APPENDIX D3: FLOODLINE DELINEATION

Floodline Delineation of a Reach of the T-Goob se Laagte River for the proposed Pella Bulk Water Pipeline Project

Pella, Northern Cape, South Africa

January 2020

Client

Prepared for:

SLR Consulting (Africa) (Pty) Ltd

Prepared by:

The Biodiversity Company

Cell: +27 81 319 1225

Fax: +27 86 527 1965

info@thebiodiversitycompany.com

www.thebiodiversitycompany

Report Name	**Floodline Delineation of a Reach of the T_Goob se Laagte River**
Submitted to	SLR
Report Writer	**Russell Tate (Pr. Sci. Nat. 400089/15)**
Report Writer	**Michael Ryan (Cand. Sci. Nat. 125128)**
Survey	**Dale Kindler**
Report Reviewer	**Andrew Husted (Pr. Sci. Nat. 400213/11)**
Declaration	The Biodiversity Company and its associates operate as independent consultants under the auspice of the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions. We declare that we have no affiliation with or vested financial interests in the proponent, other than for work performed under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2017. We have no conflicting interests in the undertaking of this activity and have no interests in secondary developments resulting from the authorisation of this project. We have no vested interest in the project, other than to provide a professional service within the constraints of the project (timing, time and budget) based on the principals of science.

The horseshoe reservoir, the endpoint of the pipeline (January 2020)

Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

Declaration

I, Russell Tate declare that:

- I act as the independent specialist in this study;
- I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the project;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this study, including knowledge of the Act, regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the study;
- I will comply with the Act, regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the study;
- I undertake to disclose to the client and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing any decision to be taken with respect to the study by the competent authority; and the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 71 and is punishable in terms of Section 24F of the Act.

Russell Tate

MSc. Aquatic Health

Pr. Sci. Nat. 400089/15

The Biodiversity Company

12/01/2020

Disclaimer

Findings, recommendations and conclusions provided in this report are based on the best available scientific methods and the author's professional knowledge and information at the time of compilation. The Biodiversity Company employees involved in the compilation of this report, however, accepts no liability for any actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, and by the use of the information contained in this document.

The modelled floodlines presented in this study are for indicative purposes only for the delineation of sensitive habitats, and not meant for any engineering designs. No form of this report may be amended or extended without the prior written consent of the author and/or a relevant reference to the report by the inclusion of an appropriately detailed citation.

1 Introduction

The Biodiversity Company was appointed by SLR Consulting (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd to undertake a baseline floodline determination in watercourses associated with the Pella bulk water pipeline. The scope of work considered in this study included the delineation of watercourses from the Pelladrift Water Treatment Plant in the north west of the project area ending at the Horseshoe Reservoir near Aggeneys. The remaining extent of the bulk water pipeline which enters the Black Mountain Mining concession was not assessed, as this will form part of the Smelter Project Environmental Impact Assessment.

An existing pipeline runs the servitude that will be used for the new pipeline. It will be located, within the existing 30m reserve of the existing above-ground pipeline. The existing pipeline received General Authorization (27/2/1/D182/1/3/4/5) in terms of section 39 of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act NO. 36 of 1998) for water use activities to be undertaken by Sediberg Water for the upgrading of the existing water supply pipeline (51km) from the Orange River to Aggeneys, Pella, Pofadder and local landowners. The proposed pipeline route will be crossing the same 8 watercourses listed in the existing pipeline authorisation and were considered in this floodline determination.

The legal definition of the extent of a watercourse is defined in the amendment of the General Authorisation for section 21 (c) and (i) water uses. The extent of the watercourse is defined as:

- A river, spring or natural channel in which water flows regularly or intermittently "within the outer edge of the 1 in 100 year floodline or riparian habitat measured from the middle of the watercourse from both banks";
- Wetlands and pans "within 500 m radius from the boundary (temporary zone) of any wetland or pan".

An example of the watercourse extent is provided in Figure 1. The aim of this study was therefore to derive the estimated flood peaks and conduct a modelling exercise which will determine the extent and height of the anticipated peak flows for the 100 year return period.



Figure 1: The extent of a watercourse (DWA, 2012)

2 Project Area

The project area, or Area of Interest (AOI), was derived to be between the Pelladrift Water Treatment Plant 39 km north east of the town of Aggeneys, running south west ending in the Horseshoe Reservoir. The project area is located within the Lower Orange Water Management Area (WMA) in the D81G and D82A quaternary catchments. The Sub Quaternary Reaches (SQR's) of concern for this determination are the ephemeral 3rd order 20 km long T-Goob se Laagte River (D81G – 03731 - SQR) and associated tributaries. The T-Goob se Laagte River is a largely natural (class B) river with a moderate ecological status and sensitivity (DWS, 2020). The remaining watercourses of concern are tributaries of the ephemeral D81G – 03840 SQR and a tributary of the ephemeral D82A – 03779 SQR (Mik River). It is noted that within the drainage area assessed during this study, some areas were observed to have endoreic (inward draining) minor catchments, this may present a limitation in the delineations of the catchment areas.

An assessment of the available data regarding the hydrology of the watercourse was made on the Department of Human Settlements, Water and Sanitation (DHSWS) database. There were, however, no gauging stations on any watercourses of concern in the project area.

In order to facilitate the development of the peak flow, the considered catchment area was separated into respective sub catchments as indicated in Section 5.1 of this report.



Figure 2: Locality map illustrating the project area (January 2020)

3 Methodology

3.1 Survey

A single site visit was completed for this determination. The site visit was completed from the 14th to17th of January 2020.

3.2 Flood Hydrology

The hydrological assessment completed in this determination was set out in line with the standards and methods stipulated in the SANRAL drainage manual (SANRAL, 2013). Based on the practical guidelines for the relevant catchment areas the following inputs were required for the peak flood calculations:

- Catchment Area;
- Slopes;
- Run-off characteristics;
- Land use, land type and underlying lithology;
- Mean annual precipitation; and
- Local hydraulic structures.

The supporting software Utility Programs for Drainage was utilised for the calculations of the various flood peaks in the appropriate 1:50 and 1:100 return periods.

3.2.1 Storm Rainfall Depths

Through the available software, Design Rainfall Estimation in South Africa (ver 3), the storm rainfall depths were derived with data presented in Smithers and Schulze (2002). The method makes use of the rainfall stations near the project area. The storm rainfall depths for various return periods and storm durations were then calculated for the project area using the abovementioned software.

3.2.2 Elevation Data and Catchment Area

Topographic factors such as catchment size, slope, stream patterns and shape are known to have an impact on the nature of flood events. Steeper catchments may have higher flood peaks over a shorter critical duration, whereas a gentle catchment topography produces longer duration flood peaks (SANRAL, 2013).

Relief data was obtained for the 2731CC Quarter Degree Square from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. The contour interval for this data was presented at 10m. The clipped contour data was used to create a Triangular Irregular Network (TIN) which was used to create a Digital Elevation Model (DEM). Standard ARCGIS 10.5 hydrology tools were then used to generate the basin and watersheds for the specific watercourse considered in this determination.

The various catchment characteristics were defined based on the ARCGIS methods stipulated in Gericke and du Plessis (2012). These characteristics included catchment slope, watercourse length and slope, longest path and catchment centroid.

3.2.3 Land Cover and Soils

Land cover types and lithology affects the rates of infiltration and runoff within a catchment. Land cover and soil coverages were used during the peak flow calculations. The land cover of the immediate catchment area upstream of the lowest point in the modelled river was assessed during the determination. In addition, land cover classes from the 2013 – 2014 South African National Land-Cover dataset (Geoterraimage, 2015) and Google Earth imagery was also utilised to calculate the overall catchment land use coverages. Generalised soil coverages for the catchment area were derived based on the Land Type and Capability dataset from the Agricultural Resource Council – Institute for Soil, Climate and Water (ARC-ISCW).

3.2.4 Manning's n Roughness Coefficients

The Manning's n roughness coefficients are values that are used to model the instream channel, the riverbanks and adjacent floodplains resistance to flow. The Mannings roughness was assessed during the site visit. The instream channels are ephemeral in nature and consisted of a wide, flat channel with sandy to rocky substrate and little to no vegetation (Figure 3). The riparian area on the banks are limited and comprised of rocky embankments or bare sandy to rocky substrate with isolated patches of vegetation (shrubs and grasses) (Figure 4 and Figure 5). Based on these observations, a Mannings n roughness coefficient of 0.025 was estimated for the channel and 0.035 for the banks from Chow (1959) as well as Arcement and Schneider (1989).

Figure 3: The watercourses of the project area (January 2020). Note the sand substrates with intermittent rocky areas

Figure 4: The largest watercourse near the pipeline source at the Orange River (January 2020). Note the slope of the embankments and isolated riparian area.

Figure 5: Riparian area of a drainage line comprised of patches of vegetation within bare soils (January 2020)

3.2.5 Hydraulic Structures

The considered river reach was assessed on the site investigation for the presence of any hydraulic structures (bridges, weirs and culverts) that may have an influence on the hydraulic condition in the watercourse.

3.2.6 Peak Flow Calculations

Peak flow calculations were completed through the Utility Drainage Programme software. Rational Method, Rational Method (alternative), Unit Hydrograph, Standard Design Flood (SDF) and Empirical methods were used to assess the peak discharge for the 1:100 and 1:50 flood periods (SANRAL, 2013).

3.2.7 Mean Annual Runoff

The most appropriate method for calculating the Mean Annual Runoff (MAR) is the SCS- SA method (Bosznay 1989). According to SANRAL (2013) the formula for the calculation is:

$$Q = \frac{(P-Ia)^2}{P-Ia+S}$$

Where

Q = Storm depth (mm)

P = Daily rainfall depth (mm)

S = Potential maximum soil water retention (mm)

$$= \frac{25400}{CN} - 254$$

CN = Curve Number

I_a = Initial losses (abstractions) prior to the commencement of stormflow (mm) – 0,1S in South Africa

The storm depth is then divided by 365 to calculate the daily MAR.

3.2.8 Software Used

- ARCGIS 10.5 is a Geographical Information System (GIS) software programme used to view, edit, create and analyse geospatial data. ARCGIS was used to view spatial data and to create maps. Its extension 3D Analyst was used for terrain modelling purposes, for converting the elevation data into Digital Elevation Model (DEM) grid format;

- HEC GEORAS utilises the ARCGIS environment and is used for the preparation of geometric data (cross-sections, river profile, banks and flow paths) for input into the HEC-RAS hydraulic model. It is further used in post processing to import HEC-RAS results back into ARCGIS, to perform flood inundation mapping;

- Design Rainfall Estimation in South Africa (ver 3);

- Utility Programme for Drainage (Van Vuuren and Van Dijk) Version 1.1.0; and

- HEC-RAS 5.0.7 (Brunner, 2010) was used to perform hydraulic modelling. HEC-RAS is a programme used to perform one/two-dimensional calculations for a range of applications.

3.2.9 Hydraulic Model Setup

Development of the hydraulic model included the following steps:

- Preparation of geometric data (cross-sections, stream centre lines, bank lines and flow paths) in HEC-GEORAS and RAS-Mapper (Figure 6);

- Importing of geometric data into HEC-RAS;

- HEC-RAS setup by inserting the appropriate roughness coefficient values at the selected cross-sections;

A 2-D Unsteady flow analysis of the peak flows using a simple triangular flow hydrograph over a 21 hour period was conducted on the established geometry and upstream boundary conditions. The peak of the hydrograph matching that of the outputs of the respective utility drainage software.

- Exporting GIS shapefiles was completed via HEC-RAS and HEC-GEORAS.



Figure 6: An excerpt of the HEC-RAS geometry model of the watercourse used for the floodline delineation

4 Limitations

The following is applicable:

- No storage facilities (dams) were modelled upstream or downstream of the project area;
- No flood protection infrastructure was modelled;
- The floodline presented should only be used for indicative and environmental planning purposes, and not for detailed engineering designs, unless signed off by a suitably qualified and registered engineer;
- No detailed contour data (<1m) was available for the modelling of the catchment areas and watercourse channels considered in this study. Considering the flat topography of the region, the absence of such data presents a significant limitation to the effective modelling of the smaller watercourses located in the upper catchment in the study area. Based on this limitation, the only floodline delineated was that associated with the lower reaches of the T-Goob se Laagte River (D81G – 03731 - SQR).
- The floodline of the Orange River was not considered in this study.
- Given the low accuracy of the available contour data, no hydraulic structures were modelled;
- The initial conditions of the HECRAS model made use of the water surface profile in the available contour data. However, based on field observations it is assumed that the initial discharge in the watercourse was below 0.1 m^3/s.
- The floodline areas modelled in this assessment should be interpreted with caution; and

- No impact/risk assessment or mitigation actions are provided in this determination.

5 Results

5.1 Catchment Description

5.1.1 Rainfall

Daily rainfall depths were extracted from DHSWS Hydrological Services website. The closest weather station was the Pella Mission @ Pella Pump Station (D8E005-MET) which is approximately 1 km north of the project area along the Orange River. The data for this station is for the period of 1983-2019.

The Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) of the weather station was 144 mm. The climate of Pella is considered a "desert” classified as BWh in the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. The average temperature in Pella was 21 °C.

The total average monthly rainfall is indicated in Figure 7. This is the average from 1983 to 2019 and includes flood events. Normally, in May the precipitation is at its peak. The driest month was August, with 2.3 mm of rain.



Figure 7: Total annual rainfall per month for the project area (DWS Hydrological Services, 2020)

5.1.2 Storm Rainfall Depths

The storm rainfall depths for the centre position of the project area were extracted from the Design Rainfall Estimation in South Africa software programme (Smithers and Schulze, 2002). The programme uses the six closest rainfall stations the specified project area. The rainfall stations used for this project area are indicated in Table 1. The gridded storm rainfall depths for the contributing catchment at the various return periods and storm durations are indicated in Table 2.

Table 1: Six Closest rainfall stations to the project area

Station Name	Station No.	Distance (km)	Record (Years)	Latitude	Longitude	MAP (mm)	Altitude (mamsl)
PELLA	0247242_W	24.2	79	29°01'S	19°09'E	50	484
POFADDER;ON SEEPKANS.	0279497_A	52.6	41	28°47S	19°17'E	78	500
ONSEEPKANS (POL)	0279497_W	56.9	47	28°44S	19°17'E	80	420
SKUITKLIP	0280351_W	84.6	47	28°51S	19°42'E	90	840
GOODHOUSE	0277386_A	86.5	21	28°56S	18°13'E	57	441
HENKRIESFON TEIN	0277177_W	98.2	29	28°057S	18°06'E	72	356

Table 2: Storm Rainfall Depths for the Catchment

Storm Duration	Return Period / Storm Rainfall Depth (mm)						
min / hr / day	**1:2 yr**	**1:5 yr**	**1:10 yr**	**1:20 yr**	**1:50 yr**	**1:100 yr**	**1:200 yr**
5 min	6.5	10.1	12.8	15.7	19.7	23	26.5
10 min	9.7	15.2	19.2	23.4	29.4	34.4	39.7
15 min	12.2	19.2	24.3	29.6	37.2	43.5	50.2
30 min	15	23.6	29.9	36.4	45.8	53.4	61.7
45 min	17	26.6	33.7	41.1	51.6	60.3	69.6
1 hr	18.5	29	36.7	44.8	56.2	65.7	75.8
1.5 hr	20.8	32.7	41.4	50.5	63.5	74.1	85.6
2 hr	22.7	35.6	45.1	55.1	69.1	80.7	93.2
4 hr	26	40.8	51.6	63	79.1	92.4	106.6
6 hr	28.1	44.1	55.8	68.1	85.6	99.9	115.4
8 hr	29.7	46.6	59	72	90.5	105.6	122
10 hr	31	48.7	61.7	75.2	94.5	110.3	127.4
12 hr	32.1	50.4	63.9	77.9	97.9	114.3	132
16 hr	34	53.3	67.5	82.4	103.5	120.8	139.5
20 hr	35.5	55.7	70.5	86.1	108.1	126.2	145.7
24 hr	36.8	57.7	73.1	89.2	111.9	130.7	151
1 day	30.2	47.4	60.1	73.3	92.1	107.5	124.1
2 day	35.8	56.2	71.2	86.9	109.1	127.4	147.1
3 day	39.6	62.1	78.6	95.9	120.5	140.7	162.4
4 day	41.7	65.4	82.8	101.1	126.9	148.2	171.1
5 day	43.4	68.1	86.3	105.3	132.2	154.3	178.2
6 day	44.9	70.4	89.2	108.8	136.6	159.5	184.2
7 day	46.1	72.4	91.7	111.9	140.5	164.1	189.4

5.1.3 Evaporation

The closest weather station was the Pella Mission @ Pella Pump Station (D8E005-MET) which is approximately 1 km north of the site. The data for this station is for the period of 1983-2019. The average evaporation for the region is displayed in Table 3.

Table 3: Symon's Pan and open water evaporation for the project area (DWS Hydrological Services, 2019)

Month	Pella Mission @ Pella Pump Station (D8E005-MET) (mm)
January	552.5
February	449.4
March	410..9
April	297.6
May	209.4
June	149.9
July	165.8
August	224.7
September	299.4
October	405.2
November	468.6
December	527.2
Total	**4296.8**

5.1.4 Mean Annual Runoff

MAR was calculated using the SCS-SA method where all input values as well as the resultant MAR can be found in Table 4 below. The formula was altered to calculate annual runoff opposed to daily runoff by using MAP instead of daily rainfall. Potential maximum soil water retention was calculated as an average of the dominant soil types in the catchment to get the initial curve number for the selected land cover data (SANRAL, 2013).

Table 4: All parameters required for MAR as well as the calculated MAR

Input values	
P (mm)	97
CN	68
S(mm)	119.53
I_a (mm)	11.95
Q (mm\year)	35.35

5.1.5 Topography, Drainage and Contributing Catchment

The project area lies directly within the D81G and D82A quaternary catchments. The overall study basin was delineated into 3 sub-catchment areas. For the purposes of this study, the pipeline structure is situated at the head of sub catchment 1 and 3 with the Mik River in catchment 1 not being significantly impacted on by the pipeline route. Further, considering that the pipeline was in the headwater zone of catchment 1, no derived channels could be delineated with the available 10m contour data. Thus, catchment 1 was not subjected to peak flow delineations in these watercourses. In order to address this limitation, buffer zones of 30m were applied to the delineated ephemeral watercourses as presented in Figure 19. The infrastructure was noted to be in proximity to the delineated discharge outlets of catchment 2 and 3. Thus, the receiving environment of sub catchments 2 and 3 were assessed in this study and a watercourse extent delineated. The longest watercourse in catchment 2 flows from west to east and is 4.9 km long. Catchment 1 had the longest main watercourse channel from the south east to north west for a distance of 46.25km.

The overall basin has an average annual precipitation rate of 97 mm. The topography of the delineated catchments varied from 370 Metres above mean sea level (mamsl) in the region near the confluence with the Orange River, to 1200 mamsl in mountainous inselbergs in the southern section of the catchment. The catchment surrounding the southern region of the catchments was indicated to be proximate to 977 mamsl. It is noted that the steepest portions of the catchments were located in proximity to the Orange River where the outlet of the catchment for the T-Goob se Laagte River (D81G – 03731 - SQR) occurs through a kloof with steep, high rocky banks. The catchment as a whole was sloping to the north east, with an average catchment slope of approximately 2% indicating a flat topography in the majority of the catchment area.



Figure 8: Digital Elevation Model for the respective catchments considered in this determination (January 2020)

5.1.6 Land Cover and Soils

The land cover associated with the catchment area is characterised by loose rocks, coarse sands and gravels. Limited vegetation cover was observed or derived to be located in the delineated catchment areas. The hydrological soil group of the region was classified as Group A, indicting high infiltration rates.

As noted in the methods component of this determination, the data presented in this section was obtained from Geoterraimage (2015). The landuse for the catchment is dominated by bare soil (54.60%) followed by grassland (44.79%). The remaining land use is comprised of mining (0.149%), thick bush (0.209%),urban built-up (0.24) and plantations (0.006%) as seen in Table 5 and Figure 9. The catchment for the project area considered is large and therefore is comprised of a wide variety of geology, land and soil types. Soils are a key natural regulator of catchment hydrological response due the capacity that soils have for absorbing, retaining and releasing water (Schulze, 1989). The soils within the catchment are varied throughout the uniform elevation. The soils are comprised of Ag soils (69.02%), Ae soils (17.55%) and Ic soils (7.56%) with the remaining population comprised of Af and IB soils as seen Figure 10. Ag soils within the catchment are freely drained, red-yellow apedal, with high base status < 300 mm deep comprised of Portsmouth (Hu35), Moriah (Hu32), Vergenoeg (Hu45), Dundee (Du10) and Quaggafontein (Hu42) in the B horizon. Ae soils in the catchment are freely drained red-yellow apedal, with high base status > 300 mm deep (no dunes), comprised of Moriah (Hu32), Zwartfontein (Hu34), Portsmouth (Hu35) Gaudam (Hu31) in the B horizon. Ic soils are comprised of miscellaneous land classes; comprised of 90% rocks and roots as well as Mispah (Ms10) in the A horizon.

These soil types belong to the S2 (87.30%) and less so S16 (12.69%) soil classes (Figure 10). S2 soils are freely drained, structureless soils with favourable physical properties however have restricted soil depths, low natural fertility and are easily eroded. S16 soils are non-soil land classes which are water intake areas with restricted land use options.

The soil patterns of the project area fall within four types namely LP2 (70.07%), AR2 (17.58%), R (10.90%) and the remaining 0.89% is comprised of AR1. LP2 are shallow soils with minimal development on hard or weathering rock, with lime generally present in part or most of the landscape. AR2 are red and yellow, well drained sandy soils with high base status. R is rock with limited soils. AR1 is red, excessively drained sandy soils with high base status, mainly dunes.

The Soil Conservation Services method for Southern Africa (SCS-SA) uses information of hydrologic soil properties to estimate surface runoff from a catchment based of the soil permeabilities. Deep, well-drained soils generally have high rates of permeability and thus resulting in greater infiltration. Consequently, highly impermeable soils therefore have a much higher runoff potential due to low potential infiltration (Macfarlane, *et al.*, 2015). The soils of the catchment are comprised of class A/B (79.35%) soils followed by class A (8.89%), B (8.23%), C (3.53%) soils (Figure 13). Class A/B soils have infiltration rates of 0.15 - 0.45 in/hr which represent moderate to high infiltration rates from sands and gravels with minor coarse silts These are well drained to semi permeable soils.

The geology of the catchment (Figure 14) is comprised of gneissic granite and other ultrametamorphic rocks of the Namaqualand Metamorphic Complex which are overlain in places covered by pedisediment materials (Early Tertiary) and older sands and deflation residues on dorbank and calcrete.

Table 5: Catchment land-use by area and percentage.

Landuse	Area (m^2)	Area (%)
Bare Soil	797482108	54.596
Thick Bush	3059254	0.209
Grassland	654227821	44.789
Mining	2177100	0.149
Plantation	98100	0.006
Urban Built-Up	3627900	0.24
Total	1460672283	100

Table 6: Catchment soil/land-type by area and percentage

Landtype	Area (m^2)	Area (%)
Ae	251547064	17.550
Af	10556469	1.067
Ag	989263372	69.021
Ib	73568617	5.133
Ic	108351665	7.560
Total	1460672283	100



Figure 9: Landcover Map for the respective catchment considered in this determination (January 2020)



Figure 10: Soil type map for the respective catchment considered in this determination (January 2020)



Figure 11: Soil class for the respective catchment considered in this determination (January 2020)



Figure 12: Soil patterns map for the respective catchment considered in this determination (January 2020)



Figure 13: SCS soils for the respective catchment considered in this determination (January 2020)



Figure 14: Geological map for the respective catchment considered in this determination (January 2020)

5.2 Hydraulic Structures

The catchment of consideration for the proposed underground pipeline had no associated hydraulic structures that included culverts. The associated infrastructure utilised for maintenance of the pipeline included an adjacent dirt road running the length of the pipeline. Where the road intersected with the watercourses, the roadway would pass over the watercourse and at times, gabions would be used to stabilise the roadway. An example of this is seen in Figure 15. All pipeline crossings can be seen in Table 7 and Figure 16. Figure 17 represents all delineated watercourses within the catchment area. Sites were named according to the river on which they fall, T1, T2, T3, T4, T5, T6, T7, T8 and T9 fall along the Te Goob se Laagte River and sites M1 and M2 are on the Mik River.

Figure 15: Ephemeral river crossing the dirt road (January 2020)



Figure 16: The location of the proposed pipeline and identified watercourse crossings (January 2020)

Table 7: Photos and co-ordinates for the sites sampled (January 2020)

	Upstream	Downstream
T4		
GPS	28°58'48.33"S 19° 8'31.45"E	
T5		
GPS	28°59'10.79"S 19° 8'43.47"E	
T6		
GPS	28°59'37.92"S 19° 8'33.63"E	

	Upstream	Downstream
T7		
GPS	28°59'56.58"S 19° 8'19.06"E	
T8		
GPS	29° 0'11.15"S 19° 8'13.32"E	
T9		
GPS	29° 3'55.07"S 19° 6'35.62"E	
M1		
GPS	29° 8'38.45"S 19° 0'50.44"E	

	Upstream	Downstream
M2		
GPS	29° 9'1.82"S 19° 0'17.04"E	



Figure 17: Watercourses within the project area (January 2020)

5.3 Peak Flow

The parameters and calculated peak flows using the peak discharge methods are summarised in Table 8, Table 9 and Table 10 respectively, with the most appropriate peak flow for the study site provided in blue highlight. When determining peak flow, it is suggested that multiple methods are considered, and the hydrologists digression is used to consider which is most appropriate. The SDF method was considered first and compared with the other methods (SANRAL, 2013). The SDF model was run first as the SDF model can achieve effective results over variable project settings, allowing for models to be simulated for any catchment size. The SDF method has modelled peak flows which occur at the upper range for the five methods used. The rational, alternative rational and SDF methods all estimated peak flows which were considered to be either over or under-estimated for the considered catchment. This over or under estimation was due to the limitation of the size of the considered catchment, where the rational and alternative rational models are typically applied to catchments below 15 km^2)(SANRAL, 2013). Therefore, the most appropriate peak flow considered was the unit hydrograph method as the method applied for catchments between 15 to 5000 km^2 (SANRAL, 2013). Catchment 1 was not considered for this assessment due to its channel size with low resolution of contour data. As a result, a sensitivity area was modelled.

Table 8: Parameters used to calculate Peak Flow

Method	Catchment 2	Catchment 3
MAP (mm)	97	97
Catchment Area (km^2)	26.7592	1276.286
Longest Watercourse (km)	4.9	46.248
H0.10L (mAMSL)	510	880
H0.85L (mAMSL)	408	495
Height Difference Along 10-85 slope (m)	102	385
Average Slope of Longest Watercourse (m/m)	0.01	0.015
Distance to catchment centroid (km)	4.339	25.365
Number of days per year thunder is heard	20	20
Veld type region	6	6
SDF Basin number	14	14
Kovacs K-region	K6	K6

Table 9: Calculated Peak flows for Catchment 2 using the different available methods (m^3/s)

Period/Method	Rational	Rational (alternative)	Unit Hydrograph (m^3/s)	SDF	Empirical
1:2 year	18.47	27.99	4.196	8.899	-
1:5 year	26.74	50.37	7.323	25.84	-
1:10 year	35.85	70.01	11.35	41.21	12.52
1:20 year	46.69	91.58	16.68	58.41	17
1:50 year	63.71	121.03	26.45	83.82	23.54
1:100 year	82.08	146.8	37.54	105	29.89

Table 10: Calculated Peak flows for Catchment 3 using the different available methods (m^3/s)

Period/Method	Rational	Rational (alternative)	Unit Hydrograph (m^3/s)	SDF	Empirical
1:2 year	105.64	228.65	16.81	71.23	-
1:5 year	153.44	406.45	30.12	206.81	-
1:10 year	206.33	563.25	46.91	329.88	112.75
1:20 year	269.71	736.38	68.99	467.58	153.14
1:50 year	370.1	973.95	109.69	670.97	212.04
1:100 year	479.48	1183.61	156.49	840.46	269.25

5.4 Floodlines and Watercourse Extents

The 1:50 and 1:100 year floodlines are indicated on Figure 18. Appropriate modelled sensitive areas are indicated in Figure 19.



Figure 18: Modelled 1-50 and 1-100 year floodlines for the project area (January 2020)



Figure 19: Modelled sensitive areas for the project area (January 2020)

6 Conclusion

As indicated in the limitations of this study, elevation data resolution was poor. Furthermore, the terrain in the study area was derived to be flat with limited undulations where drainage occurs, particularly in the source zones. The effective delineation of the floodlines of the ephemeral streams/drainage lines was therefore not possible. To address this, the drainage lines were modelled using the available elevation and topographical data. These modelled drainages were then ground truthed via the survey and aerial imagery. In order to effectively illustrate, and cover the location of these features, a 30m buffer zone was applied to the watercourse centreline. This buffer was then verified via aerial imagery and was derived to be suitable.

The lower reaches of the watercourses considered in this study were effectively modelled and the sensitive areas delineated. The proposed infrastructure is located directly within the modelled floodlines. Considering this, infrastructure should design to mitigate potential flood damage to the structure and downstream riverine habitats. The effective mitigation applicable can be obtained from the aquatic ecology report.

7 References

Arcement GJ, Schneider VR. 1989. Guide for selecting Manning's roughness coefficients for natural channels and flood plains.

Bosznay M. 1989. Generalization of SCS curve number method. Journal of irrigation and drainage engineering, 115(1), pp.139-144.

Brunner GW. 2010. HEC-RAS – River Analysis System Hydraulic Reference Manual, US Army Corps of Engineers Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC).

Chow VT. 1959. Open channel hydraulics. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Department of Water Affairs. 2012. Operational policy: regulating development and activities affecting watercourses 9.

Department of Water Affairs. 2012. Operational policy: regulating development and activities affecting watercourses 9.

Department of Water Affairs. 2019. http://www.dwa.gov.za/Hydrology/ - access 2019-10-09.

Department of Water Affairs. 2019. http://www.dwa.gov.za/Hydrology/ - access 2019-10-28.

Geoterraimage. 2015. The 2013 – 2014 South African National Land-Cover Dataset. Data User Report and MetaData.

Gericke OJ, du Plessis JA. 2012. Catchment parameter analysis in flood hydrology using GIS applications. Journal of the South African Institution of Civil Engineering. Vol 54 15-26.

Gericke OJ, du Plessis JA. 2013. Development of a Customised Design Flood Estimation Tool to Estimate Floods in Gauged and Ungauged Catchments. Water SA Vol. 39 No. 1 January 2013.

Land Type Survey Staff. 1972 - 2006. Land types of South Africa; Digital Map (1:250 000 scale) and Soil Inventory Database. Pretoria: ARC-Instatute for Soil, Climate, and Water.

Lenoir A. & Coste M. 1996. Development of a practical diatom index of overall water quality applicable to the French National Water Board Network. In Whitton B.A. & Rott, E.: Use of Algae for Monitoring Rivers II, Rott E, Institut fur Botanik, Universitat Innsbruck. Pg 29-45.

Macfarlane, D.M., Bredin, I.P., Adams, J.B., Zungu, M.M., Bate, G.C. and Dickens, C.W.S., 2015. Preliminary guideline for the determination of buffer zones for rivers, wetlands and estuaries. *Water Research Commission*.

SANRAL. 2013. The South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited (SANRAL) Drainage Manual, 6th edition.

Schmidt EJ. Schulze RE. 1987. Flood volume and peak discharge from small catchments in southern Africa, based on the SCS technique. Water Research Commission, Pretoria, WRC-TT 31/87. 164 pp.

Schulze, R.E. (ed) (1989). ACRU: Background concepts and theory. ACRU Report No. 36, Department of Agricultural Engineering, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, RSA.

Smithers JC. Schulze RE. 2002. Design Rainfall and Flood Estimation in South Africa. WRC Project No. K5/1060.

APPENDIX D4: EXEMPTION FOR HERITAGE STUDY

HCAC

11 May, 2020

Attention: Ms Natasha Higgitt
SAHRA Case Officer Northern Cape
South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)
Head Office
111 Harrington Street
CAPE TOWN
8001

Dear Ms Higgitt

RE: Letter of Recommendation for Exemption of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Pella Bulk Water Pipeline Project, Northern Cape

1. Project Background

Black Mountain Mining (Pty) Ltd, part of Vedanta Zinc International (VZI), owns and operates the Gamsberg Zinc Mine. The Gamsberg Zinc Mine as currently approved will produce up to 10 mtpa in an open pit mine together with a concentrator plant and associated infrastructure. Water is currently sourced from the Orange River through an intake pump house located at Pella Drift, almost 30 km to the north east of the Gamsberg Zinc Mine. Currently a total of 28 Ml/day water is pumped through the existing bulk water pipelines.

In order to ensure that the pipeline capacity will meet the future water demand and allow for the complete utilization of the currently licensed abstraction volume of 44 Ml/day Black Mountain Mining (Pty) Ltd, in conjunction with Sedibeng Water, is proposing to **replace** and upgrade the **existing** old underground pipeline and associated infrastructure (Figure 1 & 2). This new pipeline will be located within the existing servitude and will supply water to the proposed Gamsberg Smelter Project and existing Gamsberg Zinc Mine, Black Mountain Mine and the surrounding towns (including Aggeneys, Pella, Pofadder and local landowners).

This servitude was previously assessed by Webley and Halkett (2017), they recorded Stone Age artefact scatters of low significance. The proposed pipeline is currently located within an existing registered servitude, impacted on by the two existing pipelines (one above ground and one underground) and there is a very low likelihood that any sites of significance will be impacted on by the proposed project. It is recommended that the project can commence without a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) on the condition that a chance find procedure is implemented as part of the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) and based on approval from South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA).



Figure 1. Regional locality map (1: 250 000 topographical map).



Figure 2. Google Image of the study area.

2. The Heritage Character of the Study area

2.1. Literature review

The following studies were conducted in the general vicinity of the Pella bulk water pipeline project and were consulted for this report:

Author	Year	Project	Findings
Webley, L.	2012	Desktop Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed 1.5 Ha Extension of Gravel Mine, Portion 2 Of the Farm Aroams 57, Near Aggeneys, Northern Cape Province.	No sites
Webley, L. & Halkett, D.	2012	Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Aggeneys Photo-Voltaic Solar Power Plant on Portion 1 Of the Farm Aroams 57, Northern Cape Province.	Stone Age artefacts
Pether J.	2012	Note in Support of Exemption from Desktop Palaeontological Impact Assessment Environmental Management Plan for The Proposed Extension of Existing Raumix Aggregates (Pty) Ltd. Quarry Near Aggeneys, Northern Cape Portion of Portion 2 Of the Farm Aroams 57, Namaqualand.	No Sites
Rossouw, L.	2013	Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for proposed prospecting drilling on Portion 2 of Rozynbosch No.41 and Remaining Extent & Portion 1 of Wortel No. 42, Namaqualand District, NC Province.	No sites
Morris, D	2017	Amendment of the Final Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed AGGENEIS – PAULPUTS 400kV Transmission Powerline and Substations Upgrade, Northern Cape.	Stone age sites (artefacts and grinding hollows) as well as historical structures.
Webley, L. & Halkett, D.	2017	Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Construction of The Letsoai Csp 1 Solar Facility on The Remaining Extent of The Farm Hartebeest Vlei 86, Near Aggeneys, As Well As Waterpipeline To the Orange River, Northern Cape.	Stone Age sites and artefacts
Van der Walt, J.	2019a	Heritage Impact Assessment Van Zyl Sillimanite Mining Permit, Unpublished report for Greenmined Environmental.	No sites of significance were identified.
Van der Walt, J.	2019b	Heritage Impact Assessment Van Zyl Prospecting right application, Unpublished report for Greenmined Environmental.	No sites of significance were identified.
Van der Walt, J & Orton, J.	2019	Heritage Impact Assessment Lime Sales Mining Right Application, Aroams, Northern Cape.	No sites but isolated artefacts were noted.

2.2. Historical Background

The background of the greater study area has been summarised as follows by Orton in Van der Walt and Orton (2019):

Archaeological sites in the area tend to be focused on three types of landscape features:

1. *Places where water can be obtained – generally after rainstorms. These include pans and low, flat bedrock outcrops that have hollows and crevices that trap water.*
2. *The bases of rocky hills and outcrops. These areas frequently reveal low stone-walled structures, either at the base of the hills or, less frequently, on the rocky hills; and*
3. *On and along sand dunes*

Beaumont *et al.* (1995) have noted that there is a low-density background scatter of artefacts throughout Bushmanland. In the Aggeneys area, however, this scatter tends to be quite ephemeral. Several other surveys in the region support this distribution of archaeological materials (Halkett 2010; Morris 2011a, 2011b, 2013; Orton 2015, 2016; Webley & Halkett 2012). Within the Gamsberg inselberg, however, scatters of Early Stone Age (ESA) artefacts have been recorded in open, often eroding areas (Morris 2010; Orton 2014).

Morris (2010) located bedrock exposures with fissures in them that trap water after rain just north of the N14, while further examples were reported from the area to the south of Aggeneys (Morris 2013). The rocks bear grinding hollows with associated scatters of stone artefacts, pottery and ostrich eggshell located around them. To the west of Aggeneys, Orton (2016) found a very large bedrock outcrop with a pool of water collected at a low point and many grinding grooves and artefact scatters around it. Pans tend to be rare in the Aggeneys area but Orton (in prep.) did locate a small Later Stone Age (LSA) scatter alongside a pan to the south of Aggeneys.

Just east of Aggeneys, Webley and Halkett (2012) examined an area to the north of the N14 and recorded many isolated artefacts and a few occurrences of light quartz and quartzite artefact scatters. Orton (2015) worked in the same area and located an isolated heavily used, grooved double-sided lower grindstone. Morris's (2011b) nearby survey found much sand cover and only a small number of isolated quartz artefacts. To the south of Aggeneys Orton (in prep.) made similar findings but also noted a few isolated lower grindstones.

Morris (2011b) notes the presence of a rock painting on a boulder at Aggeneys. The painting is a finger painting likely associated with the Khoekhoen. Similar art is found on granite outcrops throughout Namaqualand but in very low densities (Orton 2013). A small finger-painted image also lies within the Gamsberg Inselberg to the south of the study area and N14 (Morris 2010; Orton 2014). Neither of these sites has any associated archaeological deposits but a small rock shelter high on Gamsberg has been excavated and found to contain a deposit some 30 cm deep (Orton 2014). Sites with deep deposits are incredibly rare in Bushmanland and sadly excavations at this site were never completed and the deposit has not been dated.

2.3. Historical Information

Because it lies so far from the original Cape Colony (i.e. Cape Town), northern Bushmanland was colonised quite late with most farms only surveyed and granted in the very late 19th or even early 20th centuries. As a result, very few historical structures and features exist on the landscape. The majority of buildings date to the early-mid-20th century and tend to be of low or no heritage significance. A number of surveys in the Bushmanland area have recorded possible isolated graves represented by unusual rocks (either isolated standing rocks or unnatural clusters). Two examples occur alongside a rocky koppie to the southeast of Aggeneys (Orton, in prep.), while others were seen to the west of Aggeneys (Orton 2016). These could be related to early '*trekboers'* passing through the area. Because they lived a very nomadic lifestyle, the physical traces of these early European stock farmers are extremely ephemeral. The ruins of small stone structures that are occasionally found alongside rock outcrops in Bushmanland are likely to represent huts and small livestock enclosures built either by 19th century '*trekboers*' or by early 20th century shepherds. They may have been covered with sticks and skins or by tarpaulins.

Some of the place names in the region reflect the living heritage of the Khoekhoen. Gamsberg (also Ghaamsberg), for example, derives from the Khoekhoen word meaning 'grassy spring' (Raper n.d.). There are unconfirmed historical reports that a massacre of Bushmen may have occurred in a kloof of the Gamsberg (Robinson 1978) but surveys have failed to yield any evidence of this. Morris (2013) seems confident of this event, however, and suggests that the kloof at the south-eastern edge of the inselberg was the location where the killing occurred.

3. Findings

3.1. Archaeology

The proposed project is located in an existing servitude in which there are two existing pipelines, the servitude is thus considered to be impacted on and is therefore disturbed from a heritage point of view. Furthermore, the greater study area is also of low heritage sensitivity. Previously, Morris (2012) applied for exemption for the construction of the above ground pipeline located in the same servitude as the current project as part of a Basic Assessment for the upgrading of the Pella Water Board Water Infrastructure, Northern Cape. Environmental Approval was given for the project in April 2013 (Reference NC/BA/NAM/KHA/PEL- AGG1/2012/NCP/EIA/0000190/2012). The conditions included for the project included the following:

- If any human remains are uncovered during the construction of the site, work should stop in that area and Heritage Northern Cape and the SAHRA Burials Unit should be notified. They will investigate and propose a way forward.
- Should any archaeological materials (artefacts; cultural material such as historic glass, ceramics; subsurface structures) be uncovered or exposed during earthworks or excavations, they will immediately be reported to the SAHRA. After assessment, and if appropriate, a permit will be obtained from SAHRA to remove such remains.

A second study by Webley and Halkett (2017) was conducted for a proposed Concentrated Solar Plant Solar facility and this study included the water pipeline located in the current servitude under investigation and recorded 4 sites close to the pipeline (Table 1 and Figure 3). These sites comprise scatters of Stone Age artefacts and are considered of low significance. These recorded sites are located along focal points on the landscape (e.g., ridges and rocky outcrops) and will not be impacted upon by the proposed pipeline. It should be noted that Webley and Halkett (2017) did not survey the entire line due to access restrictions, areas covered are indicated in purple in Figure 4.

Table 1. Recorded sites along the pipeline route (Webley & Halkett 2017).

Site Number	Latitude	Longitude	Description
LO23	-29.09948903	19.06473298	Next to a rocky knoll, near the pipeline route to Pella, a scatter of quartz flakes. Considered to be of low significance.
LO24	-29.09902602	19.06472602	Quartz artefacts, around a koppie, near the pipeline route to Pella. Considered to be of low significance.
DO36	-29.01489903	19.13812903	Scatter of quartz Middle Stone Age (MSA) artefactual material including flakes, cores and chunks adjacent to the northern side of a prominent rocky koppie. The area is very disturbed by human activity and is alongside the existing pipe trench and road. Quartz band seen on and adjacent to the koppie. A number of shallow overhangs were noted on the north side of the koppie but do not appear to have been used during the LSA as no characteristic artefacts were observed. Considered to be of low significance.
DO37	-29.06448604	19.11168697	Some typical quartz MSA alongside a quartz band. Quartz crystal was noted within the band but does not appear to have been used for artefacts. Considered to be of low significance.

The area in which the pipeline is located can be described as of low heritage sensitivity, with excellent visibility (Figure 5 – 8) that has previously been impacted on by pipeline and powerline construction (Figure 5 and 6). The recorded sites by Webley & Halkett (2017) are all located outside of the current servitude and no heritage features of high significance are expected to be impacted on (Figure 3 as well as zoomed in views in Appendix A).



Figure 3. Known sites in relation to the pipeline.



Figure 4.Track logs of the survey conducted by Webley and Halkett (Adapted from Webley and Halkett 2017).

Figure 5. General site conditions- indicating high visibility and existing infrastructure.

Figure 6. General site conditions- indicating high visibility and existing infrastructure.

Figure 7. General site conditions.

Figure 8. Abstraction tower at the Orange River

3.2. Palaeontology

The study area is indicated as of insignificant to low palaeontological significance on the SAHRA paleontological map (Figure 9). Due to the existing disturbance of the site it is not expected that surface indicators are still visible. Given the nature and relatively small scale of the development, potential impact on palaeontological heritage resources within the proposed development footprint is considered low.



Figure 9. Paleontological sensitivity of the approximate study area (in black) as indicated on the SAHRA Paleontological Map (Key in table below)

Colour	Sensitivity	Required Action
RED	VERY HIGH	Field assessment and protocol for finds is required
ORANGE/YELLOW	HIGH	Desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely
GREEN	**MODERATE**	**Desktop study is required**
BLUE	**LOW**	**No palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required**
GREY	**INSIGNIFICANT/ZERO**	**No palaeontological studies are required**
WHITE/CLEAR	UNKNOWN	These areas will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map.

4. Conclusion

From a heritage perspective the study area is, generally speaking, of low heritage significance and has previously been impacted upon by the two existing pipelines within the registered servitude. An assessment of the same servitude by Morris (2012) motivated for exemption from an HIA as part of a Basic Assessment undertaken in 2013. A second assessment of the same servitude (Webley & Halkett 2017) for a proposed Concentrated Solar Plant facility recorded 4 scatters of Stone Age artefacts of low significance. These recorded sites are located along focal points on the landscape (e.g., ridges and rocky outcrops) and will not be impacted on by the proposed pipeline. The study area is also of low to insignificant paleontological sensitivity. Due to the apparent lack of known heritage resources of significance in the study area it is recommended that the project is exempted from an HIA (following Morris 2012 and based on the assessment by Webley & Halkett 2017) but that a chance find procedure should be included in the EMPr as outlined below.

4.1. Chance find procedure

If during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist or palaeontologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find. A short summary of chance find procedures is discussed below.

This procedure applies to the developer’s permanent employees, its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, and service providers. The aim of this procedure is to establish monitoring and reporting procedures to ensure compliance with this policy and its associated procedures. Construction crews must be properly inducted to ensure they are fully aware of the procedures regarding chance finds as discussed below.

- If during the planning and design phase, construction, operational or closure phases of this project, any person employed by the developer, one of its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, or service provider, finds any artefact of cultural significance or fossil material, this person must immediately cease work at the site of the find and report this find to their immediate supervisor, and through their supervisor to the senior on-site manager.
- It is the responsibility of the senior on-site manager to make an initial assessment of the extent of the find and confirm the extent of the work stoppage in that area.
- The senior on-site manager will inform the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) of the chance find and its immediate impact on operations. The ECO will then contact a professional archaeologist or palaeontologist for an assessment of the finds who will notify the SAHRA.

Any further queries can be forwarded to Jaco van der Walt on Cell: +27 82 373 8491 or to jaco@heritageconsultants.co.za.

Jaco van der Walt
Archaeologist

5. References

Beaumont, P.B., Smith, A.B., & Vogel, J.C. 1995. Before the Einiqua: the archaeology of the frontier zone. In A. B. Smith (ed.) Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Halkett, D. 2010. An assessment of impact on archaeological heritage resulting from replacement of a section of the existing bulkwater supply pipeline from Pella to Pofadder, Northern Cape. Unpublished report prepared for Van Zyl Environmental. St James: ACO Associates cc.

Morris, D. 2010. Cultural Heritage Assessment Gamsberg: supplementary observations to a previous specialist report on archaeological resources. Unpublished report. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 2011a. A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Aggeneis – Paulputs 220kV transmission line. Unpublished report for SSI Engineers and Environmental Consultants. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 2011b. Black Mountain Concentrated Solar Power Facility Development at Aggeneys, Northern Cape: Heritage Impact Assessment. Unpublished report for SRK Consulting. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Morris, D. 2013. Heritage Impact Assessment: proposed Aggeneys Photovoltaic Solar Energy Facility at Bloemhoek near Aggeneys, Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report prepared for Solar Capital (Pty) Ltd. Kimberley: McGregor Museum.

Orton, J. 2013. Geometric rock art in western South Africa and its implications for the spread of early herding. South African Archaeological Bulletin 68: 27-40.

Orton, J. 2014. Final archaeological mitigation report for the Gamsberg Zinc Mine, Aggeneys, Northern Cape. Unpublished report prepared for ERM Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd. Diep River: ACO Associates cc.

Orton, J. 2015. Final archaeological survey for the proposed Aggeneys Solar Energy Facility, Namakwaland Magisterial District, Northern Cape. Unpublished report prepared for Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd. Muizenberg: ASHA Consulting (Pty) Ltd.

Orton, J. 2016. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Sol Invictus 1 PV Facility, Namakwaland Magisterial District, Northern Cape. Unpublished report prepared for Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd. Muizenberg: ASHA Consulting (Pty) Ltd.

Raper, P.E. Dictionary of Southern African Place Names. n.d. Onomastic Research Centre, Human Sciences research Council. Accessed online at https://archive.org/stream/DictionaryOfSouthernAfricanPlaceNames/SaPlaceNames_djvu.txt on 19 June 2015.

Van der Walt, J. 2019a. Heritage Impact Assessment Van Zyl Sillimanite Mining Permit, Unpublished report for Greenmined Environmental.

Van der Walt, J. 2019b. Heritage Impact Assessment Van Zyl Prospecting right application, Unpublished report for Greenmined Environmental.

Van der Walt, J & Orton, J. 2019 . Heritage Impact Assessment Lime Sales Mining Right Application, Aroams, Northern Cape.

Webley, L. & Halkett, D. 2017. Heritage impact assessment: proposed Aggeneys Photo-Voltaic Solar Power Plant on Portion 1 of the farm Aroams 57, Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report prepared for Digby Wells Environmental. St James: ACO Associates.

APPENDIX A



Figure 10. Zoomed in view of Site LO 23 and 24

Figure 11. Zoomed in view of Site DO 37.

Figure 12. Zoomed in view of Site DO36