasing no harmful by-products into the environment which will in turn reduce the dependency on fossil fuels.

The following specialist studies have been undertaken for the project:

- Agriculture and Soils Impact Assessment
- Avifaunal Impact Assessment
- Bat Impact Assessment
- Terrestrial Biodiversity Impact Assessment (Including Plant Species Compliance Statement and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise Assessment)
- Heritage Impact Assessment (including Paleontology, Archaeology and Cultural Landscapes)
- Desktop Geotechnical Investigation
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Social Impact Assessment
- Freshwater Impact Assessment
- Transportation Impact Assessment
- Visual Impact Assessment

The specialist assessments were conducted to address the potential impacts relating to the proposed development in order to ascertain the level of each identified impact, as well as mitigation measures which may be required. A summary of the main findings of the specialists are included in **Section 16** above.

The agricultural assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the impact of the proposed development on the agricultural production capability of the site is assessed as being low and therefore acceptable because of the above factors. From an agricultural impact point of view, it is recommended that the development be approved.

The avifaunal assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the Klipkraal WEF will have a moderate impact on avifauna which, in most instances, and could be reduced to a low impact through appropriate mitigation. Any alternative substation and laydown locations will all be situated in essentially the same habitat, i.e., Karoo scrub. The habitat is not particularly sensitive, as far as avifauna is concerned. No fatal flaws were discovered during the onsite investigations. The development is therefore supported, provided the mitigation measures listed in this report and the EMPr are strictly implemented.

The bat assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that should the proposed wind farm be approved, a minimum of 2 years of operational bat mortality monitoring should be conducted from the start of the operation of the facility. The recommended mitigation measures have been presented in the Mitigation Action Plan in this EIA phase, which must be incorporated into the EMPr. According to available information consulted during this study, there are no fatal flaws from a bat sensitivity perspective. Additionally, no known bat caves or large roosts occur in the vicinity of the site. No reasons have been identified for the Klipkraal WEF 1 development not to receive Environmental Authorisation.

The terrestrial biodiversity assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that there are no impacts associated with the development of the Klipkraal WEF 1 on terrestrial biodiversity that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level. As such, should all the proposed mitigation be implemented, the Klipkraal WEF 1 development is deemed acceptable from a terrestrial ecological impact perspective. In terms of cumulative impacts, the affected area has not been significantly impacted by renewable energy development to date and the contribution of the current wind farm development to cumulative impact is considered low and acceptable. It is thus the reasoned opinion of the specialist that the Klipkraal WEF 1 development should be authorised subject to the various mitigation and avoidance measures as indicated.

The Karoo Dwarf Tortoise Assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the direct impact of the Klipkraal WEF 1 Site on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise would be low and is not considered significant. Indirect impacts, particularly predation by crows would potentially represent a more persistent, long-term threat to the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. However, with the implementation of the suggested mitigation and avoidance measures, it is likely that his impact can be reduced to an acceptable, low level. Consequently, the development of the Klipkraal WEF 1 Site is considered acceptable with the implementation of the suggested avoidance and monitoring as indicated and should be allowed to proceed with regards to potential impacts on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise.

The heritage impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the impact of the Klipkraal WEF 1 will be reduced from very high - moderate negative rating to a medium - low negative impact rating with the implementation of the mitigation measures. This finding in addition to the implementation of a chance finds procedure, as part of the EMP, will mitigate possible impacts on unidentified heritage resources.

The palaeontology assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the significance of the impact occurring will be negative very high before mitigation. The pre-construction Palaeontological walkdown will lower the Significance of the Impact to a Medium level.

The noise assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that, based on the modelling results, the impact will be low from a noise perspective. It is recommended that the development receive environmental authorisation.

The social impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) stated that considering all social impacts associated with the project, it is evident that, at the social level, the positive elements outweigh the negative and that the project carried with it a significant social benefit at a national level and is therefore supported.

The aquatic impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that with mitigation measures in place, impacts on the aquatic environment of the study site can be potentially reduced to sufficiently low levels. This would be best achieved by incorporating the recommended management & mitigation measures into an Environmental Management Programme (EMP) for the site, together with appropriate rehabilitation guidelines and ecological monitoring recommendations. Based on the outcomes of the study, the specialist has no objection to the authorisation of the proposed activities.

The transportation impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated grid infrastructure will have a nominal impact on the existing traffic network. The project is therefore deemed acceptable from a transport perspective, provided the recommendations and

mitigation measures in the report are implemented. Hence, Environmental Authorisations (EAs) should be granted for the EIA applications.

The visual impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the project will exert a negative influence on the visual environment. However, due to the low relative visual quality of the area the overall significance of the visual impact is regarded as Moderate. Based on the field observations and the studies herein and with the implementation of the mitigation measures, it is the Visual Specialist's opinion the visual impact of the wind farm layout does not present a potential fatal flaw provided that the recommended mitigation measures are implemented.

No location alternatives are being considered for the Klipkraal WEF 1 as these sites were selected prior to the commencement of the EIA Process. The layout that was prepared for the Klipkraal WEF 1 has been assessed by specialists to identify potential impacts that may arise from the development. Based on the findings of the specialists, the potential impacts identified and the outcomes of the public participation process of the Scoping Phase, the layout has been updated to avoid environmental no-go areas to produce a final layout. This final layout has been further assessed by all specialists (refer to Impact Tables in **Section 13.3** and findings and recommendations in **Section 15**). No further layout alternatives have been considered as part of the EIA process. Impact assessments have been undertaken on the revised layout. No technology alternatives will be considered. The choice of turbine to be used will ultimately be determined by technological and economic factors at a later stage. The no-go alternative has not been assessed as part of the EIA phase.

Section 16 provides a summary of the positive and negative impacts associated with the proposed project.

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY (WEF) 1

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Overview of the EIA Process.....	3
1.2	Content Requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment Report	4
2.	PROJECT TITLE	7
3.	DETAILS OF APPLICANT	7
3.1	Name and contact details of the Applicant	7
4.	DETAILS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER AND SPECIALISTS	7
4.1	Name and contact details of the Environmental Consultant.....	7
4.2	Names and expertise of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)	8
4.3	Names and expertise of the specialists	8
5.	LOCATION OF THE ACTIVITY	9
5.1	21 Digit Surveyor General Codes and Farm names of the sites	10
5.2	Coordinates of the site	10
6.	ACTIVITY INFORMATION	12
6.1	Project Description	12
6.1.1	Final Proposed Layout and Technical Detail Summary	15
6.2	NEMA Listed Activities	17
7.	NATIONAL WEB-BASED ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TOOL	21
8.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	25
8.1	Geographical	25

8.2	Land Use	26
8.3	Climate	28
8.4	Topography	28
8.5	Aquatic/Freshwater Resource Assessment.....	28
8.5.1	Baseline Assessment	28
8.5.2	Aquatic/Freshwater Sensitivities.....	31
8.5.3	Aquatic/Freshwater Impact Assessment Conclusions	32
8.6	Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment	33
8.6.1	Baseline Assessment	33
8.6.2	Vegetation Types.....	33
8.6.3	Faunal Communities.....	35
8.6.4	Critical Biodiversity Areas and Broad-Scale Processes.....	38
8.6.5	Terrestrial Biodiversity Sensitivities.....	39
8.6.6	Terrestrial Biodiversity Conclusions	41
8.7	Agricultural	42
8.7.1	Baseline Assessment	42
8.7.2	Agricultural Compliance Statement Conclusion	42
8.8	Avifauna	43
8.8.1	Baseline Assessment	43
8.8.2	Results of the pre-construction bird monitoring.....	45
8.8.3	Avifauna Sensitivities.....	47
8.8.4	Avifaunal Assessment Conclusion	48
8.9	Bat	48
8.9.1	Baseline Assessment	48
8.9.2	Results of the pre-construction bat monitoring.....	50
8.9.3	Bat Sensitivities	50
8.9.4	Bat Assessment Conclusion.....	53
9.	DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIO- ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT	53
9.1.1	Namakwa District Municipality.....	53
9.1.2	Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality	53
9.1.3	Key Considerations/Impacts for Wind Energy Facilities.....	54
9.1.4	Key Findings and Recommendations.....	54
9.2	Cultural/Historical Environment	54
9.2.1	Baseline Assessment	54
9.2.2	Palaeontological	55

9.2.3	Heritage Fieldwork Findings in the study area	56
9.2.4	Heritage Sensitivities	57
9.2.5	Heritage Impact Assessment Conclusion.....	57
9.3	Noise	57
9.3.1	Baseline Assessment	57
9.3.2	Noise Sensitivities	58
9.3.3	Noise Impact Assessment Conclusion	59
9.4	Visual.....	59
9.4.1	Baseline Assessment	59
9.4.2	Visual Sensitivities.....	59
9.4.3	Shadow Flicker	1
9.4.4	Visual Impact Assessment Conclusion	3
9.5	Transportation	3
9.5.1	Baseline Assessment	3
9.5.2	Existing Access.....	3
9.5.3	Additional Traffic Generation	4
9.5.4	Conclusion and Impact Statement	4
9.6	Wake Effect	4
10.	POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT.....	4
10.1	The Constitution	4
10.2	National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998).....	5
10.3	Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guideline for Renewable Energy Projects, DFFE Notice 989 of 2015	5
10.4	National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998).....	6
10.5	The National Heritage Resources Act 1999 (25 of 1999).....	6
10.6	National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (NEM:BA) (Act No. 10 of 2004, as amended)	7
10.7	National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act, 2003 (Act No.57 of 2003 as amended)	8
10.8	National Forests Act (NFA) (Act No. 84 of 1998)	9
10.9	National Veld and Forest Fire Act (Act No. 101 of 1998)	9
10.10	Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (CARA) (Act No. 43 of 1983)	9
10.11	National Road Traffic Act (NRTA) (Act No. 93 of 1996, as amended)	10
10.12	Civil Aviation Act (CAA) (Act No. 13 of 2009).....	10
10.13	Astronomy Geographic Advantage Act (Act No. 21 of 2007)	11

10.14	National Energy Act (Act No. 34 of 2008).....	12
10.15	Electricity Regulation Act (Act No. 4 of 2006).....	13
10.16	Protection of Public Information Act (Act No. 4 of 2013)	13
10.17	Renewable Energy Development Zones (REDZs) and Strategic Transmission Corridors.....	13
10.18	Additional Relevant Legislation	14
11.	KEY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND GUIDELINES	15
11.1	Northern Cape Province Strategic Plan 2020 - 2025	16
11.2	Namakwa District Municipality Development Plan, 2021 – 2022	16
11.3	Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality Integrated Development Plan (2020/21 Revised)	17
12.	NEED AND DESIRABILITY	18
12.1	National Renewable Energy Requirement	18
12.2	National Renewable Energy Commitment	19
12.3	Wind Power Potential in South Africa and Internationally	20
12.4	Site Suitability.....	20
12.4.1	Wind Resource	20
12.4.2	Site Access.....	21
12.4.3	Topography and Land Use.....	21
12.4.4	Policy	21
12.4.5	Environmental.....	22
12.4.6	Land Availability.....	24
12.4.7	Access to Grid	24
12.5	Reduce dependency on fossil fuels	24
12.6	Stimulate the economy	25
12.7	Job opportunities and household livelihoods.....	25
12.8	Skills development.....	25
13.	MOTIVATION FOR THE PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT WITHIN THE APPROVED SITE AS CONTEMPLATED IN THE SCOPING REPORT	26
14.	DETAILS OF PROCESS FOLLOWED TO REACH THE PREFERRED OPTION.....	28
14.1	Details of alternatives	28

14.1.1	Location/Site alternatives	28
14.1.2	The type of activity to be undertaken	29
14.1.3	The technology to be used in the activity	29
14.1.4	Design or layout of the activity.....	29
14.1.5	No – go option	30
14.2	Details of Public Participation Process undertaken	31
14.2.1	Public Participation Process completed for the Scoping Phase.....	31
14.2.2	Public Participation Process to be undertaken for the EIA Phase	32
14.3	Impact Assessment	34
14.3.1	Planning.....	34
14.3.2	Construction Phase	34
14.3.3	Operational Phase.....	44
14.3.4	Decommissioning	51
14.3.5	Cumulative.....	56
14.3.6	Comparative Assessment of Alternatives.....	61
14.4	Concluding statement for preferred alternative	61
15.	POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT	62
16.	SUMMARY OF SPECIALIST FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	67
17.	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	75
18.	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (EMPR) AND CONDITIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION	79
19.	FINAL PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE WHICH RESPONDS TO THE IMPACT MANAGEMENT MEASURES, AVOIDANCE, AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE ASSESSMENT	79
20.	ASPECTS WHICH WERE CONDITIONAL TO THE FINDINGS OF THE ASSESSMENT EITHER BY THE EAP OR SPECIALIST WHICH ARE TO BE INCLUDED AS CONDITIONS OF AUTHORISATION	79
21.	UNCERTAINTIES, ASSUMPTIONS AND GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE	80
22.	AUTHORISATION OF THE PROPOSED KLIPKRAAL WEF 1 PROJECT	80

23.	EAP DECLARATION	80
24.	DEVIATIONS FROM THE APPROVED SCOPING REPORT	81
25.	INFORMATION REQUIRED BY CA (IF APPLICABLE).....	81
26.	CONCLUSION	81

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	CV's of EAP's involved in the process and EAP declaration
Appendix 2:	Locality Map
Appendix 3:	Site Development Plan
Appendix 4:	Photographs
Appendix 5:	Proof of public participation
Appendix 6:	Specialist studies and declarations
Appendix 7:	SiVEST Impact Rating System
Appendix 8:	Environmental Management Programme
Appendix 9:	DFFE Screening Tools

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Klipkraal WEF 1 Regional Context	2	
Figure 2: Layout showing context of Klipkraal WEF 1, Klipkraal WEF 2, Klipkraal WEF 3, Klipkraal WEF 4 and Klipkraal WEF 5.	3	
Figure 3: Site locality	10	
Figure 4: Typical components of a Wind Turbine	15	
Figure 5: Final layout showing proposed location of wind turbines	16	
Figure 6: Regional context	26	
Figure 7: Land Cover Classification	27	
Figure 8: Typical site area.....	27	
Figure 9: Typical site area.....	28	
Figure 10: Location of the NFEPA wetlands within the study area.....	29	
Figure 11: Location of the depression wetlands (light blue) and the dams (dark blue) within the study site.....	30	
Figure 12: View of a typical Depression wetland found within the study area.....	30	
Figure 13: Location of the larger seasonal watercourses identified within the site.....	31	
Figure 14: View of a typical seasonal watercourse occurring within the study area.....	31	
Figure 15: Proposed buffers and no-go areas within the Klipkraal WEF phase 1 (yellow lines are 100m and green lines are 40m).....	32	
Figure 16: Eastern Upper Karoo	Figure 17: Western Upper Karoo.....	35
Figure 18: Upper Karoo Hardeveld	Figure 19: Southern Karoo Riviere.....	35
Figure 20: Riverine Rabbit image from camera trapping undertaken.....		36
Figure 21: Namib Giant Ground Gecko <i>Chondrodactylus</i>		37
Figure 22: Map of areas considered to represent potentially suitable Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat within the Klipkraal 1 WEF site based on ground-truthed mapping from satellite imagery.		38
Figure 23: Northern Cape CBA map for the greater Klipkraal project area		39

Figure 24: Ecological Sensitivities	40
Figure 25: The proposed development site (blue outline) overlaid on agricultural sensitivity, as given by the screening tool (green = low; yellow = medium; red = high).	43
Figure 26: Verreaux's Eagles nests recorded during the pre-construction monitoring at the Klipkraal WEF	47
Figure 27: Avifaunal sensitivities for the Klipkraal WEF 1 project.....	48
Figure 28: Bat Sensitivities.....	51
Figure 29: Heritage Resources (site: blue square) identified within the Klipkraal WEF 1 region	56
Figure 30: K-09 Stone shepherds shelter	57
Figure 31: K-10 Stone ruin	57
Figure 32: Noise sensitivity areas for the Klipkraal WEF 1	58
Figure 33: Visual Receptors.....	60
Figure 34: Camera Locations.....	61
Figure 35: Photo Point 30 (see Figure 34).....	1
Figure 36: Photo Point 31	2
Figure 37: Photo Point 32	3
Figure 38: Photo Point 33	4
Figure 39: Shadow Flicker Analysis.....	2
Figure 40: Location of the project in relation to the KCAAA	12
Figure 41: Wind Data from Met Mast 1	20
Figure 42: Wind Data from Met Mast 1	21
Figure 43: Location of the Klipkraal WEF 1 in relation to the REDZ and Power corridors	22
Figure 44: Verreaux's Eagle nests identified and buffers in relation to the Klipkraal WEF sites	23
Figure 45: Turbine and supporting infrastructure sensitivity layout	26
Figure 46: Final proposed layout / development footprint with site sensitivities	27
Figure 47: Renewable Energy Projects within 35km of the Klipkraal WEF 1	56
Figure 48: Proposed layout put forward for authorisation.....	62
Figure 49: Final proposed layout with site sensitivities	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Content requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment	4
Table 2: Name and contact details of the applicant.....	7
Table 3: Name and contact details of the Environmental Consultant who prepared the report	7
Table 4: Names and details of the expertise of the EAP's involved in the preparation of this report....	8
Table 5: Names of specialists involved in the project	9
Table 6: 21 Digit Surveyor General Code	10
Table 7: Coordinates for the Klipkraal WEF 1 site boundary.....	10
Table 8: Supporting Infrastructure coordinates.....	11
Table 9: Technical Detail Summary	16
Table 10: Listed activities in terms of NEMA: EIA Regulations 2014 (as amended in 2017), applicable to the proposed project	17
Table 11: DFFE Screening Tool Environmental Sensitivity	21
Table 12: Results of the transect counts at the WEF and control sites	45
Table 13: Incidental sightings of priority species during during all surveys over four seasons	46
Table 14: The significance of sensitivity map categories for each infrastructure component	52
Table 15: The SEA for Wind and Solar PV Energy in South Africa (Phase 1 and Phase 2) (CSIR, 2015; CSIR, 2019) identified the following eleven (11) geographic areas for REDZs.....	14
Table 16: Pre and post mitigation impact ratings.....	62
Table 17: Summary of specialist findings and recommendations.....	67

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY (WEF) 1

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd (The Applicant) is proposing to construct a wind energy facility (WEF), namely the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 and associated infrastructure approximately 30 km south east of Fraserburg in the Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality, in the Northern Cape. **(Figure 1) (DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2202)**. The overall objective of the proposed development is to generate electricity by means of renewable energy technologies capturing wind energy to feed into the national grid. The proposed development will have a maximum total generation capacity of up to 300 megawatt (MWac).

SiVEST Environmental Division has subsequently been appointed as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed construction and operation of the Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated infrastructure. The proposed development requires an (Environmental Authorisation (EA) from the National Department Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE). However, the provincial authority (i.e. the Northern Cape Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs, Rural Development and Land Reform) will also be consulted. The EIA for the proposed development will be conducted in terms of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) promulgated in terms of Chapter 5 of the NEMA. In terms of these regulations, a full EIA process is required for the proposed development. All relevant legislation and guidelines will be consulted during the EIA process and will be complied with at all times.

Four additional WEF's are concurrently being considered on the properties and adjacent properties and are assessed by way of separate impact assessment processes contained in the 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (GN No. R982, as amended) for listed activities contained within Listing Notices 1, 2 and 3 (GN R983, R984 and R985, as amended). These projects are known as Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 2 **(DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2203)**, Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 3 **(DFFE Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2204)**, Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 4 **(DFFE Reference Number: TBA)** and Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 5 **(DFFE Reference Number: TBA)**.

In order to evacuate the energy generated by the WEF's to supplement the national grid, Aura Development Company (Pty) Ltd is proposing one grid connection which will be assessed in a separate BAR **(DFFE Reference Number: TBA)**:

The respective WEF and grid connection infrastructure developments will require separate Environmental Authorisations (EAs) and are subject to separate Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Basic Assessment (BA) processes respectively. The proposed grid connection infrastructure developments will be handed over to Eskom once constructed (Eskom grid connection works). The substations will include an Eskom portion (switching station) and an Independent Power Producer (IPP) portion (facility substation) hence the facility substations will be included in the respective WEF EIAs

and the Eskom switching stations in the respective associated grid connection infrastructure BA in order to allow for handover to Eskom.




Figure 1: Klipkraal WEF 1 Regional Context

Although the respective WEFs and associated grid connection infrastructure (switching stations and overhead power lines) developments will be assessed separately, it is proposed that a single public participation process be undertaken to consider all of the proposed projects [i.e. five (5) WEF EIAs and one (1) grid connection BAs]. The potential environmental impacts associated with all of the proposed developments mentioned above will be assessed as part of the cumulative impact assessment.




Figure 2: Layout showing context of Klipkraal WEF 1, Klipkraal WEF 2, Klipkraal WEF 3, Klipkraal WEF 4 and Klipkraal WEF 5.

1.1 Overview of the EIA Process

The National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No 107 of 1998) (NEMA) promotes the use of scoping and EIA in order to ensure integrated environmental management. The purpose of an EIA is to provide the Authority with sufficient information to make an informed decision on whether an activity should proceed or not, and to assist with selecting an option that will provide the most benefit, and cause the least impact. The EIA process should identify activities which may have a detrimental effect on the environment, and which would therefore require Environmental Authorisation prior to commencement.

This project requires an Environmental Authorisation (EA) in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended) and the 2014 EIA Regulations (as amended). The process triggered is a Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment report (S&EIR). All the phases including the Environmental Management Programme report (EMPr) must be prepared in terms of the NEMA and GN R. 982, (as amended by GN R. 326) and the associated activities listed under GN R. 983, GN R. 984 and GN R. 985 (as amended by GN R 327, GN R 325, and GN R 324 respectively).

Objectives and Overview of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase

The EIA Phase is a comprehensive study that addresses all the issues raised in the Scoping Phase as well as provides further assessment of the sensitivities identified by the various specialist as well as the

proposed impacts of the proposed development. The main objectives of the EIA phase is to assess the significance of the impacts that may occur from the proposed development, provide mitigation measures and management recommendations to reduce the significant impacts, compile an Environmental Management Programme for use during construction to ensure correct monitoring procedures are followed as well as to undertake further PPP.

The EAP therefore compiled a Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report and a draft Environmental Management Programme which was made available for public and stakeholder comment for a period of 30 days as part of the public participation process. All comments received in response to the DEIAr have been considered and responded to, incorporated into the Final EIA Phase and submitted to the Department for decision.

Public Participation Process

Public and Stakeholder participation is a fundamental component of the EIA Process. The inclusion of the views of the affected and interested public aids in ensuring the EIA Process is open, transparent and robust, as well as that the decision-making process is equitable and fair. This in turn guides informed choice and better environmental outcomes. It further presents a valuable source of information on key impacts, potential mitigation measures and the identification and selection of feasible alternatives. This process allows the EAP to engage further with identified key stakeholders and Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs). The Draft EIA Report was made available to all I&APs as well as Organs of State for a period of 30 days from the 9th February 2023 until the 11th March 2023, following this, all comments have been included in the Comments and Response Report which will then be submitted to the Department for decision.

1.2 Content Requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment Report

An Environmental Impact Assessment Report must contain the information that is necessary for the competent authority to consider and come to a decision on the application. The content requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment Report (as provided in Appendix 3 of the EIA Regulations 2014, as amended), as well as details of which section of the report fulfils these requirements, are shown in **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Content requirements for an Environmental Impact Assessment

Content Requirements	Applicable Section
(a) details of- (i) the EAP who prepared the report; and (ii) the expertise of the EAP, including a curriculum vitae;	4
(b) the location of the activity, including- (i) the 21-digit Surveyor General code of each cadastral land parcel; (ii) where available, the physical address and farm name; (iii) where the required information in items (i) and (ii) is not available, the coordinates of the boundary of the property or properties;	5
(c) a plan which locates the proposed activity or activities applied for at an appropriate scale, or, if it is- (i) a linear activity, a description and coordinates of the corridor in which the proposed activity or activities is to be undertaken; or (ii) on land where the property has not been defined, the coordinates within which the activity is to be undertaken;	5
(d) a description of the scope of the proposed activity, including- (i) all listed and specified activities triggered;	6.2

Content Requirements	Applicable Section
(ii) a description of the activities to be undertaken, including associated structures and infrastructure;	
(e) a description of the policy and legislative context within which the development is located and an explanation of how the proposed development complies with and responds to the legislation and policy context;	10
(f) a motivation for the need and desirability for the proposed development, including the need and desirability of the activity in the context of the preferred development footprint within the approved site as contemplated in the accepted scoping report;	12
(g) a motivation for the preferred development footprint within the approved site as contemplated in the accepted scoping report;	13
(h) a full description of the process followed to reach the proposed development footprint within the approved site as contemplated in the accepted scoping report, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) details of all the alternatives considered; (ii) details of the public participation process undertaken in terms of regulation 41 of the Regulations, including copies of the supporting documents and inputs; (iii) a summary of the issues raised by interested and affected parties, and an indication of the manner in which the issues were incorporated, or the reasons for not including them; (iv) the environmental attributes associated with the alternatives focusing on the geographical, physical, biological, social, economic, heritage and cultural aspects; (v) the impacts and risks identified including the nature, significance, consequence, extent, duration and probability of the impacts, including the degree to which these impacts— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (aa) can be reversed; (bb) may cause irreplaceable loss of resources; and (cc) can be avoided, managed or mitigated; (vi) the methodology used in determining and ranking the nature, significance, consequences, extent, duration and probability of potential environmental impacts and risks; (vii) positive and negative impacts that the proposed activity and alternatives will have on the environment and on the community that may be affected focusing on the geographical, physical, biological, social, economic, heritage and cultural aspects; (viii) the possible mitigation measures that could be applied and level of residual risk; (ix) if no alternatives, including alternative locations for the activity were investigated, the motivation for not considering such and (x) a concluding statement indicating the location of the preferred alternative development footprint within the approved site as contemplated in the accepted scoping report; 	14
(i) a full description of the process undertaken to identify, assess and rank the impacts the activity and associated structures and infrastructure will impose on the preferred development footprint on the approved site as contemplated in the accepted scoping report through the life of the activity, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a description of all environmental issues and risks that were identified during the environmental impact assessment process; and (ii) an assessment of the significance of each issue and risk and an indication of the extent to which the issue and risk could be avoided or addressed by the adoption of mitigation measures; 	14.3 Appendix 7

Content Requirements	Applicable Section
(j) an assessment of each identified potentially significant impact and risk, including— (i) cumulative impacts; (ii) the nature, significance and consequences of the impact and risk; (iii) the extent and duration of the impact and risk; (iv) the probability of the impact and risk occurring; (v) the degree to which the impact and risk can be reversed; (vi) the degree to which the impact and risk may cause irreplaceable loss of resources; and (vii) the degree to which the impact and risk can be mitigated;	14.3
(k) where applicable, a summary of the findings and recommendations of any specialist report complying with Appendix 6 to these Regulations and an indication as to how these findings and recommendations have been included in the final assessment report;	16
(l) an environmental impact statement which contains— (i) a summary of the key findings of the environmental impact assessment; (ii) a map at an appropriate scale which superimposes the proposed activity and its associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the preferred development footprint on the approved site as contemplated in the accepted scoping report indicating any areas that should be avoided, including buffers; and (iii) a summary of the positive and negative impacts and risks of the proposed activity and identified alternatives;	17
(m) based on the assessment, and where applicable, recommendations from specialist reports, the recording of proposed impact management outcomes for the development for inclusion in the EMPr as well as for inclusion as conditions of authorisation;	18
(n) the final proposed alternatives which respond to the impact management measures, avoidance, and mitigation measures identified through the assessment;	19
(o) any aspects which were conditional to the findings of the assessment either by the EAP or specialist which are to be included as conditions of authorisation;	20
(p) a description of any assumptions, uncertainties and gaps in knowledge which relate to the assessment and mitigation measures proposed;	21
(q) a reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity should or should not be authorised, and if the opinion is that it should be authorised, any conditions that should be made in respect of that authorisation;	22
(r) where the proposed activity does not include operational aspects, the period for which the environmental authorisation is required and the date on which the activity will be concluded and the post construction monitoring requirements finalised;	22
(s) an undertaking under oath or affirmation by the EAP in relation to- (i) the correctness of the information provided in the report; (ii) the inclusion of comments and inputs from stakeholders and interested and affected parties; and (iii) the inclusion of inputs and recommendations from the specialist reports where relevant; and (iv) any information provided by the EAP to interested and affected parties and any responses by the EAP to comments or inputs made by interested or affected parties;	Appendix 1
(t) where applicable, details of any financial provision for the rehabilitation, closure, and ongoing post decommissioning management of negative environmental impacts;	n/a
(u) an indication of any deviation from the approved scoping report, including the plan of study, including—	24

Content Requirements	Applicable Section
(i) any deviation from the methodology used in determining the significance of potential environmental impacts and risks; and (ii) a motivation for the deviation;	
(v) any specific information required by the competent authority; and	25
(w) any other matter required in terms of section 24(4)(a) and (b) of the Act.	All requirements have been met in this report.
(2) Where a government notice gazetted by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a scoping report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.	All requirements have been met in this report.

2. PROJECT TITLE

Proposed Development of the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 and Associated Infrastructure near Fraserburg in the Northern Cape Province

3. DETAILS OF APPLICANT

3.1 Name and contact details of the Applicant

Name and contact details of Applicant:

Table 2: Name and contact details of the applicant

Business Name of Applicant	Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd
Physical Address	22 Kildare Road, Newlands, Cape Town, South Africa
Postal Address	Same as physical address
Postal Code	7700
Telephone	083 499 0433
Fax	N/A
Email	terrence@elueenergy.co.za

4. DETAILS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER AND SPECIALISTS

4.1 Name and contact details of the Environmental Consultant

The table below provides the name and contact details of the Environmental Consultants who prepared this report:

Table 3: Name and contact details of the Environmental Consultant who prepared the report

Business Name of EAP	SiVEST SA (PTY) Ltd
Physical Address	4 Pencarrow Crescent, La Lucia Ridge Office Estate
Postal Address	PO Box 1899, Umhlanga Rocks
Postal Code	4320
Telephone	031 581 1500
Fax	031 566 2371

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

Prepared by:



Project No. 16891
Description Klipkraal WEF 1
Revision No. 1.0

Date: March 2023

Page 7 of 82

Email	luvanyan@sivest.co.za
-------	--

4.2 Names and expertise of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)

The table below provides the names of the EAP's who prepared this report:

Table 4: Names and details of the expertise of the EAP's involved in the preparation of this report

Name of the EAP representative	of	Educational Qualifications	Professional Affiliations	Experience (years)
Michelle Nevette (<i>Cert.Sci.Nat.</i>)		MEnvMgt. (Environmental Management)	SACNASP Registration No. 120356 EAPASA Registration No. 2019/1560 IAIA	19
Luvanya Naidoo (<i>Pr.Sci.Nat</i>)		BSc Hons Environmental Monitoring & Modelling	SACNASP Registration No. 126107 EAPASA Registration No. 2019/1404 IAIA	12
Michelle Guy (<i>Pr.Sci.Nat</i>)		MSc Environmental Science	SACNASP Registration No. 126338 EAPASA Registration No. 2019/868 IAIA	9

CV's of SiVEST personnel and the EAP declaration are attached in **Appendix 1**.

4.3 Names and expertise of the specialists

The table below provides the names of the specialists involved in the project:

Table 5: Names of specialists involved in the project

Company	Name of representative of the specialist	Specialist	Educational Qualifications	Experience (years)
Johann Lanz	Johann Lanz	Agricultural	MSc Environmental Geochemistry Pr.Sci.Nat	24
GCS Water and Environment (Pty) Ltd	Magnus van Rooyen	Aquatic	MPhil Environmental Management Pr.Sci.Nat	18
Chris van Rooyen Consulting	Chris van Rooyen	Avifaunal	BA LLB	22
Animalia Consultants (Pty) Ltd	Werner Marais	Bat	MSc Biodiversity and Conservation Pr.Sci.Nat (Zoological Science)	
3Foxes Biodiversity	Simon Todd	Terrestrial Ecology	MSc (Conservation Biology) Pr.Sci.Nat 400425/11	20
PGS Heritage Pty Ltd	Nicole (Nikki) Mann	Heritage	MSc Archaeology Professional Archaeologist (ASAPA)	7
SAFETECH	Dr Brett Williams	Noise	PHD Registered Occupational Hygienist	26
SiVEST SA (Pty) Ltd	Merchand Le Maitre	Transportation	BTech Civil Engineering ECSA Pr Tech Eng	16
Bapela Cave Klapwijk	Menno Klapwijk	Visual	BL Land Arch South African Council for the Landscape Architectural Professions	37
Synergy	Nondumiso Bulunga	Social	Masters in Geographical Information Systems	8

5. LOCATION OF THE ACTIVITY

The proposed WEF is located approximately 30 km south-east of Fraserburg in the Northern Cape Province and is within the Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality, in the Namakwa District Municipality.

5.1 21 Digit Surveyor General Codes and Farm names of the sites

Table 6: 21 Digit Surveyor General Code

SG CODE	DESCRIPTION
C03600000000040900000	THE FARM MATJESFONTEIN NO. 409 (RE/409)
C03600000000044700000	THE FARM KLIPFONTEIN NO. 447 (RE/44)
C03600000000044700001	THE FARM KLIPFONTEIN NO. 447 (1/447)

5.2 Coordinates of the site

The centre point coordinates for the sites are as follows:

- Latitude: 32°4'51.11"S
- Longitude: 21°46'1.91"E




Figure 3: Site locality

The centre point coordinates of the site have been included below:

Table 7: Coordinates for the Klipkraal WEF 1 site boundary

KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: APPLICATION SITE		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 2' 31.740" S	21° 45' 13.504" E

2	32° 3' 21.633" S	21° 45' 26.419" E
3	32° 3' 54.892" S	21° 46' 20.466" E
4	32° 4' 54.566" S	21° 44' 52.199" E
5	32° 5' 55.486" S	21° 44' 39.559" E
6	32° 5' 43.813" S	21° 45' 36.500" E
7	32° 5' 42.999" S	21° 46' 2.836" E
8	32° 5' 45.977" S	21° 46' 35.192" E
9	32° 5' 48.890" S	21° 46' 51.068" E
10	32° 5' 50.353" S	21° 47' 2.594" E
11	32° 5' 5.545" S	21° 46' 54.549" E
12	32° 4' 15.073" S	21° 47' 6.391" E
13	32° 3' 24.744" S	21° 46' 8.190" E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
14	32° 4'51.11"S	21°46'1.91"E

The substation coordinates have been included below:

Table 8: Supporting Infrastructure coordinates

KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: SUBSTATION		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 4'27.83"S	21°46'59.66"E
2	32° 4'28.43"S	21°47'3.43"E
3	32° 4'33.91"S	21°47'2.21"E
4	32° 4'33.52"S	21°46'58.26"E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
5	32° 4'31.09"S	21°47'0.87"E
KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: BESS		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 4'27.49"S	21°46'57.32"E
2	32° 4'27.92"S	21°46'59.54"E
3	32° 4'33.41"S	21°46'58.35"E
4	32° 4'33.14"S	21°46'56.26"E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
5	32° 4'30.70"S	21°46'57.87"E
KLIPKRAAL WEF 1: OFFICES AND BUILDINGS		
COORDINATES AT CORNER POINTS (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
1	32° 4'38.85"S	21°46'52.98"E
2	32° 4'39.70"S	21°47'0.83"E

3	32° 4'55.41"S	21°46'57.51"E
4	32° 4'54.86"S	21°46'49.24"E
COORDINATES AT CENTRE POINT (DD MM SS.sss)		
POINT	SOUTH	EAST
5	32° 4'47.30"S	21°46'55.13"E

6. ACTIVITY INFORMATION

6.1 Project Description

The application site assessed (which incorporates the farm portions / properties listed above) is approximately 1362 hectares (ha) in extent. At this stage it is anticipated that the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 will comprise up to sixty (60) wind turbines with a maximum total energy generation capacity of up to approximately 300 MWac. In summary, the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 development will include the following components:

Wind Turbines:

- Approximately 60 turbines, between 5MWac and 8MWac, with a maximum export capacity of up to approximately 300MWac. This will be subject to allowable limits in terms of the Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Procurement Programme (REIPPPP) or any other program.
- The final number of turbines and layout of the wind farm will, however, be dependent on the outcome of the Specialist Studies in the EIA phase of the project;
- Each wind turbine will have a maximum hub height of up to approximately 200m;
- Each wind turbine will have a maximum rotor diameter of up to approximately 200m;
- Permanent compacted hardstanding areas / platforms (also known as crane pads) of approximately 100m x 100m (total footprint of approx. 10 000m²) per wind turbine during construction and for on-going maintenance purposes for the lifetime of the proposed wind farm projects. This will however depend on the physical size of the wind turbine;
- Each wind turbine will consist of a foundation (i.e. foundation rings) which may vary in depth, from approximately 3m and up to 10m or greater, depending on the physical size of each wind turbine. It should be noted that the foundation can be up to as much as approximately 700m³;

Electrical Transformers:

- Electrical transformers will be constructed near the foot of each respective wind turbine in order to step up the voltage to 66kV.
- The typical footprint of the electrical transformers is up to approximately 10m x 10m, but can be up to 20m x 20m at certain locations;

Step-up / Collector Substations:

- One 11-66/132-400kV step-up / collector substation, each occupying an area of up to approximately 2ha,
- The proposed substation will include an Eskom portion and an Independent Power Producer (IPP) portion, hence the substation has been included in this EIA and in the grid connection infrastructure

BA (separate application - substations, switching stations and power lines) to allow for handover to Eskom.

- Following construction, the substation will be owned and managed by Eskom. The current applicant will retain control of the medium voltage components (i.e. 33kV components) of the substation, while the high voltage components (i.e. 400kV components) of the substation will likely be ceded to Eskom shortly after the completion of construction;

Main Transmission Substations (MTS):

- One (1) new 132/400kV Main Transmission Substation (MTS) is being proposed, occupying an area of up to approximately 120ha.
- The proposed MTS will include an Eskom portion and an IPP portion.
- Following construction, the substation will be owned and managed by Eskom. The current applicant will retain control of the 132-400kV and lower voltage components of each MTS, while the 132/400kV voltage components of the MTS will likely be ceded to Eskom shortly after the completion of construction;

Electrical Infrastructure:

- The wind turbines will be connected to the proposed substation via medium voltage (i.e. 33kV) cables.
- These cables will be buried along access roads wherever technically feasible, however, the cables can also be overhead (if required);
- Each WEF will then connect to the MTS via an up to 400kV powerline.

Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS):

- One (1) Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will be constructed for the wind farm and will be located next to the 33-66/132-400kV step-up / collector substations which form part of the respective wind farms, or in between the wind turbines.
- It is anticipated that the type of technology will be either Lithium Ion or Sodium-Sulphur (or as determined prior to construction).
- These batteries are not considered hazardous goods as they will be storing 'energy'.
- The size, storage capacity and type of technology will be determined / confirmed prior to construction. This information will be provided to I&AP's prior to the commencement of construction.

Roads:

- Internal roads with a temporary width of up to approximately 15m will provide access to the location of each wind turbine. These roads will be rehabilitated back to 8m once construction has been completed.
- Existing site roads will be used wherever possible, although new site roads will be constructed where necessary.
- Existing site roads may also be upgraded using temporary concrete stones in order to accommodate for the heavy loads.
- Turns will have a radius of up to 50m for abnormal loads (especially turbine blades) to access the various wind turbine positions.

Site Access:

- The proposed wind farm application site will be accessed via existing gravel roads from the R353 Regional Route;

Temporary Staging Areas:

- A temporary staging area will be required for the wind farm and will be located both at the foot of each wind turbine and at the storage facility (i.e. turbine development area) to allow for working requirements.
- One (1) temporary staging area per wind turbine / range of wind turbines will be required.
- Temporary staging areas will cover an area of up to approximately 100m x 100m (10 000m² / 1ha) each;

Temporary Construction Camps:

- One (1) temporary construction camp will be required during the construction phase for the wind farm.
- This area will be used as a permanent maintenance area during the operational phase.
- The combined Temporary Construction Camp / Permanent Maintenance Area will cover an area of up to approximately 2.25ha.
- A cement batching plant as well as a chemical storage area will fall within the Temporary Construction Camp and Permanent Maintenance Area.
- The Temporary Construction Camp and Permanent Maintenance Area will be strategically placed within the proposed wind farm site and will avoid all high sensitivity and/or 'no-go' areas;

Offices, Accommodation, a Visitors' Centre and Operation & Maintenance (O&M) Buildings:

- An office (including ablution facilities), accommodation (including ablution facilities), a Visitors' Centre and an Operation & Maintenance (O&M) building will be required and will occupy areas of up to approximately 100m x 100m (i.e. 1ha).
- Each wind farm (i.e. each phase) will have its own O&M building and Office, however, the Accommodation and Visitors' Centre will be centralised locations which will be shared between certain wind farm projects (i.e. shared between certain phases which will be confirmed at a later stage);

Septic Tank and Soak-Away Systems:

- The proposed wind farm will consist of a septic tank and soak-away system.
- This will be required for construction as well as long term use.
- The septic tank and soak-away system will be placed 100m or more from water resource (which includes boreholes);

Fencing:

- Fencing will be required and will surround the wind farm.
- The maximum height of the fencing as well as the area which the fencing will cover will be confirmed during the detailed design phase, prior to construction commencing.
- Fences will however be constructed according to specifications recommended by the Ecologist and Avifauna specialist (and as per the EMPr);

Temporary Infrastructure to Obtain Water from Available Local Sources:

- Temporary infrastructure to obtain water from available local sources will be required. Water may also be obtained from onsite boreholes and from the town of Fraserburg.
- New or existing boreholes, including a potential temporary above ground pipeline (approximately 50cm in diameter) for each wind farm, to feed water to the sites are being proposed.
- Water will potentially be stored in temporary water storage tanks.
- The necessary approvals from the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) will be applied for separately (should this be required); and

Temporary Containers:

- Temporary containers of up to approximately 80m³ will be required for the storage of fuel on-site during the construction phase of the wind farm.
The chemical storage area will fall within the Temporary Construction Camp and permanent Maintenance Area.

Please refer to the section below for a description of the typical components of a wind turbine.




Figure 4: Typical components of a Wind Turbine

6.1.1 Final Proposed Layout and Technical Detail Summary

The Final Proposed Layout is reflected below in **Figure 8** and attached in **Appendix 3**. Photographs of the site are included in **Appendix 4**.




Figure 5: Final layout showing proposed location of wind turbines

The wind turbines and all other project infrastructure have been placed strategically within the development area based on environmental constraints and sensitivity findings.

A summary of the project technical details is provided in **Table 9** below.

Table 9: Technical Detail Summary

Component	Description / Dimensions
Location of site (centre point)	32° 4'51.11"S 21° 46'1.91"E
Application site area	1362 ha
Total Klipkraal WEF area	Approximately 6507ha
Turbine development area	Turbine Foundation Area = 45m*32m*60 turbines = 8.6 Ha
SG codes	C02600000000040900000 C02600000000044700003 C02600000000044700001
Export capacity	Up to 300MWac
Proposed technology	Wind turbines and associated infrastructure
Hub height from ground	Up to 200 m
Rotor diameter	Up to 200 m
Substation Area	Approximately 2 ha

Component	Description / Dimensions
O&M building area	Approximately 1 ha
Temporary staging area	Up to 1 ha
Permanent laydown area	To be determined based on final layout
Temporary site camp	Up to 2.25ha
Hard stand areas	700m ³ per turbine
Width of internal access roads	Approximately 15 m
Length of internal access roads	To be confirmed during the detailed design phase
Site Access	The Klipkraal WEF 1 development access point is from Road DR02312, bisecting the northern quadrant of the Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409. Road DR02312 is classified as a Class R4 in the RCAM Classification – Rural Collector Road with an average road reserve width of 20m, a gravel surface of ±6m wide, and an average speed of 80 km/h. The Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409 has one (1) existing access point emanating from Road DR02312 at Km 82.51. The access point is located on Road DR02312 within the first 10 m as the road enters the farm, travelling west to east.
Proximity to grid connection	Approximately 70km from application site
Height of fencing (for substation)	To be confirmed during the detailed design phase, Eskom specifications.
Type of fencing (for substation)	To be confirmed during the detailed design phase, Eskom specifications.

6.2 NEMA Listed Activities

The amended EIA Regulations promulgated under Section 24(5) of the National Environmental Management Act, Act 107 of 1998 and published in Government Notice No. R. 326 list activities which may not commence without environmental authorization from the Competent Authority. The proposed activity is identified in terms of Government Notice No. R. 327, 325 and 324 for activities which must follow a full Environmental Impact Assessment Process. The project will trigger the following listed activities:

Table 10: Listed activities in terms of NEMA: EIA Regulations 2014 (as amended in 2017), applicable to the proposed project

Activity No(s):	Relevant Basic Assessment Activity(ies) as set out in Listing Notice 1 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended	Description
11 (i)	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 11: The development of facilities or infrastructure for the transmission and distribution of electricity— (i) outside urban areas or industrial complexes with a capacity of more than 33 but less than 275 kilovolts.	New switching / collector substations and Main Transmission Substations (MTS) will be constructed as part of the proposed wind farm project. The proposed substations will be located outside urban areas. The switching / collector substations will have capacities of 33/132kV, while the MTS will have capacities of 132/400kV.
12 (ii) (a) (c)	GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 12: The development of:	The proposed wind farm projects will entail the construction of WEF, buildings and

	<p>ii) infrastructure or structures with a physical footprint of 100 square metres or more;</p> <p>where such development occurs-</p> <p>(a) within a watercourse;</p> <p>(c) if no development setback exists, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse.</p>	<p>other infrastructure (including the 11-66kv/132-400kv shared on-site substation and BESS) with physical footprints of approximately 100m² or more within a surface water feature / watercourse or within 32m of a surface water feature / watercourse. The infrastructure/structures associated with the proposed projects will most likely avoid the identified surface water features / watercourses where possible, although some infrastructure or structures will occur within a surface water feature / watercourse and/or within 32m of a surface water feature / watercourse.</p>
19	<p>GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 19: The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from a watercourse;</p>	<p>The proposed wind farm project will likely involve the excavation, removal, infilling, depositing and moving of more than 10 cubic metres (m³) of soil, sand, pebbles or rock from some of the identified surface water features / watercourses.</p> <p>Although the layout of the proposed wind farm project will be designed to avoid the identified surface water features / watercourses as far as possible, some of the infrastructure, internal and/or access roads may need to traverse the identified surface water features / watercourses. In addition, during construction, soil may need to be removed from some of the identified surface water features / watercourses.</p>
28 (ii)	<p>GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 28: Residential, mixed, retail, commercial, industrial or institutional developments where such land was used for agriculture, game farming, equestrian purposes or afforestation on or after 01 April 1998 and where such development:</p> <p>(ii) will occur outside an urban area, where the total land to be developed is bigger than 1 hectare;</p>	<p>The proposed wind farm project sites are currently zoned for agricultural land use. The proposed wind farm projects will result in special zoning being required, as an area greater than 1ha outside an urban area, will be transformed into industrial / commercial use.</p>
48 (i) (a) (c)	<p>GN R. 327 (as amended) Item 48: The expansion of-</p> <p>(i) infrastructure or structures where the physical footprint is expanded by 100 square metres or more;</p> <p>where such expansion occurs—</p> <p>(a) within a watercourse; or</p> <p>(c) if no development setback exists, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse;</p>	<p>The proposed wind farm projects will most likely entail the expansion (upgrading) of roads and other infrastructure by 100m² or more within a surface water feature / watercourse or within 32m from the edge of a surface water feature / watercourse.</p> <p>Although the layouts of the proposed wind farm projects will be designed to avoid the identified surface water features / watercourses as far as possible, some of the internal and access roads/services to be upgraded will likely need to traverse the identified surface water features /</p>

		watercourses and construction will likely occur within some of the surface water features / watercourses and/or be within 32m of some of the surface water features / watercourses.
56 (ii)	<p>GN R. 327 Item 56: The widening of a road by more than 6 metres, or the lengthening of a road by more than 1 kilometre -</p> <p>(i) where the existing reserve is wider than 13,5 metres; or</p> <p>(ii) where no reserve exists, where the existing road is wider than 8 metres –</p>	Internal access roads will be required to access the wind turbines as well as the respective substations. Existing roads will be used wherever possible, although new roads will be constructed where necessary. The existing access roads might thus need to be upgraded by widening them more than 6m, or by lengthening them by more than 1 kilometre (km).
Activity No(s):	Relevant Scoping and EIA Activity(ies) as set out in Listing Notice 2 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended	Description
1	<p>GN R. 325 (as amended) Item 1: The development of facilities or infrastructure for the generation of electricity from a renewable resource where the electricity output is 20 megawatts or more, excluding where such development of facilities or infrastructure is for photovoltaic installations and occurs –</p> <p>(a) within an urban area; or</p> <p>(b) on existing infrastructure</p>	The proposed development will entail the construction of a WEF where the respective electricity output will be approximately 300MWac. In addition, the proposed WEF developments will be located outside urban areas.
15	<p>GN R. 325 (as amended) Item 15: The clearance of an area of 20 hectares or more of indigenous vegetation, excluding where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for —</p> <p>(i) the undertaking of a linear activity; or</p> <p>(ii) maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan..</p>	The proposed WEF development will involve the clearance of more than 20ha of indigenous vegetation. Clearance will also be required for the proposed substations, internal access roads and other associated infrastructure and buildings.
Activity No(s):	Relevant Basic Assessment Activity(ies) as set out in Listing Notice 3 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended	Description
4 (g) (ii) (ee)	<p>GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 4: The development of a road wider than 4 metres with a reserve less than 13,5 metres.</p> <p>g. Northern Cape</p> <p>ii. Outside urban areas;</p> <p>(ee) Critical biodiversity areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans.</p>	<p>The development of the WEF facilities and associated infrastructures will require the development of roads wider than 4m with a reserve of less than 13.5m within CBA 2 and an ESA.</p> <p>These roads will occur within the Northern Cape Province, outside urban areas.</p>
12 (g) (ii)	<p>GN R. 985 (as amended) Item 12: The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan.</p> <p>g. Northern Cape</p>	The proposed development will entail the construction of the WEF and associated infrastructure (cabling and roads) with physical footprints of approximately 300m ² or more within CBA 2 and an ESA. As such, approximately 300m ² or more of indigenous vegetation will be cleared as part of the respective proposed developments.

	ii. Within critical biodiversity areas identified in bioregional plans;	
14 ii. (a) (c) g (ii) (ff)	<p>GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 14: The development of—</p> <p>(ii) infrastructure or structures with a physical footprint of 10 square metres or more;</p> <p>where such development occurs—</p> <p>(a) within a watercourse;</p> <p>(b) in front of a development setback; or</p> <p>(c) if no development setback has been adopted, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse;</p> <p>excluding the development of infrastructure or structures within existing ports or harbours that will not increase the development footprint of the port or harbour.</p> <p>g. Northern Cape</p> <p>i. Outside urban areas:</p> <p>(ff) Critical biodiversity areas or ecosystem service areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans;</p>	<p>The proposed development will entail the development of infrastructure or structures with physical footprints of 10m² or more within a watercourse / surface water feature or within 32m from the edge of a watercourse / surface water feature.</p> <p>Although the layouts of the respective proposed developments will be designed to avoid the identified surface water features / watercourse as far as possible, some of the infrastructure / structures will need to traverse the identified surface water features / watercourses.</p> <p>The construction of the infrastructure (MV cabling and roads) for the development will occur within Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) located outside of urban areas.</p>
18 g (ii) (ee)	<p>GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 18: The widening of a road by more than 4 meters, or the lengthening of a road by more than 1 kilometer-</p> <p>g. Northern Cape</p> <p>ii. Outside urban areas:</p> <p>(ee) Critical biodiversity areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans;</p> <p>(ii) Areas within a watercourse or wetland; or within 100m from the edge of a watercourse or wetland.</p>	<p>Internal access roads will be required to access the wind turbines as well as the respective substations. Existing roads will be used wherever possible. Internal access roads will thus be widened by more than 4m or lengthened by more than 1km. These roads will occur within the Northern Cape Province, outside urban areas. The widening of the roads will occur within CBAs and or within 100m from the edge of a watercourse or wetland.</p>
23 ii (a) (c) (g) (ii) (ee)	<p>GN R. 324 (as amended) Item 23: The expansion of—</p> <p>(ii) infrastructure or structures where the physical footprint is expanded by 10 square metres or more;</p> <p>where such expansion occurs—</p> <p>(a) within a watercourse;</p> <p>(b) in front of a development setback adopted in the prescribed manner; or</p> <p>(c) if no development setback has been adopted, within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse;</p>	<p>The proposed development will entail the development and expansion of roads and other infrastructure or structures by 10m² or more within a surface water feature / watercourse or within 32m from the edge of a surface water feature / watercourse.</p> <p>Although the layout of the proposed development will be designed to avoid the identified surface water features / watercourses as far as possible, some of the existing internal and access roads will need to traverse some of the identified surface water features / watercourses.</p>

	<p>excluding the expansion of infrastructure or structures within existing ports or harbours that will not increase the development footprint of the port or harbour.</p> <p>g. Northern Cape ii. Outside urban areas: (ee) Critical biodiversity areas as identified in systematic biodiversity plans adopted by the competent authority or in bioregional plans;</p>	<p>The proposed development occurs within CBA 2 and an ESA, and are located outside urban areas.</p>
--	---	--

7. NATIONAL WEB-BASED ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING TOOL

The National Web based Environmental Screening Tool is a geographically based web-enabled application which allows a proponent intending to submit an application for environmental authorisation in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2014, as amended to screen their proposed site for any environmental sensitivity.

According to the DFFE Screening Tool Report (attached in **Appendix 9**), the following themes described in **Table 11** below are applicable to the proposed development:

Table 11: DFFE Screening Tool Environmental Sensitivity

Theme	Sensitivity	Comment
Agriculture Theme	Medium	<p>The Agricultural Compliance Statement is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>The agricultural sensitivity, as identified by the screening tool, has been confirmed by the specialist. The motivation for confirming the medium sensitivity is predominantly that the climate data (low rainfall of approximately 168 to 179 mm per annum and high evaporation of approximately 1,320 to 1,360 mm per annum) proves the area to be very arid, and therefore of limited land capability.</p>
Animal Species Theme	Medium	<p>The Terrestrial Ecological Report is included Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the report, in terms of the site verification, the presence of the Riverine Rabbit has been confirmed on the Klipkraal site through camera trapping but was not detected within the Klipkraal 1 development area. As the field assessment indicates that there is very little potentially suitable habitat for the Riverine Rabbit within the Klipkraal 1 development area, it is considered to be low sensitivity for this species. The field verification however confirmed that the site includes suitable habitat for the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. While no</p>

Theme	Sensitivity	Comment
		<p>specimens of this species were observed within site despite extensive searching, the presence of historical records from the area and the presence of suitable habitat are considered sufficient to confirm the likely presence of this species within the site. As such a full assessment for the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise is required (attached in Appendix 6).</p> <p>In terms of fauna of concern that may be present on the site, but which are not listed under the DFFE Screening Tool, several different species are potentially present on the site including Mountain Reedbuck <i>Redunca fulvorufula</i> (EN), Black-footed Cat <i>Felis nigripes</i> (VU), Grey Rhebok <i>Pelea capreolus</i> (NT), and Brown Hyena <i>Hyaena brunnea</i> (NT). Extensive camera trapping was conducted across the site and since none of these species have been detected within the site, it is considered to be low sensitivity for these species.</p>
Aquatic Biodiversity Theme	Very High	<p>The Aquatic Ecological Report is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>It is the specialist's opinion that the Aquatic Theme of the site is considered to be of Low Significance.</p>
Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Theme	Low	<p>The Heritage Report is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the heritage specialist, the low rating as provided by the Environmental Screening Tool possibly reflects scarcity of heritage reports conducted in the region. The field work that was conducted in the study area demonstrates that there are in fact some heritage resources of heritage significance that warrant conservation. Therefore, a full Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken for the Klipkraal WEF 1 project.</p>
Avian (Wind) Theme	Low	<p>The Avifaunal Report is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the report, the project area of impact contains confirmed habitat for species of conservation concern (SCC) as defined in the Protocol for the specialist assessment and minimum report content requirements for environmental impacts on terrestrial animal species (Government Gazette No 43855, 30 October 2020). The occurrence of SCC was confirmed during the integrated pre-construction monitoring programme, with observations of Ludwig's Bustard, Karoo Korhaan, Martial Eagle, Verreaux's</p>

Theme	Sensitivity	Comment
		Eagle and Black Stork recorded within the PAOI and its immediate surrounds. Based on the field surveys to date, the specialist has recommended a classification of High sensitivity for avifauna in the screening tool is therefore appropriate.
Bats (Wind) Theme	High	<p>The Bat Report is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>The bat sensitivity map produced by the specialist, share similarities to the screening tool sensitivities with regards to the identification of several water courses and open water sources as high sensitivity areas. However, additional watercourses, rocky cliffs and koppies have been identified as additional high sensitivities by the Specialist. The sensitivities identified in the Specialist assessment have been verified against the National Environmental Screening Tool.</p>
Civil Aviation (Wind) Theme	Low	The closest airport is the Kenhardt Aerodrome, located approximately 26.5 km from the site.
Defence (Wind) Theme	Low	The entire site has a low sensitivity in terms of the defence theme. No further specialist study required.
Flicker Theme	Very High	<p>To ensure that Shadow Flicker Impacts (SFI) do not take place, a SFI needs to be undertaken for any turbines located within 1km from the inhabited settlements.</p> <p>The Visual Assessment is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the specialist, the Screening Tool report provided a Flicker Theme Sensitivity map that showed areas of low sensitivity and very high sensitivity, which specifically relate to areas with “potential temporarily or permanently inhabited residence”. This coincided with the information obtained from Google Earth in terms of homesteads and structures. However, several of the homesteads appeared to be unoccupied or even abandoned. If this is the case the issue regarding flicker would not be applicable to all these dwellings.</p>
Landscape (Wind) Theme	Very High	<p>The Visual Assessment is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the report, landscape themes do not relate specifically to the visual impact except for the more aesthetically pleasing mountain tops and high ridges as well as rivers and wetlands. The flatter slopes and the low vegetation increase the visual sensitivity of the area. The mountains are</p>

Theme	Sensitivity	Comment
		experienced below the plateau on the visual periphery and are generally not visible from the study area. The study area is not regarded as having a high visual quality when compared to other areas in the region such as the Swartberg Mountains, Meiringspoort and the mountains around Beaufort West and the Karoo National Park but it does display the typical and iconic Karoo landscape.
Palaeontology Theme	Very High	<p>The Palaeontological Report is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>The Site Sensitivities of the proposed Klipkraal WEF 2 has been verified and it was found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SAHRIS Palaeosensitivity map indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the development is Very High to unknown. • The National Environmental Web-based Screening Tool indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the development is Very High to Medium. <p>These maps indicate that the proposed WEF development is highly Sensitive from a Palaeontological point of view. A site investigation in the spring of 2021 uncovered various fossiliferous sites, where fossils were found to be well-preserved. This classification is thus confirmed to be accurate (National Environmental Web-based Screening Tool and SAHRIS) as far as the impact of the Klipkraal WEF 2 is concerned, based on actual conditions recorded on the ground during the site visit in the spring of 2022.</p>
Noise Theme	Very High	<p>The Noise Site Sensitivity Verification Report is included in Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the report, the site visit confirmed the location of the Noise Sensitive Areas identified in the DFFE screening tool. Additional NSA's were also identified by the specialist.</p>
Plant Species Theme	Medium	<p>The Terrestrial Ecological Report and Plant Species Compliance Statement is included Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>According to the specialist, the DFFE Screening Tool indicates that there are several potential botanical sensitivities from the Klipkraal 1 study area. None of these species were observed at the site and it is</p>

Theme	Sensitivity	Comment
		unlikely that any of these species are present but were not observed. As such, The Klipkraal 1 site is considered to be low sensitivity for the Plant Species Theme.
RFI (Wind Theme)	Very High	<p>The screening tool described the study area as very high Radio Frequency Interference Theme (RFI) sensitivity due to the cluster falling within the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) Karoo Central Radio Astronomy Advantage Area 1 buffer.</p> <p>Based on correspondence received from SARAO, it was determined that the Klipkraal WEF 1 represents a low risk of interference to the SKA radio telescope with a compliance surplus of 9.84 dBm/Hz for the project site within the KCAAA1. SARAO therefore did not require an EMC Control Plan and had no objection to the development.</p>
Terrestrial Biodiversity Theme	Very High	<p>The Terrestrial Ecological Report is included Appendix 6 of the Final EIA Report.</p> <p>The overall combined Terrestrial Biodiversity theme indicates that the site consists largely of low sensitivity areas with some areas of Very High sensitivity along the margins of the affected area, associated with areas classified as CBA 2, ESA and FEPA Subcatchments. Since these are anthropogenic conservation planning-based features, it is not possible to verify these features in the field, apart from an assessment of their condition and characteristics. Based on the presence of these features within the site, a full terrestrial biodiversity assessment is required (attached in Appendix 6).</p>

8. DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

8.1 Geographical

The proposed WEF is located approximately 30 km south-east of Fraserburg in the Northern Cape Province and is within the Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality, in the Namakwa District Municipality. The regional context of the proposed application site is shown in **Figure 9** below.




Figure 6: Regional context

8.2 Land Use

According to the South African National Land Cover dataset (2018), much of the assessment area is classified as “Bare / Barren Land”, interspersed with areas of “Low shrubland (nama Karoo)” (Figure 10). In most cases these patches of land are undisturbed areas with very sparse vegetation cover. The study area is an extensive flat plain with minimal relief (Figure 11 and 12).




Figure 7: Land Cover Classification



Figure 8: Typical site area



Figure 9: Typical site area

8.3 Climate

The study site experiences low rainfall of approximately 110mm per annum, with the major rainfall months being in the summer months (December to April). The Koppen-Geiger Climate Zones (2071 – 2100) classifies the climate in the area as arid, desert, and cold. At Fraserburg, the summers are hot; the winters are cold; and it is dry, windy, and mostly clear year-round. Over the course of the year, the temperature typically varies from 1°C to 31°C and is rarely below -3°C or above 35°C.

The average hourly wind speed at Fraserburg experiences mild seasonal variation over the course of the year. The windier part of the year lasts for approximately 8 months, from May to January, with average wind speeds of more than 18km per hour. The windiest month of the year at Fraserburg is July, with an average hourly wind speed of approximately 20km per hour.

The calmer time of year lasts for approximately 3 months, from January to May. The calmest month of the year at Fraserburg is March, with an average hourly wind speed of approximately 16km per hour. (<https://weatherspark.com/y/150028/Average-Weather-at-Fraserburg-South-Africa-Year-Round>)

8.4 Topography

The project site is located immediately north of the border between the Western Cape and the Northern Cape Provinces. The Klipkraal se Berg (altitude of 1 907m) and the Skurwekop (altitude 1 599m) are the two dominant topographical features in the area and are located to the south of the project site with an unnamed ridge line located at the northern extremity of the site which reaches a height of approximately 1 400m. The areas between these two high-lying features is relatively flat falling in a northerly direction.

8.5 Aquatic/Freshwater Resource Assessment

An Aquatic Ecological Study was undertaken by GCS (report dated 14 December 2022).

8.5.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the assessment, there are two freshwater biodiversity conservation mapping initiatives of relevance to the study area, these are the National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas (NFEPA) and

the 2016 Northern Cape Critical Biodiversity Areas. The NFEPA are intended to provide strategic spatial priorities for conserving South Africa's freshwater ecosystem and supporting sustainable use of water resources.

The locations of these NFEPA Wetlands are indicated in the figure below. The wetland feature identified to the north of the study site is classified as a Channelled Valley Bottom wetland, a wetland area in the south classified as a Seep wetland and the wetland feature to the east of the site is classified as Channelled Valley Bottom wetland. These three features are identified as artificial in nature. The two wetland features that occur along the eastern boundary of the project site is classified as Depressions (pans) and are considered to be natural features.



Figure 10: Location of the NFEPA wetlands within the study area

In addition to the aquatic features that were identified in the NFEPA Database indicated in the section above, the field assessment of the property undertaken by the specialist has identified a number of additional artificial and natural aquatic features. The three aquatic features identified in the NFEPA Database were found to be farm dams and therefore artificial in nature, while a number of natural Depression wetlands (or pans) were identified within the study area. The Depression wetlands are ephemeral in nature with water accumulating in these features during rainfall events. No water flows out of these features with the primary water loss being as a result of evaporation. The location of these depression wetlands and dams are indicated in the figure below.

A number of seasonal watercourses were also identified by the specialist within the study area. According to the report, these watercourses predominantly form unnamed tributaries of the Damfontainspruit and drains towards this feature (to the east). These watercourses are very seasonal significant/detrimental transformations of the FEPA1 and Upstream prioritized sub-quaternary in nature

and will only have flow during heavy rainfall events. Years might pass between flow events in these watercourses. The location of the larger watercourses are indicated in the figure below.




Figure 11: Location of the depression wetlands (light blue) and the dams (dark blue) within the study site



Figure 12: View of a typical Depression wetland found within the study area



Figure 13: Location of the larger seasonal watercourses identified within the site



Figure 14: View of a typical seasonal watercourse occurring within the study area

8.5.2 Aquatic/Freshwater Sensitivities

Due to the water scarce nature of the area as well as the study site, the provision of buffers around the artificial and natural wetland areas as well as the watercourses must be adhered to. The primary reason for these buffers is to protect these features from any impacts that might arise from the development of the Klipkraal WEF. As such, the specialist has suggested the following:

- No turbine platforms (construction or operational) associated with the Klipkraal WEF 1 must be allowed within 40m of any watercourse on the site;
- No turbine platforms (construction or operational) associated with the Klipkraal WEF 1 must be allowed within 100m of any of the Depression wetlands or dams on the site; and
- No construction camp or operational facility must be allowed within 100m of any watercourses, Depression wetlands or dams on the site.

In addition, all watercourse crossings (access roads and other linear infrastructure) must be designed to be free draining during rainfall events and the size must be kept as small as possible to allow for adequate operations of the WEF. No infrastructure must be allowed within the delineated boundaries or within 100m of the Depression wetlands on the site. The figure below indicates the proposed extent of these buffers, the yellow lines make provision for the 100m buffers around the dams and wetland features while the green lines represent the 40m buffer around the watercourses.

Based on the above, the final proposed layout has no turbines placed within aquatic no-go areas.




Figure 15: Proposed buffers and no-go areas within the Klipkraal WEF phase 1 (yellow lines are 100m and green lines are 40m)

8.5.3 Aquatic/Freshwater Impact Assessment Conclusions

According to the Aquatic/Freshwater Assessment Report, the provided layout (revised by the screening and pre-application scoping phase inputs) has, to a large degree, avoided any sensitive aquatic features and associated buffer areas, significantly reducing the potential overall impact and risk to aquatic resources on the study site.

The specialist further added, that based on the findings of this study, there is no objection from an aquatic/freshwater perspective to the authorisation of the proposed activities assuming that all mitigation and management measures indicated in this assessment are implemented to limit the impact on the aquatic environment of the study site.

8.6 Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment

A Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment was undertaken by 3 Foxes (report dated January 2023).

8.6.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the report, the greater Klipkraal WEF site is located within a relatively heterogenous area with several vegetation types present including Eastern Upper Karoo, Western Upper Karoo, Upper Karoo Hardeveld and Southern Karoo Riviere. The open plains and low hills which comprise the majority of the Klipkraal 1 site are however relatively homogenous in terms of vegetation, with few species or habitats of concern present. These areas are considered low sensitivity in terms of vegetation and are considered suitable for the development of the wind farm. There are however, also numerous constraints operating across the site, associated largely with the drainage features of the area, Riverine Rabbit habitat and their associated applied buffers and the steep slopes and dolerite outcrops which occur across site and which represent Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat. In terms of fauna, there are several listed mammals which occur in the wider area and which would potentially be impacted by the development. This includes the Riverine Rabbit, Black-footed Cat, Brown Hyena, Grey Rhebok, Mountain Reedbuck and Karoo Padloper. The Riverine Rabbit is of greatest potential concern as it has the highest threat status and is confirmed present within the wider Klipkraal site based on camera trap observations.

8.6.2 Vegetation Types

Eastern Upper Karoo

Eastern Upper Karoo dominates the northern section of the Klipkraal 1 development area, where it occupies the typical open plains and low hills of the site. Eastern Upper Karoo has an extent of 49 821 km² and is the most extensive vegetation type in South Africa and forms a large proportion of the central and eastern Nama Karoo Biome. This vegetation type is classified as Least Threatened, and about 2% of the original extent has been transformed largely for intensive agriculture. Eastern Upper Karoo is however poorly protected and less than 1% of the 21% target has been formally conserved. Mucina & Rutherford (2006) list eight endemic species for this vegetation type, which considering that it is the most extensive unit in the country, is not very high. As a result, this is not considered to represent a sensitive vegetation type. In general, the areas of Eastern Upper Karoo are represented by large tracts of fairly homogenous landscapes of low plant diversity. Dominant and characteristic species include low woody shrubs such as *Pentzia globosa*, *Rosenia humulis*, *Asparagus capensis*, *Eriocephalus ericoides*, *Pteronia sordida*, *Pteronia incana*, *Plinthus karooicus*, *Helichrysum luciloides*, *Felicia muricata*, with a varying density of low succulent shrubs such as *Zygophyllum lichtensteinii*, *Aridaria noctiflora* and *Ruschia spinosa*, with a variable grass layer dominated by *Stipagrostis ciliata*, *Stipagrostis obtusa*, *Enneapogon desvauxii* and *Tragus berteronianus*.

Western Upper Karoo

The Western Upper Karoo vegetation type occurs in the Northern Cape Province and a small part in the Western Cape and occurs on plains from the Fish River and upper reaches of the Renoster River

in the west as far as Fraserburg and Carnarvon in the east, sandwiched between the Bushmanland Basin in the north and the Roggeveld Karoo and edges of the Great Escarpment in the south. In the southwest the dissected landscape is associated with the tributaries of the upper catchment of the Sak River (e.g. Renoster River, Riet River, Klein Sak River) and is often rocky. It is a mixture of small-leaved shrubs and shrubby succulents (*Brownanthus*, *Drosanthemum*, *Ruschia* etc.) with drought-resistant (mostly 'white') grasses a determinant feature of the vegetation structure. Within the Klipkraal site, there is not a lot of difference between the areas of Western Upper Karoo and Eastern Upper Karoo and there are not usually a distinct boundary between these vegetation types. However, in general, the lower elevation and southern, warmer areas consist of Western Upper Karoo, while the northern and colder areas consist of Eastern Upper Karoo. Common and dominant shrub species include *Lycium cinereum*, *Tripteris sinuata*, *Chrysocoma ciliata*, *Eriocephalus ericoides* subsp. *ericoides*, *Helichrysum lucilioides*, *Pentzia globosa*, *Tetragonia arbuscula*, *Asparagus capensis* var. *capensis*, *Berkheya annectens*, *Eriocephalus decussatus*, *Euryops multifidus*, *Felicia muricata*, *Hermannia cuneifolia*, *H. spinosa*, *Melolobium candicans*, *Pegolettia retrofracta*, *Pentzia incana*, *Pteronia adenocarpa*, *P. glauca*, *P. mucronata*, *P. sordida*, *Rosenia glandulosa*, *Selago albida* and *Zygophyllum microphyllum*. Succulent shrubs include *Ruschia intricata*, *Aridaria noctiflora* subsp. *straminea*, *Brownanthus ciliatus* subsp. *ciliatus*, *Drosanthemum lique*, *Euphorbia rectirama*, *Galenia sarcophylla*, *Salsola calluna*, *S. glabrescens*, *S. rabieana*, *S. tuberculata*, *Sarcocaulon patersonii* and *Psilocaulon coriarium*. Grasses include *Aristida congesta*, *Enneapogon desvauxii*, *Stipagrostis ciliata*, *S. obtusa*, *Aristida adscensionis*, *A. diffusa*, *Eragrostis obtusa*, *Fingerhuthia africana*, *Tragus berteronianus* and *T. koelerioides*. Although there are some communities present such as the halophytic plains habitat that are considered sensitive, in general, this is not considered to represent a sensitive vegetation type.

Upper Karoo Hardeveld

The areas mapped under the VegMap as Upper Karoo Hardeveld within the site are very coarsely mapped and there are some additional areas of Upper Karoo Hardeveld present within the Klipkraal Cluster that have not been mapped. The Upper Karoo Hardeveld vegetation type is associated with 11 734 km² of the steep slopes of koppies, buttes mesas and parts of the Great Escarpment covered with large boulders and stones. The vegetation type occurs as discrete areas associated with slopes and ridges from Middelpoos in the west and Strydenburg, Richmond and Nieu-Bethesda in the east, as well as most south-facing slopes and crests of the Great Escarpment between Teekloofpas and eastwards to Graaff-Reinet. Altitude varies from 1000-1900m. Mucina & Rutherford (2006) list 17 species known to be endemic to the vegetation type. This is a high number given the wide distribution of most karoo species and illustrates the relative sensitivity of this vegetation type compared to the surrounding Eastern Upper Karoo. Most of the hills, outcrops and steep slopes within the Klipkraal Cluster site consist of Upper Karoo Hardeveld and this unit has been under-mapped within the national vegetation map. This vegetation type usually consists of very rocky ground and is often associated with steep slopes, with the result that it is considered vulnerable to disturbance but is also an important habitat for fauna. It also contains a higher abundance of protected plant species than the adjacent areas of Eastern Upper Karoo. Consequently, it is generally considered higher ecological sensitivity than the surrounding areas. This habitat creates a wide variety of microhabitats for fauna and flora and the areas with large amounts of exposed rock have therefore been mapped as high sensitivity. The steep slopes and areas with very large fractured boulders have been mapped as no-go areas for turbines and roads.

Southern Karoo Riviere

Although not all areas associated with this vegetation type have been mapped in the VegMap, the vegetation along the major rivers within the site corresponds with the Southern Karoo Riviere vegetation type. In the area, the riparian areas are mapped as Bushmanland Vloere in the VegMap, but this is not

an appropriate designation for these areas and the riparian areas within the site, correspond better with the Southern Karoo Riviere vegetation type. The Southern Karoo Riviere vegetation type is associated with the rivers of the central karoo such as the Buffels, Bloed, Dwyka, Gamka, Sout, Kariega and Sundays Rivers. About 12% has been transformed as a result of intensive agriculture and the construction of dams. Although it is classified as Least Threatened, it is associated with rivers and drainage lines and as such represents areas that are considered ecologically significant. Common and dominant species in the drainage lines and within the adjacent floodplain vegetation include *Sporobolus ioclados*, *Helichrysum pentzioides*, *Drosanthemum lique*, *Pentzia globosa*, *Salsola aphylla*, *Tribulis terrestris*, *Felicia muricata*, *Atriplex vestita*, *Zygophyllum retrofractum*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Chrysocoma ciliata*, *Stipagostis namaquensis*, *Lycium pumilum*, *Lycium cinereum*, *Artemisia africana*, *Tripteris spinescens*, *Exomis microphylla* and *Derrera denudata*.

The figures below depict the vegetation types found on the Klipkraal WEF 1 site:



Figure 16: Eastern Upper Karoo



Figure 17: Western Upper Karoo



Figure 18: Upper Karoo Hardeveld



Figure 19: Southern Karoo Riviere

The plant species identified on the Klipkraal WEF 1 site are listed in the Terrestrial Ecological Report (Appendix 6).

8.6.3 Faunal Communities

Mammals

As many as 70 mammals are listed for the wider study area in the MammalMap database, but many of these are introduced or conservation dependent and approximately 48 can be considered to be free-roaming and potentially impacted by the development. This includes several red-listed species including the Riverine Rabbit *Bunolagus monticularis* (CR), Black-footed Cat *Felis nigripes* (VU), Grey Rhebok *Pelea capreolus* (NT), Mountain Reedbuck *Redunca fulvorufula* (EN) and Brown Hyena *Hyaena brunnea* (NT). Based on the camera trapping conducted on the site, the Grey Rhebok is confirmed

present within the wider Klipkraal site, but not within the Klipkraal WEF 1 site. The camera trapping also picked up the Riverine Rabbit within the greater Klipkraal site but not within the Klipkraal WEF 1 project area. This suggests that while this species is present in the wider area, there is not sufficient suitable habitat within the Klipkraal 1 site and the footprint can be considered low sensitivity for this species. There would however be a significant increase in traffic within and to and from the site related to the construction and to a lesser degree the operation of the Klipkraal WEF 1, which would potentially have a negative impact through mortality of rabbits related to vehicle collisions. Hence, some mitigation and avoidance for this species has been included to reduce these possible impacts.

In terms of the sensitivity mapping relating more generally to mammals, the riparian areas have been classified as Very High sensitivity based on their value as Riverine Rabbit habitat but also as a result of their general ecological significance. The rocky hills and steep slopes have been classified as Very High sensitivity on account of the value of these areas as habitat for mammals associated with rocky areas and the more general ecological value of these areas. The Riverine Rabbit is potentially of concern for the Klipkraal WEF Cluster. The areas of potentially suitable habitat have been mapped in and buffered by up to 500m depending on the landscape context and the potential for impact on Riverine Rabbit due to turbine noise and flicker. Currently, under the layout provided for the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1, there are no turbines within the mapped habitat or buffer areas, with the result that impacts on this species from the current project are expected to be low.



Figure 20: Riverine Rabbit image from camera trapping undertaken

Reptiles

Reptile diversity in the wider area is relatively high which can be ascribed to the diversity of habitats present, especially along the Nuweveld escarpment south of the site. Approximately 63 reptile species are known from the general region and may potentially occur within the study area, with 14 being of confirmed occurrence, 45 of probable occurrence and four of possible occurrence. Species of potential concern include the local endemic, Braack's Pygmy Gecko and the Karoo Padloper. Braack's Pygmy Gecko *Goggia braacki* is a Western Cape endemic with an extremely restricted distribution range. Most of its distribution is associated with a section of the Hoogland Mountains range within the Karoo National

Park. It is however not currently red-listed, but it can perhaps be regarded as the reptile icon for the Hoogland/Beaufort West region. It has thus far, not been recorded in the Klipkraal project study area, but it may possibly (not probably) be present within the wind farm area. The only threatened (Red Listed) reptile species in this region is the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise (EN). This small tortoise is seldom observed, even when specifically targeted during herpetofaunal surveys as it is active for only very short parts of the day and may also aestivate for extended periods during unfavourable environmental conditions. They are associated with dolerite ridges and rocky outcrops of the southern Succulent and Nama Karoo biomes. Threats to this species include habitat degradation due to agricultural activities and overgrazing, and predation by the Pied Crows which in recent decades have expanded in distribution range. While there is certainly suitable habitat within the Klipkraal development cluster this species has not been observed within the site thus far. Nevertheless, it is considered likely that this species is present at the site, within areas of suitable habitat. Tortoises are however one of the few groups of reptiles that have been specifically studied with regards to their responses to wind energy development and no significant negative impacts have been detected within population's resident on wind farms. Consequently, habitat loss for this species is likely to be the major avenue of potential impact resulting from the wind farm development. Specific attention to potential habitat loss for this species was paid during the sensitivity mapping and all areas which represent highly favourable habitat for this species have been mapped as high sensitivity or no-go areas for turbines. There would however, still be some impact on the smaller ridges due to turbines and access roads and hence some degree of habitat loss for this species.



Figure 21: Namib Giant Ground Gecko *Chondrodactylus angulifer* observed at the Klipkraal site.

Karoo Dwarf Tortoise

A Karoo Dwarf Tortoise Assessment has been undertaken by 3Foxes (report dated January 2023). According to the report, there are fairly extensive tracts of potentially suitable habitat for the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise within the Klipkraal 1 WEF site. The areas of habitat have been split into areas of dolerite hills considered to represent favourable habitat and areas of shale and mudstone hills with less rock cover considered to be less favourable/sub-optimal and hence less likely to harbour Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. The total extent of highly favourable habitat within the corridor is estimated at 17.24 ha, while the areas of suboptimal habitat is estimated at 131 ha. Under the layout provided for the assessment, there are no turbines within the highly favourable areas and it would only be a few roads and underground cabling routes that would impact some of the less favourable areas of potential habitat.




Figure 22: Map of areas considered to represent potentially suitable Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat within the Klipkraal 1 WEF site based on ground-truthed mapping from satellite imagery.

8.6.4 Critical Biodiversity Areas and Broad-Scale Processes

There are no major CBAs located within the Klipkraal 1 WEF site, although there is a CBA along the south-eastern boundary of the site that is associated with a drainage line that lies outside of the Klipkraal 1 footprint area. There are no turbines or other wind-farm associated infrastructure within the CBA associated with the Klipkraal 1 WEF. As a result, the impact of the Klipkraal 1 WEF on CBAs and ESAs would be minimal and this is not considered to represent a significant impact associated with the Klipkraal 1 WEF development.

Under the layout assessed, there are two turbines along the western boundary of the site that fall within a FEPA Priority Subcatchment. The overall footprint of the development in this area would be low and is not considered sufficient to impact the larger FEPA subcatchment or the quality and quantity of water produced from the sub catchment or the ecological features of the subcatchment. As such, the impact of the Klipkraal 1 WEF development on the affected FEPA subcatchment is considered to be very low and acceptable.

In terms of the conservation planning priorities and features of the site, there are no NPAES Focus Areas within the site. Given the low transformation rate and extensive nature of the affected vegetation types, the development would have minimal impact on the future ability to meet conservation targets for these vegetation types. There are no Strategic Water Source Areas (SWSA's) within the study area.




Figure 23: Northern Cape CBA map for the greater Klipkraal project area

8.6.5 Terrestrial Biodiversity Sensitivities

In order to ensure the maintenance of ecological processes within the site and the minimisation of impacts on terrestrial biodiversity, a constraints map for the site was produced by the specialist (Figure below). This has been used to inform the wind farm layout and ensure that impacts on the sensitive features of the site are maintained within acceptable limits. There are numerous constraints operating across the site, associated firstly with the major drainage features of the site with associated Riverine Rabbit habitat and secondly with the mountains, slopes and dolerite outcrops of the site which are ecologically significant in their own right, but also represent Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat. The areas

mapped as Very High sensitivity are considered no-go areas for wind turbines but may be traversed by overhead cables or turbine access roads where required, subject to review. The areas mapped as High sensitivity represent other sensitive features such as minor drainage lines or slopes deemed to be sub-optimal as Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat. These areas should also be avoided by turbines as much as possible. Under the layout provided for the assessment, there are no turbines in areas mapped as Very High or High sensitivity. As a result, the development of the Klipkraal WEF 1 would avoid significant impact on the major ecological features of the site and as such, the development is considered acceptable and would generate a low impact on fauna, flora and terrestrial biodiversity generally.




Figure 24: Ecological Sensitivities

8.6.6 Terrestrial Biodiversity Conclusions

The Klipkraal WEF 1 is mapped as falling primarily within the Eastern Upper Karoo and Western Upper Karoo vegetation types. However, the site verification and field assessment undertaken by the specialist confirmed the presence of Upper Karoo Hardeveld and Southern Karoo Riviere within the site as well. All of these vegetation types have only been impacted to a limited extent by transformation, and are classified as Least Threatened. In terms of fauna, there are several listed fauna which occur in the area and which would potentially be impacted by the development. Of greatest concern would be the Riverine Rabbit and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise, neither of which were observed within the Klipkraal 1 site but are known from the immediate area. There are no areas of habitat within the site that are considered highly suitable for this species and the extent of habitat loss for this species within the site would be minimal. There are confirmed areas of Karoo Dwarf Tortoise within the site that have been classified in the sensitivity mapping as high or very high sensitivity and in response to this mapping the developer has ensured that there are no turbines in these areas. Consequently, there would be a low impact on this species as a result of habitat loss. The major sensitive features of the site including Riverine Rabbit habitat and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat have been mapped as high or very high sensitivity and would not be impacted by turbine footprint areas. Some impact to these areas from limited amounts of overhead cabling or turbine access roads are considered acceptable.

There are no CBAs within the development footprint, with the result that an impact on CBAs and ESAs as a result of the development is considered unlikely. There are however some areas of FEPA Subcatchment along the western boundary of the site that would be impacted to some degree by the development as there are two turbines located within this area. The overall footprint within the FEPA Subcatchment would be less than 2ha and is not considered significant. A number of avoidance and mitigation measures have however been recommended which would reduce impacts on the FEPA Subcatchments to a low level.

The Klipkraal 1 WEF Site includes a few rocky ridges and mountainous areas considered to represent potentially suitable habitat for the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. As some of these are quite extensive within the corridor, it would not be possible to entirely avoid these areas. Consequently, some direct habitat loss for the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise within these areas is inevitable but has been estimated at no more than 7ha. This is insignificant when considered in context of the range of this species. Direct habitat loss is therefore not considered to represent a significant source of potential impact associated with the Klipkraal 1 WEF Site on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise.

During operation, there is a risk that the pylons would attract crows and increase the local density of crows, thereby increasing predation levels on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. Given the low reproductive rate of the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise, even relatively low levels of predation would be likely to have significant long-term negative impacts on local tortoise populations. It is therefore recommended that the pylons are designed in a manner which discourages the use of the pylons by crows for nesting, and that crow nests are removed regularly from pylons within and near (1km) suitable Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat as mapped in this assessment.

Provided that the various mitigation and avoidance measures as suggested are implemented, the overall long-term impact of the grid connection development on Karoo Dwarf Tortoises and associated habitat is likely to be low and hence considered acceptable.

8.7 Agricultural

An Agricultural Compliance Statement was undertaken by Johann Lanz (revised report dated 1 March 2023).

8.7.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the report, the arid climate (low rainfall of approximately 168 to 179 mm per annum and high evaporation of approximately 1,320 to 1,360 mm per annum) is the limiting factor for land capability, regardless of the soil capability and terrain. Moisture availability is insufficient for crop production without irrigation and the potential agricultural land use of the site is therefore limited to grazing. The land is used for the grazing of sheep and game and has a low long-term grazing capacity of 32 hectares per large stock unit. Due to the climate being the limiting factor that controls production potential, it is the only aspect of the agro-ecosystem description that is required for assessing the agricultural impact of this development. Therefore, the agricultural impact of this proposed development is assessed here as being of low significance as indicated by the specialist.

8.7.2 Agricultural Compliance Statement Conclusion

According to the specialist, the conclusion of this assessment is that the agricultural impact of the proposed development is acceptable as the agricultural production potential of the site is completely limited by the aridity of the climate and is therefore only suitable as grazing land, and therefore it offers a valuable opportunity for renewable energy development with insignificant loss of future agricultural production potential.




Figure 25: The proposed development site (blue outline) overlaid on agricultural sensitivity, as given by the screening tool (green = low; yellow = medium; red = high).

8.8 Avifauna

An Avifaunal Assessment was undertaken by Chris van Rooyen Consulting (report dated 19 January 2023).

8.8.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the report, it is estimated that a total of 127 bird species could potentially occur in the broader area. Refer the avifaunal Report (**Appendix 6**) which provides a comprehensive list of all the species in the broader area. Of these, 16 species are classified as priority species for wind developments. The proposed WEF will pose a collision risk to several priority species which could occur regularly at the site. Species exposed to this risk are large terrestrial species i.e., mostly bustards such as Karoo Korhaan, although generally seem to be not as vulnerable to turbine collisions as was originally anticipated. Soaring priority species, i.e., raptors such as Martial Eagle, Pale Chanting Goshawk, Lanner Falcon, Booted Eagle and Greater Kestrel are most at risk of all the priority species likely to occur regularly at the project site. Verreaux's Eagle might also be at risk to some extent, although the species is unlikely to venture regularly into the project area of interest (PAOI). The Karoo National Park Important Bird Area (IBA) SA102 is the closest IBA and is located approximately 23.5km

south-east of the PAOI at its closest point (Marnewick et al. 2015). The development is not expected to have any impact on the avifauna in this IBA due to the distance from the development area.

Bird behaviour

The priority species which could occur with some regularity at the proposed WEF can be classified as either terrestrial species, soaring species or occasional long-distance fliers. Terrestrial species spend most of the time foraging on the ground. They do not fly often and when they do, they generally fly for short distances at low to medium altitude. At the application site, Ludwig Bustard, Karoo Korhaan, Blue Crane, Grey-winged Francolin and Double-banded Courser are included in this category. Occasional long-distance fliers generally behave as terrestrial species but can and do undertake long distance flights on occasion. Species in this category are Ludwig's Bustard and Blue Crane. Soaring species spend a significant time on the wing in a variety of flight modes including soaring, kiting, hovering and gliding at medium to high altitudes. At the project site, these include all the raptors and storks which could occur i.e., Lanner Falcon, Booted Eagle, Martial Eagle, Greater Kestrel, Pale Chanting Goshawk, Verreaux's Eagle and Black Stork. Based on the time spent potentially flying at rotor height, soaring species are likely to be at greater risk of collision.

Avoidance behaviour

It is anticipated that most birds at the proposed WEF will avoid the wind turbines, as is generally the case at all wind farms. Exceptions already mentioned are raptors that engage in hunting which might serve to distract them and place them at risk of collision, birds engaged in display behaviour or inter- and intraspecific aggressive interaction. Complete macro-avoidance of the wind farm is unlikely for any of the priority species likely to occur at the proposed WEF.

Bird Abundance

The abundance of priority species at the proposed WEF will fluctuate depending on the season of the year, and especially in response to rainfall e.g., Ludwig's Bustard and Blue Crane.

Landscape Features

The PAOI does not contain many landscape features as it is situated on a plateau. Bordering the PAOI to the south-west is a series of rugged mountains. The most significant landscape features at the PAOI from a collision risk perspective are the ground dams, and the drainage lines (when flowing). Surface water attracts many birds, including Red Listed species such as Martial Eagle, Lanner Falcon, Black Stork, Blue Crane and Verreaux's Eagle.

Flight Paths

The only distinctive potential flight paths identified at the PAOI are the drainage lines, which may serve as a flight path for waterbirds when they flow. However, they are dry most of the time.

Food availability

The current very low levels of bird activity at the proposed WEF could be partially attributed to the lack of food, brought about by the drought conditions which were prevalent during the pre-construction monitoring so far. This could change significantly if the site experiences average to above average rainfall for a number of years, which would result in better foraging conditions.

Displacement due to disturbance and habitat loss

It is inevitable that a measure of displacement will take place for all priority species during the construction phase, due to the disturbance factor associated with the construction activities. This is likely to affect ground nesting species the most, as this could temporarily disrupt their reproductive cycle. Species which fall in this category are Ludwig's Bustard, Karoo Korhaan, Double-banded Courser, Grey-winged Francolin and Spotted Eagle-Owl. Some raptors might also be affected, e.g., Pale Chanting Goshawk which could potentially breed in the small Vachellia trees in the drainage lines. Some species might be able to recolonise the area after the completion of the construction phase, but for some species this might only be partially the case, resulting in lower densities than before once the WEF is operational, due to the disturbance factor of the operational turbines.

The network of roads is likely to result in significant habitat fragmentation, and it could have an effect on the density of several species, particularly larger terrestrial species such as Ludwig's Bustard and Karoo Korhaan, and raptors. Given the current density of the proposed turbine layout and associated road infra-structure, it is not expected that any priority species will be permanently displaced from the PAOI. The alternative substation locations are likely to be all situated in essentially the same habitat, i.e., Karoo scrub. The habitat is not particularly sensitive, as far as avifauna is concerned, therefore any of the alternative locations should be acceptable. The same goes for any alternative laydown and compound areas.

8.8.2 Results of the pre-construction bird monitoring

Wind priority species were identified using the latest (November 2014) BirdLife SA (BLSA) list of priority species for wind farms. The surveys of the pre-construction monitoring programme at the proposed Klipkraal WEF sites were conducted during the following periods:

- 15 – 19 February 2022
- 09 – 14 May 2022
- 12 – 20 July 2022
- 17 – 22 October 2022
- 26 – 31 December 2022
- 10 – 14 January 2023

Transects

The results of the transect counts are displayed in the table below:

Table 12: Results of the transect counts at the WEF and control sites

Turbine Site	Number
Species composition	
All Species	77
Priority Species (10%)	8 (10%)
Non-Priority Species	69
Total count	
Drive transects	1327
Walk transects	2791

	4118
Control Site	Number
Species composition	
All Species	65
Priority Species (5%)	7 (11%)
Non-Priority Species	58
Total count	
Drive transects	1409
Walk transects	958
	2367

Incidental Counts

The table provides an overview of the incidental sightings of priority species recorded thus far at the five WEF sites.

Table 13: Incidental sightings of priority species during during all surveys over four seasons

Priority Species (Incidentals)		Surv ey 1	Surv ey 2	Surv ey 3	Surv ey 4	Surv ey 5	Surv ey 6	Grand Total
Booted Eagle	<i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Common Buzzard	<i>Buteo buteo</i>	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Jackal Buzzard	<i>Buteo rufofuscus</i>	1	0	1	2	6	2	12
Karoo Korhaan	<i>Eupodotis vigorsii</i>	6	8	4	12	11	1	42
Lesser Kestrel	<i>Falco naumanni</i>	0	0	0	0	4	4	8
Ludwig's Bustard	<i>Neotis ludwigii</i>	0	27	0	0	0	0	27
Martial Eagle	<i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pale Chanting Goshawk	<i>Melierax canorus</i>	1	2	0	0	1	1	5
Rufous-breasted Sparrowhawk	<i>Accipiter rufiventris</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Verreaux's Eagle	<i>Aquila verreauxii</i>	2	0	0	0	3	4	9

The figure below shows the locations of the Verreaux's Eagle nests in relation to the Klipkraal WEF 1 site.




Figure 26: Verreaux's Eagles nests recorded during the pre-construction monitoring at the Klipkraal WEF

8.8.3 Avifauna Sensitivities

The avifaunal specialist has identified the following environmental sensitivities from an avifaunal perspective for the proposed wind energy facility:

- High sensitivity no-turbine buffer: Surface water.

Included in this category are areas within 200m of pans and earth dams, and 150m from all major drainage lines. Surface water in this arid habitat is crucially important for priority avifauna, including several Red Data species such as Martial Eagle, Lanner Falcon, Black Stork, Blue Crane and Verreaux's Eagle, and many non-priority species, including several waterbirds. Drainage lines when flowing attract waterbirds on occasion, as do the large pools that remain in the channel after the flow has stopped. Wind turbines that are placed near these sources of surface water pose a collision risk to birds using the water for drinking and bathing, and drainage lines, when flowing, are natural flight paths for birds. Refer to figure below for a map indicating the no-turbine buffers and locations of the turbines and associated infrastructure on the Klipkraal WEF 1 site.

The final proposed layout has no turbines located within avifaunal no-go areas. The BESS, switching yard and some of the internal roads are located within this area however there are no restrictions for the construction of the infrastructure within the high sensitivity areas.




Figure 27: Avifaunal sensitivities for the Klipkraal WEF 1 project.

8.8.4 Avifaunal Assessment Conclusion

According to the avifaunal assessment, the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 will have a moderate impact on avifauna which, in most instances, could be reduced to a low impact through appropriate mitigation. Any alternative substation and laydown locations will all be situated in essentially the same habitat, i.e., Karoo scrub. The habitat is not particularly sensitive, as far as avifauna is concerned. No fatal flaws are expected to be discovered during the onsite investigations. The avifaunal specialist has therefore supported the development, provided the mitigation measures listed in their report are strictly implemented.

8.9 Bat

A bat specialist study was undertaken by Animalia Consulting (report dated November 2022).

8.9.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the report, bats form part of the Order Chiroptera and are the second largest group of mammals after rodents. They are the only mammals to have developed true powered flight and have undergone various skeletal changes to accommodate this. Most South African bats are insectivorous and are capable of consuming vast quantities of insects on a nightly basis, however, they have also been found to feed on amphibians, fruit, nectar and other invertebrates. As a result, insectivorous bats are the predominant predators of nocturnal flying insects in South Africa and contribute greatly to the suppression of these numbers. Their prey also includes agricultural pests such as moths and vectors for diseases such as mosquitoes. According to the report, the most commonly occurring bats on site are those at greatest risk of fatal collision with wind turbines. The species at risk in this High-risk category (*Tadarida aegyptiaca* and *Sauromys petrophilus*) are open air foragers which regularly fly at heights corresponding with the rotor swept zone. *Miniopterus natalensis* and *Myotis tricolor* are cave dwelling species but may also take residence in smaller numbers in culverts and other suitable man-

made hollows, these species did not show any abrupt peaks of activity that may indicate that the site is on any migration route. The species was not particularly frequently recorded on the systems, although it was present in the data from all systems.

There are several bat species in the vicinity of the site that occur commonly in the area. Some of these species are of special importance based on their likelihood of being impacted by the proposed wind farm, due to high abundances and certain behavioural traits. They have also been dominating records of fatalities at operational wind farms in South Africa.

The seven bat species detected on site thus far are: *Eptesicus hottentotus*, *Tadarida aegyptiaca*, *Sauromys petrophilus*, *Laephotis capensis*, *Myotis tricolor*, *Rhinolophus clivosus* and *Miniopterus natalensis*. Even though the presence of *Cistugo lesueuri* could not be confirmed or disproved since the echolocation signature overlaps with the known call structure of *L. capensis*, it is included in the assessment since it is endemic to South Africa and Lesotho and is represented in museum records from the larger area around site. The following are bat species that may be impacted the most by the WEF:

- The Egyptian Free-tailed Bat, *Tadarida aegyptiaca*, is a Least Concern species (IUCN Red List 2016) as it has a wide distribution and high abundance throughout South Africa and is part of the Free-tailed bat family (Molossidae). It occurs from the Western Cape of South Africa, north through to Namibia and southern Angola; and through Zimbabwe to central and northern Mozambique. This species is protected by national legislation in South Africa.
- *Laephotis capensis* (Cape serotine bat, formerly *Neoromicia capensis*) has a conservation status of Least Concern (IUCN Red List 2016) as it is found in high numbers and is widespread over much of Sub-Saharan Africa. High mortality rates of this species due to wind turbines would be a cause for concern as *L. capensis* is abundant and widespread and as such has a more significant role to play within the local ecosystem than the rarer bat species. They do not undertake migrations and thus are considered residents of the site.
- *Miniopterus natalensis* (Natal long-fingered bat), occurs widely across the country but mostly within the southern and eastern regions and is listed as Near Threatened. The Natal long-fingered bat undertakes *short* migratory journeys between hibernaculum and maternity roosts. Due to this migratory behaviour, they are considered to be at high risk of fatality from wind turbines if a wind farm is placed within a migratory path. The mass movement of bats during migratory periods could result in mass casualties if wind turbines are positioned over a mass migratory route and such turbines are not effectively mitigated. Very little is known about the migratory behaviour and paths of *M. natalensis* in South Africa with migration distances exceeding 150 kilometres. If the site is located within a migratory path the bat detection systems should detect high numbers and activity of the Natal long-fingered bat, this will be examined over the course of the 12-month monitoring survey. However, it should be noted that no migration routes are known to occur on site or in the surrounding area.
- *Cistugo lesueuri* (Lesueur's Wing-gland bat) and has a conservation status of Least Concern (IUCN Red List 2016) and Near Threatened in the 2004 IUCN Red List, it has a limited distribution and is endemic to South Africa and Lesotho with only a few museum records. It appears to be associated with high altitude montane grasslands where open drinking water and rock crevices are present. A specimen has been collected in 1979 just outside the town of Beaufort West, indicating that the habitat of the larger area can be suitable for this species. It has relatively short and broad wings with an intermediate wing loading and low aspect ratio, indicating it's a clutter edge forager. It may arguably therefore be placed in the same risk category as *Laephotis capensis* at medium likelihood of risk of fatality due to wind turbines.

8.9.2 Results of the pre-construction bat monitoring

Passive bat data have been collected for the EIA Bat Monitoring Report at the Klipkraal WEF. Data collection commenced in September 2021 and concluded in October 2022, representing one year of passive bat activity monitoring.

The seven bat species detected on site thus far are: *Eptesicus hottentotus*, *Tadarida aegyptiaca*, *Sauromys petrophilus*, *Laephotis capensis*, *Myotis tricolor*, *Rhinolophus clivosus* and *Miniopterus natalensis*. Even though the presence of *Cistugo lesueuri* could not be confirmed or disproved since the echolocation signature overlaps with the known call structure of *L. capensis*, it is included into the above table since it is endemic to South Africa and Lesotho and is represented in museum records from the larger area around site.

The total number of bat passes from the 12 months of data retrieved shows that bat activity at the Met Mast decreased with increasing height. This is a well-known trend. The highest number of passes was recorded at the lowest microphone (7m) of Met Mast M2, with 23 121 passes recorded across all species, and with the lowest activity for this system (9 781 passes) recorded at the highest microphone (115m). ShM3 recorded the fewest bat passes overall, however, with a total of 7 295 at a height of 7m above ground. Bat activity was thus not consistent at the same height across the landscape, and reflects the spatial suitability of foraging resources for these animals. The landscape associated with ShM3 is relatively flat and situated further away from a drainage line compared to the more elevated topography and closer proximity to drainage lines at the remaining systems. These were associated with higher bat activity; this feeds back into our confidence in our spatial sensitivity mapping, where proximity to these features is indicative of higher activity levels.

Across all heights, and indeed across each system, the High-risk category of bats displayed the greatest number of total passes compared to the other categories, with the Medium-risk category displaying the next highest number of passes, although to a far lesser degree. Bats in the Medium-High and Low-risk profiles have not been well represented in the data thus far. It is noteworthy that overwhelmingly, the most commonly occurring bats on site are those at greatest risk of fatal collision with wind turbines. The species at risk in this High-risk category (*Tadarida aegyptiaca* and *Sauromys petrophilus*) are open air foragers which regularly fly at heights corresponding with the rotor swept zone.

8.9.3 Bat Sensitivities

The figure below depicts the sensitive areas of the site, based on features identified to be important for foraging and roosting of the species that most commonly occur on site. Thus, the sensitivity map is based on species ecology and habitat preferences.





Figure 28: Bat Sensitivities

The specialist has recommended the following sensitivity categories and buffers:

Table 14: The significance of sensitivity map categories for each infrastructure component

Sensitivity	Turbines	Roads and cables	Internal overhead transmission lines	Buildings (including substation, battery storage facility and construction camp/yards)
High Sensitivity	These areas are 'no-go' zones and turbines may not be placed in these areas. Turbine blades (blade overhang) may not intrude into these areas.	Preferably keep to a minimum within these areas where practically feasible.	Allowed inside these areas.	Avoid these areas (no-go areas).
High Sensitivity buffer	These areas are 'no-go' zones and turbines may not be placed in these areas. Turbine blades (blade overhang) may not intrude into these areas.	Allowed inside these areas.	Allowed inside these areas.	Allowed, preferably keep to a minimum within these areas where practically feasible.
Moderate Sensitivity	Turbines within these areas may require priority (not excluding all other turbines) during post-construction studies, and in some instances, there is a higher likelihood that mitigation measures may need to be applied to them.	Allowed inside these areas.	Allowed inside these areas.	Allowed inside these areas.
Moderate Sensitivity buffer	Turbines within these areas may require priority (not excluding all other turbines) during post-construction studies, and in some instances, there is a higher likelihood that mitigation measures may need to be applied to them.	Allowed inside these areas.	Allowed inside these areas.	Allowed inside these areas.

Based on the above, the final proposed layout currently has no turbines located within a no-go high bat sensitivity area, 13 turbines within the no-go high sensitivity buffer (turbines 4, 8, 9, 10, 18, 26, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37, 42, 44), 2 turbines within a moderate bat sensitivity area (11, 17) and 13 turbines with the moderate bat sensitivity buffer (1, 8, 9, 13, 15, 19, 20, 26, 32, 34, 44, 45, 50). This is based on the

turbines having a 100m blade length. No overhanging turbine blade may intrude into the above buffers, meaning that should the final turbine model specify a rotor radius of 100m, the base of the turbine needs to be situated, at a minimum, an additional 100m from the outer edge of the High sensitivity No-go buffer.

8.9.4 Bat Assessment Conclusion

According to the specialist, there are no fatal flaws from a bat sensitivity perspective which should prevent the Klipkraal WEF 1 from being approved. Additionally, no known bat caves or large roosts occur in the vicinity of the site. No reasons have been identified for the Klipkraal WEF 1 development not to receive Environmental Authorisation. Should the proposed WEF be approved, a minimum of two years of operational bat mortality monitoring should be conducted from the start of the operation of the facility.

9. DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIO- ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

A Social Impact Assessment was undertaken by Synergy (report dated 7 November 2022).

9.1.1 Namakwa District Municipality

According to the report, the Namakwa District Municipality (NDM) is situated in the north-western corner of South Africa and is bordered by the Atlantic Ocean to the west, Namibia to the north, ZF Mgcawu and Pixley ka Seme District Municipalities to the north-east and east, respectively and the Western Cape Province to the south. The NDM is made up of six local municipalities, namely Richtersveld, Nama Khoi, Khai Ma, Kamiesberg, Hantam and Karoo Hoogland. The district has an area of 126 836km², making it the largest district municipality in South Africa, with the town of Springbok functions as the administrative centre. The National Route 7 (N7), an important transport route, passes through the district.

The main economic sectors contributing to the district are agriculture, mining, mari-culture, tourism, industry and electricity. Between 2003 and 2013, the tertiary sector had the highest contribution to the economy with an average annual contribution of 63.1%. This was followed by the primary sector contributing an annual average of 33.8%.

The agricultural sector is the second largest employer in the district and includes stock-farming and the cultivation of various fruits along the Orange River. Abalone and oyster production along the western coast offer further opportunities which could be developed.

The NDM had the highest solar radiation intensity in Southern Africa, making it an ideal location for solar projects. Wind, wave and nuclear energy have also been identified as renewable energy sources which could potentially support the energy sector.

9.1.2 Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality

According to the report, the Karoo Hoogland (KH) is one of six local municipalities that make up the Namakwa District (ND) Municipality. The three main towns in Karoo Hoogland are Williston, Fraserburg and Sutherland. The town of Sutherland was founded in 1855 as a church and market town to serve the sheep farming community in the area. The town is located approximately 100 km north of the small village of Matjiesfontein and is accessed via the R 354. The main economic activities include tourism

and sheep farming. South African Astronomical Observatory (SAAO) was established outside the town in 1972 and plays a key role in the town's tourism related economy.

It is the second-largest of the six municipalities in the district, making up a quarter of its geographical area. Although the municipality's towns are separated by more than 100km by road, they share many administrative tasks. The Main Administration Office is situated in Williston.

Main Economic Sectors: Community, social and personal services (42.5%), transport, storage and communication (15%), wholesale and retail trade, catering and accommodation (13.7%), agriculture, forestry and fishing (13%), finance, insurance, real estate and business services (8.8%), manufacturing (5.9%).

9.1.3 Key Considerations/Impacts for Wind Energy Facilities

Health and social wellbeing – The health and social wellbeing impacts related to the project include air quality, noise, shadow flicker, blade glint, electromagnetic field and RF interference, increase in crime, increased risk of HIV infections, influx of construction workers and hazard exposure.

Quality of living environment – including disruption of daily living patterns, disruptions to social and community infrastructure, transformation of the sense of place

Economic – impacts related to job creation and skills development and socio-economic stimulation

Cultural – at a social level, it is likely that any cultural impact would be associated with sensitive archaeological and/or heritage sites

9.1.4 Key Findings and Recommendations

The social impacts identified (including all positive and negative impacts) will be either of a low or medium significance. No negative impacts with a high significance rating have been identified to be associated with the development of the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility (WEF) 1. All negative social impacts are within acceptable limits with no impacts considered as unacceptable from a social perspective at scoping level. The recommendations proposed for the project are appropriate and suitable for the mitigation of the negative impacts and the enhancement of the positive impacts.

9.2 Cultural/Historical Environment

A Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken by PGS Heritage (revised report dated 10 March 2023).

9.2.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the report, the evaluation of satellite imagery and the analysis of the studies previously undertaken in the area has indicated that certain areas may be sensitive from a heritage perspective. Archaeological surveys and studies in the area have shown rocky outcrops, dry riverbeds, riverbanks and confluence to be prime localities for archaeological finds and specifically Stone Age sites. The following areas within the study area have been referenced as having possible heritage sensitivity:

Drainage lines/ Dry water course

Drainage lines, such as dry riverbeds, erosion dongas as well as sheet erosion has been shown to yield rich archaeological deposits due to the exposure of archaeological material as well as the fact that human settlement is drawn to water sources in arid regions.

Ridges/Outcrops

Numerous ridges, koppies and mountains have been identified in the study area and are associated with human settlement and activity. Stonewalling from herders, rock engravings and knapping sites associated with Later Stone Age manufacturing technology is known to occur in these areas.

Palaeontology

According to the report and the Palaeosensitivity Map available on the South African Heritage Resources Information System database (SAHRIS), the Palaeontological Sensitivity, a portion of the proposed study area is rated as Very High. This means that a Palaeontological field assessment and protocol for finds would be required.

Fraserburg is recognised as a region that has a wealth of fossil remains. The local Old Rectory museum houses exquisite fossil displays with exhibits of Karoo tetrapods – pareiasaurids, therapsids, palaeoniscoid fish, petrified wood etc. A significant palaeosurface (Palaeo-site) is found on Gansfontein Farm, showing well-preserved Permian trackways and other trace fossils.

9.2.2 Palaeontological

According to the Palaeontological Impact Assessment, the 3220 Sutherland Geological Map (Council of Geosciences, Pretoria) indicates that a small portion of the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 is underlain by the Jurassic Dolerite while the rest of the footprint is underlain by the Adelaide Subgroup (Beaufort Group). The PalaeoMap of the South African Heritage Resources Information System) indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Jurassic Dolerite is Zero as it is igneous in origin and thus unfossiliferous while that of the Adelaide Subgroup is Very High (Almond and Pether, 2009; Almond et al., 2013). Large areas of the development on the PalaeoMap are underlain by white and indicates that these areas have not been allocated so a specific Palaeontological Sensitivity. The updated Geology (Council of Geosciences, Pretoria); refines the geology of the 1983 Geological Map and indicates that the north-eastern portion is underlain by Jurassic dolerite, the largest portion of the development is underlain by the Middleton Formation with the south western portion underlain by the Balfour Formation. Both the Middleton and Balfour Formations forms part of Adelaide Subgroup (Beaufort Group).

In the last few decades extensive research and collecting have been conducted by palaeontologists in this part of the basin and the Fraserburg area was found to be highly fossiliferous. A two day-site-specific field survey of the development footprint was conducted on foot 24-26 September 2021. Various fossiliferous sites, where fossils were found to be well-preserved, has been identified in the development footprint.

As the site visit was conducted in 2021 the layout of the WEF was not yet known. The specific layout of the Klipkraal WEF 1 development was thus not investigated in detail. It is thus recommended that a Palaeontological Walkdown of the development is conducted pre-construction once when the final design of the roads and turbines have been established. The appointed Palaeontologist will also have to include a Chance Find Protocol for the Klipkraal WEF 1 development and training of accountable supervisory personnel by a qualified palaeontologist in the recognition of fossil heritage is necessary.

The significance of the impact occurring will be negative very high before mitigation. The pre-construction Palaeontological walkdown will lower the Significance of the Impact to a Medium level.

9.2.3 Heritage Fieldwork Findings in the study area

The heritage specialist undertook a selective survey of the study area from the 22nd to the 27th September 2021. Due to the nature of cultural remains, with the majority of artefacts occurring below surface, one archaeologist from PGS and a field assistant conducted a vehicle and foot-survey of the proposed development area. The fieldwork was logged with GPS devices to provide a tracklog of the area covered. Approximately 130km of the larger assessment region was traversed. The main Klipkraal farmstead and associated laborer’s dwellings, are not included in this assessment, as the nearest proposed turbine is situated more than 600m away.

The fieldwork conducted in September 2021, identified heritage resources that were then classified as either find spots, structures (incl. historical farmsteads) or graves. Two (2) sites were identified within an area which has been allocated for the proposed Klipkraal Phase 1 WEF development area. The stone ruin farmstead (K-10) and stone shepherds’ shelter (K09) were situated a substantial distance away from the proposed wind turbines within the study area (**Figure 32** and **Figure 33**).




Figure 29: Heritage Resources (site: blue square) identified within the Klipkraal WEF 1 region



Figure 30: K-09 Stone shepherds shelter



Figure 31: K-10 Stone ruin

9.2.4 Heritage Sensitivities

The heritage specialist has recommended that a 30m buffer be applied to the identified heritage sites (no-go area). No turbines or associated infrastructure may encroach into these areas. Currently, no turbines or associated infrastructure have been planned in the preliminary layout within a heritage no-go area for the Klipkraal WEF 1 site.

9.2.5 Heritage Impact Assessment Conclusion

The fieldwork conducted for the evaluation of the possible impact of the Klipkraal WEF 1 has revealed the presence of two (2) heritage resources that were then classified as structures (incl. historical farmstead). According to the report, the overall impact of the Klipkraal WEF 1, on the two heritage resources, is seen as acceptably low after the recommendations have been implemented and therefore, impacts can be mitigated to acceptable levels allowing for the development to be authorised.

9.3 Noise

A Noise Impact Assessment Report was undertaken by Safetech (revised report dated 6 March 2023).

9.3.1 Baseline Assessment

According to the report, the sources of sounds emitted from operating wind turbines can be divided into two categories, firstly mechanical sounds, from the interaction of turbine components, and secondly aerodynamic sounds, produced by the flow of air over the blades and past the tower. Sound emitted from large modern wind turbines during constant speed operation tend to increase more slowly with increasing wind speed, than wind generated sound. As a result, wind turbine noise is more commonly a concern at lower wind speeds.

Infrasound was a significant characteristic of some wind turbine models that has been attributed to early designs in which turbine blades were downwind of the main tower. The effect was generated as the blades cut through the turbulence generated around the downwind side of the tower. Modern designs generally have the blades upwind of the tower. Wind conditions around the blades and improved blade design minimize the generation of the effect. The typical range of sound power level for wind turbine generators is in the range of 100 to 105 dB(A) – a much lower sound power level (10 dB or more) than the majority of construction machinery such as bulldozers. For infrasound to be audible even to a person

with the most sensitive hearing at a distance of 300 m would require a sound power level of at least 140 dB at 10 Hz and even higher emission levels than this at lower frequencies and at greater distances. There is no information available to indicate that wind turbine generators emit infrasound anywhere near this intensity.

9.3.2 Noise Sensitivities

According to the report, the project could impact on several noise sensitive areas. A total of 23 Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs) were identified for the entire Klipkraal project (i.e. Klipkraal WEF 1- 5). However only one of these (NSA 2) falls within the site boundary of the Klipkraal WEF 1 site. The recommended 500m buffer of NSA 8 also falls within the site boundary of the Klipkraal WEF 1 site. The site verification process determined that most NSAs are not permanently occupied. Furthermore, some NSAs are kraals for livestock and abandoned buildings. The noise emissions could have an impact on the residents at the NSA's. The figure below shows the NSA's that are most likely to be impacted by Klipkraal WEF 1, due to their distance to the closest turbine

The noise specialist has recommended that a 500m buffer be applied to the noise sensitive areas identified for the Klipkraal WEF 1 Project. Currently, no turbines have been planned in the final layout within a noise sensitive area or buffer for the Klipkraal WEF 1 site.




Figure 32: Noise sensitivity areas for the Klipkraal WEF 1

9.3.3 Noise Impact Assessment Conclusion

Based on the modelling results, the impact will be low from a noise perspective. It is recommended that the development receives environmental authorisation.

9.4 Visual

A Visual Impact Assessment was undertaken by Bapela Cave Klapwijk (report dated November 2022).

9.4.1 Baseline Assessment

The site is situated on the top of a plateau landform. The edge of the landform forms an escarpment that descends generally to the south. Intermittent views are contained mainly to the upper plateau levels. The landscape is flat and stony dotted with hills and mountains. The groundcover is mainly grassy dwarf shrubland containing very few trees if at all any. The low ground cover does not assist in any visual screening or blending with the landscape, especially bearing in mind the scale and magnitude of the wind turbines.

9.4.2 Visual Sensitivities

Visibility

The visibility is dependent on the topography. The existing topography is very flat which does not assist in limiting the views. Visibility of the structures, due to the tall and imposing scale of the turbines, will be continuous and uninterrupted to beyond 40-50 km. It is considered that beyond 50 km views of the development, though still visible are considered insignificant in the landscape due to the exponential diminishing effect of distance.

The critical views are from those visual receptors that are most impacted by the visual intrusion of the proposed development. These would include users of public roads, towns, villages, game farms and lodges, settlements as well as farmsteads in the nearby vicinity. Although not all homesteads are occupied fulltime, (see **Figure** below) many of these will be in direct line of sight and within the 0-5 km zone where the magnitude of impact could be high. Other sensitive receptors include Fraserburg, the Karoo National Park, travellers on the main roads such as the R353, R356 and the R61, activities and institutions that rely on the aesthetic environment such as game farms, national parks, lodges, guesthouses as well as hunting and or photographic safari operations.

Farmsteads and other housing in close proximity to the wind turbines could experience the effect of flicker. A wind turbine's moving blades can cast a moving shadow on locations within a certain distance of a turbine. These moving shadows are called shadow flicker and can be a temporary phenomenon experienced by people at nearby residences or public gathering places. The impact area depends on the time of year and day (which determines the sun's azimuth and altitude angles) and the wind turbine's physical characteristics (height, rotor diameter, blade width, and orientation of the rotor blades). Shadow flicker generally occurs during low angle sunlight conditions, typically during sunrise and sunset times of the day. However, when the sun angle gets very low (less than 3 degrees), the light has to pass through more atmosphere and becomes too diffused to form a coherent shadow. Shadow flicker will not occur when the sun is obscured by clouds or fog, at night, or when the source turbine(s) are not operating.




Figure 33: Visual Receptors

Landscape Diversity

The study area’s landscape varies from relatively flat to rolling with low ridges. The area is located on top of a rather featureless plateau which drops down over the edge to the south. The landscape is covered with low growing and sparse vegetation. The current land-use is primarily small stock grazing. The peripheral visual boundaries to the north and east are truncated by low ridges. The peripheral visual boundary to the south and west is relatively undistinguished. The area appears to be sparsely populated, which was borne out during the site visit. The study area is not regarded as having a high visual quality when compared to other areas in the region such as the Swartberg Mountains, Meiringspoort and the mountains around Beaufort West and the Karoo National Park but it does display the typical and iconic Karoo landscape. However, the very nature of the vegetation in this area (Western Upper Karoo, Eastern Upper Karoo and Roggeveld Shale Renosterveld) is low growing and visually uniform which does not provide much visual screening. Although the vegetation is not overly sensitive to the development it does not assist in reducing the visual expose of the turbines. The vegetation is typical of the Karoo ambience, and it is this together with the topography which provides the Karoo sense of place.

The existing land-use does not add to the diversity of the area being mainly low-density small stock farming. Low hills and shallow drainage ways occur. The tallest structures in the area are power lines and wind pumps. The area exhibits a low visual diversity. The higher the visual diversity, the greater is the opportunity to visually blend the project with the environment as these will more readily accept visual change or any structure placed within them. The higher the diversity, the higher the Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC) or the ability of the environment to accept visual change. The low visual diversity of

area will result in a low VAC and will in turn result in any large scale or tall structure to be highly visible due to the lack of screening and the high visual contrast. The surrounding hills and mountains on the visual periphery contain the views and terminate the views.

Landscape Quality and Character

The quality of *Genius Loci* is a function of attributes such as the scenic beauty or uniqueness and distinctive character of the built and cultural landscape. The *Genius Loci* or sense of place of the study area is typical Nama Karoo with its low arid bushes, wide open landscape and the sheep and goat farming. The only tall structures in the area are the odd wind pump and transmission lines. The sense of place of the rural and natural ambience and character of the setting will be changed by the high visual prominence of the turbines. The visual quality can be categorised as low visual quality for the study area. The low visual quality is based on the lack of visual diversity as a result of the uniformity of the vegetation which lack specific interest, and the surrounding flat and open landscape.

Critical Views

The critical views are those sensitive receptors which include Fraserburg, the Karoo National Park, travellers on the main roads such as the R353, R356 and the R61, activities and institutions that rely on the aesthetic environment such as game farms, national parks, lodges, guesthouses as well as hunting and or photographic safari operations. Although not all homesteads are occupied fulltime, many of these will be in direct line of sight and within the 0-5 km zone where the magnitude of impact could be high.




Figure 34: Camera Locations



Figure 35: Photo Point 30 (see Figure 34)



Figure 36: Photo Point 31



Figure 37: Photo Point 32



Figure 38: Photo Point 33

9.4.3 Shadow Flicker

Farmsteads and other housing in close proximity to the wind turbines could experience the effect of flicker. A wind turbine's moving blades can cast a moving shadow on locations within a certain distance of a turbine. These moving shadows are called shadow flicker and can be a temporary phenomenon experienced by people at nearby residences or public gathering places. The impact area depends on the time of year and day (which determines the sun's azimuth and altitude angles) and the wind turbine's physical characteristics (height, rotor diameter, blade width, and orientation of the rotor blades). Shadow flicker generally occurs during low angle sunlight conditions, typically during sunrise and sunset times of the day. However, when the sun angle gets very low (less than 3 degrees), the light has to pass through more atmosphere and becomes too diffused to form a coherent shadow. Shadow flicker will not occur when the sun is obscured by clouds or fog, at night, or when the source turbine(s) are not operating. (Green Rhino Energy). Not only can shadow flicker be a nuisance to nearby residents but, it has been suggested, could aggravate medical problems such as migraine and epilepsy.

Shadow flicker intensity is defined as the difference in brightness at a given location in the presence and absence of a shadow. Shadow flicker intensity diminishes with greater receptor-to-turbine separation distance. Shadow flicker intensity for receptor-to-turbine distances beyond 1,500 meters is very low and generally considered imperceptible. Shadow flicker intensity for receptor-to-turbine distances between 1,000 and 1,500 meters is also low and considered barely noticeable. At this distance shadow flicker intensity would only tend to be noticed under conditions that would enhance the intensity difference, such as observing from a dark room with a single window directly facing the turbine casting the shadow during sunny conditions. At distances less than 1,000 meters, shadow flicker may be more noticeable. In general, the largest number of shadow flicker hours, along with greatest shadow flicker intensity, occurs nearest the wind turbines (Green Rhino Energy).

A shadow flicker analysis calculates for each point of interest, in this case for each turbine:

- Number of hours per year that the flickering occurs,
- Maximum length (in minutes) that flickering occurs on the worst day in the year, and
- Number of days in the year that shadow flickering appears at all.

All the above are calculated for both the worst case.

Following German regulation, shadow flickering cannot be perceived by the human eye if the angle of the sun over the horizon is less than 3°. Plus, the blades of the turbines must cover at least 20% of the sun. While guidelines differ, the ones in Germany are most widely adopted. Accordingly, the maximum impact allowed by shadow flickering is:

- 30 hours per annum of flickering in the worst case
- 30 minutes maximum on the worst day in the year

The shadow flicker exercise was done for each of the turbine towers. The area of flicker influence was determined by the areas receiving 30 or more hours of flickering. The area bounded by the yellow (30-99 hours per annum) is the extent of shadow flicker impact (see figure below). The areas in red reflect those areas that will receive at least 100 hours per annum while the green areas will receive 10-29 hours per annum. The areas unshaded will receive less than 10 hours per annum. Furthermore, zone of influence does not extend more than 2 km beyond any of the towers.

Implications for the Project

The greatest impact is within the 16 km zone. There is little that topography and vegetation can help to mitigate this impact. This will have a high impact on the critical visual receptors such as the farmsteads and occupied buildings. There are farmsteads that will be directly impacted as well as some of the district roads that service the area such as the one that transects the study area which connects Fraserburg with Loxton via the R381 midway between Loxton and Beaufort West. The N1 to the south, the R353 to the west and the R356 to the north are all beyond the visibility zone of influence. There are relatively few visual receptors, such as those that rely on the visual quality of the visual environment, such as game farms, national parks, lodges, and guesthouses, that will be affected.

To minimise the visual intrusion of the red hazard flashing navigation lights, the use of AVWS (Audio Visual Warning System) technology should be investigated. AVWS is a radar-based obstacle avoidance system that activates obstruction lighting and audio signals only when an aircraft is in close proximity to an obstruction on which an AVWS unit is mounted, such as a wind turbine. The obstruction lights and audio warnings are inactive when aircraft are not in proximity to the obstruction.

The substations and the access road will have relatively no impact on the overall visibility as these are visually insignificant compared to the turbine towers. The turbines would be the overwhelming visual intrusion within the landscape and would dominate any lesser structures. The analysis of potential shadow flicker impacts from the development on the visual receptors indicates that the impacts are expected to be minor. It is not expected that the zone of influence will extend further than 2 km from any of the turbines. In reality the impacts beyond 1 km will be very low intensity. Also, shadow flicker is not expected to be a significant environmental impact.




Figure 39: Shadow Flicker Analysis

9.4.4 Visual Impact Assessment Conclusion

The description of the visual impacts of the phases of construction and decommissioning are not considered as significant visual impacts since the period of activity is of relatively short duration and of a primary impact (localized, of short duration and easily mitigated at the end of the phase). The fact that disturbed areas, e.g. camps / lay-down areas will be rehabilitated also reduces the impacts of these phases. It is the operational phase that presents the most significant long term visual impact. This is due primarily to the scale and form of the proposed development. Visibility reduces exponentially the further the viewer is from the proposed development.

The project will exert a negative influence on the visual environment. However, due to the low relative visual quality of the area the overall significance of the visual impact is regarded as Moderate. Based on the field observations and the studies herein and with the implementation of the mitigation measures, it is the Visual Specialist's opinion the visual impact of the wind farm layout does not present a potential fatal flaw provided that the recommended mitigation measures are implemented.

9.5 Transportation

A transportation study was undertaken by SiVEST SA (PTY) Ltd (dated 3rd February 2023).

9.5.1 Baseline Assessment

Existing Road Network

The existing road network surrounding the proposed development is well established and provides a high degree of mobility and access. The mobility roads join the major centres and towns with each other, while access roads provide access roads to serve smaller nodes and individual properties.

Existing Traffic Conditions

Based on typical traffic data for remote areas in the Northern Cape Province, it can be concluded that the existing peak traffic on the N001 section of the road is in the morning at 07:00 (AM) and afternoon at 17:00 (PM). In contrast, on lower order roads, the peak would occur midday between 11:00 – 14:00. Therefore, the specialist has recommended that the transportation of material and abnormal loads on the N001 Freeway be completed in the off-peak periods 09:00 – 15:00. In contrast, we recommend transporting staff from Fraserburg to Klipkraal WEF 1 on Road MR0584 and DR2312 be completed in the mornings before 09:00 and the afternoons after 15:00.

9.5.2 Existing Access

Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated grid infrastructure will be located on a portion of two farms, REM of the Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409 and PTN 1 of the Farm Klipfontein No. 447. Klipkraal WEF 2 and 3 will also be located on these farms, including the REM of the Farm Klipfontein No. 447. All three 3 developments will share a common access point from Road DR02312, bisecting the northern quadrant of the Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409.

Road DR02312 is classified as a Class R4 in the RCAM Classification – Rural Collector Road with an average road reserve width of 20m, a gravel surface of ±6m wide, and an average speed of 80 km/h. The Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409 has one (1) existing access point emanating from Road DR02312 at

Km 82.51. The access point is located on Road DR02312 within the first 10 m as the road enters the farm, travelling west to east.

9.5.3 Additional Traffic Generation

The construction phase for this development will typically generate the highest number of additional vehicles. Of these additional vehicles, ± 82 trips / hour will occur in the morning and afternoon outside of the peak period, while ± 2 trips / hour will occur during the midday peak for construction material and abnormal loads. The impact will, however, be temporary and is considered to be nominal if adequately mitigated. During the operation phase, it is expected that the facility will accommodate ± 30 employees and generate an additional ± 15 trips / day in the morning and afternoon peak period. This impact is considered to be nominal.

9.5.4 Conclusion and Impact Statement

According to the report, it is the specialist's opinion that the Klipkraal WEF 1 will have a nominal impact on the existing traffic network. The project is therefore deemed acceptable from a transport perspective, provided the recommendations and mitigation measures in this report are implemented.

9.6 Wake Effect

A Wake Effect Specialist and DFFE were consulted with regarding the need for a Wake Effect Assessment. Based on discussions held, due to the location of the project and individual turbine locations, a Wake Effect Assessment is not required and therefore has not been undertaken for the Klipkraal 1 WEF project.

10. POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

The relationship between the project and certain key pieces of environmental legislation is discussed in the subsections to follow.

10.1 The Constitution

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996 sets the legal context in which environmental law in South Africa occurs and was formulated. All environmental aspects should be interpreted within the context of the Constitution, National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 and the Environment Conservation Act 73 of 1989.

The Constitution has enhanced the status of the environment by virtue of the fact that an environmental right has been established (Section 24) and because other rights created in the Bill of Rights may impact on environmental management through, for example, access to health care, food and water and social security (Section 27). An objective of local government is to provide a safe and healthy environment (Section 152) and public administration must be accountable, transparent and encourage participation (Section 195(1) (e) to (g)).

Section 24 of the Constitution states that:

"Everyone has the right –

- *To an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and*
- *To have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that:*
 - Prevent pollution and ecological degradation;
 - Promote conservation and
 - Secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development.”

The Constitution is the overarching legislation for South Africa. Although it provides for certain rights and obligations, the NEMA has been promulgated in order to manage the various spheres of both the social and natural environment.

10.2 National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998)

The National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) was promulgated in 1998 but has since been amended on several occasions from this date. The act intends to provide for:

- co-operative environmental governance by establishing principles for decision-making on matters affecting the environment;
- institutions that will promote co-operative governance and procedures for coordinating environmental functions exercised by organs of state;
- to provide for the prohibition, restriction or control of activities which are likely to have a detrimental effect on the environment; and
- to provide for matters connected therewith.

NEMA is the overarching legislation which governs the EIA process and environmental management in South Africa. Sections 24 and 44 of NEMA make provision for the promulgation of regulations that identify activities which may not commence without an EA. Activities that may significantly affect the environment must be considered, investigated and assessed prior to implementation.

According to Section 2(3) of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act No. 107 of 1998), “development must be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable”, which means the integration of these three factors into planning, implementation and decision-making so as to ensure that development serves present and future generations.

The EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) identify lists of activities which have the potential to result in detrimental environmental impacts and thus require EA, subject to either “Basic Assessment” or “Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment”. The Regulations prescribe the procedural and substantive requirements for the undertaking of EIAs and the issue of EA’s.

The proposed project triggers listed activities under Listing Notice 1, 2 and 3 (as detailed in Section 6 above), and thus requires an EA subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Process.

10.3 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guideline for Renewable Energy Projects, DFFE Notice 989 of 2015

The purpose of this document is primarily to provide guidance on the environmental management legal framework applicable to renewable energy operations and all the role players in the sector. The guideline is principally intended for use by the following stakeholder groups:

- Public Sector Authorities (as regulator and/or competent authority);
- Joint public sector authorities and project funders (e.g., Eskom, IDC, etc.);
- Private Sector Entities (as project funder / developer / consultant); and
- Other interested and affected parties (as determined by the project location and/or scope).

This guideline seeks to identify activities requiring authorisation prior to commencement of that activity and provide an interface between national EIA Regulations and other legislative requirements of various authorities.

The guidelines are applicable for the construction, installation and/or development of the following renewable energy projects:

- Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) Plant;
- Wind Energy Facility (WEF);
- Hydropower Station; and
- Photovoltaic (PV) Power Plant.

10.4 National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998)

The National Water Act (NWA) No 36 of 1998 was promulgated on the 20th of August 1998. This Act is important in that it provides a framework to protect water resources against over exploitation and to ensure that there is water for socio-economic and economic development, human needs and to meet the needs of the aquatic environment. The Act also recognises that water belongs to the whole nation for the benefit of all people.

Water resources as defined include a watercourse, surface water, estuary or aquifer. Specifically, a watercourse is defined as (inter alia):

- A river or spring;
- A natural channel in which water flows regularly or intermittently; and
- A wetland, lake or dam into which, or from which water flows.

Due to the possible encroachment into the wetland areas, the following Section 21 water uses in terms of the NWA may be triggered and require licensing:

- (c) impeding or diverting the flow of water in a watercourse; and
- (i) altering the bed, banks, course or characteristics of a watercourse.

In light of the above, there are a number of stipulations within the NWA that are relevant to the potential impacts on rivers, streams and wetlands that may be associated with the proposed development. An Aquatic / Freshwater Impact Assessment (**Appendix 6**) has been conducted to explore how the proposed development may impact on identified water resources as protected by the Act. Should the proposed development require a General Authorisation (GA) or Water Use Licence (WUL), it will be determined and applied for separately prior to construction.

10.5 The National Heritage Resources Act 1999 (25 of 1999)

The National Heritage Resources Act promotes good management of the heritage resources of South Africa which are deemed to have cultural significance and to enable and encourage communities to ensure that these resources are maintained for future generations.

The aim of the Act is to introduce an integrated, three-tier system for the identification, assessment and management of national heritage resources (operating at a national, provincial and local level). This legislation makes provision for a grading system for the evaluation of heritage resources on three levels which broadly coincide with their national, provincial and local significance.

This Act requires investigation to determine the impact of heritage resources when developments exceed the thresholds list in section 38 (1) of the act:

- a) the construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300 m in length;
- b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50 m in length;
- c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site—
 - (i) exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or
 - (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
 - (iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
 - (iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;
- d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or
- e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority,

The proposed development would involve; (c) the development of a WEF and associated infrastructure that will change the character of more than 0.5 ha, and (d), the rezoning of a site that will exceed 1ha.

Under the legislation the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA), was established, which replaced the National Monuments Council. SAHRA is responsible for the preservation of heritage resources with exceptional qualities of special national significance (Grade I sites). A Provincial Heritage Resources Authority, established in each province, will protect Grade II heritage resources which are significance within the context of a province or region. Buildings and sites of local interest (Grade III sites) is the responsibility of local authorities as part of their planning functions. In this case, the Heritage Western Cape (HWC) will need to be consulted with extensively throughout the process.

Within the scope of this project, Section 38 of the NHRA (25 of 1999), states that, as described above, an assessment of potential heritage resources in the development area needs to be done. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA), Paleontological Impact Assessment (PIA) and Cultural Landscape Assessment (CLA) was commissioned to explore how the proposed development may impact on heritage resources and potential cultural artefacts as protected by the Act.

10.6 National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (NEM:BA) (Act No. 10 of 2004, as amended)

As the principal national act regulating biodiversity protection, the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (NEM:BA) (Act No. 10 of 2004), which is administered by the DFFE, is concerned with

the management and conservation of biological diversity, as well as the use of indigenous biological resources in a sustainable manner.

The overarching aim of the NEM:BA, within the framework of the NEMA, is to provide for:

- The management and conservation of biological diversity within South Africa, and of the components of such biological diversity;
- The use of indigenous biological resources in a sustainable manner; and
- The fair and equitable sharing among stakeholders of benefits arising from bio-prospecting involving indigenous biological resources.

In terms of this Act, the developer has a responsibility to:

- Conserve endangered ecosystems and restriction of activities according to the categorisation of the area (not just by listed activity as specified in the EIA regulations);
- Promote the application of appropriate environmental management tools in order to ensure integrated environmental management of activities thereby ensuring that all development within the area are in line with ecological sustainable development and protection of biodiversity; and
- Limit further loss of biodiversity and conserve endangered ecosystems.

The South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) was established in terms of the NEM:BA, its purpose being (inter alia) to report on the status of the country's biodiversity and the conservation status of all listed threatened or protected species and ecosystems.

The NEM:BA provides for a range of measures to protect ecosystems and for the protection of species that are threatened or in need of protection to ensure their survival in the wild, including a prohibition on carrying out a 'restricted activity' involving a specimen of a listed threatened or protected species without a permit issued in terms of Chapter 7 of the Act. According to Section 57 of the Act, 'Restricted activities involving listed threatened or protected species':

A Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment (**Appendix 6**) has been conducted to explore how the proposed development may impact on biodiversity as protected by the Act.

In addition, all relevant conservation departments (such as the SANBI and DENC) will be invited to provide comments with regards to the proposed development.

10.7 National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act, 2003 (Act No.57 of 2003 as amended)

The overarching aim of the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (NEMPAA) Act No. 57 of 2003, within the framework of NEMA, is to provide for:

- the declaration and management of protected areas;
- co-operative governance in the declaration and management of protected areas;
- effect a national system of protected areas in South Africa as part of a strategy to manage and conserve its biodiversity;
- a representative network of protected areas on state land, private land and communal land;
- promote sustainable utilisation of protected areas for the benefit of people, in a manner that would preserve the ecological character of such areas;

- promote participation of local communities in the management of protected areas, where appropriate; and
- the continued existence of South African National Parks.

The proposed project is not located in close proximity to any protected areas.

10.8 National Forests Act (NFA) (Act No. 84 of 1998)

The National Forest Act (NFA) (Act No. 24 of 1998) was enacted to:

- Provide for the protection, management and utilisation of forests;
- The protection of certain plant and animal life;
- The regulation of trade in forest produce; and
- The control and management of a national hiking way system and National Botanic Gardens.

The NFA enforces the necessity for a license to be obtained prior to destroying any indigenous tree in a natural forest and, subject to certain exemptions, cutting, disturbing, damaging, destroying or removing any protected tree. The list of protected trees is currently contained in GN 908 of 21 November 2014. Licenses are issued by the Minister and are subject to periods and conditions as may be stipulated.

Protected trees

According to this act, the Minister may declare a tree, group of trees, woodland or a species of trees as protected. The prohibitions provide that 'no person may cut, damage, disturb, destroy or remove any protected tree, or collect, remove, transport, export, purchase, sell, donate or in any other manner acquire or dispose of any protected tree, except under a licence granted by the Minister'.

Forests

Prohibits the destruction of indigenous trees in any natural forest without a licence.

The NFA is relevant to the proposed development as the removal and/or disturbance and/or clearance of indigenous vegetation will be required and a license in terms of the NFA may be required for this to be done.

A Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment (**Appendix 6**) has been conducted to explore how the proposed development may impact on vegetation as protected by the Act.

In addition, all relevant conservation departments (such as the SANBI and DENC) will be invited to provide comments with regards to the proposed development.

10.9 National Veld and Forest Fire Act (Act No. 101 of 1998)

Provides requirements for veldfire prevention through firebreaks and required measures for firefighting. Chapter 4 of the Act places a duty on landowners to prepare and maintain firebreaks. Chapter 5 of the Act places a duty on all landowners to acquire equipment and have available personnel to fight fires.

10.10 Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (CARA) (Act No. 43 of 1983)

The Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (CARA) (Act No. 43 of 1983) controls the utilisation of natural agricultural resources in South Africa. The Act promotes the conservation of soil, water sources and vegetation as well as the combating weeds and invader plants. The Act requires the protection of land against soil erosion and the prevention of water logging and salinization of soils by means of suitable soil conservation works to be constructed and maintained. The utilisation of marshes, water sponges and watercourses are also addressed.

The primary objective of the Act is to conserve natural agricultural resources by:

- maintaining the production potential of land;
- combating and preventing erosion and weakening or destruction of the water resources;
- protecting vegetation; and
- combating weeds and invaders plants.

In terms of this Act, no degradation of natural land is permitted. Rehabilitation after disturbance to agricultural land is also managed by this Act. The CARA is relevant to the proposed development as the construction of a WEF as well as other components (such as the on-site switching substation and permanent guard house) may impact on agricultural resources and vegetation on the site. The Act prohibits the spreading of weeds and prescribes control measures that need to be complied with in order to achieve this. As such, measures will need to be taken to protect agricultural resources and prevent weeds and exotic plants from invading the site as a result of the proposed development.

Declared Weeds and Invaders in South Africa are categorised according to one (1) of the following categories:

- Category 1 plants: are prohibited and must be controlled.
- Category 2 plants: (commercially used plants) may be grown in demarcated areas providing that there is a permit and that steps are taken to prevent their spread.
- Category 3 plants: (ornamentally used plants) may no longer be planted; existing plants may remain, as long as all reasonable steps are taken to prevent the spreading thereof, except within the flood line of watercourses and wetlands.

An Agricultural and Soils Site Verification (**Appendix 6**) has been conducted to explore how the proposed development may impact on the agricultural production potential of the proposed site.

10.11 National Road Traffic Act (NRTA) (Act No. 93 of 1996, as amended)

The National Road Traffic Act (NRTA) (Act No. 93 of 1996, as amended) provides for all road traffic matters and is applied uniformly throughout South Africa. The Act enforces the necessity of registering and licensing motor vehicles. It also stipulates requirements regarding fitness of drivers and vehicles as well as making provision for the transportation of dangerous goods.

All the requirements stipulated in the NRTA will need to be complied with during the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.

10.12 Civil Aviation Act (CAA) (Act No. 13 of 2009)

The Civil Aviation Act (CAA) (Act No. 13 of 2009) controls and regulates aviation within South Africa. It provides for the establishment of a South African Civil Aviation Authority (SACAA) and independent

Aviation Safety Investigation Board in compliance with Annexure 13 of the Chicago Convention. It gives effect to various conventions related to aircraft offences, civil aviation safety and security, and provides for additional measures directed at more effective control of the safety and security of aircrafts, airports and matters connected thereto.

Although the Act is not directly relevant to the proposed development, it should be considered as the establishment of electricity distribution infrastructure (such as a substation and powerlines) may impact on aviation and air traffic safety, if located directly within aircraft flight paths.

The Air Traffic and Navigation Services Company Limited (ATNS) and the SACAA will be consulted throughout the EIA process, however the screening assessment identified low sensitivity for civil aviation and no significant impacts on civil aviation is expected. No additional requirements were identified in this regard.

10.13 Astronomy Geographic Advantage Act (Act No. 21 of 2007)

The Astronomy Geographic Advantage Act (Act No. 21 of 2007) provides for:

- The preservation and protection of areas that are uniquely suited for optical and radio astronomy; and
- Intergovernmental cooperation and public consultation on matters concerning nationally significant astronomy advantage areas and matters connected therewith.

Under Section 22(1) of the Act, the Minister has the authority to protect the radio frequency spectrum for astronomy observations within a core or central astronomy advantage area. As such, the Minister may under section 23(1) of the Act, declare that no person may undertake certain activities within a core or central Astronomy Advantage Area (AAA). These activities include the construction, expansion or operation; of any fixed radio frequency interference source, facilities for the generation, transmission or distribution of electricity, or any activity capable of causing radio frequency interference or which may detrimentally influence the astronomy and scientific endeavours.

In terms of section 7(1) and 7(2) of this Act, national government established the following AAAs:

- Karoo Central AAA (GN 198 of 2014) – proposed development falls inside of this AAA
- Sutherland Central AAA – proposed development falls outside this AAA
- Northern Cape AAA (GN 115 of 2010) – proposed development falls outside of this AA




Figure 40: Location of the project in relation to the KCAAA

The proposed site falls within the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) Karoo Central Radio Astronomy Advantage Area (KCAAA) 1 buffer (refer **Figure** above). The main impacts of renewable energy developments on the SKA is RFI. RFI is a part of the Electromagnetic Compatibility (EMC) discipline that includes Electromagnetic emissions and Electromagnetic immunity. Based on correspondence received from SARAO, it was determined that the Klipkraal 1 WEF represents a low risk of interference to the SKA radio telescope with a compliance surplus of 9.84 dBm/Hz for the project site within the KCAAA1. SARAO therefore did not require an EMC Control Plan and had no objection to the development.

10.14 National Energy Act (Act No. 34 of 2008)

South Africa has two (2) acts that direct the planning and development of the country's electricity sector, namely:

- i. The National Energy Act of 2008 (Act No. 34 of 2008); and
- ii. The Electricity Regulation Act (ERA) of 2006 (Act No. 4 of 2006).

The National Energy Act (Act No. 34 of 2008), promulgated in 2008, has, as one (1) of its key objectives, the promotion of diversity of supply of energy and its sources. From this standpoint, the Act directly references the importance of the renewable energy (RE) sector, with a mention of the solar energy sector included. The aim is to ensure that the South African economy is able to grow and develop, fast-tracking poverty alleviation, through the availability of a sustainable, diverse energy mix. Moreover, the goal is to provide for the increased generation and consumption of RE (Republic of South Africa, 2008).

10.15 Electricity Regulation Act (Act No. 4 of 2006)

In 2011, the electricity regulation on new generation capacity was published under Section 35(4) of the Electricity Regulation Act (ERA) (Act No. 4 of 2006). These regulations apply to the procurement of new generation capacity by organs of state.

The objectives of the regulations include:

- To facilitate planning for the establishment of new generation capacity;
- The regulation of entry by a buyer and a generator into a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA);
- To set minimum standards or requirements for PPAs;
- The facilitation of the full recovery by the buyer of all costs efficiently incurred by it under, or in connection with, a PPA including a reasonable return based on the risks assumed by the buyer thereunder and to ensure transparency and cost reflectivity in the determination of electricity tariffs; and
- The provision of a framework for implementation of an Independent Power Producer (IPP) procurement programme and the relevant agreements concluded.

The Act establishes a National Energy Regulator as the custodian and enforcer of the National Electricity Regulatory Framework. The Act also provides for licenses and registration as the manner in which generation, transmission, distribution, trading and the import and export of electricity are regulated.

10.16 Protection of Public Information Act (Act No. 4 of 2013)

The Protection of Public Information Act (Act No. 4 of 2013) (POPIA) recognises the Constitutional requirement that everyone has a right to privacy.

Ultimately the Act promotes “the protection of personal information processed by public and private bodies; to introduce certain conditions so as to establish minimum requirements for the processing of personal information; to provide for the establishment of an Information Regulator to exercise certain powers and to perform certain duties and functions in terms of this Act and the Promotion of Access to Information Act, 2000 (PAIA); to provide for the issuing of codes of conduct; to provide for the rights of persons regarding unsolicited electronic communications and automated decision making; to regulate the flow of personal information across the borders of the Republic; and to provide for matters connected therewith”.

Due to the requirements around the Public Participation Process, SIVEST will process and capture information aligned to the POPIA and always obtain consent for I&APs information to be gathered, stored and distributed for the purpose of this project.

10.17 Renewable Energy Development Zones (REDZs) and Strategic Transmission Corridors

The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for Wind and Solar PV Energy in South Africa (CSIR, 2015) originally identified eight (8) formally gazetted Renewable Energy Development Zones (REDZs) that are of strategic importance for large-scale wind and solar PV development in terms of Strategic Integrated Project 8: Green Energy in Support of the South African Economy, as well as associated

strategic transmission corridors, including the rollout of its supporting transmission and distribution infrastructure, in terms of Strategic Integrated Project 10: Electricity Transmission and Distribution.

- REDZs for large-scale wind and solar photovoltaic development;
- associated Strategic Transmission Corridors which support areas where long-term electricity grid will be developed;
- process of basic assessment to be followed and reduced decision-making timeframe for processing of applications for environmental authorisation in terms of the NEMA; and
- acceptance of routes which have been pre-negotiated with all landowners as part of applications for environmental authorisations for power lines and substations.

In addition to the eight (8) formally gazetted REDZs mentioned above, the Phase 2 SEA for Wind and Solar Photovoltaic Energy in South Africa (2019) identified three (3) additional REDZs (namely REDZ 9, REDZ 10 and REDZ 11) that are of strategic importance for large scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy development. These REDZs were published under Government Notice No. 786, Government Gazette No. 43528 of 17 July of 2020, and were officially gazetted under Government Notice No. 144, Government Gazette No. 44191 of 26 February 2021.

Table 15: The SEA for Wind and Solar PV Energy in South Africa (Phase 1 and Phase 2) (CSIR, 2015; CSIR, 2019) identified the following eleven (11) geographic areas for REDZs

REDZ Number	Name	Applicability of REDZ
REDZ 1	Overberg	Large-scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 2	Komsberg	Large-scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 3	Cookhouse	Large-scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 4	Stormberg	Large-scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 5	Kimberley	Large-scale solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 6	Vryburg	Large-scale solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 7	Upington	Large-scale solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 8	Springbok	Large-scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 9	Emalahieni	Large scale solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 10	Klerksdorp	Large scale solar photovoltaic energy facilities
REDZ 11	Beaufort West	Large scale wind and solar photovoltaic energy facilities

It should be noted that the powerline and proposed 400kV MTS (to be assessed under a separate application) are located within the Northern Corridor of the Strategic Transmission Corridors, as defined and in terms of the procedures laid out in Government Gazette No. 41445 and No. 44191.

The proposed development will be subject to an EIA process in terms of the NEMA, as amended, and the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended). Since the proposed project falls within one (1) of the Strategic Transmission Corridors, it is expected to contribute towards the requirement of renewable energy highlighted by the development of these zones. A map of the development in relation to the nearest REDZ has been included in **Appendix 2**.

10.18 Additional Relevant Legislation

- White Paper on the Energy Policy of the Republic of South Africa (1998)
- Occupational Health and Safety Act (Act No. 85 of 1993) [OHSA];
- Environment Conservation Act (Act 73 of 1989) [ECA]

- Road Safety Act (Act No. 93 of 1996) [RSA];
- National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (Act No. 39 of 2004) [NEM:AQA];
- National Environmental Management: Waste Act (Act No. 59 of 2008, as amended) [NEM;WA];
- Development Facilitation Act (Act No. 67 of 1995) [DFA];
- Promotion of Access to Information Act, (Act No. 2 of 2000); [PAIA]
- The Hazardous Substances Act (Act No. 15 of 1973) [HSA];
- Water Services Act (Act No. 108 of 1998) [WSA];
- Municipal Systems Act (Act No. 32 of 2000) [MSA];
- Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act, 70 of 1970, and
- Mineral and Petroleum Resource Development Act (Act No. 28 of 2002, as amended) [MPRDA].

11. KEY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND GUIDELINES

In his 2021 State of the Nation Address, President Cyril Rhamaposa announced government are taking the following measures to rapidly and significantly increase generation capacity outside of Eskom:

- *One of the priority investment areas is to rapidly expand energy generation capacity.*
- *Restoring Eskom to operational and financial health and accelerating its restructuring process is central to achieving this objective. Eskom has been restructured into three separate entities for generation, transmission and distribution.*
- *A Section 34 Ministerial Determination will be issued shortly to give effect to the Integrated Resource Plan 2019, enabling the development of additional grid capacity from renewable energy, natural gas, hydro power, battery storage and coal.*
- *We will initiate the procurement of emergency power from projects that can deliver electricity into the grid within 3 to 12 months from approval.*
- *The Department of Mineral Resources and Energy gazetted the Amended Schedule 2 of the Electricity Regulation Act 4 of 2006 on 12 August 2021, for 100 Megawatts of embedded electricity generation as approved by Minister Gwede Mantashe.*
- *We will negotiate supplementary power purchase agreements to acquire additional capacity from existing wind and solar plants.*
- *We will also put in place measures to enable municipalities in good financial standing to procure their own power from independent power producers.*

Policy decisions taken in the next decade will largely determine the dimension of the impact of climate change. Local government is in the front line of implementation and service delivery, and thus needs to pursue adequate mitigation and adaptation strategies which should include participation from the public sector, the private sector and NGOs.

The DoE gazetted its White Paper on Renewable Energy in 2003 and introduced it as a 'policy that envisages a range of measures to bring about integration of renewable energies into the mainstream energy economy.' At that time, the national target was fixed at 10 000 GWh (0.8 Mtoe) renewable energy contribution to final energy consumption by 2013. The White Paper proposed that this would be produced mainly from biomass, wind, solar and small-scale hydropower. It went on to recommend that this renewable energy should be utilised for power generation and non-electric technologies such as solar water heating and biofuels. Since the White Paper was gazetted, South Africa's primary and secondary energy requirements have remained heavily fossil-fuel dependent, both in terms of indigenous coal production and use, as well as the use of imported oil resources. Alongside this, the projected electricity demand of the country has led the National utility Eskom, to embark upon an

intensive build programme to secure South Africa's longer-term energy needs, together with an adequate reserve margin.

The National Development Plan (NDP), 2011 – 2030, aims to address parts of the South African triple development challenges of poverty and inequality by 2030. In order to achieve this, numerous enabling milestones and critical actions have been formulated. One (1) of the critical actions is the formulation and implementation of interventions that aim to ensure environmental sustainability and resilience to future shocks.

The emphasis is on South African investment and assistance in the exploitation of various opportunities for low-carbon energy in the clean energy sources of Southern Africa (National Planning Commission, 2011).

A more efficient and competitive infrastructure is envisaged, particularly infrastructure that facilitates economic activity and is conducive to growth and job creation. The plan identifies key services that need strengthening; namely commercial transport, energy, telecommunications and water, while ensuring their long-term affordability and sustainability. The National Planning Commission maintains that South Africa has missed a generation of capital investment in many infrastructure opportunities including electricity. Therefore, one (1) infrastructure investment priority is in the procurement of at least 20,000 MW of renewable energy-efficiency (National Planning Commission, 2011).

The proposed project is thus well aligned with the aims of the NDP which is further detailed in the following national and provincial plans:

- National Integrated Resource Plan for Electricity (2010-2030);
- Integrated Resource Plan (IRP 2019)
- National Infrastructure Plan 2012, as amended;
- Northern Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework;
- Northern Cape Province Strategic Plan 2020-2025 (refer section 8)

11.1 Northern Cape Province Strategic Plan 2020 - 2025

The Northern Cape Province Strategic Plan 2020-2025, highlights the need for energy security and the finalization of the draft Northern Cape Renewable Energy Strategy was identified as a key focus area. The Northern Cape province not only supports this sector but are identifying ways to tap into and draw benefit from the endless opportunities that the renewable energy sector holds for the economic development of the Province.

11.2 Namakwa District Municipality Development Plan, 2021 – 2022

The Namakwa District Municipality IDP contains thirteen strategic objectives namely:

- Monitor and support local municipalities to deliver basic services which include water, sanitation, housing, electricity and waste management
- Support vulnerable groups
- Improve administrative and financial viability and capability
- Promote and facilitate Local Economic development
- Enhance good governance
- Promote and facilitate spatial transformation and sustainable urban development

- Improve communication and communication systems
- Establish a customer care system
- Invest in the improvement of ICT systems
- To render a municipal health service
- To coordinate the disaster management and fire management services in the district
- Implement the climate change response plan
- Caring for the environment

The IDP includes sectoral plans which are intended to ensure alignment between the different organs of state while providing input in the overall strategic objectives of the municipality. Sectoral plans include the Rural Development Plan, Climate Change Response Plan, Tourism Sector Plan, Air Quality Plan and the Housing Sector Plan.

The Rural Development Plan notes that the NDM has a competitive advantage in the energy sector with solar, wind, nuclear, wave and natural gas energy plants identified for the area. Of note is the potential for an Eskom nuclear power plant to be constructed at Klienzee. RE has recently become one of the cornerstones of NDM's economy of the District and there needs to be engagement on a National level to ensure that the district profits from this resource. The plan notes unemployment as one of the main reasons for poverty and highlights the importance of productive employment opportunities for reducing poverty and achieving sustainable economic and social development. Economic diversification in rural areas is crucial for bringing about rural development.

The Tourism Sector Plan is of relevance to the proposed development as it identifies existing and priority tourism clusters based on destinations and distribution points. Five such clusters have been identified. The clusters include the diamond and history cluster, the river and grapes cluster, outdoor action cluster, the Kalahari adventure cluster and the Ocean, desert and flower cluster, which the proposed power line would pass by.

11.3 Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality Integrated Development Plan (2020/21 Revised)

The KH IDP (2017-2022) identifies four Key Performance Areas (KPA's). The following categories of importance for the Municipality is as follows for the KPA's: KPA 1, Basic Service Delivery and KPA 2, Local Economic Development, are the most relevant to the proposed project.

In terms of KPA 2, Local Economic Development (LED), the IDP highlights the importance of private public partnerships for achieving economic development in the KH. The LED policy framework identifies a number of LED Policy Pillars/Thrusts. Of relevance to the Needs Assessment these include building a diverse economic base, developing learning and skilful economies, and enterprise development and support. The IDP identifies a number of projects associated with the LED Pillar/Thrusts. Of relevance these include:

Building a diverse economic base

- Investigate possible opportunities for development of renewable energy.

Developing learning and skillful local economies

- Identify skill gaps and implements skills development and training programmes

Developing inclusive economies

- Support the informal and rural economy.
- Support development of women and the youth.
- Establish community gardens.

The IDP also highlights the need to support for the rural economy, with specific reference to the One House Hold One Hectare (1HH1HA) Programme. The Objectives of the 1HH1HA Programme include reducing poverty in rural areas, creating opportunities for Black Commercial Smallholding Farmers, improving security of tenure for HD rural communities and develop farming skills. The benefits for the 1HH1HA Programme include job creating, poverty alleviation, food security, skills development, security of tenure and restoration of dignity to marginalised HD rural communities.

The high unemployment levels and the lack of meaningful employment opportunities represents a key challenge faced by the youth in the KH. There are also inadequate educational facilities/institutions such as Technikons, FET colleges and Universities in the KH and ND.

The IDP also refers to the need to interact with National and Provincial and District agencies aimed at youth development. The provision of quality education at Early Child Development (ECD) is also a key need. The challenges facing ECDs include lack of proper facilities and support material at learning centres, lack of funding, and food security.

The IDP also highlights the threat posed by climate change, noting it threatens food security, poverty alleviation and sustainable socio-economic growth. Vulnerable households are at most risk. A combination of increasing temperatures and reduced and/or more variable rainfall could have severe negative impacts for the Namakwa District, including the KHM. In this regard the KHM is characterised by high levels of poverty and inequality, isolated communities, and a large geographical area, which results in a vulnerable population. Large numbers of people, both private and communal, are also directly dependent on agriculture, and therefore on functioning ecosystems and water regimes, for their livelihoods. These communities and households are therefore directly affected by the risks posed by climate change.

The IDP notes that the KHM is likely to be one of the most affected municipalities in terms of the impact of climate change on water quality and availability. Addressing these threats and the needs associated with the threat posed by climate change is therefore a key challenge.

12. NEED AND DESIRABILITY

12.1 National Renewable Energy Requirement

In 2010, South Africa had 44,157 MW of power generation capacity installed. Current forecasts indicate that by 2025, the expected growth in demand will require the current installed power generation capacity to be almost doubled to approximately 74,000 MW (SAWEA, 2010).

This growing demand, fuelled by increasing economic growth and social development within Southern Africa, is placing increasing pressure on South Africa's existing power generation capacity. Coupled with this, is the growing awareness of environmental impact, climate change and the need for sustainable development. Despite the worldwide concern regarding Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and climate change, South Africa continues to rely heavily on coal as its primary source of energy, while most of the countries renewable energy resources remain largely untapped (DME, 2003). There is therefore an increasing need to establish a new source of generating power in SA within the next decade.

The use of renewable energy technologies, as one (1)10 of a mix of technologies needed to meet future energy consumption requirements is being investigated as part of Eskom's long-term strategic planning and research process. It must be remembered that wind energy is plentiful, renewable, widely distributed, clean and reduces GHG emissions when it displaces fossil-fuel derived from electricity. In this light, renewable wind energy can be seen as desirable.

The REIPPP programme and the competitive nature of the bidding process has resulted in significant lowering of solar and wind tariff prices since 2011. Further projects will increase the competitive nature of the REIPPP program and further result in cost savings to South African consumers.

12.2 National Renewable Energy Commitment

In support of the need to find solutions for the current electricity shortages, the increasing demand for energy, as well as the need to find more sustainable and environmentally friendly energy resources, South Africa has embarked on an infrastructure growth programme supported by various government initiatives. These include the National Development Plan (NDP), the Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Commission (PICC), the DoE's IRP, the National Strategy for Sustainable Development, the National Climate Change Response White Paper, the Presidency of the Republic of South Africa's Medium-Term Framework, and the National Treasury's Carbon Tax Policy Paper.

The Government's commitment to growing the renewable energy industry in South Africa is also supported by the White Paper on Renewable Energy (2003) which sets out the Government's principals, goals and objectives for promoting and implementing renewable energy in South Africa. In order to achieve the long term goal of achieving a sustainable renewable energy industry, the DoE has set a target of contributing 17,8GW of renewable energy to the final energy consumption by 2030. This target is to be produced mainly through, wind and solar; but also through biomass and small scale hydro (DME, 2003; IRP, 2010). Further renewable energy targets have been proposed within the latest IRP, which was gazetted in 2019.

The 2019 Integrated Resource Plan (2019) (IRP2019) was released on 18 October 2019 and includes the following capacity allocation:

- 1 500 MW of new coal power (noting that there will be decommissioning of coal capacity over the period);
- 2 500 MW of hydro power;
- 6 000 MW solar;
- 14 400 MW wind;
- 2 000 MW of storage;
- 3 000 MW from gas.

12.3 Wind Power Potential in South Africa and Internationally

Onshore wind energy technology is the most commonly used and commercially developed renewable energy technology in South Africa as wind is abundant and inexhaustible (DEA Guideline for Renewable Energy, 2015). Wind energy is one (1) of the lowest-priced renewable energy sources and is economically competitive (www.wasaproject.info).

12.4 Site Suitability

The location of the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 (this application) and proposed on-site Switching / Collector Substation included several key aspects including wind resource, grid connection suitability/infrastructure as well as environmental and social constraints, proximity to various planning units and strategic areas and topography and access.

12.4.1 Wind Resource

The applicant installed two met masts on the project site in September 2021. Wind speed trends have been monitored and data has been collected and analysed. The analysis of this data has confirmed that the proposed site is deemed suitable in terms of wind resource.




Figure 41: Wind Data from Met Mast 1




Figure 42: Wind Data from Met Mast 1

12.4.2 Site Access

The Klipkraal WEF 1 development access point is from Road DR02312, bisecting the northern quadrant of the Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409. Road DR02312 is classified as a Class R4 in the RCAM Classification – Rural Collector Road with an average road reserve width of 20m, a gravel surface of ± 6 m wide, and an average speed of 80 km/h. The Farm Matjes Fontein No. 409 has one (1) existing access point emanating from Road DR02312 at Km 82.51. The access point is located on Road DR02312 within the first 10 m as the road enters the farm, travelling west to east.

12.4.3 Topography and Land Use

The project site is located immediately north of the border between the Western Cape and the Northern Cape Provinces. The Klipkraal se Berg (altitude of 1 907m) and the Skurwekop (altitude 1 599m) are the two dominant topographical features in the area and are located to the south of the project site with an unnamed ridge line is located at the northern extremity of the site which reaches a height of approximately 1 400m. The areas between these two high lying is relatively flat falling in a northerly direction.

The proposed project site has topography which is suitable for the development of a WEF.

12.4.4 Policy

From a strategic renewable energy development perspective, the Klipkraal WEF 1 site is located approximately 72 km east of the Komsberg Wind Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ) 2. In addition, the associated grid route is located within the Electrical Grid Infrastructure (EGI) Central corridor. The proposed project site is therefore linked to the national planning vision for wind and solar development in South Africa.




Figure 43: Location of the Klipkraal WEF 1 in relation to the REDZ and Power corridors

12.4.5 Environmental

The applicant conducted an extensive environmental screening process (including avifaunal and terrestrial ecological) using various available desktop data and tools to determine the suitability of the site. The National Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environmental (DFFE) screening tool was also utilized to generate a site sensitivity report for the proposed Klipkraal WEF cluster. The outcome of the site selection process was the identification of a ±3,314 ha potentially developable area on which three wind farm projects are being proposed, one of which it the Klipkraal WEF 1. In addition to the screening tool, the pre-application environmental screening process also involved the following:

Avifaunal

An avifaunal specialist was appointed to conduct a site sensitivity screening visit to identify key priority species nesting within the project or neighbouring properties which may require buffering out of large portions of the proposed project site. Numerous Verreaux's eagle nests were identified on the southern portion of the greater Klipkraal WEF project site (Refer Figure 41 below). A 3.7 km no-go buffer (red layer in figure below) and a 5.2 km medium sensitivity buffer (orange layer in figure below) were applied to each nest identified. This resulted in the site boundaries and layouts for the individual WEF projects being amended to accommodate the buffers prescribed. The Klipkraal WEF 1 has therefore avoided these buffers.




Figure 44: Verreaux's Eagle nests identified and buffers in relation to the Klipkraal WEF sites

Aquatic

An aquatic specialist was appointed to undertake a pre-application screening to identify the presence of aquatic features on the project. The specialist delineated the aquatic features and prescribed buffers which the applicant took into consideration when amending the individual site boundaries and for the development of the preliminary layout. The preliminary layout was then further refined based on specialist findings during the scoping phase which informed the final proposed layout.

Terrestrial Ecological

The Klipkraal cluster site was visited on two occasions for the current study, from 22-28 June 2021 and 05 September 2021. The initial site visit included putting camera traps out across the Klipkraal site (a total of 30 cameras) with the aim of verifying the presence of the Riverine Rabbit but also other fauna more generally. During the site visits, the wind farm site was extensively investigated in the field. Potentially sensitive features within the site were investigated, validated and characterised in the field including any pans, rocky outcrops and major drainage features that were observed in the field or from satellite imagery of the site. Particular attention was paid to the integrity of habitats present as well as the broader ecological context in terms of connectivity and broad-scale ecological processes likely to be operating at the site.

In terms of the actual sampling approaches that were used, the vegetation of the site was characterised through walk-through surveys distributed across the site, in which plant species lists for the different habitats observed were compiled. Specific attention was paid to the possible presence of species of conservation concern (SCC) as well as other species which are considered to be of ecological significance. In terms of fauna, active searches were conducted for reptiles and amphibians across the site, within habitats where such species are likely to be encountered. In addition, all reptiles and

amphibians encountered while doing other field work were recorded. The camera traps were concentrated within riparian and floodplain areas identified as the most favourable potential habitat for this species. This amounted to approximately two-thirds of the cameras and the remainder were located in other habitats. In order to increase the number of fauna captured, the cameras were placed along paths, fences etc. where fauna are likely to pass and be captured by the cameras. The cameras were placed in the field in June 2021 and retrieved in September 2021, giving rise to nine weeks of camera trapping to inform the current study.

The specialist delineated the sensitivities on site and prescribed buffers based on the above, which the applicant took into consideration when amending the individual site boundaries and preliminary layout. The preliminary layout was then further refined based on specialist findings during the scoping phase which informed the final proposed layout. The major sensitive features of the site including Riverine Rabbit habitat and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat have been mapped as high or faunae very high sensitivity and would not be impacted by turbine footprint areas. Some impact to these areas from limited amounts of overhead cabling or turbine access roads are considered acceptable.

12.4.6 Land Availability

Availability of land is a key feasibility criterion in the site selection process. The identified project site for the Klipkraal WEF 1 is of a suitable land size for the proposed development. Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd has entered into an option to lease agreements with the respective landowners of the properties within the project site. All affected landowners have given their consent and have signed letters of consent for the undertaking of the Scoping and EIA Process and the subsequent development of the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 should EA be granted.

12.4.7 Access to Grid

The cost estimate letter has been applied for with Eskom. The applicant has engaged with Eskom on numerous occasions and is dealing with their distribution and transmission network planners. The proposed WEF will connect to the Droerivier MTS (approximately 70km from the application site). Eskom has been fully engaged on the full development of the Klipkraal project and the capacity required to be evacuated from the entire development.

The site is considered suitable for the reasons provided above. The investigation of an alternative site is not currently proposed within this Scoping Report. There is therefore no site alternative for the Klipkraal WEF.

12.5 Reduce dependency on fossil fuels

At present, more than 90% of South Africa's energy is generated by coal-fired power stations. Apart from the fact that these are finite resources that will eventually run out, fossil fuels are also harmful to the environment when used to produce electricity. During combustion, fossil fuels such as coal emit many by-products into the atmosphere, two (2) of which are carbon dioxide (CO₂) and sulphur dioxide (SO₂). Both these gases have been shown to contribute to the worsening climate crisis. Wind is a free and infinite resource that occurs naturally in the environment. Converting wind energy into electricity releases no harmful by-products into the environment and will reduce the dependency on fossil fuels.

12.6 Stimulate the economy

The proposed development has the potential to stimulate the demand for other industries, among others construction services, engineering service, transport services, steel structures, cement and other aggregates, and electrical equipment. At the local level, increase in demand for accommodation, personal services, perishable and non-perishable goods is expected, which will stimulate the local economies of the towns and settlements, where labour will be procured from or where migrant workers will be temporarily located.

Some of the local businesses could benefit from sub-contracting opportunities, if the construction companies appointed by the developer implement a local community procurement policy, and consumer expenditure of the construction crew. Furthermore, the demand for hospitality services (including accommodation and catering in the towns Fraserburg and other nearby towns) is expected to increase and provide for much-needed stimulus for the local economy.

According to the Social Impact Assessment, any project which contributes positively towards the objectives mentioned within national policies could be considered strategically important for the country. A review of the national policy environment suggests that the increased utilisation of Renewable Energy (RE) sources is considered integral to reducing South Africa's carbon footprint, diversifying the national economy, and contributing towards social upliftment and economic development. As the project comprises a RE project and would contribute RE supply to provincial and national targets set out and supported within these national policies, it is considered that the project fits within the national policy framework.

12.7 Job opportunities and household livelihoods

Wind energy projects create both temporary and permanent job opportunities in South Africa for both skilled and unskilled workers. Given the local unemployment rate and limited job opportunities, this development will bring job opportunities in the area, that will represent a localized, social benefit. Even more the sector of the local economy most likely to benefit from the proposed development.

12.8 Skills development

In addition to the job creation, there is valuable opportunities for skills enhancement/development/training and knowledge transfer as quite often input from experts are required in this field. Therefore, opportunities for guiding and training of local workers is created. A variation of skill sets is required ranging from semi-skilled construction workers to highly skilled engineers. The skill set of the majority of the municipality's residents comprises of low-skills, which means that with proper planning and recruitment strategies, many of the local unemployed residents could be hired as temporary construction workers on site provided they satisfy any other recruitment criteria.

Those employed will either develop new skills or enhance current skills. This insinuates that inexperienced workers will have the opportunity to attain and develop new skills, while experienced workers will further improve their existing skills. Albeit the employment is temporary, the skills attained will be of long-term benefit to employees. However, as any skills set it will need to be supported and practised on a regular basis to maintain its currency.

13. MOTIVATION FOR THE PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT WITHIN THE APPROVED SITE AS CONTEMPLATED IN THE SCOPING REPORT

The layout that was included in the Scoping Phase reporting has been refined based on specialist findings and a final proposed layout has been compiled for approval (refer **Figure 44 and 45** below). The final proposed layout / preferred development footprint that is being put forward is the most feasible layout configuration. The layout has been refined based on information from the pre-screening phase through to the impact assessment phase which has resulted in a layout where all turbine and supporting infrastructure (with the exception of certain internal roads) avoids the no-go areas identified.

All no-go areas identified to date by the specialists as indicated in the sensitivity mapping below have been taken into account and the turbines and supporting infrastructure shifted where necessary to inform the proposed turbine layout for the Klipkraal WEF 1. All turbines and associated infrastructure (the substation and BESS fall within the high sensitivity buffer, however the bat specialist has indicated that development of infrastructure within the high sensitivity buffer is acceptable but must be kept to a minimum) are placed outside of the no-go areas (which are inclusive of the associated buffers) identified by specialists. Refer **Figure 44** below of the turbine and supporting infrastructure layout.




Figure 45: Turbine and supporting infrastructure sensitivity layout

The avifaunal undertook a site sensitivity screening visit to identify key priority species nesting within the project or neighbouring properties which may require buffering out of large portions of the proposed project site. Numerous Verreaux's eagle nests were identified on the southern portion of the greater Klipkraal WEF project site (Refer Figure 41 below). A 3.7 km no-go buffer and a 5.2 km medium sensitivity buffer (refer to section 12.4) were applied to each nest identified. This resulted in the site

boundaries and layouts for the individual WEF projects being amended to accommodate the buffers prescribed. The Klippraal WEF 1 has therefore avoided these buffers which in turn informed the development footprint.

The provided layout (revised by the screening and pre-application scoping phase inputs) has, to a large degree, avoided any sensitive aquatic features and associated buffer areas, significantly reducing the potential overall impact and risk to aquatic resources on the study site. Where watercourses have to be crossed by access roads or cable infrastructure, the specialist has recommended that the design of these crossings must make provision for adequate hydraulic sizing to prevent any damming on the upstream side of these structures.

The bat specialist has stated that whilst the turbine locations do not fall within the bat no-go areas (high sensitivity area and high sensitivity buffers), a blade overhang of 100m on the turbines listed in section 8 will fall within the high sensitivity buffer. The applicant has therefore indicated that the blade overhang on these turbines will be reduced as to avoid these no-go areas once the final design layout has been determined. In addition, the substation and BESS fall within the high sensitivity buffer, however the bat specialist has indicated that development of infrastructure within the high sensitivity buffer is acceptable but must be kept to a minimum.

No fatal flaws have been identified by any of the specialists and all impacts can be mitigated to acceptable levels.




Figure 46: Final proposed layout / development footprint with site sensitivities

The following updates have been made to the layout:

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

Prepared by:



Project No. 16891
 Description Klippraal WEF 1
 Revision No. 1.0

Date: March 2023

- All turbines are placed outside of the no-go areas identified by specialists.
- The substation, BESS and offices and buildings have been placed in areas deemed acceptable by the specialists.
- Some associated roads and MV cables do cross drainage lines in some instances, however existing crossings will be used as far as possible. Specialist recommendations and mitigations will be applied in areas where crossing of drainage lines / watercourses is required.

The proposed final layout has therefore considered the sensitivities identified throughout the process and has informed the final proposed development footprint and layout put forward for authorisation.

14. DETAILS OF PROCESS FOLLOWED TO REACH THE PREFERRED OPTION

14.1 Details of alternatives

As per Chapter 1 of the EIA regulations (2014), as amended, feasible and reasonable alternatives are required to be considered during the EIA process. Alternatives are defined as “*different means of meeting the general purpose and requirements of the activity*”. These alternatives may include:

- (a) The property on which or location where it is proposed to undertake the activity;
- (b) The type of activity to be undertaken;
- (c) The design or layout of the activity;
- (d) The technology to be used in the activity;
- (e) The operational aspects of the activity; and
- (f) The option of not implementing the activity.

Each of these alternatives are discussed in relation to the proposed development in the sections below. The EIA Regulations, 2010 guideline document stipulates that the environmental investigation needs to consider feasible alternatives for the proposed development. The developer should be encouraged to consider alternatives that would meet the objective of the original proposal and which could have an acceptable impact on the environment. The role of alternatives in the EIA process is therefore to find the most effective way of meeting the need and purpose of the proposal, either through enhancing the environmental benefits of the proposed activity, and/or through reducing or avoiding potentially significant negative impacts.

14.1.1 Location/Site alternatives

Prior to the initiation of the EIA, alternative properties / sites were considered and pre-screened for the location of the proposed development. As discussed in above, the selection of a potential wind farm site includes several key aspects including wind resource, grid connection suitability/infrastructure as well as environmental and social constraints, proximity to various planning units and strategic areas and topography and access. This proposed project site was selected based on the above criteria ahead of other regional properties / sites due to the cumulative assessment of all criteria. This internal process takes several weeks to complete and ensures that the least environmentally sensitive property / site is selected in the specific region of development.

Based on the reasons above no site alternatives have been considered during the EIA process for this proposed development. The placement of wind energy facilities is dependent on the factors discussed above, all of which are favourable at the proposed site location. Two met mast was installed on the project site and the proposed site has been deemed suitable in terms of wind resource. The proposed

project site has topography which is suitable for the development of a WEF. In addition, the proposed project site also has a limited agricultural potential and is easily accessible off Road DR02312. The site is therefore considered highly suitable for the proposed development of a WEF and no other site locations have been considered during the EIA process.

14.1.2 The type of activity to be undertaken

No other activity alternatives have been considered. Renewable Energy developments in South Africa are highly desirable from a social, environmental and development perspectives respectively. The importance of renewable energy has been outlined in **Section 10** and **11** above highlighting national, district and local support. Wind energy installations are also more suitable for the proposed site because of the high wind resource.

South Africa is under immense pressure to provide clean sources of electricity generating capacity in order to reduce the current electricity demand from aging and polluting coal-fired power stations. With the global focus on climate change, the government is under severe pressure to explore alternative energy sources in addition to coal-fired power stations. Although wind energy is not the only solution to solving the energy crisis in South Africa, it is a suitable sustainable solution to the energy crisis and this project could contribute to addressing the problem. This project will thus aid in achieving South Africa's goals in terms of sustainability, energy security, mitigating energy cost risks, local economic development and national job creation.

14.1.3 The technology to be used in the activity

The importance of renewable energy has been outlined in **Section 10** and **11** above highlighting national, district and local support. Wind energy installations are also more suitable for the proposed site because of the high wind resource.

Wind turbine technology is developing at a rapid pace and could evolve by the time the project reached the construction phase. Therefore, various wind turbine designs and layouts have been considered for the site in order to maximise the electricity generation capacity and efficiency, whilst taking into account the environmental constraints. The turbine manufacturer and turbine model has not yet been determined and will not be decided upon until the completion of further wind analysis and competitive tendering.

Furthermore, from a policy perspective the 2019 IRP indicated a higher allocation target to wind energy compared to solar energy for new additional capacity from 2022 to 2030 (i.e. 14 400 MW as opposed to 6 000 MW) which further supports the development of a WEF at this location. Based on the above, a WEF at the proposed location is considered to be reasonable and feasible and therefore is selected as the preferred technology alternative as it would be able to generate sufficient energy to support an economically viable wind energy project.

14.1.4 Design or layout of the activity

The alternatives strategy was discussed in detail with DFFE during the two pre-application meetings held (30th of September 2021 and 6th of May 2022). As agreed with the department, site layout alternatives will not be comparatively assessed, but rather a single layout will be refined as additional information becomes available throughout the EIA process (e.g., specialist input, additional site surveys, and ongoing stakeholder engagement). All constraints identified by the respective specialists are being considered and the layout is being refined to avoid all no-go areas.

The development area presented in the Scoping Report has been selected as a practicable option for the Klipkraal WEF 1 considering technical preference and constraints, as well as initial No-Go layers informed by the relevant specialist during the initial screening studies.

14.1.5 No – go option

The option of not implementing the activity, or the “no-go” alternative, has been considered in the EIA process. South Africa is under immense pressure to provide clean sources of electricity generating capacity in order to reduce the current electricity demand from aging and polluting coal-fired power stations. With the global focus on climate change, the government is under severe pressure to explore alternative energy sources in addition to coal-fired power stations. Although wind energy is not the only solution to solving the energy crisis in South Africa, not establishing the proposed WEF and associated infrastructure would be detrimental to the mandate that the government has set to promote the implementation of renewable energy. It is a suitable sustainable solution to the energy crisis and this project could contribute to addressing the problem. This project will thus aid in achieving South Africa’s goals in terms of sustainability, energy security, mitigating energy cost risks, local economic development and national job creation.

The no-go alternative assumes that the proposed project will not go ahead i.e. it is the option of not developing the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1. This alternative would result in no environmental, social or economic impacts (positive or negative) from the proposed project on the site or surrounding local area.

The following implications will occur if the no-go alternative is implemented (i.e. the proposed project does not proceed):

- Aquatic - Should the project not proceed, then the current status quo with regards to the aquatic environmental would remain unchanged. Overall, the catchment and subsequent watercourses are largely in a natural state. However, impacts are present in localised areas and include the following:
 - Erosion as a result of road crossings
 - Several farm dams; and
 - Undersized culverts within present day road crossingsThese impacts have resulted in a slow degradation within the aquatic systems
- Agricultural - The one identified potential impact is that due to non-regular rainfall in the area, which is likely to be exacerbated by climate change, agriculture in the area will come under increased pressure in terms of economic viability. The development compliments agriculture by providing an additional income source, without excluding agriculture from the land, or decreasing production.
- Terrestrial Ecology - Under the ‘no-go’ alternative, the current land use, consisting of extensive livestock grazing, would continue. When applied correctly, such livestock grazing is considered to be largely compatible with long-term biodiversity conservation, although in practice there are some negative effects associated with such land use, such as predator control and negative impacts on habitat availability for the larger ungulates that would historically have utilised the area. Under the current circumstances, the ‘no-go’ alternative is considered to represent a low long-term negative impact on the environment.
- Social - On a social basis, the no-go alternative will have a significant negative effect in that a less efficient, reliable and consistent supply of electricity will have economic, health and safety and nuisance consequences. Economic in that disruptive electricity supply seriously undermine business confidence. Health and safety risks in respect of disrupted medical/surgical procedures and treatment and increased safety risk to motorists, pedestrian and the general public due to road

traffic signalling outages and other public safety issues. Nuisance factor can range from disrupted entertainment, inability to use power tools and computers to missed appointments due to traffic congestion. All of this will have negative social impacts and could result in increased stress levels as well as, increased public health, and safety risks.

- Avifauna: The no-go alternative will result in the current status quo being maintained as far as the avifauna is concerned. The low human population in the area is definitely advantageous to sensitive avifauna, especially Red Data species. The no-go option would eliminate any additional impact on the ecological integrity of the proposed site as far as avifauna is concerned.

14.2 Details of Public Participation Process undertaken

Public participation is the cornerstone of any EIA. The principles of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) as well as the EIA Regulations (as amended 2017) govern the EIA process, including public participation. These include provision of sufficient and transparent information on an ongoing basis to stakeholders to allow them to comment, and ensuring the participation of previously disadvantaged people, women and the youth. All documents relating to the PP process have been included in **Appendix 5**.

14.2.1 Public Participation Process completed for the Scoping Phase

The aim of the Scoping phase was to collect the issues, concerns and queries of interested and affected parties (I&APs) and determine the scope of the following phase of the EIA. The main objective of the Scoping phase is to:

- Inform the stakeholders about the proposed project and the environmental assessment process to be followed;
- Provide opportunity to all parties to exchange information and express their views and concerns;
- Obtain contributions from stakeholders (including the client, consultants, relevant authorities and the public) and ensure that all issues, concerns and queries raised are fully documented;
- Evaluate the issues raised and identify the significant issues; and
- Provide comment on how these issues are to be assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Process.

The comment periods during the scoping phase were implemented according to the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended). The comment periods that were implemented during the scoping phase (as set out by the EIA Regulations, 2014) were as follows:

Comment and review period for the Draft Scoping Report (DSR)

- The DSR underwent a 30-day comment and review period that ran from Thursday 16th of September 2022 until the 17th October 2022 (excluding public holidays).
- An I&AP database was compiled which includes all affected landowners, adjacent landowners, occupiers of affected and adjacent land, other I&APs, key stakeholders (such as OoS) and other surrounding project developers. The I&AP database is included in **Appendix 5**.
- Issuing of the notifications and initial landowner consultation were circulated to all I&APs on the 15th of September 2022 respectively as part of the Draft Scoping Report (proof included in **Appendix 5**).

- Placement of site notices in English and Afrikaans (as per regulations) were placed along the entrance road to the application site and around the site itself on 29th of August 2022 (proof included in **Appendix 5**).
- Notification letters were sent via E-mail or sms (if cellphone number / email is available, it is assumed that the I&AP have an email or cellphone).
- Public notification of the EIA process was advertised in a local newspaper (namely Noordwester), as required according to Regulation 41(2) (c) of the EIA Regulations (2014), as amended. Proof included in **Appendix 5** of the Final Scoping Report.

Availability of report for review:

- The draft Scoping report was made available on SiVEST's website and via WeTransfer for download.
- Electronic copies were made available to parties upon request for the documentation.
- The Draft Scoping Report was available for review at the following location:
 - Frasersburg Library, 35 Voortrekker Street, Northern Cape, South Africa

Summary of issues raised

Issues, comments and concerns raised during the scoping phase public participation process have been captured in the Comments and Response Report (C&RR). The C&RR provides a summary of the comments received and issues raised by I&APs and key stakeholders, as well as the responses provided. This information has been used to feed into the evaluation of environmental and social impacts and has also been taken into consideration when compiling this report. All comments received to date have been included in the C&RR and attached in **Appendix 5**.

The Final Scoping Report was accepted by DFFE on the 2nd of December 2022.

14.2.2 Public Participation Process undertaken for the EIA Phase

Public participation forms a critical component of the EIA process, as it provides all interested and affected parties with an opportunity to learn about a project, but more importantly to understand how a project will impact on them. The following has been undertaken during the EIA Phase (as per the approved Final Scoping and Plan of Study):

- The DEIR underwent a 30-day comment and review period that ran from the 9th of February 2023 until the 11th of March 2023, (excluding public holidays).
- The I&AP database was updated and includes all affected landowners, adjacent landowners, occupiers of affected and adjacent land, other I&APs, key stakeholders (such as OoS) and other surrounding project developers. The I&AP database is included in Appendix 5.
- Issuing of the notifications was circulated to all I&APs on the 9th of February 2023 as part of the Draft EIA Report (proof included in Appendix 5).
- Reminder notifications of the closing of the DEIR comment period were sent out on the 23rd of February 2023 in order to ensure that comments and/or concerns were received from the OoS and/or registered I&APs.
- All comments received from I&APs and the responses thereto has been included in this final EIA Report, which has been submitted to DFFE.
- A Comments and Responses Report has been updated and included in the EIA Report, which records the date that issues were raised, a summary of each issue, and the response of the team

to address the issue. The Final EIA report with all comments included has been submitted to DFFE for review and approval.

- All I&APs have been notified via email, sms or fax of the submission of the Final EIA Report to DFFE.
- All I&APs will be notified via email, sms or fax after having received written notice from DFFE on the final decision on the application. These notifications will include the process required to lodge an appeal, as well as the prescribed timeframes in which documentation should be submitted.

14.3 Impact Assessment

The potential impacts for the identified environmental aspects have been assessed and mitigation measures identified below (refer **Appendix 6**).

14.3.1 Planning

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Heritage																				
Unidentified heritage resources	Due to the size of the area assessed, there's a possibility of encountering heritage features in un-surveyed areas does exist.	1	3	4	2	4	2	28	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A management plan, after a walkdown of the final layout, for the heritage resources needs then to be compiled and approved for implementation during construction and operations. 	1	3	4	2	4	1	14	-	Low
Palaeontological Resources - Loss of Fossil Heritage	Damage, disturbance, destruction or sealing-in of legally-protected, scientifically valuable fossil heritage at or beneath the ground surface within the road footprint, mainly due to ground clearance and excavations.	2	4	4	4	4	4	72	-	Very High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A pre-construction Palaeontological Walkdown is recommended during the EIA phase. Most recorded fossil sites can be effectively mitigated by a professional palaeontologist in the pre-construction phase (recording / collection). Newly exposed fossils can be mitigated through a Chance Fossil Finds Procedure. However, residual impacts following mitigation may be locally high, given the unavoidable difficulties of identifying and sampling fossils from on-going construction phase excavations and site clearance. 	2	4	4	4	4	2	34	-	Medium

14.3.2 Construction Phase

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Aquatic / Freshwater																				
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic feature because of inadequate stormwater management..	2	2	2	3	3	2	24	-	Medium	<p>The stormwater outlets associated with the watercourse crossing infrastructure as well as the turbine platforms must make provision for energy dissipators at the mouth of the outlets. This will reduce the risk of erosion and</p>	2	2	2	2	3	1	11	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION																			
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S											
												associated siltation which can contaminate the water quality.																			
Hydrology	Impact to the hydrological characteristics of the aquatic feature due to changes in the catchment.	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	4	-	Medium	The provision for adequate stormwater management (as described above) as well as the hydraulic structures that have adequate sizes to prevent any damming of water upstream of the structure must be ensured.	2	2	2	2	3	1	11	-	Low										
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of the leakages from the portable chemical toilets that will be used during construction.	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	-	Low	<p>The following management and mitigation measures must be included into the EMPr Report for the project to limit the potential impacts of leakages from the ablation facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No portable chemical toilets may be placed within 40m of any watercourse or 100m from the edge of any wetland area. Only portable chemical toilets with a sealed reservoir will be allowed on site. The capacity of the reservoirs in the portable chemical toilets must be monitored on a daily basis to ensure that they can be serviced timeously. All removal of the collected sewage waste from the portable chemical toilets must be conducted by a registered service provider for disposal at a municipal wastewater treatment facility. 	2	1	2	1	2	1	9	-	Low										
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from plant and equipment.	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	0	-	Medium	<p>The following management and mitigation measures must be included into the EMPr for the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All plant and equipment that make use of petrochemical substances must be checked leakages daily before operations commence. All plant and equipment that are found to be leaking must be removed from the property and only returned once the leakages have been addressed. All refuelling of plant and equipment must be conducted over a drip-tray. If any plant or equipment is to be parked on the site, these must be parked at a designated parking area that is 40m away from any watercourse and 100m away from the delineated edge of a wetland. If any spillages from plant or equipment occur, the spill must be immediately contained, the contaminated soils must be collected and bagged in impermeable bags and stored on site to be removed 	2	1	2	1	2	2	16	-	Low										

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION														
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S						
												and disposed of by a registered service provider. For this purpose, the presence of spill-kits on site for the duration of the construction phase is imperative.														
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leaking petrochemical storage facilities.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	<p>It is assumed that all petrochemical storage facilities will be located within the construction camp, as such, the location of the construction camp may not be located within 40m of the edge of any watercourse or within a 100m of the delineated edge of a wetland. In addition, the following management and mitigation measures must be included in the EMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All storage containers must be contained in a bunded area that has the capacity of 110% of the total volume of the storage containers. The bunded area must consist of an impermeable floor as well as walls and be fitted with a valve that can be used to drain any spillages. If the storage facility will be in use during the rainy season, the bunded area must be rooved to prevent any rainwater entering the bund and reducing its capacity. The filling of containers, plant, equipment or vehicles from these storage facilities must be done on an impermeable surface to ensure the containment of any possible spillages. 	2	1	2	1	2	2	16	-	Low						
Hydrology	Impact to the flow of water in the watercourses that will be crossed by infrastructure.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	<p>In the absence of any design drawings making provision for the watercourse crossing structures, the following recommendations are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible, all works in the watercourses must be conducted during the dry season to limit the potential flow of water in the watercourses. If the above is not possible, all efforts must be made during the construction phase to allow for unobstructed flow through the construction works. The crossing structures that will be put in place must all be size accordingly to ensure that all water that flows in the watercourse can pass unobstructed. 	2	1	2	1	2	2	16	-	Low						
Terrestrial Biodiversity																										
Construction Phase impact on broad-scale	Impacts on broad-scale ecological processes as a result of construction phase activities, including disturbance and habitat loss.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise the development footprint as far as possible. 	1	1	2	2	2	2	16	-	Low						

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION									
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S	
ecological processes												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locate temporary-use areas such as construction camps and lay-down areas in low sensitivity or previously disturbed areas. Minimise the development footprint in areas mapped as high sensitivity (i.e. near watercourses and other ecologically significant features). Clearly demarcate riparian areas near to the development footprint as No-Go areas with appropriate signage and barriers. Appropriate design of roads and other infrastructure to minimise faunal impacts and allow fauna to pass over, through or underneath these features as appropriate. The fencing around substations or other infrastructure should not have any electrified strands within 30cm of the ground as this may result in tortoises being electrocuted. Alternatively, guard wires or mesh can be placed outside of the fence to prevent tortoises from accessing the electrified fence. Monitoring of construction activities to ensure that the development footprint within sensitive areas is restricted to the authorised development footprint. 									
Construction Phase impact on FEPA Subcatchments	Impacts on ecosystem services within FEPA Priority Subcatchments as a result of construction phase activities, including disturbance and soil erosion.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbance within or near the drainage lines should be kept to a minimum and any disturbance in these areas should be rehabilitated as quickly as possible. An erosion monitoring programme should be put in place for at least 3 years after construction. Any problems observed should be rectified as soon as possible using the appropriate revegetation and erosion control works. 	1	2	2	2	2	2	18	-	Low
Construction Phase impact on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise	Impacts on Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of construction phase activities, including vehicle collisions, disturbance and habitat loss.	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	0	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No turbines to be placed in areas mapped as being of medium or high SEI for the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. Any overhead grid lines with associated pylons required within the facility should be of a design that discourages the use of the pylons for nesting by crows. All vehicles should adhere to a low-speed limit on site. Heavy vehicles should be restricted to 30km/h and light vehicles to 40km/h. Construction staff should remain within the construction footprint and access routes and should not be allowed to wander into the veld. No fauna including tortoises should be disturbed or removed from the veld. 	2	2	2	2	2	2	10	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION										
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No holes or trenches should be left open for extended periods as tortoises may fall in and become trapped. Trenches should have soils ramps present that allow for tortoises and other fauna to escape. Holes should also be checked regularly for tortoises and other fauna that may have fallen in. Search and Rescue before construction clearing of areas of high-quality habitat within the development footprint as identified and mapped during a preconstruction walk-through of the development footprint. 										
Agricultural – compliance statement – none identified																						
Avifaunal																						
Avifauna	Displacement due to disturbance associated with the construction of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	1	4	2	3	1	3	3	3	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction activity should be restricted to the immediate footprint of the infrastructure as far as possible. Access to the remainder of the area should be strictly controlled to prevent unnecessary disturbance of priority species. Measures to control noise and dust should be applied according to current best practice in the industry. 	1	4	2	3	1	2	22	-	Low	
Avifauna	Displacement due to habitat transformation associated with the construction of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	1	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of vegetation must be restricted to a minimum and must be rehabilitated to its former state where possible after construction. Construction of new roads should only be considered if existing roads cannot be upgraded. The recommendations of the ecological and botanical specialist studies must be strictly implemented, especially as far as limitation of the activity footprint is concerned. 	1	2	2	2	3	2	20	-	Low	
Bat																						
Loss of foraging habitat by clearing of vegetation.	Bat foraging habitat will be destroyed during construction, however the relative footprint is small.	1	4	2	2	3	1	1	2	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adhere to the sensitivity map criteria. Rehabilitate cleared vegetation where possible at areas such as laydown yards. The ECO on site during construction must ensure that the sensitivity map is adhered to during construction. 	1	3	2	2	3	1	11	-	Low	
Roost destruction during earthworks.	Bat roosts in rock crevices may be destroyed during construction, this can cause bat mortalities or permanent disturbances to roosts.	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	0	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid No-go areas by adhering to the sensitivity map. The ECO on site during construction must ensure that the sensitivity map is adhered to during construction. 	1	1	2	2	3	2	18	-	Low	
Social																						

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
	Noise	1	1	1	1	3	1	6	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to mitigation measures suggested by noise specialist 	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	Low
	Increased in crime	2	2	3	2	2	2	18	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that construction workers are clearly identifiable. All workers should carry identification cards and wear identifiable clothing. Fence off the construction sites and control access to these sites. Appoint an independent security company to monitor the site; Encourage local people to report any suspicious activity associated with the construction sites through the establishment of a community liaison forum. Prevent loitering within the vicinity of the construction camp as well as construction sites 	2	2	3	2	2	2	18	-	Low
	Increased risk of HIV infections	3	4	3	3	3	3	48	-	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that an onsite HIV Infections Policy is in place and that construction workers have easy access to condoms. Expose workers to a health and HIV/AIDS awareness educational program. Extend the HIV/AIDS program into the community with a specific focus on schools and youth clubs. 	3	3	2	2	3	2	16	-	Medium
	Influx of construction workers	1	4	1	1	1	2	16	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicate the limitation of opportunities created by the project through Community Leaders and Ward Councillors. Draw up a recruitment policy in consultation with the Community Leaders and Ward Councillors of the area and ensure compliance with this policy. 	1	4	1	1	1	2	16	-	Low
	Hazard exposure	2	4	2	2	1	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that all construction equipment and vehicles are properly maintained at all times. Ensure that operators and drivers are properly trained and make them aware, through regular toolbox talks, of any risk they may pose to the community. Place specific emphasis on the vulnerable sector of the population such as children and the elderly. Ensure that fires lit by construction staff are only ignited in designated areas and that the appropriate safety precautions, such as not lighting fires in strong winds and completely extinguishing fires 	2	2	2	2	1	2	18	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												before leaving them unattended, are strictly adhered to. • Make staff aware of the dangers of fire during regular toolbox talks.								
Quality of the living environment	Disruption of daily living patterns	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	-	Low	• Ensure that, at all times, people have access to their properties as well as to social facilities	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
	Disruptions to social and community infrastructure	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	-	Low	• Regularly monitor the effect that construction is having on infrastructure and immediately report any damage to infrastructure to the appropriate authority. • Ensure that where communities' access is obstructed that this access is restored to an acceptable state	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
Economic	Job creation and skills development	2	4	2	3	1	2	2	+	Medium	• Wherever feasible, local residents should be recruited to fill semi and unskilled jobs. • Women should be given equal employment opportunities and encouraged to apply for positions. • A skills transfer plan should be put in place at an early stage and workers should be given the opportunity to develop skills which they can use to secure jobs elsewhere post construction.	2	4	2	3	1	2	24	+	Medium
	Socio-economic stimulation	3	4	2	3	1	2	2	+	Medium	• A procurement policy promoting the use of local business should, where possible, be put in place to be applied throughout the construction phase.	3	4	2	3	1	2	26	+	Medium
Heritage																				
Unidentified heritage resources	Due to the size of the area assessed, there's a possibility of encountering heritage features in un-surveyed areas does exist.	1	3	4	2	4	2	2	-	Medium	• A management plan, after a walkdown of the final layout, for the heritage resources needs then to be compiled and approved for implementation during construction and operations.	1	3	4	2	4	1	14	-	Low
Palaeontological Resources - Loss of Fossil Heritage	Damage, disturbance, destruction or sealing-in of legally-protected, scientifically valuable fossil heritage at or beneath the ground surface within the road footprint, mainly due to ground clearance and excavations.	2	4	4	4	4	4	7	-	Very High	• A pre-construction Palaeontological Walkdown is recommended during the EIA phase. • Most recorded fossil sites can be effectively mitigated by a professional palaeontologist in the pre-construction phase (recording / collection). • Newly exposed fossils can be mitigated through a Chance Fossil Finds Procedure. However, residual impacts following mitigation may be locally high, given the unavoidable difficulties of identifying and sampling fossils from on-going construction phase excavations and site clearance.	2	4	4	4	4	2	34	-	Medium

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Noise																				
Noise emissions during the Construction Phase	Noise pollution due to construction activities (equipment and vehicle noise)	2	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff to receive training on noise sensitivity. Monitoring of noise during the construction phase to confirm noise levels are within limits. Limit construction to daytime in order to take advantage of unstable weather conditions. Regularly service equipment to ensure no unnecessary noise is emitted. 	2	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	Low
Visual																				
Visual	Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors	2	1	2	1	1	2	14	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site turbines at least 2 km from any occupied homestead or hospitality/tourism facility, where possible to limit effect of shadow flicker 	2	1	1	1	1	2	12	-	Low
Visual	Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit area of disturbance for turbine footprint, access roads and construction camp or sites. Suppress dust during construction. Site turbines at least 2 km from any occupied homestead hospitality/tourism facility, where possible. Mitigation will already have been implemented by the placement of turbines according to distance from visual receptors. Limit area of disturbance for access roads, substations and construction camp sites. Locate construction camps and all related facilities such as stockpiles, lay-down areas, batching plants in areas already impacted such as existing farmyards or in unobtrusive locations away from the main visual receptors. Limit access tracks for construction and maintenance vehicles to existing roads where possible. Once established do not allow random access through the veld. Suppress dust during construction. Blend edges of road and platforms with surrounding landscape Rehabilitate exposed disturbed areas. Avoid vegetation stripping in straight lines but rather non-geometric shapes that blend with the landscape. Limit need for security lighting. Use non-reflective materials. 	2	3	2	1	2	2	20	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paint all other project infrastructure elements such as operational buildings, support poles etc. a dark colour. Avoid bright colour/patterns and logos. 								
Visual	Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit area of disturbance for footprint, access roads and construction camp or sites Suppress dust during construction Site turbines at least 2 km from any occupied homestead hospitality/tourism facility, where possible. Mitigation will already have been implemented by the placement of turbines according to distance from visual receptors Limit area of disturbance for access roads, substations and construction camp sites. Locate construction camps and all related facilities such as stockpiles, lay-down areas, batching plants in areas already impacted such as existing farmyards or in unobtrusive locations away from the main visual receptors. Limit access tracks for construction and maintenance vehicles to existing roads where possible. Once established do not allow random access through the veld. Suppress dust during construction. Blend edges of road and platforms with surrounding landscape Rehabilitate exposed disturbed areas. Avoid vegetation stripping in straight lines but rather non-geometric shapes that blend with the landscape. Limit need for security lighting. Use non-reflective materials. Paint all other project infrastructure elements such as operational buildings, support poles etc. a dark colour. Avoid bright colour/patterns and logos 	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
Traffic																				
Additional Traffic Generation	Increase in Traffic	2	4	1	2	1	3	30	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure staff transport is done in the 'off peak' periods and by bus, if possible Stagger material, component, and abnormal loads delivery. Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. 	2	4	1	2	1	2	20	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION									
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S	
	Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	2	3	2	4	1	2	2	4	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade of existing / new access points. Reduction in the speed of vehicles. Adequate enforcement of the law. Implementation of pedestrian safety initiatives. Regular maintenance of farm fences & access cattle grids Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. 	2	3	2	4	1	1	12	-	Low
	Increase in dust from gravel roads	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	0	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upgrade of existing / new access point. Reduction in the speed of the vehicles. Construction of gravel roads in terms of TRH20. Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department. Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. 	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
	Increase in Road Maintenance	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department. Construction of an on-site batching plant to reduce trips. 	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
Abnormal Loads	Additional Abnormal Loads	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	0	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure abnormal vehicles travel to and from the proposed development in the 'off peak' periods or stagger delivery. Adequate enforcement of the law. 	3	2	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low
Internal Access Roads	Increase in dust from gravel roads	1	4	1	1	1	2	1	6	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforce a maximum speed limit on the development. Appropriate, timely and high-quality maintenance required in terms of TRH20. Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. 	1	3	1	1	1	2	14	-	Low
	New / Larger Access points	1	4	1	2	1	1	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate road signage according to the SARTSM Approval from the respective roads department. 	1	4	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low

14.3.3 Operational Phase

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Aquatic / Freshwater																				
Hydrology	Impact to the hydrological characteristics of the aquatic feature due to changes in the catchment.	2	2	2	3	3	2	24	-	Medium	The stormwater outlets associated with the infrastructure associated with the Klipkraal WEF must make provision for energy dissipators at the mouth of the outlets. This will reduce the risk of erosion and associated siltation which can contaminate the water quality. In addition, provision must be made for adequate stormwater management (as described above) as well as the adequate sizing of the hydraulic structures that will be used for the watercourse crossings to prevent any upstream damming by the structure. These hydraulic structures will also need to be monitored on a regular basis to ensure that they are free draining and have no blockages that can cause damming on the upstream side.	2	2	2	2	2	1	10	-	Low
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of inadequate stormwater management.	2	2	2	3	3	2	24	-	Medium	The stormwater outlets associated with the infrastructure associated with the Klipkraal WEF must make provision for energy dissipators at the mouth of the outlets. This will reduce the risk of erosion and associated siltation which can contaminate the water quality. In addition, provision must be made for adequate stormwater management (as described above) as well as the adequate sizing of the hydraulic structures that will be used for the watercourse crossings to prevent any upstream damming by the structure. These hydraulic structures will	2	3	2	1	1	2	8	-	Low
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leakages from vehicles and plant moving on the site.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	As the majority of the vehicles, plant and equipment that will travel within the site will be associated with the Klipkraal WEF, the regular management and maintenance of these vehicles, plant and equipment must be ensured to limit the risk of any leakages.	2	1	2	1	2	1	8	-	Low
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from petrochemical storage areas within the site.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	It is assumed that all petrochemical storage facilities will be located within the operational facility, as such, the location of this facility may not be located within 40m of the edge of any watercourse or within a 100m of the delineated edge of a wetland. In addition, the following management and mitigation measures must be included in the EMPr: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All storage containers must be contained in a bunded area that has the capacity of 110% of the total volume of the storage containers. 	2	1	2	1	2	2	6	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION										
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bunded area must consist of an impermeable floor as well as walls and be fitted with a valve that can be used to drain any spillages. If the storage facility will be in use during the rainy season, the bunded area must be rooved to prevent any rainwater entering the bund and reducing its capacity. The filling of containers, plant, equipment or vehicles from these storage facilities must be done on an impermeable surface to ensure the containment of any possible spillages. 										
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leakages from the sanitation infrastructure servicing the operations.	2	2	2	3	2	3	33	N	Medium	<p>It is understood that provision has been made in the project design for a septic tank or soak-away-system. It is suggested that the design should be finalised with a septic tank system that is serviced on a regular basis by a registered service provider which will significantly limit the risk of contamination on the site. The septic tank must be monitored on a regular basis to ensure that it is cleared before it spills into the environment.</p> <p>The collected sewage must be disposed of at a municipal sewage treatment facility. The following management and mitigation measures must be included into the EMP Report for the project to limit the potential impacts of leakages from the ablution facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No portable chemical toilets may be placed within 40m of any watercourse or 100m from the edge of any wetland area. Only portable chemical toilets with a sealed reservoir will be allowed on site. The capacity of the reservoirs in the portable chemical toilets must be monitored on a daily basis to ensure that they can be serviced timeously. All removal of the collected sewage waste from the portable chemical toilets must be conducted by a registered service provider for disposal at a municipal wastewater treatment facility 	2	1	2	1	2	1	9	N	Low		
Terrestrial Biodiversity																						
Operational Phase impact on broad-scale ecological processes	Impacts on broad-scale ecological processes as a result of operational phase activities, including disturbance turbine noise.	2	2	2	2	3	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All service vehicles on site should adhere to a low speed limit on site. Heavy vehicles should be restricted to 30km/h and light vehicles to 40km/h. 	1	2	2	2	3	2	20	-	Low		

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION									
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S	
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service staff should remain within the wind farm footprint areas and access routes and should not be allowed to wander into the veld. No fauna including tortoises should be disturbed or removed from the veld. A log should be kept detailing and fauna-related incidences or mortalities that occur on site, including roadkill, electrocutions etc. These should be reviewed annually by the Environmental Officer and used to inform operational management and mitigation measures. 									
Operational Phase impact on FEPA Sub catchments	Impacts on ecosystem services within FEPA Priority Subcatchments as a result of operational phase activities, including disturbance and soil erosion.	2	2	2	2	3	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erosion management at the site should take place according to the Erosion Management Plan and Rehabilitation Plan. This should make provision for annual monitoring and rehabilitation. All erosion problems observed should be rectified as soon as possible, using the appropriate erosion control structures and revegetation techniques. There should be follow-up rehabilitation and revegetation of any remaining bare areas with indigenous perennial shrubs, grasses and trees from the local area. Alien management at the site should take place according to the Alien Invasive Management Plan. Regular (annual) monitoring for alien plants during operation to ensure that no alien invasive problems have developed as result of the disturbance, as per the Alien Management Plan for the project. Woody aliens should be controlled on at least an annual basis using the appropriate best-practice alien control techniques as determined by the species present. 	1	2	2	2	2	2	18	-	Low	
Operational Phase impact on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise	There would potentially be impact on Karoo Dwarf Tortoises at the site during operation due to operational activities (vehicles/disturbance) as well as predation by crows.	2	2	2	2	3	3	33	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crow nests along any overhead lines within the site, identified during annual surveys and located within 1km of suitable Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat should be removed. Apply additional mitigation in consultation with a terrestrial ecologist to prevent roadkill mortalities and / or discourage predation of Karoo Dwarf Tortoise by crows if monitoring demonstrates these aspects to be the cause of persistent impacts on this species. Conduct annual surveys along any overhead lines within the site to census crow nesting sites, and log tortoise carcasses observed along the powerline and especially under any crow nests if present. 	2	2	2	2	3	2	22	-	Low	

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION													
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S					
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If any Dwarf Tortoise mortalities within the site are confirmed it is recommended that structured monitoring of the local Dwarf Tortoise population within the site is initiated using mark-recapture and similar techniques to monitor population stability and structure. Should further declines become evident, then the wind farm should contribute towards active conservation of this species within the site and in the broader area. 													
Agricultural – compliance statement – none identified																									
Avifaunal																									
Avifauna	Mortality of priority species due to collisions with the wind turbines.	2	3	1	3	3	3	36	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A procedure for the prompt removal of carcasses within the development area must be implemented to prevent vultures from being attracted to the area where they could be at risk of collision with the turbines. Based on the results of the pre-construction monitoring, a 2.8kmturbine exclusion zone must be implemented around the vulture roost on the Aries – Aggeneys 1 400kV high voltage line. All infilling for road construction should be compacted and all loose rock piles at the base or periphery of such infilling should be covered and packed down so as to eliminate all potential crevices and shelter for small mammals such as Rock Hyraxes (the primary source of food for the Verreaux's Eagles). Live-bird monitoring and carcass searches should be implemented in the operational phase, as per the most recent edition of the Best Practice Guidelines at the time (Jenkins et al. 2015) to assess collision rates. If an Endangered or Critically Endangered species mortality is recorded during the first year of operational monitoring, additional mitigation measures must be implemented which could include shut down on demand, or other proven mitigation measures as recommended by the avifaunal specialist. » Placement of turbines in highly suitable Red Lark habitat to be avoided where possible. If avoidance is not possible, turbine cut in-speeds should be increased to 3m/s (measured at ground level) during daylight hours when a rainfall event of 10mm or higher is recorded at the site, for turbines located in areas of highly suitable Red Lark habitat, as determined by the avifaunal specialist. The increased cut-in speeds to be maintained for a period of six weeks after the rainfall event. 	2	2	1	2	3	2	20	-	Low					

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Avifauna	Mortality of priority species due to electrocutions on the overhead sections of the internal 33kV cables.	2	3	1	3	3	2	24	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underground cabling should be used as much as practically possible. If the use of overhead lines is unavoidable due to technical reasons, the Avifaunal Specialist must be consulted timeously to ensure that a raptor friendly pole design is used, and that appropriate mitigation is implemented pro-actively for complicated pole structures e.g., insulation of live components to prevent electrocutions on terminal structures and pole transformers. Bi-monthly inspections of the overhead sections of the internal reticulation network must be conducted during the operational phase to look for carcasses, as per the most recent edition of the Best Practice Guidelines at the time (Jenkins et al. 2015). 	2	2	1	2	3	1	10	-	Low
Avifauna	Mortality due to collisions with the overhead sections of the internal 33kV cables.	2	3	2	3	3	2	26	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bird flight diverters should be installed on all the overhead line sections for the full span length according to the applicable Eskom Engineering Instruction (Eskom Unique Identifier 240 – 93563150: The utilisation of Bird Flight Diverters on Eskom Overhead Lines). These devices must be installed as soon as the conductors are strung. 	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low
Bat																				
Bat mortalities during foraging.	Foraging bats can be killed by colliding with turbine blades, or by suffering barotrauma.	2	4	2	3	3	4	56	-	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid No-go areas by adhering to the sensitivity map. Where needed, if indicated through operational monitoring, reducing blade movement at selected turbines and high-risk bat activity times/weather conditions. Acoustic deterrents are developed well enough to be trialled and may be recommended during operational monitoring. 	2	2	2	3	3	3	36	-	Medium
Bat mortalities during migration.	Migrating bats influence several ecosystems since they are cave dwelling species, also over a larger area due to the distances that may be travelled. If turbines are placed within a migration path, a larger area and higher diversity of ecosystems may be impacted.	3	2	2	3	3	4	52	-	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid No-go areas by adhering to the sensitivity map. Where needed, if indicated through operational monitoring, reducing blade movement at selected turbines and high-risk bat activity times/weather conditions. Acoustic deterrents are developed well enough to be trialled and may be recommended during operational monitoring. Each WEF in a migration path should apply appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that each facility's bat mortalities are below a sustainable threshold. 	3	2	2	3	3	3	39	-	Medium
Increased bat mortalities due to light attraction and habitat creation.	Floodlights and other lights at turbine bases or nearby buildings, will attract insect eating bats and therefore significantly increase the likelihood of these bats being impacted on by moving turbine	1	4	1	3	3	4	48	-	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the planning phase for wind farm it must become mandatory to only use lights with low sensitivity motion sensors that switch off automatically when no persons are nearby, to prevent the creation of regular insect 	1	2	1	3	3	2	20	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Grievance Mechanism should be put in place and all grievances should be dealt with transparently. The mitigation measures recommended in the Heritage and Palaeontology Impact Assessment should be followed. 								
Economic	Job creation and skills development	2	4	2	2	3	2	26	+	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a training and skills development programme for locals. Work closely with the appropriate municipal structures regarding establishing a social responsibility programme. 	2	4	2	2	3	2	26	+	Medium
	Socio-economic stimulation	4	4	2	3	3	2	32	+	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the procurement policy supports local enterprises. Establish a social responsibility programme either in line with the REIPPP BID guidelines or equivalent. Work closely with the appropriate municipal structures regarding establishing a social responsibility programme. Ensure that any trusts or funds are strictly managed in respect of outcomes and funds. 	4	4	2	3	3	2	32	+	Medium
Heritage – none identified																				
Noise																				
Noise emissions during Operational Phase (Day time)	Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components.	2	1	1	1	3	1	8	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct noise monitoring during the operational phase to determine actual noise impact and whether further mitigation measures need to be implemented such as running the turbines in low power mode at certain wind speeds at night. 	2	1	1	1	3	1	8	-	Low
Noise emissions during Operational Phase (Night time)	Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components.	2	1	1	1	3	2	16	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a 500m “no-go” buffer around all noise sensitive areas to ensure no wind turbines impact these noise sensitive areas. 	2	1	1	1	3	1	8	-	Low
Visual																				
Visual	Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors	2	3	2	2	3	3	36	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation will already have been implemented by the placement of turbines according to distance from visual receptors. Manage need for top of turbine red hazard lighting to only operate when a plane enters the affected airspace rather than be permanently lit Limit need for security lighting 	2	3	1	1	1	1	8	-	Low
Visual	Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on landscape receptors	2	3	2	2	3	3	36	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation will already have been implemented by the placement of turbines according to distance from visual receptors Limit need for security lighting 	2	3	2	2	3	3	36	-	Medium

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I / M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use non-reflective materials Paint all other project infrastructure elements such as operational buildings, support poles etc. a dark colour Avoid bright colour/patterns and logos 								
Visual	Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	2	3	2	2	3	2	24		Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain rehabilitated disturbed areas 	2	3	2	2	3	2	24	-	Medium
Traffic																				
Additional Traffic Generation	Increase in Traffic	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in traffic for this phase of the development is negligible and will not have a significant impact. 	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low
	Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in traffic for this phase of the development is negligible and will not have a significant impact. 	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low
	Increase in dust from gravel roads	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in traffic for this phase of the development is negligible and will not have a significant impact. 	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low
	Increase in Road Maintenance	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in traffic for this phase of the development is negligible and will not have a significant impact. 	2	1	1	2	3	1	9	-	Low
Abnormal Loads	Additional Abnormal Loads	3	1	1	2	3	1	10	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increase in traffic for this phase of the development is negligible and will not have a significant impact. 	3	1	1	2	3	1	10	-	Low
Internal Access Roads	New / Larger Access points	1	1	1	2	3	1	8	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate road signage according to the SARTSM. Approval from the respective roads department. 	1	1	1	2	3	1	8	-	Low

14.3.4 Decommissioning

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Aquatic / Freshwater																				
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of the leakages from the portable chemical toilets that will be used during decommissioning. Reduction in and/or loss of species of conservation concern (i.e. rare, threatened/endangered species).	2	2	2	3	2	2	22	-	Low	The following management and mitigation measures must be included into the EMPr Report for the project to limit the potential impacts of leakages from the ablution facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No portable chemical toilets may be placed within 40m of any watercourse or 100m from the edge of any wetland area. Only portable chemical toilets with a sealed reservoir will be allowed on site. The capacity of the reservoirs in the portable chemical toilets must be monitored on a daily basis to ensure that they can be serviced timeously. All removal of the collected sewage waste from the portable chemical toilets must be conducted by a registered service provider for disposal at a municipal wastewater treatment facility. 	2	1	2	1	2	1	9	-	Low
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from plant and equipment.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	The following management and mitigation measures must be included into the EMPr for the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All plant and equipment that make use of petrochemical substances must be checked leakages daily before operations commence. All plant and equipment that are found to be leaking must be removed from the property and only returned once the leakages have been addressed. All refuelling of plant and equipment must be conducted over a drip-tray. If any plant or equipment is to be parked on the site, these must be parked at a designated parking area that is 40m away from any watercourse and 100m away from the delineated edge of a wetland. If any spillages from plant or equipment occur, the spill must be immediately contained, the contaminated soils must be collected and bagged in impermeable bags and stored on site to be removed and disposed of by a registered service provider. For this purpose, the presence of spill-kits on site for the duration of the decommissioning phase is imperative. 	2	1	2	1	2	2	16	-	Low
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leaking petrochemical storage facilities.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is assumed that all petrochemical storage facilities will be located within the construction camp, as such, the location of the construction camp may not be located within 40m of the edge of any watercourse or within a 100m of the delineated edge of a wetland. In addition, the 	1	1	1	2	1	1	6	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												following management and mitigation measures must be included in the EMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All storage containers must be contained in a bunded area that has the capacity of 110% of the total volume of the storage containers. The bunded area must consist of an impermeable floor as well as walls and be fitted with a valve that can be used to drain any spillages. If the storage facility will be in use during the rainy season, the bunded area must be rooved to prevent any rainwater entering the bund and reducing its capacity. The filling of containers, plant, equipment or vehicles from these storage facilities must be done on an impermeable surface to ensure the containment of any possible spillages. 								
Terrestrial Biodiversity																				
Decommissioning Phase impact on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise	Impacts on Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of decommissioning phase activities, including vehicle collisions, disturbance.	2	2	2	2	2	2	20	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All vehicles should adhere to a low-speed limit on site. Heavy vehicles should be restricted to 30km/h and light vehicles to 40km/h. Decommissioning staff should remain within the power line footprint areas and access routes and should not be allowed to wander into the veld. No fauna including tortoises should be disturbed or removed from the veld. No holes or trenches should be left open for extended periods as tortoises may fall in and become trapped. Trenches should have soils ramps present that allow for tortoises and other fauna to escape. Holes should also be checked regularly for tortoises and other fauna that may have fallen in. No litter or other material from the power line or decommissioning activity should be left lying around as tortoises and other fauna may become trapped in fibres, plastic and other waste material. 	2	2	2	2	2	1	10	-	Low
Agricultural – compliance statement – none identified																				
Avifaunal																				
Avifauna	Displacement due to disturbance associated with the dismantling of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	1	4	1	2	1	2	18	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dismantling activity should be restricted to the immediate footprint of the infrastructure as far as possible. Access to the remainder of the area should be strictly controlled to prevent unnecessary disturbance of priority species. 	1	3	1	2	1	2	16	-	Low

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures to control noise and dust should be applied according to current best practice in the industry. 								
Bat – none identified																				
Social																				
Economic	Job loss	2	4	2	3	1	2	24	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major social impacts associated with decommissioning phase are linked to the loss of jobs and associated income. As part of the decommissioning phase, it would likely involve the disassembly and replacement of existing components with more modern technology therefore creation of additional construction type jobs although limited. It is recommended that the implementation of a reskilling, job placement, retrenchment and downscaling programme be implemented. 	2	4	2	3	1	2	24	-	Medium
Heritage – none identified																				
Noise																				
Noise emissions during Decommissioning Phase	Noise pollution similar to construction activities (equipment and vehicle noise)	2	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff to receive training on noise sensitivity. Monitoring of noise during the construction phase to confirm noise levels are within limits. Limit construction to daytime in order to take advantage of unstable weather conditions. Regularly service equipment to ensure no unnecessary noise is emitted. 	2	1	1	1	1	1	6	-	Low
Visual																				
Visual	Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors											<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove all project components from site. Rip all compacted hard surfaces such as platforms, words areas, access and service roads etc. and reshape to blend with the surrounding landscape. Rehabilitate/revegetate all disturbed areas to visually the original state by shaping and planting. 								
Visual	Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	2	3	2	2	2	1	11	0	Low		2	3	2	2	2	1	11	-	Low
Visual	Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors																			
Traffic																				

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Additional Traffic Generation	Increase in Traffic	2	4	1	2	1	3	30	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure staff transport is done in the 'off peak' periods and by bus. Stagger material, component, and abnormal loads removal. Construction of an on-site sorter and pressing machine to reduce trips. 	2	4	1	2	1	2	20	-	Low
	Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	2	3	2	4	1	2	24	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the speed of vehicles. Adequate enforcement of the law. Implementation of pedestrian safety initiatives Regular maintenance of farm fences & access cattle grids. 	2	3	2	4	1	1	12	-	Low
	Increase in dust from gravel roads	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the speed of the vehicles. Appropriate, timely and high-quality maintenance required in terms of TRH20. Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department. Construction of an on-site sorter and pressing machine to reduce trips. 	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
	Increase in Road Maintenance	2	3	2	2	2	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department. 	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
Abnormal Loads	Additional Abnormal Loads	3	2	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure abnormal vehicles travel to and from the proposed development in the 'off peak' periods or stagger delivery. Adequate enforcement of the law. 	3	2	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low
Internal Access Roads	Increase in dust from gravel roads	1	4	1	1	1	1	8	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforce a maximum speed limit on the development. Appropriate, timely and high-quality maintenance required in terms of TRH20. Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. 	1	3	1	1	1	2	14	-	Low
	New / Larger Access points	1	4	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate road signage according to the SARTSM. Approval from the respective roads department. 	1	4	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low

14.3.5 Cumulative

There are no other WEF projects located within a 35km radius of the Klipkraal WEF 1 Project. Therefore, cumulative impacts assessed are based on the Klipkraal project in its entirety.




Figure 47: Renewable Energy Projects within 35km of the Klipkraal WEF 1

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
Aquatic / Freshwater																				
Hydrology	Impact to the hydrological regime of the aquatic features.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	Provision of adequate stormwater measures associated with the discharge of stormwater from the construction and operational areas (as discussed in sections above) will limit the impact on the hydrological regime in the area. In addition, the design and management of all the watercourse crossing structures and measures must be conducted in accordance with the measures provided above which will significantly limit the impact on the regional hydrological regime of the aquatic features.	2	1	1	1	2	1	7	-	Low
Water Quality	Impact to the water quality of the aquatic features as a result of inadequate stormwater management.	2	2	2	2	2	3	30	-	Medium	The potential cumulative impact on the water quality of the water in the identified aquatic features is a critical aspect that must be addressed. The management and mitigation measures discussed in other sections of this report must be implemented to ensure that the potential sources of contamination is adequately designed and managed to ensure that the risk of water contamination is limited.	2	1	1	1	2	1	7	-	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity																				
Cumulative impact on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise	Cumulative impacts on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of habitat loss, disturbance and increased predation and poaching.	2	2	2	2	3	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitation of disturbed areas and annual monitoring and management of erosion and alien vegetation along the site access roads and turbine hard stands. Annual monitoring and action to ensure that crow nests are removed from any overhead power lines where present. 	2	2	2	2	3	1	11	-	Low
Agricultural – compliance statement																				
Avifaunal																				
Avifauna	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mortality due to collisions with the wind turbines Displacement due to disturbance during construction and operation of the wind farm Displacement due to habitat change and loss at the wind farm Mortality due to electrocution on the electrical infrastructure	2	3	1	2	3	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All the mitigation measures listed in the various bird specialist studies compiled for the nine renewable energy facilities within a 35km radius around the project. 	2	2	1	2	3	2	20	-	Low
Bat																				
Bat mortalities during foraging.	Bat mortalities over long periods of time can negatively impact species genetic diversity in a population. If this occurs over a larger area of several wind farms, it decreases the chances of bat populations recovering to a prior state. Bats play an important role in controlling insect numbers, certain species of insects	3	3	2	3	3	4	56	-	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bat mortalities over long periods of time can negatively impact species genetic diversity in a population. If this occurs over a larger area of several wind farms, it decreases the chances of bat populations recovering to a prior state. Bats play an important role in controlling insect numbers, certain species of insects may increase in numbers over a larger area if bats are negatively impacted. Each wind farm is 	3	2	2	3	3	3	39	-	Medium

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT / NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION										RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION									
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S	E		P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		
	Risk of HIV and AIDS	4	3	4	3	4	3	54	-	High												
Quality of the living environment	Sense of place	2	4	4	3	4	3	51	-	High												
	Service supplies and infrastructure	2	3	2	2	2	2	22	-	Low												
Economic	Job creation and skills development	4	4	3	3	3	4	68	+	Very high												
	Socio-economic stimulation	2	4	2	2	3	2	26	+	Medium												
Heritage – none identified																						
Noise																						
Noise emissions from the cumulative effect of all three Klipkraal WEFs operating simultaneously.	Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components of all three Klipkraal WEFs	2	1	1	1	3	2	16	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct noise monitoring during the operational phase to determine actual noise impact and whether further mitigation measures need to be implemented such as running the turbines in low power mode at certain wind speeds at night. Implement a 500m “no-go” buffer around all noise sensitive areas to ensure no wind turbines impact these noise sensitive areas. 	2	1	1	1	3	1	8	-	Low		
Visual																						
Visual	The introduction of a WEF into a landscape that is devoid of any such similar structures	2	3	2	2	3	3	36	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	2	3	2	2	3	3	36	-	Medium		
Traffic																						
Additional Traffic Generation	Increase in Traffic	2	4	1	2	1	4	40	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure a large portion of vehicles travelling to and from the proposed development travels in the 'off peak' periods or by bus. Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. 	2	4	1	2	1	3	30	-	Medium		

ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER	ISSUE / IMPACT / ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT/ NATURE	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION									RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES	ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION								
		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S		E	P	R	L	D	I/M	TOTAL	STATUS (+ OR -)	S
												<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination between all developers in the area. 								
	Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	2	3	2	4	1	3	36	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the speed of vehicles. Adequate enforcement of the law. Implementation of pedestrian safety initiatives. Regular maintenance of farm fences, and access cattle grids. Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. Coordination between all developers in the area. 	2	3	2	4	1	2	24	-	Medium
	Increase in dust from gravel roads	2	3	2	2	1	4	40	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction in the speed of the vehicles. Construction of gravel roads in terms of TRH20. Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department. Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. Coordination between all developers in the area. 	2	3	2	2	1	2	20	-	Low
	Increase in Road Maintenance	2	3	2	2	2	2	22	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department Construction of an on-site batching plant and tower construction to reduce trips. Coordination between all developers in the area. 	2	3	2	2	2	2	22	-	Low
Abnormal Loads	Additional Abnormal Loads	3	3	1	2	1	4	40	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure abnormal vehicles travel to and from the proposed development in the 'off peak' periods. Adequate enforcement of the law. Coordination between all developers in the area. 	3	2	1	2	1	2	18	-	Low
Internal Access Roads	Increase in dust from gravel roads	1	4	1	1	1	3	24	-	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforce a maximum speed limit on the development. Appropriate, timely and high-quality maintenance required in terms of TRH20. Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. 	1	3	1	1	1	2	14	-	Low
	New / Larger Access points	1	4	1	2	1	2	18	-	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate road signage according to the SARTSM. Approval from the respective roads department. 	1	4	1	2	1	1	9	-	Low

14.3.6 Comparative Assessment of Alternatives

Site layout alternatives have not been comparatively assessed, but rather a single layout has been refined as additional information becomes available throughout the EIA process (e.g. specialist input, additional site surveys, and ongoing stakeholder engagement). As a result, the layout provided in the Scoping Phase has been updated and all turbines and supporting infrastructure (i.e. substation, BESS, offices) are situated outside of no-go areas.

The development area presented in the final Environmental Impact Assessment Report has been selected as a practicable option for the Klipkraal WEF 1 considering technical preference and constraints, as well as full infield impact assessments informed by the relevant specialist during their investigations.

14.4 Concluding statement for preferred alternative

No activity alternatives are being considered. Renewable Energy development in South Africa is highly desirable from a social, environmental and development point of view. Wind energy installations are more suitable for the site because of the high wind resource.

Site layout alternatives have not been comparatively assessed, but rather a single layout has been refined as additional information become available throughout the EIA process. The layout has therefore been refined throughout the process from the pre-screening phase through to the impact assessment phase which has resulted in a layout where all turbine and supporting infrastructure avoids the no-go areas identified. The proposed layout has been assessed by the specialists in their respective specialist studies. All constraints identified to date as indicated in the sensitivity mapping have been taken into account and the turbines and supporting infrastructure shifted where necessary to inform the proposed turbine layout for the Klipkraal WEF 1 (**Figure 46** below). This is the layout being put forward for environmental authorisation.




Figure 48: Proposed layout put forward for authorisation

15. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

A summary of the impacts pre-mitigation and post-mitigation are provided below:

Table 16: Pre and post mitigation impact ratings

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
PLANNING		
Heritage		
Unidentified heritage resources - Due to the size of the area assessed, there's a possibility of encountering heritage features in un-surveyed areas does exist.	Medium	Low
Paleontological Resources - Damage, disturbance, destruction or sealing-in of legally-protected, scientifically valuable fossil heritage at or beneath the ground surface within the road footprint, mainly due to ground clearance and excavations	Very High	Medium
CONSTRUCTION		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic feature because of inadequate stormwater management..	Medium	Low
Hydrology - Impact to the hydrological characteristics of the aquatic feature due to changes in the catchment.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of the leakages from the portable chemical toilets that will be used during construction.	Low	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from plant and equipment.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leaking petrochemical storage facilities.	Medium	Low
Hydrology - Impact to the flow of water in the watercourses that will be crossed by infrastructure.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Impacts on broad-scale ecological processes as a result of construction phase activities, including disturbance and habitat loss.	Medium	Low
Impacts on ecosystem services within FEPA Priority Subcatchments as a result of construction phase activities, including disturbance and soil erosion.	Medium	Low
Agricultural – compliance statement – none identified		
Avifaunal		
Displacement due to disturbance associated with the construction of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	Medium	Low
Displacement due to habitat transformation associated with the construction of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	Low	Low
Bat		
Loss of foraging habitat by clearing of vegetation.	Low	Low
Roost destruction during earthworks.	Low	Low
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		
Noise	Low	Low
Increase in crime	Low	Low
Increase risk of HIV infections	High	Medium
An influx of construction workers	Low	Low
Hazard exposure	Low	Low
Quality of the living environment - Disruption of daily living patterns	Low	Low
Quality of the living environment - Disruption to social and community infrastructure	Low	Low
Economic - Job creation and skills development	Medium	Medium
Economic - Socio-economic stimulation	Medium	Medium
Heritage		
Unidentified heritage resources - Due to the size of the area assessed, there's a possibility of encountering heritage features in un-surveyed areas does exist.	Medium	Low
Paleontological Resources - Damage, disturbance, destruction or sealing-in of legally-protected, scientifically valuable fossil heritage at or beneath the ground surface within the road footprint, mainly due to ground clearance and excavations	Very High	Medium
Noise		
Noise pollution due to construction activities (equipment and vehicle noise)	Low	Low
Visual		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Medium	Low
Traffic		
Increase in traffic	Medium	Low
Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Medium	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
Increase in Road Maintenance	Low	Low
Additional Abnormal Loads	Low	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
New / Larger Access points	Low	Low
OPERATIONAL		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Hydrology - Impact to the hydrological characteristics of the aquatic feature due to changes in the catchment	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of inadequate stormwater management	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leakages from vehicles and plant moving on the site	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from petrochemical storage areas within the site.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leakages from the sanitation infrastructure servicing the operations.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Impacts on broad-scale ecological processes as a result of operational phase activities, including disturbance turbine noise.	Low	Low
Impacts on ecosystem services within FEPA Priority Subcatchments as a result of operational phase activities, including disturbance and soil erosion.	Low	Low
Potential impact on Karoo Dwarf Tortoises at the site during operation due to operational activities (vehicles/disturbance) as well as predation by crows.	Medium	Low
Agricultural - compliance statement – none identified		
Avifaunal		
Mortality of priority species due to collisions with the wind turbines.	Medium	Low
Mortality of priority species due to electrocutions on the overhead sections of the internal 33kV cables.	Medium	Low
Mortality due to collisions with the overhead sections of the internal 33kV cables.	Medium	Low
Bat		
Bat mortalities during foraging.	High	Medium
Bat mortalities during migration.	High	Medium
Increased bat mortalities due to light attraction and habitat creation.	High	Low
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Shadow flicker WEF only	Low	Low
Electromagnetic field and RF interference	Low	Low
Hazard exposure	Low	Low
Quality of living environment – Transformation of sense of place	Medium	Low
Economic - Job creation and skills development	Medium	Medium
Economic - Socio-economic stimulation	Medium	Medium
Heritage – none identified		
Heritage (Palaeontology) – none identified		
Noise		
Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components. (Day time)	Low	Low
Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components. (Night time)	Low	Low
Visual		
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on landscape receptors	Medium	Low
Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Medium	Medium
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on landscape receptors	Medium	Medium
Traffic		
Increase in traffic	Low	Low
Increase of incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Low	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
Increase in road maintenance	Low	Low
Additional abnormal loads	Low	Low
New / Larger access points	Low	Low
DECOMMISSIONING		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of the leakages from the portable chemical toilets that will be used during decommissioning. Reduction in and/or loss of species of conservation concern (i.e. rare, threatened/endangered species).	Low	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features because of petrochemical spillages from plant and equipment.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality in the aquatic features as a result of leaking petrochemical storage facilities.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Impacts on Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of decommissioning phase activities, including vehicle collisions, disturbance.	Low	Low
Agricultural – none identified		
Avifaunal		
Displacement due to disturbance associated with the dismantling of the wind turbines and associated infrastructure.	Low	Low
Bat – none identified		
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Economic – Job loss	Medium	Medium
Heritage – none identified		
Heritage (Palaeontology) – none identified		
Noise		
Noise pollution due to construction activities (equipment and vehicle noise)	Low	Low
Visual		
Visual intrusion and potential flicker effect by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by wind turbines and associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Low	Low
Visual intrusion by Access Road, Substations and Associated structures and infrastructure on visual and landscape receptors	Low	Low
Traffic		
Increase in Traffic	Medium	Low
Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Medium	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
Increase in Road Maintenance	Low	Low
Additional Abnormal Loads	Low	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Low	Low
New / Larger Access points	Low	Low
CUMULATIVE		
Impacts to Biophysical Systems		
Aquatic / Freshwater		
Hydrology - Impact to the hydrological regime of the aquatic features.	Medium	Low
Water Quality - Impact to the water quality of the aquatic features as a result of inadequate stormwater management.	Medium	Low
Terrestrial Biodiversity		
Cumulative impacts on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise as a result of habitat loss, disturbance and increased predation and poaching.	Low	Low
Agricultural – compliance statement - none identified		
Avifaunal		
Mortality due to collisions with the wind turbines Displacement due to disturbance during construction and operation of the wind farm Displacement due to habitat change and loss at the wind farm Mortality due to electrocution on the electrical infrastructure	Low	Low
Bat		
Bat mortalities during foraging	High	Medium
Bat mortalities during migration	High	Medium
Increased bat mortalities due to light attraction and habitat creation.	High	Low
Impacts to Socio-Economic Component		
Social		

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Noise	Low	Mitigation can only be considered implemented through a readiness action plan at a regional level and will driven on a provincial and municipal basis; underpinned by national government, private sector and public support
Shadow Flicker	Low	
Blade glint	Low	
Risk of HIV and AIDS	High	
Sense of place	High	
Service supplies and infrastructure	Low	
Job creation and skills development	Very high	
Socio-economic stimulation	Medium	
Heritage – None identified		
Noise		
Mechanical and aerodynamic noise from the operation of the wind turbine components of all three Pofadder WEFs.	Low	Low
Visual		
The introduction of a WEF into a landscape that is devoid of any such similar structures	Medium	Medium
Traffic		
Increase in Traffic	Medium	Medium
Increase of Incidents with pedestrians and livestock	Medium	Medium
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Medium	Low
Increase in Road Maintenance	Low	Low
Additional Abnormal Loads	Medium	Low
Increase in dust from gravel roads	Medium	Low
New / Larger Access points	Low	Low

16. SUMMARY OF SPECIALIST FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 17: Summary of specialist findings and recommendations

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
Aquatic / Freshwater	The Klipkraal WEF phase 1 has a small footprint spread over a large area, allowing for the retention of a much of the natural system so that the system should remain largely unaffected. A variety of aquatic features, mostly ephemeral in nature were observed within the study area and were mapped	The assessment report makes a recommendation for the implementation of a 40m buffer around any watercourse and a buffer of 100m from any of the ephemeral wetlands that have been identified as well as any of the farm dams on the property.

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>and buffered as necessary for their protection and handed over as constraints to inform the design of the project layout.</p> <p>The field assessment of the property has identified a number of additional artificial and natural aquatic features. The three aquatic features identified in the NFEPA Database were found to be farm dams and therefore artificial in nature, while a number of natural Depression wetlands (or pans) were identified within the study area. The Depression wetlands are ephemeral in nature with water accumulating in these features during rainfall events. No water flows out of these features with the primary water loss being as a result of evaporation.</p> <p>A number of seasonal watercourses were also identified within the study area. These watercourses predominantly form unnamed tributaries of the Damfontainspruit and drains towards this feature (to the east). These watercourses are very seasonal in nature and will only have flow during heavy rainfall events. Years might pass between flow events in these watercourses.</p> <p>The impact assessment was conducted in consideration of the provision of these buffers providing for management and mitigation for potential impacts.</p> <p>The final layout (revised by the screening and pre-application scoping phase inputs) has, to a large degree, avoided any sensitive aquatic features and associated buffer areas, significantly reducing the potential overall impact and risk to aquatic resources on the study site. The assessment of the potential impacts associated with the project were completed where avoidance of aquatic features was not possible, or the nature of the activities involve a potential risk to aquatic features even at great distance. Overall, it is expected that the impact on the aquatic environment would be Low Negative.</p>	<p>Adherence to these buffers as prescribed further limits the potential impact on the aquatic environment of the study site.</p> <p>Where watercourses must be crossed by access roads or cable infrastructure, the design of these crossings must make provision for adequate hydraulic sizing to prevent any damming on the upstream side of these structures. Furthermore, the functionality of these structures must be monitored to ensure that they are kept fully functional.</p>
Terrestrial Ecology	The Klipkraal 1 WEF is mapped as falling primarily within the Eastern Upper Karoo and Western Upper Karoo vegetation types. However, the site	The major sensitive features of the site including Riverine Rabbit habitat and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise habitat have been mapped as high or very high

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>verification and field assessment confirmed the presence of Upper Karoo Hardeveld and Southern Karoo Riviere within the site as well. All of these vegetation types have only been impacted to a limited extent by transformation, and are classified as Least Threatened.</p> <p>In terms of fauna, there are several listed fauna which occur in the area and which would potentially be impacted by the development. Of greatest concern would be the Riverine Rabbit and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise, neither of which were observed within the Klipkraal 1 site but are known from the immediate area. There are no areas of habitat within the site that are considered highly suitable for this species and the extent of habitat loss for this species within the site would be minimal. There are confirmed areas of Karoo Dwarf Tortoise within the site that have been classified in the sensitivity mapping as high or very high sensitivity and in response to this mapping the developer has ensured that there are no turbines in these areas. Consequently, there would be a low impact on this species as a result of habitat loss.</p> <p>There are no CBAs within the development footprint, with the result that an impact on CBAs and ESAs as a result of the development is considered unlikely. There are however some areas of FEPA Subcatchment along the western boundary of the site that would be impacted to some degree by the development as there are two turbines located within this area. The overall footprint within the FEPA Subcatchment would be less than 2ha and is not considered significant. A number of avoidance and mitigation measures have however been recommended which would reduce impacts on the FEPA Subcatchments to a low level.</p>	<p>sensitivity and would not be impacted by turbine footprint areas. Some impact to these areas from limited amounts of overhead cabling or turbine access roads are considered acceptable.</p> <p>There are no CBAs within the development footprint, with the result that an impact on CBAs and ESAs as a result of the development is considered unlikely. There are however some areas of FEPA Subcatchment along the western boundary of the site that would be impacted to some degree by the development as there are two turbines located within this area. The overall footprint within the FEPA Subcatchment would be less than 2ha and is not considered significant. A number of avoidance and mitigation measures have however been recommended which would reduce impacts on the FEPA Subcatchments to a low level.</p>
Agricultural	None of the land is classified as cropland, agricultural sensitivity is purely a function of land capability. The land capability of the site on the screening tool is predominantly 4 to 5, but varies from 2 to 6. The small scale differences in the modelled land capability across the project area are not very accurate or significant at this scale and are more a function of how the data is generated by modelling, than actual meaningful	The recommended mitigation measures are implementation of an effective system of storm water run-off control; maintenance of vegetation cover; and stripping, stockpiling and re-spreading of topsoil.

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>differences in agricultural potential on the ground. Values of 2 to 5 translate to a low agricultural sensitivity and values of 6 translate to a medium agricultural sensitivity, although there is little real difference between low and medium agricultural sensitivity on the ground.</p> <p>The climate data (low rainfall of approximately 168 to 179 mm per annum and high evaporation of approximately 1,320 to 1,360 mm per annum) (Schulze, 2009) proves the area to be very arid, and therefore of limited land capability.</p> <p>The land capability value is in keeping with the climate limitations that make the site totally unsuitable for dryland crop production.</p>	
Avifauna	<p>The proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 will have several potential impacts on priority avifauna. These impacts are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displacement of priority species due to disturbance linked to construction activities in the construction phase - The impact is rated as medium but could be mitigated to low levels. • Displacement due to habitat transformation in the construction phase - The impact is rated as low both pre- and post-mitigation. • Collision mortality caused by the wind turbines in the operational phase - The impact is rated as medium pre-mitigation and low post-mitigation. • Electrocution on the 33kV MV overhead lines (if any) in the operational phase - The impact is rated as medium pre-mitigation and low post-mitigation. • Collisions with the 33 kV MV overhead lines (if any) in the operational phase - The impact is rated as medium pre-mitigation and low post-mitigation. • Displacement of priority species due to disturbance linked to dismantling activities in the decommissioning phase. 	<p><u>High sensitivity no-turbine buffer</u></p> <p>Included in this category are areas within 200m of pans and earth dams, and 150m from all major drainage lines. Surface water in this arid habitat is crucially important for priority avifauna, including several Red Data species such as Martial Eagle, Lanner Falcon, Black Stork, Blue Crane and Verreaux's Eagle, and many non-priority species, including several waterbirds. Drainage lines when flowing attract waterbirds on occasion, as do the large pools that remain in the channel after the flow has stopped. Wind turbines that are placed near these sources of surface water pose a collision risk to birds using the water for drinking and bathing, and drainage lines, when flowing, are natural flight paths for birds.</p>
Bat	<p>Information from literature as well as available bat activity data from site confirms that seven bat species occur on the site and another three species are likely to occur. Of this total of ten species, six have a Medium – High or High likelihood to be negatively impacted by wind</p>	<p>Buffers have been placed around key habitat features as per best practice resulting in the identification of several No-Go areas for turbine placement.</p> <p>Bat fatality must be monitored for a minimum of two years from commencement of operation and</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	energy due to their foraging and behavioural patterns.	estimated fatality levels compared to the thresholds set for the project. If these thresholds are exceeded, an adaptive management plan for bats must be developed which will outline the use of curtailment and/or acoustic deterrents to reduce fatality to below threshold levels.
Social	<p>It is evident that the cumulative impacts associated with changes to the social environment of the region are more significant than those attached to any one project.</p> <p>The initiative to address these cumulative impacts lies at a far higher level than at an individual project level. In this regard conclusions are drawn to the findings of this assessment conducted for the proposed Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 which indicates that during the construction and the operational phase of the proposed development, various employment opportunities, with different levels of skills will be created. In addition this will create local business opportunities benefitting the socio-economic development of the local community of Fraserburg.</p>	<p>The proposed project and associated infrastructure will create a number of potential socio-economic opportunities and benefits and is unlikely to result in permanent damaging social impacts. From a social perspective it is concluded that the project is acceptable subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation and enhancement measures and management actions identified for the project. Considering the findings of the report and potential for mitigation it is the reasoned opinion of the specialist that the project can be authorised from a social perspective.</p>
Heritage	<p>The fieldwork conducted in 2021 within the Klipkraal WEF 1 study area identified two (2) heritage resources that were classified as structures (incl. historical farmstead).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 stone ruin farmstead (K-10) was rated as having medium heritage significance. • 1 stone shepherds shelter (K-09) was rated as having low heritage significance. <p>The pre-construction and construction phase of the proposed WEF will entail extensive surface clearance as well as excavations into the superficial sediment cover and underlying bedrock (e.g., for widened or new access roads, wind turbine foundations, hardstanding areas, on-site substation, underground cables, construction laydown area, O&M building and BESS).</p> <p>Construction of the facility may adversely affect potential archaeological and fossil heritage within the development footprint by damaging, destroying, disturbing or permanently sealing-in fossils preserved at or beneath the surface of the</p>	<p>The calculated impact confirms the impact of the new Klipkraal WEF 1 will be reduced with the implementation of the mitigation measures. This finding in addition to the implementation of a chance finds procedure, as part of the EMP, will mitigate possible impacts on unidentified heritage resources. The following mitigation measures will be required if associated infrastructure does encroach upon the identified heritage sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30m buffer zone around historical structures • It is essential that a walk down survey of the final footprint of the new Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated grid connection infrastructure be conducted. • A management plan for the heritage resources then needs to be compiled and approved for implementation during construction and operations.

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>ground that are then no longer available for scientific research or other public good.</p> <p>The possible pre-construction impacts calculated on the tangible cultural heritage resources is overall VERY HIGH to MODERATE NEGATIVE rating but with the implementation of the recommended buffers and management guidelines will be reduced to a MEDIUM - LOW NEGATIVE impact.</p>	
Heritage (Palaeontology)	<p>The Palaeontological Impact assessment (PIA) conducted by Butler (2022) determined that the Jurassic Dolerite underlies a small portion of the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 while the rest of the footprint is underlain by the Adelaide Subgroup (Beaufort Group). The PalaeoMap of the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) indicates that the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Jurassic Dolerite is Zero as it is igneous in origin and thus unfossiliferous while that of the Adelaide Subgroup is Very High (Almond and Pether, 2009; Almond et al., 2013). Large areas of the development on the PalaeoMap are underlain by white, indicating that these areas have not been allocated so a specific Palaeontological Sensitivity. The updated Geology (Council of Geosciences, Pretoria); refines the geology of the 1983 Geological Map and indicates that the north-eastern portion is underlain by Jurassic dolerite, the most significant portion of the development is underlain by the Middleton Formation with the south western portion underlain by the Balfour Formation. Both the Middleton and Balfour Formations forms part of Adelaide Subgroup (Beaufort Group).</p> <p>In the last few decades extensive research and collecting have been conducted by palaeontologists in this part of the basin and the Fraserburg area was found to be highly fossiliferous. A two day-site-specific field survey of the development footprint was conducted on foot 24-26 September 2021. Various fossiliferous sites, where fossils were found to be well-preserved, has been identified in the development footprint.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a Palaeontological Walkdown of the development is conducted prior to the commencement of construction.</p> <p>The appointed Palaeontologist will also have to include a Chance Find Protocol for the Klipkraal WEF 1 development and training of accountable supervisory personnel by a qualified palaeontologist in the recognition of fossil heritage is necessary.</p>
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be a short-term increase in noise in the vicinity of the site during the construction phase. 	<p>Due to the potential low noise impacts associated with the construction and operational phases of the proposed project, it is recommended the project</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area surrounding the construction sites will be affected for short periods of time in all directions, should numerous construction equipment be used simultaneously. • The day time SANS 10103:2008 noise limit of 45dB(A) will not be exceeded at any of the noise sensitive areas. • The night-time outdoor guideline noise rating limit of 35dB(A) will not be exceeded at any of the noise sensitive areas, except at two noise sensitive areas (NSA 2 and NSA 8) when the windspeed is above 10m/s. There will most likely be wind noise masking at this windspeed that will mitigate the impact. On site monitoring at these two noise sensitive areas is recommended during the operational phase. Mitigation measures to be considered if the noise impact exceeds the 35dB(A) night noise rating limit, include running the turbines in low power mode at certain wind speeds at night. It is unlikely that the indoor limit will be exceeded as the residents' buildings will attenuate some sound. • The cumulative impacts will not exceed the day time SANS 10103:2008 noise limit of 45dB(A). • The cumulative impacts will exceed the night time SANS 10103:2008 noise limit of 35dB(A) at NSA 2 and NSA 8. There will most likely be wind noise masking at this windspeed that will mitigate the effect. • The construction phase and operational phase will have a low noise impact on the noise sensitive receptors. 	<p>receive Environmental Authorisation, from a noise impact perspective.</p>
Visual	<p>The project will exert a negative influence on the visual environment. This is largely due to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high visibility of the wind turbines which can be 180-200m high (300 to tip of the blade), within the study area. • the high visibility of construction and operation activity within the low growing, uniform open Karoo veld of uniform visual pattern; • the low VAC of the area due to the low and uniform visual pattern of vegetation which does not allow for the project to be visually accommodated within the landscape as a result 	<p>Based on the field observations and the studies herein and with the implementation of the mitigation measures, it is the Visual Specialist's opinion the visual impact of the wind farm layout does not present a potential fatal flaw provided that the recommended mitigation measures are implemented.</p>

Specialist Study	Findings	Recommendations
	<p>of the high visual contrast and absent screening;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scale of the project in a rural setting; the introduction of an extensive project within a rural setting that will be brightly lit by security lighting including red flashing aviation warning/hazard lights on the top of the turbines throughout the night. <p>However, due to the low relative visual quality of the area the overall significance of the visual impact is regarded as Moderate.</p>	
Traffic	<p>The development is in close proximity to an existing road network with minor upgrades proposed on the gravel roads between Fraserburg and the development. The current access point on Road DR2312 has an insufficient sight distance of 240 m; therefore, we propose the access position be moved towards the east at Km 89.55. Before work commences, external road upgrades require approval and a wayleave application from the Northern Cape Department of Public Works & Roads (NCdr&pw).</p> <p>The construction / balance of plant phase of this development will typically generate the highest number of additional vehicles. However, it will be temporary, and impacts are considered nominal.</p> <p>Abnormal loads have been presumed from the Port of Saldanha through Moorreesburg, Wolseley and Worcester towards Matjiesfontein on the N001 Freeway. The section from Matjiesfontein to Fraserburg would require passing over the Theekloofpas and could pose problems for the transportation of rotor blades. Our recommendation is to route through Sutherland with minor deviations in places; however, a more comprehensive route analysis will be required before construction better to understand the required works and the potential risks.</p> <p>Several mitigation measures are proposed to accommodate the development and reduce the impact on the surrounding road network.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures to be included in the construction phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure staff transport is done in the 'Off Peak' period and by bus to reduce impact in the peak periods. Stagger material, component, and abnormal loads deliveries. Adequate road signage on all external roads carrying development traffic according to the South African Road Traffic Sign Manual (SARTSM). Reduction in the speed of vehicles. Adequate enforcement of the law. Implementation of pedestrian safety initiatives. Regular maintenance of farm fences & access cattle grids. Construction of gravel roads in terms of Technical Recommendations for Highways (TRH20). Implement a road maintenance program under the auspices of the respective transport department; and Possible use of approved dust suppressant techniques. <p>It is the traffic specialist opinion that the Klipkraal WEF 1 will have a nominal impact on the existing traffic network. The project is therefore deemed acceptable from a transportation perspective, provided the recommendations and mitigation measures in this report are implemented. Hence, Environmental Authorisations (EAs) should be granted for the EIA applications.</p>

17. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd is proposing to develop, construct and operate the Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated infrastructure. on a site located approximately 30 km South East of Fraserburg within the Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality and the Namakwa District Municipality in the Northern Cape Province.

The overall objective of the proposed development is to generate much needed electricity by means of renewable energy technologies capturing wind energy to feed into the national grid. The use of renewable energy to provide power to South Africa is supported at international, national, provincial and local level. Given South Africa's need for additional electricity generation and the need to decrease the country's dependency on coal-based power, renewable energy has been identified as a national priority, with wind energy identified as one of the readily available, technically viable and commercially cost-effective sources of renewable energy.

Taking into consideration the findings of the EIA process for the proposed development and the fact that specialist recommendations have been used to inform the project design and layout of the facility, it is the opinion of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) that the majority of the negative impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project can be mitigated to acceptable levels. While there are potential negative environmental impacts associated with the proposed development, the extent of the positive benefits associated with the implementation of the project in terms of renewable energy supply and positive local and regional economic impact are considered to outweigh the negative impacts.

After consideration of the findings presented in the EIR and based on the preferred layout presented within this report, it is the reasoned opinion of the EAP that the proposed Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility 1 is acceptable and Environmental Authorisation could be granted.




Figure 49: Final proposed layout with site sensitivities

The Klipkraal WEF 1 will assist by converting wind energy into electricity, thereby releasing no harmful by-products into the environment which will in turn reduce the dependency on fossil fuels.

The following specialist studies have been undertaken for the project:

- Agriculture and Soils Impact Assessment
- Avifaunal Impact Assessment
- Bat Impact Assessment
- Terrestrial Biodiversity Impact Assessment (Including Plant Species Compliance Statement and Karoo Dwarf Tortoise Assessment)
- Heritage Impact Assessment (including Paleontology, Archaeology and Cultural Landscapes)
- Desktop Geotechnical Investigation
- Noise Impact Assessment
- Social Impact Assessment
- Freshwater Impact Assessment
- Transportation Impact Assessment
- Visual Impact Assessment

KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY 1 (PTY) LTD

Project No. 16891
Description Klipkraal WEF 1
Revision No. 1.0

Date: March 2023

Prepared by:



The specialist assessments were conducted to address the potential impacts relating to the proposed development in order to ascertain the level of each identified impact, as well as mitigation measures which may be required. A summary of the main findings of the specialists are included in **Section 16** above.

The agricultural assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the impact of the proposed development on the agricultural production capability of the site is assessed as being low and therefore acceptable because of the above factors. From an agricultural impact point of view, it is recommended that the development be approved.

The avifaunal assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the Klipkraal WEF will have a moderate impact on avifauna which, in most instances, and could be reduced to a low impact through appropriate mitigation. Any alternative substation and laydown locations will all be situated in essentially the same habitat, i.e., Karoo scrub. The habitat is not particularly sensitive, as far as avifauna is concerned. No fatal flaws were discovered during the onsite investigations. The development is therefore supported, provided the mitigation measures listed in this report and the EMPr are strictly implemented.

The bat assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that should the proposed wind farm be approved, a minimum of 2 years of operational bat mortality monitoring should be conducted from the start of the operation of the facility. The recommended mitigation measures have been presented in the Mitigation Action Plan in this EIA phase, which must be incorporated into the EMPr. According to available information consulted during this study, there are no fatal flaws from a bat sensitivity perspective. Additionally, no known bat caves or large roosts occur in the vicinity of the site. No reasons have been identified for the Klipkraal WEF 1 development not to receive Environmental Authorisation.

The terrestrial biodiversity assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that there are no impacts associated with the development of the Klipkraal WEF 1 on terrestrial biodiversity that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level. As such, should all the proposed mitigation be implemented, the Klipkraal WEF 1 development is deemed acceptable from a terrestrial ecological impact perspective. In terms of cumulative impacts, the affected area has not been significantly impacted by renewable energy development to date and the contribution of the current wind farm development to cumulative impact is considered low and acceptable. It is thus the reasoned opinion of the specialist that the Klipkraal WEF 1 development should be authorised subject to the various mitigation and avoidance measures as indicated.

The Karoo Dwarf Tortoise Assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the direct impact of the Klipkraal WEF 1 Site on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise would be low and is not considered significant. Indirect impacts, particularly predation by crows would potentially represent a more persistent, long-term threat to the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise. However, with the implementation of the suggested mitigation and avoidance measures, it is likely that his impact can be reduced to an acceptable, low level. Consequently, the development of the Klipkraal WEF 1 Site is considered acceptable with the implementation of the suggested avoidance and monitoring as indicated and should be allowed to proceed with regards to potential impacts on the Karoo Dwarf Tortoise.

The heritage impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the impact of the Klipkraal WEF 1 will be reduced from very high - moderate negative rating to a medium - low negative impact rating with the implementation of the mitigation measures. This finding in addition to the implementation of a chance finds procedure, as part of the EMPr, will mitigate possible impacts on unidentified heritage resources.

The palaeontology assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the significance of the impact occurring will be negative very high before mitigation. The pre-construction Palaeontological walkdown will lower the Significance of the Impact to a Medium level.

The noise assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that, based on the modelling results, the impact will be low from a noise perspective. It is recommended that the development receive environmental authorisation.

The social impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) stated that considering all social impacts associated with the project, it is evident that, at the social level, the positive elements outweigh the negative and that the project carried with it a significant social benefit at a national level and is therefore supported.

The aquatic impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that with mitigation measures in place, impacts on the aquatic environment of the study site can be potentially reduced to sufficiently low levels. This would be best achieved by incorporating the recommended management & mitigation measures into an Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) for the site, together with appropriate rehabilitation guidelines and ecological monitoring recommendations. Based on the outcomes of the study, the specialist has no objection to the authorisation of the proposed activities.

The transportation impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the Klipkraal WEF 1 and associated grid infrastructure will have a nominal impact on the existing traffic network. The project is therefore deemed acceptable from a transport perspective, provided the recommendations and mitigation measures in the report are implemented. Hence, Environmental Authorisations (EAs) should be granted for the EIA applications.

The visual impact assessment (refer to **Appendix 6**) concluded that the project will exert a negative influence on the visual environment. However, due to the low relative visual quality of the area the overall significance of the visual impact is regarded as Moderate. Based on the field observations and the studies herein and with the implementation of the mitigation measures, it is the Visual Specialist's opinion the visual impact of the wind farm layout does not present a potential fatal flaw provided that the recommended mitigation measures are implemented.

No location alternatives are being considered for the Klipkraal WEF 1 as these sites were selected prior to the commencement of the EIA Process. The layout that was prepared for the Klipkraal WEF 1 has been assessed by specialists to identify potential impacts that may arise from the development. Based on the findings of the specialists, the potential impacts identified and the outcomes of the public participation process of the Scoping Phase, the layout has been updated to avoid environmental no-go areas to produce a final layout. This final layout has been further assessed by all specialists (refer to Impact Tables in **Section 13.3** and findings and recommendations in **Section 15**). No further layout alternatives have been considered as part of the EIA process. Impact assessments have been undertaken on the revised layout. No technology alternatives will be considered. The choice of turbine to be used will ultimately be determined by technological and economic factors at a later stage. The no-go alternative has not been assessed as part of the EIA phase.

Section 16 provides a summary of the positive and negative impacts associated with the proposed project.

18. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME (EMPr) AND CONDITIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION

In accordance with Appendix 4 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended), an EMPr has been included within the EIA. The EMPr includes the impact management measures formulated by the various specialists and the recording of the proposed impact management outcomes for the development have also been included in the EMPr (**Appendix 8**).

The EMPr provides suitable measures to avoid, reverse, mitigate or manage identified impacts and to determine the extent of the residual risks that need to be managed and monitored. The relevant management plans have also been incorporated into the EMPr (where required), which will assist in this regard. Taking into account the potential negative and significant positive impacts that the proposed development could have on the biophysical and social environment, it is the opinion of the EAP that the proposed development should be authorised subject to the following conditions of authorisation:

- All of the mitigation measures identified in this EIA Report (**Section 14.3**) must be made conditions of the authorisation.
- It is important that all of the listed mitigation measures are costed for in the construction phase financial planning and budget so that the contractor and/or developer cannot give financial budget constraints as reasons for non-compliance.
- All feasible and practical mitigation measures recommended by the various specialists must be incorporated into the Final Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) and implemented, where applicable;
- The specialist recommendations included in Section 16 must be made conditions of the authorisation.
- Where applicable, monitoring should be undertaken to evaluate the success of the mitigation measures recommended by the various specialists.
- The activity-specific construction EMPr must be adhered to.
- An independent Environmental Control Officer (ECO) must be appointed by the applicant to monitor the implementation of the construction EMP. The ECO should undertake regular site inspections and compile an environmental audit report.

19. FINAL PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE WHICH RESPONDS TO THE IMPACT MANAGEMENT MEASURES, AVOIDANCE, AND MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE ASSESSMENT

The final proposed alternative is the layout that has been assessed in this report.

20. ASPECTS WHICH WERE CONDITIONAL TO THE FINDINGS OF THE ASSESSMENT EITHER BY THE EAP OR SPECIALIST WHICH ARE TO BE INCLUDED AS CONDITIONS OF AUTHORISATION

None identified.

21. UNCERTAINTIES, ASSUMPTIONS AND GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE

The assessment has been based by SiVEST on information sourced and provided by the Applicant, site visits conducted, specialist findings and the application of the SiVEST assessment criteria. The EAP is of the opinion that the assessment method applied is acceptable. SiVEST assumes that:

- All the information provided by the Applicant is accurate and unbiased.
- The available data, including Topocadastral maps, Orthophotographs, geological maps and Google Earth images, are reasonably accurate.
- All information contained in the specialist studies provided is accurate and unbiased.
- Refer to specialist studies (**Appendix 6**) for their specific assumptions and limitations.
- It is not always possible to involve all Interested and/or Affected Parties (I&APs) individually, however, every effort has/will be made to involve as many interested parties as possible. It is also assumed that individuals representing various associations or parties convey the necessary information to these associations / parties.
- It is not possible to determine the actual degree of the impact that the development will have on the immediate environment without some level of uncertainties. Actual impacts can only be determined following construction and/or operation commences.

22. AUTHORISATION OF THE PROPOSED KLIPKRAAL WEF 1 PROJECT

The final layout for the Klipkraal WEF 1 has been designed to avoid no-go features on site that have been identified through the various specialist studies that have been undertaken. No fatal flaws were identified by the specialists who have undertaken their respective assessment for the project. Whilst it is acknowledged that the project will result in negative impacts, these can be mitigated to acceptable levels.

Based on the findings of the specialist studies and this assessment, provided further comments and concerns are not raised during the pending public participation process, the EAP has no reason to recommend that the project not be authorised, provided that the mitigation measures are adhered to. The conditions to be included in the Environmental Authorisation for the construction phase are listed in **Section 18** above.

The environmental authorization should be valid for a period of 10 years. It is anticipated that construction will be completed within 5 years of receipt of the environmental authorisation.

23. EAP DECLARATION

The EAP declarations, CV's and qualifications for the EAP's responsible for the preparation of this report have been attached in **Appendix 1**.

24. DEVIATIONS FROM THE APPROVED SCOPING REPORT

There are currently no deviations from the approved scoping report.

25. INFORMATION REQUIRED BY CA (IF APPLICABLE)

Currently n/a.

26. CONCLUSION

This EIA Report has covered activities and findings related to the scoping and EIA process for the proposed Klipkraal WEF 1 Project. Professional experience, specialist knowledge, relevant literature and local knowledge of the area have all been used to identify the potential issues associated with the proposed project. No fatal flaws were identified during the EIA Phase. In conclusion, SiVEST, as the independent EAP, is therefore of the view that:

- The site location and project description can be authorised based on the findings of the suite of specialist assessments;
- A cumulative impact assessment of similar developments in the area was undertaken by the respective specialists. Based on their findings, majority of the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed development can be kept either low or medium after the implementation of mitigation measures. In addition, the Social specialist found that the project will result in several positive cumulative effects on the socio-economic environment and that these cumulative impacts will be positive medium, before and after the implementation of mitigation measures; and
- Through the implementation of mitigation measures, together with adequate compliance monitoring, auditing and enforcement thereof by the appointed Environmental Control Officer (ECO) as well as the competent authority, the potential detrimental negative impacts associated with the proposed development can be mitigated to acceptable levels.



SiVEST Environmental Division

4 Pencarrow Crescent,
La Lucia Ridge Office Estate,
Umhlanga Rocks, 4320
PO Box 1899, Umhlanga Rocks, 4320
KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Tel +27 31 581 1579
Email info@sivest.co.za
www.sivest.co.za

Contact Person: Luvanya Naidoo
Email: luvanyan@sivest.com