



SCOPING ASSESSMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED MARIKANA SOLAR PROJECT

Marikana, North West Province

April 2022

CLIENT

savannah
environmental

Prepared by:

The Biodiversity Company

Cell: +27 81 319 1225

Fax: +27 86 527 1965

info@thebiodiversitycompany.com

www.thebiodiversitycompany.com



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview of the Proposed Projects	1
1.2	Background.....	3
1.3	Specialist Details	6
2	Scope of Work.....	7
3	Key Legislative Requirements	7
4	Methods	8
4.1	Desktop Assessment	8
4.1.1	Ecologically Important Landscape Features.....	8
4.1.2	Desktop Flora Assessment	9
4.1.3	Desktop Faunal Assessment	10
4.2	Terms of Methodology	10
4.2.1	Flora Survey	10
4.2.2	Fauna Survey	11
4.3	Terrestrial Site Ecological Importance.....	11
4.4	Wetland Assessment	14
4.4.1	Wetland Identification and Mapping	14
4.4.2	Functional Assessment.....	15
4.4.3	Present Ecological Status	15
4.4.4	Importance and Sensitivity.....	16
4.4.5	Determining Buffer Requirements.....	16
4.5	Land Capability	16
4.5.1	Climate Capability	18
4.5.2	Current Land Use	19
4.6	Assumptions and Limitations	19
5	Results & Discussion.....	19
5.1	Desktop Assessment	19
5.1.1	Ecologically Important Landscape Features.....	19
5.1.2	Flora Assessment.....	27
5.1.3	Faunal Assessment	29

5.1.4	Topography	32
5.1.5	Land Capability	32
6	Impact Risk Assessment	33
6.1	Terrestrial Impact Assessment.....	33
6.1.1	Cummulative Impacts	35
6.2	Avifauna Impact Assessment.....	36
6.3	Wetland Impact Assessment.....	38
6.3.1	Cumulative Impacts	39
6.4	Soil Impact Assessment.....	40
6.4.1	Cumulative Impacts	40
7	Conclusion	41
7.1	Terrestrial Ecology.....	41
7.2	Avifauna.....	41
7.3	Wetlands.....	41
7.4	Agricultural Potential	42
8	References.....	43
9	Appendix Items.....	45
9.1	Appendix A – Specialist Declaration of Independence	45

List of Tables

Table 3-1	A list of key legislative requirements relevant to biodiversity and conservation in the North West Provinces	7
Table 4-1	Summary of Conservation Importance (CI) criteria	12
Table 4-2	Summary of Functional Integrity (FI) criteria	12
Table 4-3	Matrix used to derive Biodiversity Importance (BI) from Functional Integrity (FI) and Conservation Importance (CI)	13
Table 4-4	Summary of Receptor Resilience (RR) criteria	13
Table 4-5	Matrix used to derive Site Ecological Importance from Receptor Resilience (RR) and Biodiversity Importance (BI)	13
Table 4-6	Guidelines for interpreting Site Ecological Importance in the context of the proposed development activities	14
Table 4-7	Classes for determining the likely extent to which a benefit is being supplied	15
Table 4-8	The Present Ecological Status categories (Macfarlane et al., 2009).....	15
Table 4-9	Description of Ecological Importance and Sensitivity categories	16
Table 4-10	Land capability class and intensity of use (Smith, 2006)	16
Table 4-11	The combination table for land potential classification.....	17
Table 4-12	The Land Potential Classes.	17
Table 4-13	Climatic capability (step 1) (Smith, 2006)	18
Table 5-1	Summary of relevance of the proposed project to ecologically important landscape features	19
Table 5-2	Threatened flora species that may occur within the project area.	29
Table 5-3	Threatened amphibian species that are expected to occur within the project area	29
Table 5-4	Threatened reptile species that are expected to occur within the project area	29
Table 5-5	Threatened mammal species that are expected to occur within the project area.	30
Table 5-6	Threatened avifauna species that are expected to occur within the project area	31
Table 6-1	Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to terrestrial biodiversity.....	34
Table 6-2	Cumulative impact of the solar plant and battery system	35
Table 6-3	Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to avifauna.....	36
Table 6-4	Cumulative impact of the solar plant and battery system	38

Table 6-5	Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to wetlands	38
Table 6-6	Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to soils	40

List of Figures

Figure 1-1	Proposed location of the project area in relation to the nearby towns.....	4
Figure 1-2	The various components of the project	5
Figure 4-1	Map illustrating extent of area used to obtain the expected flora species list from the Plants of South Africa (POSA) database. Yellow dot indicates approximate location of the project area. The red squares are cluster markers of botanical records as per POSA data	10
Figure 4-2	Cross section through a wetland, indicating how the soil wetness and vegetation indicators change (Ollis et al., 2013).	15
Figure 5-1	Map illustrating the ecosystem threat status associated with the project area.	20
Figure 5-2	Map illustrating the ecosystem protection level associated with the project area	21
Figure 5-3	Map illustrating the locations of CBAs in the project area.....	22
Figure 5-4	The project area in relation to the protected areas	23
Figure 5-5	The project area in relation to the National Protected Area Expansion Strategy	24
Figure 5-6	The project area in relation to the Magaliesberg IBA.....	25
Figure 5-7	Map illustrating ecosystem threat status of rivers and wetland ecosystems in the project area.....	26
Figure 5-8	The project area in relation to the National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas.	27
Figure 5-9	Map illustrating the vegetation type associated with the project area	28
Figure 5-10	The slope percentage calculated for the project area.....	32
Figure 5-11	Climate for the Marikana Thornveld (SVcb 6).....	33
Figure 5-10	Illustration of land type Ea 3 terrain unit (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)	33

1 Introduction

The development of renewable energy facilities is proposed by various Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs). The project entails the development of three (3) separate solar Photovoltaic (PV) facilities with a combined contracted capacity of up to 205MW and will be known as SRPM Solar PV, Karee Solar PV, and Marikana Solar PV respectively, each including a grid connection and other associated infrastructure. The Solar PV facilities are based near current Sibanye Stillwater mining operations ~6km east of the town of Rustenburg, 3km east of the town of Photshaneng and 8km east from the town of Marikana within the Rustenburg and Madibeng Local Municipalities respectively, and within the greater Bonjanala Platinum District Municipality, North West Province (NWP). The projects will all tie-in to the electricity grid behind the Eskom meter at the respective Sibanye customer substations.

As of 2019, the Industrial Sector was the leading electricity consumer in South Africa, with up to 56 percent of the total consumption (Ratshomo 2019). Mining and quarrying accounted for 10% of the industrial consumption while non-ferrous metals and non-metallic both accounted for 8% and 5%, respectively (Chamber of Mines of South Africa, 2017,). The NWP is rated as the fourth largest electricity consuming province in South Africa and consumes approximately 12% of the available electricity (Department of Economic Development, Environment, Conservation and Tourism (DEDECT) 2012). This is mainly due to the high demand of the electrical energy-intensive mining and related industrial sector. Approximately 63% of the electricity supplied to the NWP is consumed in its mining sector (DEDECT 2012)

The North West DEDECT's renewable energy strategy aims to improve the North West Province's environment, reduce the NWP's contribution to climate change, and alleviate energy poverty, whilst promoting economic development and job creation in the province whilst developing its green economy. Sibanye Stillwater aims to comply with the Mining industry's Mission to decarbonise.

The successful development of the renewable energy projects will enable Sibanye Stillwater to make a valuable and meaningful contribution towards growing the green economy within the province and South Africa. This will assist the NWP in creating green jobs and reducing Green House Gas emissions, whilst reducing the energy demand on the National Grid.

1.1 Overview of the Proposed Projects

A development footprint of approximately up to 230 ha for SRPM Solar PV, up to 210 ha for Karee Solar PV and up to 100 ha for Marikana Solar PV has been identified within the broader combined project sites (approximately 780 ha in extent) for the development of the Rustenburg Solar facilities. Infrastructure associated with each solar PV facility will include the following:

The onsite infrastructure will include:

- Solar PV array comprising bifacial PV modules and mounting structures, using single axis tracking technology. Once installed, the entire structure will stand up to 5m above ground level.
- Inverters and transformers.
- Cabling between the project components.
- Balance of Plant.
- On-site facility substation to facilitate the connection between the solar PV facility and Eskom electricity grid. The size and capacity of each of the on-site stations will be 80MVA, 95MVA and 30MVA respectively.
- An onsite Medium Voltage (MV) switching station forming part of the collector substation.
- 100MWh Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) per site.
- Temporary Laydown areas.

Proposed Solar

- Access roads, internal roads and fencing around the development area.
- Up to 132kV Overhead Power Lines (OHPL) – maximum of 30m height with a 15m servitude width.
- Underground LV cabling will be used on the PV sites.

The details on the PV Facilities and grid connection infrastructure are listed below:

PV Facilities

Applicant	Project Name	Generating capacity	Farm Name and No.	Portion No.
SRPM Solar (Pty) Ltd	SRPM Solar PV	80MW	Farm Waterval No. 303	5, 6, 8, 16, and 48
K4 Solar (Pty) Ltd	Karee Solar PV	95MW	Farm Brakspruit No. 299	23
Marikana Solar (Pty) Ltd	Marikana Solar PV	30MW	Farm Middelkraal No. 466	9

Grid connection infrastructure

Applicant	Project Name	Cap acity	Farm Name/s and no/s.	Alternatives	Infrastructure components
SRPM Solar (Pty) Ltd	SRPM Solar PV	11kV	Farm Waterval No. 303	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Alternative 1: Farm Waterval 303, RE/16, 14, 9, RE10 RE303,19 » Alternative 2: RE16, 14, 9, RE10, RE303, 19 » Alternative 3: RE16, 14, 9, RE10, RE303, 19 » Alternative to option 2, of both MV rooms with an OHL RE16, 14 	Power line to the Paardekraal and UG2 sub-station
K4 Solar (Pty) Ltd	Karee Solar PV	33kV	Farm Brakspruit No. 299 Portion 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Alternative 1: Farm Rooikoppies 297, RE/276, 277 » Alternative 2: is an option to avoid some infrastructure and is an extension of Alternative 1 with the addition of crossing portion 42/297 157, 159 » Alternative 3: RE/276, 223, 135, RE/116, 123, 171, 170, 169, 168, 164, 158, 156,155 » Alternative 3b: RE/276, 223, 135, RE/116,297, 123, 171, 170, 169, 168, 164, 158, 156,155, 157, 42 	Power line to the Karee sub-station
Marikana Solar (Pty) Ltd	Marikana Solar PV	88Kv	Farm Middelkraal No. 466 Portions 9, 12, 7, 36, 5, 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Alternative 1: farm Middelkraal 466, Portions 9, 12, 7, 15, 14, 3 » Alternative 2: farm Middelkraal 466, RE/9, 12, 7, 15, 14, RE/3. » Alternative 3: farm Middelkraal 466: RE/9, 12, 7, 36, RE/5, River crossing, 18, RE/3. » Alternative addition to Alternative 1 to reach tie in point: RE/3. 	Power line to the Marikana sub-station
N/A	Marikana alternatives from Karee			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Alternative 1: Farm Brakspruit No. 299 Portion 23, Farm Rooikoppies 297: 280, RE/329,RE/281,RE/282, 283, 1, 221, 248, 250, 249, 247, RE/415, 244, 122, RE/333; Farm Elandsdrift 467: RE/2, 100, RE/21, 56, 38; Farm 	

Proposed Solar

Applicant	Project Name	Capacity	Farm Name/s and no/s.	Alternatives	Infrastructure components
				Middelkraal No. 466: RE/22, 48, RE/23, 49, RE/1, 29, 30, 47, 16, 14, Unmarked, RE/3; » Alternative 2: Farm Brakspruit No. 299 Portion 23, Farm Rooikoppies 297: 280, RE/314, RE/5; Farm Elandsdrift 467; Farm Middelkraal No. 466: 14, Unmarked, RE/3;	

1.2 Background

The Biodiversity Company was appointed to undertake a scoping assessment for the proposed Marikana Solar project in Marikana, North West Province. The focus area has been identified by the potential development area for the construction and operation of a solar facility consisting of a 35MW system (Figure 1-2).

The approach was informed by the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. 2014 (GNR 326, 7 April 2017) of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA). The approach has taken cognisance of the recently published Government Notices 320 (20 March 2020) in terms of NEMA, dated 20 March and 30 October 2020: “Procedures for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting on Identified Environmental Themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, when applying for Environmental Authorisation” (Reporting Criteria). The National Web based Environmental Screening Tool has characterised the terrestrial theme sensitivity of the project area as “Very High”. The agricultural theme sensitivity has been characterised as “High”. Whilst the screening tool does not pertain specifically to wetlands, the presence of wetlands does contribute to the aquatic theme sensitivity being characterised as “Very High”.

The purpose of the specialist studies is to provide relevant input into the environmental authorisation process and provide a report for the proposed activities associated with the project. This report, after taking into consideration the findings and recommendations provided by the specialist herein, should inform and guide the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) and regulatory authorities, enabling informed decision making, as to the ecological viability of the proposed project.




Figure 1-1 Proposed location of the project area in relation to the nearby towns







Figure 1-2 The various components of the project

1.3 Specialist Details

Report Name	SCOPING ASSESSMENTS FOR THE PROPOSED MARIKANA SOLAR PROJECT
Reference	Marikana PV
Submitted to	
Report Writer	<p>Lindi Steyn </p> <p>Dr Lindi Steyn has completed her PhD in Biodiversity and Conservation from the University of Johannesburg. Lindi is a terrestrial ecologist with a special interest in ornithology. She has completed numerous studies ranging from basic Assessments to Environmental Impact Assessments following IFC standards.</p>
Reviewer	<p>Andrew Husted </p> <p>Andrew Husted is Pr Sci Nat registered (400213/11) in the following fields of practice: Ecological Science, Environmental Science and Aquatic Science. Andrew is an Aquatic, Wetland and Biodiversity Specialist with more than 12 years' experience in the environmental consulting field. Andrew has completed numerous wetland training courses, and is an accredited wetland practitioner, recognised by the DWS, and also the Mondi Wetlands programme as a competent wetland consultant.</p>
Declaration	<p>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.</p>

2 Scope of Work

The principle aim of the assessment was to provide information to guide the risk of the proposed activity to the ecological communities of the associated ecosystems and the agricultural potential within the project area. This was achieved through the following:

- Desktop assessment to identify the relevant ecologically important geographical features within the project area;
- Desktop assessment to compile an expected species list and identify possible threatened flora and fauna species that occur within the project area;
- A desktop description of the land type and soil characteristics for the area;
- Identify the manner that the proposed project impacts based on the screening assessment information and the desktop information, and evaluate the level of risk of these potential impacts; and
- The prescription of mitigation measures and recommendations for identified risks.

3 Key Legislative Requirements

The legislation, policies and guidelines listed below in Table 3-1 are applicable to the current project. The list below, although extensive, may not be complete and other legislation, policies and guidelines may apply in addition to those listed below.

Table 3-1 *A list of key legislative requirements relevant to biodiversity and conservation in the North West Provinces*

Region	Legislation / Guideline
International	Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1993)
	The Convention on Wetlands (RAMSAR Convention, 1971)
	The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 1994)
	The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES 1973)
	The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention, 1979)
National	Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996)
	The National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act No. 107 of 1998)
	The National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (Act No. 57 of 2003)
	The National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (Act No. 10 of 2004), Threatened or Protected Species Regulations
	Procedures for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting on Identified Environmental Themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, GNR 320 of Government Gazette 43310 (March 2020)
	Procedures for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting on Identified Environmental Themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, GNR 1150 of Government Gazette 43855 (October 2020)
	The National Environmental Management: Waste Act, 2008 (Act 59 of 2008);
	The Environment Conservation Act (Act No. 73 of 1989)
	National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy (NPAES)
	Natural Scientific Professions Act (Act No. 27 of 2003)
	National Biodiversity Framework (NBF, 2009)
	National Forest Act (Act No. 84 of 1998)
	National Veld and Forest Fire Act (101 of 1998)

	National Water Act (NWA) (Act No. 36 of 1998)
	National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment (NSBA)
	World Heritage Convention Act (Act No. 49 of 1999)
	Municipal Systems Act (Act No. 32 of 2000)
	Alien and Invasive Species Regulations and, Alien and Invasive Species List 2014/2020, published under NEMBA
	South Africa's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)
	Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act, 1983 (Act 43 of 1983) (CARA)
	Sustainable Utilisation of Agricultural Resources (Draft Legislation).
	White Paper on Biodiversity
Provincial	North-West Biodiversity Sector Plan of 2015 (READ, 2015).
	The North West Biodiversity Management Amendment Bill, 2017

4 Methods

4.1 Desktop Assessment

The desktop assessment was principally undertaken using a Geographic Information System (GIS) to access the latest available spatial datasets to develop digital cartographs and species lists. These datasets and their date of publishing are provided below.

4.1.1 Ecologically Important Landscape Features

Existing ecologically relevant data layers were incorporated into a GIS to establish how the proposed project might interact with any ecologically important entities. Emphasis was placed around the following spatial datasets:

- National Biodiversity Assessment 2018 (Skowno et al, 2019) (NBA) - The purpose of the NBA is to assess the state of South Africa's biodiversity based on best available science, with a view to understanding trends over time and informing policy and decision-making across a range of sectors. The NBA deals with all three components of biodiversity: genes, species, and ecosystems; and assesses biodiversity and ecosystems across terrestrial, freshwater, estuarine and marine environments. The two headline indicators assessed in the NBA are:
 - *Ecosystem Threat Status* – indicator of an ecosystem's wellbeing, based on the level of change in structure, function or composition. Ecosystem types are categorised as Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU), Near Threatened (NT) or Least Concern (LC), based on the proportion of the original extent of each ecosystem type that remains in good ecological condition.
 - *Ecosystem Protection Level* – indicator of the extent to which ecosystems are adequately protected or under-protected. Ecosystem types are categorised as Well Protected (WP), Moderately Protected (MP), Poorly Protected (PP), or Not Protected (NP), based on the proportion of the biodiversity target for each ecosystem type that is included within one or more protected areas. NP, PP or MP ecosystem types are collectively referred to as under-protected ecosystems.
- Protected areas - South Africa Protected Areas Database (SAPAD) (DEA, 2021) – The SAPAD Database contains spatial data pertinent to the conservation of South African biodiversity. It includes spatial and attribute information for both formally protected areas and areas that have less formal protection. SAPAD is updated on a continuous basis and forms the basis for the

Register of Protected Areas, which is a legislative requirement under the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act, Act 57 of 2003.

- National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy (NPAES) (SANBI, 2016) – The NPAES provides spatial information on areas that are suitable for terrestrial ecosystem protection. These focus areas are large, intact and unfragmented and therefore, of high importance for biodiversity, climate resilience and freshwater protection.

- Conservation/Biodiversity Sector Plans:

The North-West Department of Rural, Environment, and Agricultural Development (READ), as custodian of the environment in the North West, is the primary implementing agent of the Biodiversity Sector Plan. The spatial component of the Biodiversity Sector Plan is based on systematic biodiversity planning undertaken by READ. The purpose of a Biodiversity Sector Plan is to inform land use planning, environmental assessments, land and water use authorisations, as well as natural resource management, undertaken by a range of sectors whose policies and decisions impact on biodiversity. This is done by providing a map of biodiversity priority areas, referred to as Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) and Ecological Support Areas (ESAs), with accompanying land use planning and decision-making guidelines (READ, 2015).

- Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) (BirdLife South Africa, 2015) – IBAs constitute a global network of over 13 500 sites, of which 112 sites are found in South Africa. IBAs are sites of global significance for bird conservation, identified through multi-stakeholder processes using globally standardised, quantitative and scientifically agreed criteria; and
- South African Inventory of Inland Aquatic Ecosystems (SAIIAE) (Van Deventer *et al.*, 2018) – A SAIIAE was established during the NBA of 2018. It is a collection of data layers that represent the extent of river and inland wetland ecosystem types and pressures on these systems.

4.1.2 Desktop Flora Assessment

The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006) and SANBI (2019) was used to identify the vegetation type that would have occurred under natural or pre-anthropogenically altered conditions. Furthermore, the Plants of Southern Africa (POSA) database was accessed to compile a list of expected flora species within the project area (Figure 4-1). The Red List of South African Plants (Raimondo *et al.*, 2009; SANBI, 2020) was utilized to provide the most current national conservation status of flora species.




Figure 4-1 Map illustrating extent of area used to obtain the expected flora species list from the Plants of South Africa (POSA) database. Yellow dot indicates approximate location of the project area. The red squares are cluster markers of botanical records as per POSA data

4.1.3 Desktop Faunal Assessment

The faunal desktop assessment comprised of the following, compiling an expected:

- Amphibian list, generated from the IUCN spatial dataset (2017) and AmphibianMap database (Fitzpatrick Institute of African Ornithology, 2021a), using the 2527 quarter degree square;
- Reptile list, generated from the IUCN spatial dataset (2017) and ReptileMap database (Fitzpatrick Institute of African Ornithology, 2021b), using the 2527 quarter degree square;
- Avifauna list, generated from the SABAP2 dataset by looking at pentads 2540_2720; 2540_2725; 2540_2730; 2540_2735; 2545_2720; 2545_2725; 2545_2730; 2545_2730; 2545_2735); and
- Mammal list from the IUCN spatial dataset (2017).

4.2 Terms of Methodology

4.2.1 Flora Survey

The fieldwork and sample sites will be placed within targeted areas (i.e., target sites) perceived as ecologically sensitive based on the preliminary interpretation of satellite imagery (Google Corporation) and GIS analysis (which will included the latest applicable biodiversity datasets) available prior to the fieldwork. The focus of the fieldwork will therefore be to maximise coverage and navigate to each target site in the field, to perform a rapid vegetation and ecological assessment at each sample site. Emphasis will be placed on sensitive habitats, especially those overlapping with the proposed project area.

Homogenous vegetation units will be subjectively identified using satellite imagery and existing land cover maps. The floristic diversity and search for flora SCC will be conducted through timed meanders

within representative habitat units delineated during the fieldwork. Emphasis will be placed mostly on sensitive habitats overlapping with the proposed project areas.

The timed random meander method is highly efficient for conducting floristic analysis, specifically in detecting flora SCC and maximising floristic coverage. In addition, the method is time and cost effective and highly suited for compiling flora species lists and therefore gives a rapid indication of flora diversity. The timed meander search will be performed based on the original technique described by Goff *et al.* (1982). Suitable habitat for SCC will be identified according to Raimondo *et al.* (2009) and targeted as part of the timed meanders.

At each sample site notes will be made regarding current impacts (e.g., livestock grazing, erosion etc.), subjective recording of dominant vegetation species, and any sensitive features (e.g., wetlands, outcrops etc.). In addition, opportunistic observations will be made while navigating through the project area.

4.2.2 Fauna Survey

The faunal assessment within this report pertains to herpetofauna (amphibians and reptiles), avifauna and mammals. The faunal field survey will be comprised of the following techniques:

- Visual and auditory searches - This typically comprises of meandering and using binoculars to view species from a distance without them being disturbed; and listening to species calls;
- Active hand-searches - Used for species that shelter in or under particular micro-habitats (typically rocks, exfoliating rock outcrops, fallen trees, leaf litter, bark etc.);
- Point counts for the avifauna; and
- Utilization of local knowledge.

Relevant field guides and texts that will be consulted for identification purposes included the following:

- Field Guide to Snakes and other Reptiles of Southern Africa (Branch, 1998);
- A Complete Guide to the Snakes of Southern Africa (Marais, 2004);
- Atlas and Red List of the Reptiles of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (Bates *et al.*, 2014);
- A Complete Guide to the Frogs of Southern Africa (du Preez and Carruthers, 2009);
- Smithers' Mammals of Southern Africa (Apps, 2000);
- A Field Guide to the Tracks and Signs of Southern and East African Wildlife (Stuart and Stuart, 2000);
- Book of birds of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (Taylor *et al.*, 2015); and
- Roberts – Birds of Southern Africa (Hockey *et al.*, 2005).

4.3 Terrestrial Site Ecological Importance

The different habitat types within the project area will be delineated and identified based on observations during the field assessment, and available satellite imagery. These habitat types will be assigned Ecological Importance (EI) categories based on their ecological integrity, conservation value, the presence of species of conservation concern and their ecosystem processes.

Site Ecological Importance (SEI) is a function of the Biodiversity Importance (BI) of the receptor (e.g., SCC, the vegetation/fauna community or habitat type present on the site) and Receptor Resilience (RR) (its resilience to impacts) as follows.

BI is a function of Conservation Importance (CI) and the Functional Integrity (FI) of the receptor as follows. The criteria for the CI and FI ratings are provided in Table 4-1 and Table 4-2, respectively.

Table 4-1 Summary of Conservation Importance (CI) criteria

Conservation Importance	Fulfilling Criteria
Very High	Confirmed or highly likely occurrence of Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU) or Extremely Rare or CR species that have a global extent of occurrence (EOO) of < 10 km ² . Any area of natural habitat of a CR ecosystem type or large area (> 0.1% of the total ecosystem type extent) of natural habitat of an EN ecosystem type. Globally significant populations of congregatory species (> 10% of global population).
High	Confirmed or highly likely occurrence of CR, EN, VU species that have a global EOO of > 10 km ² . IUCN threatened species (CR, EN, VU) must be listed under any criterion other than A. If listed as threatened only under Criterion A, include if there are less than 10 locations or < 10 000 mature individuals remaining. Small area (> 0.01% but < 0.1% of the total ecosystem type extent) of natural habitat of EN ecosystem type or large area (> 0.1%) of natural habitat of VU ecosystem type. Presence of Rare species. Globally significant populations of congregatory species (> 1% but < 10% of global population).
Medium	Confirmed or highly likely occurrence of populations of Near Threatened (NT) species, threatened species (CR, EN, VU) listed under Criterion A only and which have more than 10 locations or more than 10 000 mature individuals. Any area of natural habitat of threatened ecosystem type with status of VU. Presence of range-restricted species. > 50% of receptor contains natural habitat with potential to support SCC.
Low	No confirmed or highly likely populations of SCC. No confirmed or highly likely populations of range-restricted species. < 50% of receptor contains natural habitat with limited potential to support SCC.
Very Low	No confirmed and highly unlikely populations of SCC. No confirmed and highly unlikely populations of range-restricted species. No natural habitat remaining.

Table 4-2 Summary of Functional Integrity (FI) criteria

Functional Integrity	Fulfilling Criteria
Very High	Very large (> 100 ha) intact area for any conservation status of ecosystem type or > 5 ha for CR ecosystem types. High habitat connectivity serving as functional ecological corridors, limited road network between intact habitat patches. No or minimal current negative ecological impacts, with no signs of major past disturbance.
High	Large (> 20 ha but < 100 ha) intact area for any conservation status of ecosystem type or > 10 ha for EN ecosystem types. Good habitat connectivity, with potentially functional ecological corridors and a regularly used road network between intact habitat patches. Only minor current negative ecological impacts, with no signs of major past disturbance and good rehabilitation potential.
Medium	Medium (> 5 ha but < 20 ha) semi-intact area for any conservation status of ecosystem type or > 20 ha for VU ecosystem types. Only narrow corridors of good habitat connectivity or larger areas of poor habitat connectivity and a busy used road network between intact habitat patches. Mostly minor current negative ecological impacts, with some major impacts and a few signs of minor past disturbance. Moderate rehabilitation potential.
Low	Small (> 1 ha but < 5 ha) area. Almost no habitat connectivity but migrations still possible across some modified or degraded natural habitat and a very busy used road network surrounds the area. Low rehabilitation potential. Several minor and major current negative ecological impacts.
Very Low	Very small (< 1 ha) area. No habitat connectivity except for flying species or flora with wind-dispersed seeds. Several major current negative ecological impacts.

BI can be derived from a simple matrix of CI and FI as provided in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3 Matrix used to derive Biodiversity Importance (BI) from Functional Integrity (FI) and Conservation Importance (CI)

Biodiversity Importance (BI)		Conservation Importance (CI)				
		Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Functional Integrity (FI)	Very high	Very high	Very high	High	Medium	Low
	High	Very high	High	Medium	Medium	Low
	Medium	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Very low
	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Very low
	Very low	Medium	Low	Very low	Very low	Very low

The fulfilling criteria to evaluate RR are based on the estimated recovery time required to restore an appreciable portion of functionality to the receptor, as summarised in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4 Summary of Receptor Resilience (RR) criteria

Resilience	Fulfilling Criteria
Very High	Habitat that can recover rapidly (~ less than 5 years) to restore > 75% of the original species composition and functionality of the receptor functionality, or species that have a very high likelihood of: (i) remaining at a site even when a disturbance or impact is occurring, or (ii) returning to a site once the disturbance or impact has been removed.
High	Habitat that can recover relatively quickly (~ 5–10 years) to restore > 75% of the original species composition and functionality of the receptor functionality, or species that have a high likelihood of: (i) remaining at a site even when a disturbance or impact is occurring, or (ii) returning to a site once the disturbance or impact has been removed.
Medium	Will recover slowly (~ more than 10 years) to restore > 75% of the original species composition and functionality of the receptor functionality, or species that have a moderate likelihood of: (i) remaining at a site even when a disturbance or impact is occurring, or (ii) returning to a site once the disturbance or impact has been removed.
Low	Habitat that is unlikely to be able to recover fully after a relatively long period: > 15 years required to restore ~ less than 50% of the original species composition and functionality of the receptor functionality, or species that have a low likelihood of: (i) remaining at a site even when a disturbance or impact is occurring, or (ii) returning to a site once the disturbance or impact has been removed.
Very Low	Habitat that is unable to recover from major impacts, or species that are unlikely to: (i) remain at a site even when a disturbance or impact is occurring, or (ii) return to a site once the disturbance or impact has been removed.

Subsequent to the determination of the BI and RR, the SEI can be ascertained using the matrix as provided in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5 Matrix used to derive Site Ecological Importance from Receptor Resilience (RR) and Biodiversity Importance (BI)

Site Ecological Importance		Biodiversity Importance (BI)				
		Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
Receptor Resilience (RR)	Very Low	Very high	Very high	High	Medium	Low
	Low	Very high	Very high	High	Medium	Very low
	Medium	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
	High	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very low
	Very High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very low	Very low

Interpretation of the SEI in the context of the proposed project is provided in Table 4-6.

Table 4-6 Guidelines for interpreting Site Ecological Importance in the context of the proposed development activities

Site Ecological Importance	Interpretation in relation to proposed development activities
Very High	Avoidance mitigation – no destructive development activities should be considered. Offset mitigation not acceptable/not possible (i.e., last remaining populations of species, last remaining good condition patches of ecosystems/unique species assemblages). Destructive impacts for species/ecosystems where persistence target remains.
High	Avoidance mitigation wherever possible. Minimisation mitigation – changes to project infrastructure design to limit the amount of habitat impacted, limited development activities of low impact acceptable. Offset mitigation may be required for high impact activities.
Medium	Minimisation and restoration mitigation – development activities of medium impact acceptable followed by appropriate restoration activities.
Low	Minimisation and restoration mitigation – development activities of medium to high impact acceptable followed by appropriate restoration activities.
Very Low	Minimisation mitigation – development activities of medium to high impact acceptable and restoration activities may not be required.

The SEI evaluated for each taxon can be combined into a single multi-taxon evaluation of SEI for the assessment area. Either a combination of the maximum SEI for each receptor should be applied, or the SEI may be evaluated only once per receptor but for all necessary taxa simultaneously. For the latter, justification of the SEI for each receptor is based on the criteria that conforms to the highest CI and FI, and the lowest RR across all taxa.

4.4 Wetland Assessment

4.4.1 Wetland Identification and Mapping

The National Wetland Classification Systems (NWCS) developed by the SANBI was considered for this assessment. This system comprises a hierarchical classification process of defining a wetland based on the principles of the hydrogeomorphic (HGM) approach at higher levels. In addition, the method also includes the assessment of structural features at the lower levels of classification (Ollis et al., 2013).

The wetland areas are delineated in accordance with the DWAF (2005) guidelines, a cross section is presented in Figure 4-2. The outer edges of the wetland areas were identified by considering the following four specific indicators, the:

- Terrain Unit Indicator helps to identify those parts of the landscape where wetlands are more likely to occur;
- Soil Form Indicator identifies the soil forms, as defined by the Soil Classification Working Group (1991), which are associated with prolonged and frequent saturation.
 - The soil forms (types of soil) found in the landscape were identified using the South African soil classification system namely; Soil Classification: A Taxonomic System for South Africa (Soil Classification Working Group, 1991);
- Soil Wetness Indicator identifies the morphological "signatures" developed in the soil profile due to prolonged and frequent saturation; and
- Vegetation Indicator identifies hydrophilic vegetation associated with frequently saturated soils.

Vegetation is used as the primary wetland indicator. However, in practice the soil wetness indicator tends to be the most important, and the other three indicators are used in a confirmatory role.




Figure 4-2 Cross section through a wetland, indicating how the soil wetness and vegetation indicators change (Ollis et al., 2013).

4.4.2 Functional Assessment

Wetland Functionality refers to the ability of wetlands to provide healthy conditions for the wide variety of organisms found in wetlands and humans. EcoServices serve as the main factor contributing to wetland functionality.

The assessment of the ecosystem services supplied by the identified wetlands was conducted per the guidelines as described in WET-EcoServices (Kotze et al. 2008). An assessment was undertaken that examines and rates the following services according to their degree of importance and the degree to which the services are provided (Table 4-7).

Table 4-7 Classes for determining the likely extent to which a benefit is being supplied

Score	Rating of likely extent to which a benefit is being supplied
< 0.5	Low
0.6 - 1.2	Moderately Low
1.3 - 2.0	Intermediate
2.1 - 3.0	Moderately High
> 3.0	High

4.4.3 Present Ecological Status

The overall approach is to quantify the impacts of human activity or clearly visible impacts on wetland health, and then to convert the impact scores to a Present Ecological Status (PES) score. This takes the form of assessing the spatial extent of impact of individual activities/occurrences and then separately assessing the intensity of impact of each activity in the affected area. The extent and intensity are then combined to determine an overall magnitude of impact. The Present State categories are provided in Table 4-8.

Table 4-8 The Present Ecological Status categories (Macfarlane et al., 2009)

Impact Category	Description	Impact Score Range	PES
None	Unmodified, natural	0 to 0.9	A
Small	Largely Natural with few modifications. A slight change in ecosystem processes is discernible and a small loss of natural habitats and biota may have taken place.	1.0 to 1.9	B

Moderate	Moderately Modified. A moderate change in ecosystem processes and loss of natural habitats has taken place, but the natural habitat remains predominantly intact.	2.0 to 3.9	C
Large	Largely Modified. A large change in ecosystem processes and loss of natural habitat and biota has occurred.	4.0 to 5.9	D
Serious	Seriously Modified. The change in ecosystem processes and loss of natural habitat and biota is great, but some remaining natural habitat features are still recognizable.	6.0 to 7.9	E
Critical	Critical Modification. The modifications have reached a critical level and the ecosystem processes have been modified completely with an almost complete loss of natural habitat and biota.	8.0 to 10	F

4.4.4 Importance and Sensitivity

The importance and sensitivity of water resources is determined to establish resources that provide higher than average ecosystem services, biodiversity support functions or are particularly sensitive to impacts. The mean of the determinants is used to assign the Importance and Sensitivity (IS) category, as listed in Table 4-9 (Rountree and Kotze, 2013).

Table 4-9 Description of Ecological Importance and Sensitivity categories

EIS Category	Range of Mean	Recommended Ecological Management Class
Very High	3.1 to 4.0	A
High	2.1 to 3.0	B
Moderate	1.1 to 2.0	C
Low Marginal	< 1.0	D

4.4.5 Determining Buffer Requirements

The “Preliminary Guideline for the Determination of Buffer Zones for Rivers, Wetlands and Estuaries” (Macfarlane et al., 2014) was used to determine the appropriate buffer zone for the proposed activity.

4.5 Land Capability

Land capability and agricultural potential will be determined by a combination of soil, terrain and climate features. Land capability is defined by the most intensive long-term sustainable use of land under rain-fed conditions. At the same time an indication is given about the permanent limitations associated with the different land use classes.

Land capability is divided into eight classes and these may be divided into three capability groups. Table 4-10 shows how the land classes and groups are arranged in order of decreasing capability and ranges of use. The risk of use and sensitivity increases from class I to class VIII (Smith, 2006).

Table 4-10 Land capability class and intensity of use (Smith, 2006)

Land Capability Class	Increased Intensity of Use									Land Capability Groups
	W	F	LG	MG	IG	LC	MC	IC	VIC	
I	W	F	LG	MG	IG	LC	MC	IC	VIC	Arable Land
II	W	F	LG	MG	IG	LC	MC	IC		
III	W	F	LG	MG	IG	LC	MC			
IV	W	F	LG	MG	IG	LC				
V	W	F	LG	MG						Grazing Land
VI	W	F	LG	MG						
VII	W	F	LG							

4.5.1 Climate Capability

According to Smith (2006), climatic capability is determined by taking into consideration various steps pertaining to the temperature, rainfall and Class A-pan of a region. The first step in this methodology is to determine the MAP to Class A-pan ratio.

Table 4-13 Climatic capability (step 1) (Smith, 2006)

Climatic Capability Class	Limitation Rating	Description	MAP: Class A pan Class
C1	None to Slight	Local climate is favourable for good yields for a wide range of adapted crops throughout the year.	0.75-1.00
C2	Slight	Local climate is favourable for a wide range of adapted crops and a year-round growing season. Moisture stress and lower temperature increase risk and decrease yields relative to C1.	0.50-0.75
C3	Slight to Moderate	Slightly restricted growing season due to the occurrence of low temperatures and frost. Good yield potential for a moderate range of adapted crops.	0.47-0.50
C4	Moderate	Moderately restricted growing season due to the occurrence of low temperatures and severe frost. Good yield potential for a moderate range of adapted crops but planting date options more limited than C3.	0.44-0.47
C5	Moderate to Severe	Moderately restricted growing season due to low temperatures, frost and/or moisture stress. Suitable crops at risk of some yield loss.	0.41-0.44
C6	Severe	Moderately restricted growing season due to low temperatures, frost and/or moisture stress. Limited suitable crops that frequently experience yield loss.	0.38-0.41
C7	Severe to Very Severe	Severely restricted choice of crops due to heat and moisture stress.	0.34-0.38
C8	Very Severe	Very severely restricted choice of crops due to heat and moisture stress. Suitable crops at high risk of yield loss.	0.30-0.34

In the event that the MAP: Class A-pan ratio is calculated to fall within the C7 or C8 class, no further steps are required, and the climatic capability can therefore be determined to be C7 or C8. In cases where the above-mentioned ratio falls within C1-C6, steps 2 to 3 will be required to further refine the climatic capability.

Step 2

Mean September temperatures;

- <10°C = C6
- 10 - 11°C = C5
- 11 - 12°C = C4
- 12 - 13°C = C3
- >13°C = C1

Step 3

Mean June temperatures;

- <9°C = C5
- 9 - 10°C = C4
- 10 - 11°C = C3
- 11 - 12°C = C2

4.5.2 Current Land Use

A generalised land-use will be derived for the larger project area considering agricultural productivity. This information is typically sourced from satellite imagery and also the South African National Land-Cover 2018 (SANLC 2018) dataset. The overall map accuracy for the SANLC 2018 dataset is 90.14%. Broad land-use categories include:

- Mining;
- Bare areas;
- Agriculture crops;
- Natural veld;
- Grazing lands;
- Forest;
- Plantation;
- Urban;
- Built-up;
- Waterbodies; and
- Wetlands.

4.6 Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions and limitations are applicable for this assessment:

- The assessment area was based on the area provided by the client and any alterations to the footprint and/or missing GIS information pertaining to the assessment area would have affected the area surveyed;
- The species likelihood of occurrence is based on desktop information and might be changed after the assessment;
- The impact assessment included is preliminary and is solely based on the screening survey and desktop information; and
- No decommissioning phase impacts have been considered for this project. The life of operation is unknown and expected for perpetuity.

5 Results & Discussion

5.1 Desktop Assessment

5.1.1 Ecologically Important Landscape Features

The GIS analysis pertaining to the relevance of the proposed project to ecologically important landscape features is summarised in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1 Summary of relevance of the proposed project to ecologically important landscape features

Desktop Information Considered	Relevant/Irrelevant	Section
Ecosystem Threat Status	Relevant – Overlaps with an Endangered ecosystem	5.1.1.1
Ecosystem Protection Level	Relevant – Overlaps with a Poorly Protected Ecosystem	5.1.1.2
Protected Areas	Relevant – The project area overlaps with the Magaliesberg Biosphere Reserve	5.1.1.4
Renewable Energy Development Zones	Irrelevant - The project area is 109 km from the closest REDZ	-
Powerline Corridor	Irrelevant- The project area falls 10km from the closest Corridor	-
National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy	Relevant – The project area overlaps with an NPAES priority focus area	5.1.1.5
Critical Biodiversity Area	Relevant – The project area overlaps with CBA2, ESA1 and ESA2 classified areas.	5.1.1.3

Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas	Relevant – The project area lies in the Magaliesberg IBA	5.1.1.6
South African Inventory of Inland Aquatic Ecosystems	Relevant - The project area overlaps with a NP river	5.1.1.7
National Freshwater Priority Area	Relevant – The project area overlap with an unclassified FEPA wetland and a FEPA river.	5.1.1.8
Strategic Water Source Areas	Irrelevant- The project area is 123 km from the closest SWSA	-
Coordinated Avifaunal Road Count	Relevant – 27 km from the closest CAR route	-

5.1.1.1 Ecosystem Threat Status

The Ecosystem Threat Status is an indicator of an ecosystem’s wellbeing, based on the level of change in structure, function or composition. Ecosystem types are categorised as Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU), Near Threatened (NT) or Least Concern (LC), based on the proportion of the original extent of each ecosystem type that remains in good ecological condition. According to the spatial dataset the proposed project overlaps with an EN ecosystem (Figure 5-1).




Figure 5-1 Map illustrating the ecosystem threat status associated with the project area.

5.1.1.2 Ecosystem Protection Level

This is an indicator of the extent to which ecosystems are adequately protected or under-protected. Ecosystem types are categorised as Well Protected (WP), Moderately Protected (MP), Poorly Protected (PP), or Not Protected (NP), based on the proportion of the biodiversity target for each ecosystem type that is included within one or more protected areas. NP, PP or MP ecosystem types are collectively referred to as under-protected ecosystems. The proposed project overlaps with a PP ecosystem (Figure 5-2).




Figure 5-2 Map illustrating the ecosystem protection level associated with the project area

5.1.1.3 Critical Biodiversity Areas and Ecological Support Areas

The conservation of CBAs is crucial, in that if these areas are not maintained in a natural or near-natural state, biodiversity conservation targets cannot be met. Maintaining an area in a natural state can include a variety of biodiversity compatible land uses and resource uses (SANBI-BGIS, 2017).

Figure 5-3 shows the project area superimposed on the Terrestrial CBA maps. The project area overlaps with CBA2, ESA1 and ESA2 classified areas.




Figure 5-3 Map illustrating the locations of CBAs in the project area

5.1.1.4 Protected areas

According to the protected area spatial datasets from SACAD (2021), the project area overlaps with the Magaliesberg Biosphere Reserve (Figure 5-4). No SAPAD reserves are found within 5km of the project area.




Figure 5-4 The project area in relation to the protected areas

5.1.1.5 National Protected Area Expansion Strategy

National Protected Area Expansion Strategy 2016 (NPAES) areas were identified through a systematic biodiversity planning process. They present the best opportunities for meeting the ecosystem-specific protected area targets set in the NPAES and were designed with a strong emphasis on climate change resilience and requirements for protecting freshwater ecosystems. These areas should not be seen as future boundaries of protected areas, as in many cases only a portion of a particular focus area would be required to meet the protected area targets set in the NPAES. They are also not a replacement for finescale planning which may identify a range of different priority sites based on local requirements, constraints and opportunities (NPAES, 2016). The project area overlaps with an NPAES priority focus area as can be seen in Figure 5-5.




Figure 5-5 The project area in relation to the National Protected Area Expansion Strategy

5.1.1.6 Important Bird and Biodiversity Area

Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) are the sites of international significance for the conservation of the world's birds and other conservation significant species as identified by BirdLife International. These sites are also all Key Biodiversity Areas; sites that contribute significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity (Birdlife, 2017).

The project area overlaps with the Magaliesberg IBA (Figure 5-6). This IBA consists mainly of the Magaliesberg range, which extends in an arc from just north-west of Rustenburg in the west to the N1 in the east near Pretoria. The most important trigger species in the IBA is the globally threatened Cape Vulture (*Gyps coprotheres*). The number of breeding pairs in the Skeerpoort colony seems to be stable at 200–250. Secretarybird (*Sagittarius serpentarius*) is the other globally threatened species in the IBA. Regionally threatened species are Lanner Falcon (*Falco biarmicus*), Half-collared Kingfisher (*Alcedo semitorquata*), African Grass Owl (*Tyto capensis*), African Finfoot (*Podica senegalensis*) and Verreaux's Eagle (*Aquila verreauxii*). Biome-restricted species include White-bellied Sunbird (*Cinnyris talatala*), Kurrichane Thrush (*Turdus libonyanus*), White-throated Robin-chat (*Cossypha humeralis*), Kalahari Scrub Robin (*Erythropygia paena*) and Barred Wren-Warbler (*Calamonastes fasciolatus*) (Birdlife International, 2018).




Figure 5-6 The project area in relation to the Magaliesberg IBA

5.1.1.7 Hydrological Setting

The South African Inventory of Inland Aquatic Ecosystems (SAIIAE) was released with the NBA 2018. Ecosystem threat status (ETS) of river and wetland ecosystem types are based on the extent to which each river ecosystem type had been altered from its natural condition. Ecosystem types are categorised as CR, EN, VU or LT, with CR, EN and VU ecosystem types collectively referred to as ‘threatened’ (Van Deventer *et al.*, 2019; Skowno *et al.*, 2019). The project area overlaps with a NP river (Figure 5-7).




Figure 5-7 Map illustrating ecosystem threat status of rivers and wetland ecosystems in the project area

5.1.1.8 National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area Status

In an attempt to better conserve aquatic ecosystems, South Africa has categorised its river systems according to set ecological criteria (i.e., ecosystem representation, water yield, connectivity, unique features, and threatened taxa) to identify Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas (FEPAs) (Driver *et al.*, 2011). The FEPAs are intended to be conservation support tools and envisioned to guide the effective implementation of measures to achieve the National Environment Management Biodiversity Act’s (NEM:BA) biodiversity goals (Nel *et al.*, 2011).

Figure 5-8 shows the project area overlap with an unclassified FEPA wetland and a FEPA river.




Figure 5-8 The project area in relation to the National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas.

5.1.2 Flora Assessment

This section is divided into a description of the vegetation type expected to occur under natural conditions and the expected flora species.

5.1.2.1 Vegetation Type

The project area is situated in the Savanna biome. The savanna vegetation of South Africa represents the southernmost extension of the most widespread biome in Africa (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006). Major macroclimatic traits that characterise the Savanna biome include:

- a) Seasonal precipitation; and
- b) (Sub) tropical thermal regime with no or usually low incidence of frost (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Most savanna vegetation communities are characterised by a herbaceous layer dominated by grasses and a discontinuous to sometimes very open tree layer (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

The savanna biome is the largest biome in South Africa, extending throughout the east and north-eastern areas of the country. Savannas are characterised by a dominant grass layer, over-topped by a discontinuous, but distinct woody plant layer. At a structural level, Africa’s savannas can be broadly categorised as either fine-leaved (microphyllous) savannas or broad-leaved savannas. Fine-leaved savannas typically occur on nutrient rich soils and are dominated by microphyllous woody plants of the Mimosaceae family (Common genera include *Acacia* and *Albizia*) and a generally dense herbaceous layer (Scholes & Walker, 1993).

On a fine-scale vegetation type, the project area overlaps with the Marikana Thornveld vegetation type (Figure 5-9).




Figure 5-9 Map illustrating the vegetation type associated with the project area

5.1.2.1.1 Marikana Thornveld

The Marikana Thornveld vegetation type occurs in valleys and slightly undulating plains. Dense growth of shrubs can be found along drainage lines on termitaria and rocky outcrops.

Important plant taxa are those species that have a high abundance, a frequent occurrence or are prominent in the landscape within a particular vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006). The following species are important in the Marikana Thornveld.

Tall Tree: *Senegalia burkei*.

Small Trees: *Senegalia caffra*, *Vachellia gerrardii*, *Vachellia karroo*, *Combretum molle*, *Searsia lancea*, *Ziziphus mucronata*, *Vachellia nilotica*, *Vachellia tortilis* subsp. *heteracantha*, *Celtis africana*, *Dombeya rotundifolia*, *Pappea capensis*, *Peltophorum africanum*, *Terminalia sericea*.

Tall Shrubs: *Euclea crispa* subsp. *crispa*, *Olea europaea* subsp. *africana*, *Searsia pyroides* var. *pyroides*, *Diospyros lycioides* subsp. *guerkei*, *Ehretia rigida* subsp. *rigida*, *Euclea undulata*, *Grewia flava*, *Pavetta gardeniifolia*.

Low Shrubs: *Asparagus cooperi*, *Rhynchosia nitens*, *Indigofera zeyheri*, *Justicia flava*.

Woody Climbers: *Clematis brachiata*, *Helinus integrifolius*.

Herbaceous Climbers: *Pentarrhinum insipidum*, *Cyphostemma cirrhosum*.

Graminoids: *Elionurus muticus*, *Eragrostis lehmanniana*, *Setaria sphacelata*, *Themeda triandra*, *Aristida scabrivalvis* subsp. *scabrivalvis*, *Fingerhuthia africana*, *Heteropogon contortus*, *Hyperthelia dissoluta*, *Melinis nerviglumis*, *Pogonarthria squarrosa*.

Herbs: *Hermannia depressa*, *Ipomoea obscura*, *Barleria macrostegia*, *Dianthus mooiensis* subsp. *mooiensis*, *Ipomoea oblongata*, *Vernonia oligocephala*.

Geophytic Herbs: *Ledebouria revoluta*, *Ornithogalum tenuifolium*, *Sansevieria aethiopica*.

Conservation Status of the Vegetation Type

This vegetation type is classified as EN, with its national conservation target being 19%. More than 48% has already been transformed by urban expansion and cultivation.

5.1.2.2 Expected Flora Species

The POSA database indicates that 351 species of indigenous plants are expected to occur within the project area (The full list of species will be provided in the final report). One (1) SCC based on their conservation status could be expected to occur within the project area and are provided in Table 5-2 below.

Table 5-2 Threatened flora species that may occur within the project area.

Family	Taxon	Author	IUCN	Ecology
Crassulaceae	<i>Adromischus umbraticola</i> subsp. <i>umbraticola</i>	C.A.Sm.	NT	Indigenous; Endemic

5.1.3 Faunal Assessment

5.1.3.1 Amphibians

Based on the IUCN Red List Spatial Data and AmphibianMap, 26 amphibian species are expected to occur within the area (The full list will be provided in the final assessment). One (1) are regarded as threatened (Table 5-3).

Table 5-3 Threatened amphibian species that are expected to occur within the project area

Species	Common Name	Conservation Status		Likelihood of occurrence
		Regional (SANBI, 2016)	IUCN (2021)	
<i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i>	Giant Bullfrog	NT	LC	Low

Giant Bull Frog (*Pyxicephalus adspersus*) is a species of conservation concern that will possibly occur in the project area, especially in the area with the wetlands. The Giant Bull Frog is listed as near threatened on a regional scale. It is a species of drier savannas where it is fossorial for most of the year, remaining buried in cocoons. They emerge at the start of the rains, and breed in shallow, temporary waters in pools, pans and ditches (IUCN, 2017). Based on the lack of water sources in the project area, this species were given a low likelihood of occurrence.

5.1.3.2 Reptiles

Based on the IUCN Red List Spatial Data and the ReptileMAP database, 80 reptile species are expected to occur within the area (The full list will be provided in the final assessment). Two (2) are regarded as threatened (Table 5-4).

Table 5-4 Threatened reptile species that are expected to occur within the project area

Species	Common Name	Conservation Status		Likelihood of Occurrence
		Regional (SANBI, 2016)	IUCN (2021)	
<i>Crocodylus niloticus</i>	Nile Crocodile	VU	VU	Low
<i>Homoroselaps dorsalis</i>	Striped Harlequin Snake	NT	LC	Moderate

Crocodylus niloticus (Nile Crocodile) is listed as VU on a regional basis. The Nile crocodile is quite widespread throughout sub-Saharan Africa, in different types of aquatic environments such as lakes, rivers, and marshlands. Due to the lack of suitable water sources in the project area the likelihood of occurrence is rated as Low.

Homoroselaps dorsalis (Striped Harlequin Snake) is partially fossorial and known to inhabit old termitaria in grassland habitat (IUCN, 2017). Most of its range is at moderately high altitudes, reaching 1,800 m in Mpumalanga and Swaziland, but it is also found at elevations as low as about 100 m in KwaZulu-Natal. The likelihood of occurrence was rated as moderate.

5.1.3.3 Mammals

The IUCN Red List Spatial Data lists 93 mammal species that could be expected to occur within the area (The full list will be provided in the final assessment). This list excludes large mammal species that are normally restricted to protected areas. Fifteen (15) of these expected species are regarded as threatened (Table 5-5), twelve of these have a low likelihood of occurrence based on the lack of suitable habitat and food sources in the project area.

Table 5-5 Threatened mammal species that are expected to occur within the project area.

Species	Common Name	Conservation Status		Likelihood of occurrence
		Regional (SANBI, 2016)	IUCN (2021)	
<i>Aonyx capensis</i>	Cape Clawless Otter	NT	NT	Low
<i>Atelerix frontalis</i>	South Africa Hedgehog	NT	LC	Moderate
<i>Cloeotis percivali</i>	Short-eared Trident Bat	EN	LC	High
<i>Crocidura mariquensis</i>	Swamp Musk Shrew	NT	LC	Low
<i>Eidolon helvum</i>	African Straw-colored Fruit Bat	LC	NT	Low
<i>Felis nigripes</i>	Black-footed Cat	VU	VU	Low
<i>Hydrictis maculicollis</i>	Spotted-necked Otter	VU	NT	Low
<i>Leptailurus serval</i>	Serval	NT	LC	Moderate
<i>Mystromys albicaudatus</i>	White-tailed Rat	VU	EN	Low
<i>Ourebia ourebi</i>	Oribi	EN	LC	Low
<i>Panthera pardus</i>	Leopard	VU	VU	Low
<i>Parahyaena brunnea</i>	Brown Hyaena	NT	NT	Low
<i>Pelea capreolus</i>	Grey Rhebok	NT	NT	Low
<i>Poecilogale albinucha</i>	African Striped Weasel	NT	LC	Low
<i>Redunca fulvorufula</i>	Mountain Reedbuck	EN	EN	Low

Atelerix frontalis (South African Hedgehog) has a tolerance to a degree for habitat modification and occurs in a wide variety of semi-arid and sub-temperate habitats (IUCN, 2017). Based on the Red List of Mammals of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (2016), *A. frontalis* populations are decreasing due to the threats of electrocution, veld fires, road collisions, predation from domestic pets and illegal harvesting. Suitable habitat might occur in the project area therefore the species has a moderate likelihood of occurrence.

Cloeotis percivali (Short-eared Trident Bat) occurs in savanna areas where there is sufficient cover in the form of caves and mine tunnels for day roosting (IUCN, 2017). It feeds exclusively on moths and appears to be very sensitive to disturbance. Suitable habitat and roosting area can be found around the project area and therefore the likelihood of finding this species is rated as high.

Leptailurus serval (Serval) occurs widely through sub-Saharan Africa and is commonly recorded from most major national parks and reserves (IUCN, 2017). The Serval's status outside reserves is not certain, but they are inconspicuous and may be common in suitable habitat as they are tolerant of farming practices provided there is cover and food available. In sub-Saharan Africa they are found in habitat with well-watered savanna long-grass environments and are particularly associated with reedbeds and other riparian vegetation types. Some areas of suitable habitat is present for this species in the project area, as such the likelihood of occurrence is rated as moderate.

5.1.3.4 Avifauna

The SABAP2 Data lists 346 avifauna species that could be expected to occur within the area (The full list will be provided in the final assessment). Fourteen (14) of these expected species are regarded as threatened (Table 5-6). Eleven of the species have a low likelihood of occurrence due to lack of suitable habitat and food sources in the project area. The likelihood of occurrence is also related to the disturbed nature of the project area. Some of the larger birds might fly over but it is unlikely that they would be residents on site.

Table 5-6 Threatened avifauna species that are expected to occur within the project area

Species	Common Name	Conservation Status		Likelihood of occurrence
		Regional (SANBI, 2016)	IUCN (2021)	
<i>Alcedo semitorquata</i>	Kingfisher, Half-collared	NT	LC	Low
<i>Aquila rapax</i>	Eagle, Tawny	EN	VU	Low
<i>Aquila verreauxii</i>	Eagle, Verreaux's	VU	LC	Low
<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>	Sandpiper, Curlew	LC	NT	Low
<i>Ciconia abdimii</i>	Stork, Abdim's	NT	LC	Low
<i>Coracias garrulus</i>	Roller, European	NT	LC	Moderate
<i>Falco biarmicus</i>	Falcon, Lanner	VU	LC	High
<i>Falco vespertinus</i>	Falcon, Red-footed	NT	NT	Moderate
<i>Gyps coprotheres</i>	Vulture, Cape	EN	EN	Low
<i>Oxyura maccoa</i>	Duck, Maccoa	NT	VU	Low
<i>Phoeniconaias minor</i>	Flamingo, Lesser	NT	NT	Low
<i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i>	Eagle, Martial	EN	EN	Low
<i>Pterocles gutturalis</i>	Sandgrouse, Yellow-throated	NT	LC	Low
<i>Rostratula benghalensis</i>	Painted-snipe, Greater	NT	LC	Low

Coracias garrulous (European Roller) is a winter migrant from most of South-central Europe and Asia occurring throughout sub-Saharan Africa (IUCN, 2017). The European Roller has a preference for bushy plains and dry savannah areas (IUCN, 2017). There is a moderate chance of this species occurring in the project area as they prefer to forage in open areas.

Falco biarmicus (Lanner Falcon) is native to South Africa and inhabits a wide variety of habitats, from lowland deserts to forested mountains (IUCN, 2017). They may occur in groups up to 20 individuals but have also been observed solitary. Their diet is mainly composed of small birds such as pigeons and francolins. The likelihood of incidental records of this species in the project area is rated as high due to the presence of many bird species on which Lanner Falcons may predate.

Falco vespertinus (Red-footed Falcon) is known to breed from eastern Europe and northern Asia to north-western China, heading south in the non-breeding season to southern Angola and southern Africa. Within southern Africa it is locally uncommon to common in Botswana, northern Namibia, central Zimbabwe and the area in and around Gauteng, South Africa (Hockey *et al.*, 2005). The habitat it

generally prefers is open habitats with scattered trees, such as open grassy woodland, wetlands, forest fringes and croplands. Some of these habitats are present in the project area and thus the likelihood of occurrence is rated as moderate.

5.1.4 Topography

The slope percentage of the project areas has been calculated and is illustrated in Figure 5-10. Most of the project area is characterised by a slope percentage between 0 and 10%, with some smaller patches within the project area characterised by a slope percentage ranging from 10 to 30%. Slopes in excess of 10% are largely associated with mining infrastructure.




Figure 5-10 The slope percentage calculated for the project area

5.1.5 Land Capability

As part of the desktop assessment, soil information was obtained using published South African Land Type Data. Land type data for the site was obtained from the Institute for Soil Climate and Water (ISCW) of the Agricultural Research Council (ARC) (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006). The land type data is presented at a scale of 1:250 000 and comprises of the division of land into land types.

5.1.5.1 Climate

This region is characterised by dry winters with a summer rainfall, see below. The mean annual precipitation ranges from 600 to 700 mm with frost occurring fairly frequent around the base of hills during winter months, Mucina & Rutherford (2006).




Figure 5-11 Climate for the Marikana Thornveld (SVcb 6)

5.1.5.2 Geology and Soil

The geology of this area is characterised by norite, gabbro, pyroxenite and anorthosite of the Bushveld Complex. Occasional dykes of syenite and diabase.

According to the land type database (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972-2006) the project area is located within the Ea3 land type. The dominant soil form within this land type include the Arcadia form (70.2%), and shallow Mispah / rocky outcrops (15.9%). The remaining soil forms, each with comprising less than 10% of the land type include Hutton (3.9%), Shortlands (3.2%), Rensburg (6.0%) and Swartlands (0.9%). The land terrain unit for the featured land type is illustrated from Figure 5-12.

Based on the above land type data and soil characteristics, for a land type to be classed as the dominant land type, more than 40% of the land type must fall within a specific category. the dominant land capability for the project area is a Class III.




Figure 5-12 Illustration of land type Ea 3 terrain unit (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)

6 Impact Risk Assessment

6.1 Terrestrial Impact Assessment

Anthropogenic activities drive habitat destruction causing displacement of fauna and flora and possibly direct mortality. Land clearing destroys local wildlife habitat and can lead to the loss of local breeding grounds, nesting sites and wildlife movement corridors such as rivers, streams and drainage lines, or other locally important features. The removal of natural vegetation may reduce the habitat available for fauna species and may reduce animal populations and species compositions within the area.

The terrestrial habitat expected in the project area consists of Marikana Thornveld and is classified as an EN threatened ecosystem. The project area also overlap with areas classified as CBA2 and ESA2. The footprint of the proposed PV plant is surrounded by numerous mining activities and has historically been disturbed.

Table 6-1 Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to terrestrial biodiversity

Impact Biodiversity loss/disturbance			
Issue	Nature of Impact	Extent of Impact	No-Go Areas
Destruction, fragmentation and degradation of habitats and ecosystems	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Disturbance / degradation / loss to vegetation and habitats » Ecological corridors are disrupted » Habitat fragmentation	Regional	Water resources and buffer area
	<u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Erosion risk increases » Fire risk increases » Increase in invasive alien species		
Spread and/or establishment of alien and/or invasive species	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Loss of vegetation and habitat due to increase in alien species <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Creation of infrastructure suitable for breeding activities of alien and/or invasive species » Spreading of potentially dangerous diseases due to invasive and pest species	Regional	None identified at this stage
Direct mortality of fauna	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Loss of SCC species » Loss of fauna diversity <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of diversity and species composition in the area. » Possible impact on the food chain	Regional/International	None identified at this stage
Reduced dispersal/migration of fauna	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Loss of genetic diversity » Isolation of species and groups leading to inbreeding <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Reduced seed dispersal » Loss of ecosystem services	Regional/National	None identified at this stage
Environmental pollution due to water runoff, spills from vehicles and erosion	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Pollution in watercourses and the surrounding environment » Faunal mortality (direct and indirectly) <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Ground water pollution » Loss of ecosystem services	Regional	None identified at this stage
Disruption/alteration of ecological life cycles (breeding, migration, feeding) due to noise, dust, heat radiation and light pollution.	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Disruption/alteration of ecological life cycles due to noise » Reduced pollination and growth of vegetation due to dust » Faunal mortality due to light pollution (nocturnal species becoming more visible to predators) » Heat radiation could lead to the displacement of species <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of ecosystem services	Regional	None identified at this stage
Staff and others interacting directly with fauna (potentially dangerous) or poaching of animals	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Loss of SCCs or TOPS species <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of ecosystem service » Loss of genetic diversity	Regional	None identified at this stage

Description of expected significance of impact

The development of the area could result in the loss or degradation of the habitat and vegetation, most of which is still in a natural condition and supports a number of fauna species. The construction of the solar facility could also lead to the displacement/mortalities of the fauna and more specifically SCC fauna species. The operation of the facility could result in the disruption of ecological life cycles. This could be as a result of a number of things, but mainly due to dust, noise, light pollution and heat radiation. The disturbance of the soil/vegetation layer will allow for the establishment of flora alien invasive species, the new infrastructure in turn will provide refuge for invasive/feral fauna species. Erosion is another possible impact that could result from the disturbance of the top soil and vegetation cover. A number of machines, vehicles and equipment will be required, aided by chemicals and concrete mixes for the project. Leaks, spillages or breakages from any of these could result in contamination of the receiving water resources. Contaminated water resources are likely to have an effect on the associated biota.

Gaps in knowledge & recommendations for further study

- » This is completed at a desktop level only.
- » Identification and descriptions of habitats.
- » Identification of the Site Ecological Importance.
- » Location and identification of SCCs as well as in the case of fauna their location of the nests/dens.
- » Determine a suitable buffer width for the identified features.

Recommendations with regards to general field surveys

- » Field surveys to prioritise the development areas, but also consider the 500 m PAOI.
- » Fieldwork to be undertaken during the wet season period.
- » Avifauna assessment field work to be conducted over two seasons to ensure migratory species are considered.

6.1.1 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are assessed in context of the extent of the proposed project area; other developments in the area; and general habitat loss and transformation resulting from other activities in the area.

The impacts of projects are often assessed by comparing the post-project situation to a pre-existing baseline. Where projects can be considered in isolation this provides a good method of assessing a project's impact. However, in areas where baselines have already been affected, or where future development will continue to add to the impacts in an area or region, it is appropriate to consider the cumulative effects of development. This is similar to the concept of shifting baselines, which describes how the environmental baseline at a point in time may represent a significant change from the original state of the system. This section describes the potential impacts of the project that are cumulative for fauna and flora.

Localised cumulative impacts include the cumulative effects from operations that are close enough to potentially cause additive effects on the environment or sensitive receivers (such as nearby solar farm activities within the area). These include dust deposition, noise and vibration, disruption of corridors or habitat, groundwater drawdown, groundwater and surface water quality, and transport.

As the surrounding area has been extensively mined and altered it is therefore unlikely that the cumulative impact will have a great effect on the local ecosystem (Table 6-2).

Table 6-2 Cumulative impact of the solar plant and battery system

The development of the proposed infrastructure will contribute to cumulative habitat loss within CBAs/ ESAs and thereby impact the ecological processes in the region.

	Overall impact of the proposed development considered in isolation	Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area
Extent	Moderate (3)	Medium (3)
Duration	Moderate term (3)	Moderate term (3)
Magnitude	Low (4)	Moderate (6)
Probability	Probable (3)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Medium	Low
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative

Reversibility	High	Low
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Yes
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation:		
• This impact cannot be mitigated as the loss of vegetation is unavoidable.		
Residual Impacts:		
Will result in the loss of:		
» CBA 1 & ESA2		
» Endemic species;		
» SCC fauna and flora species;		
» Portions of a NPAES; and		
» Niche habitats.		

6.2 Avifauna Impact Assessment

The destruction of habitat along with the risk of electrocutions and collisions is regarded as the greatest risk for avifauna associated with solar plants and associated grid lines. These risks as well as others are described in *Table 6-3*.

Table 6-3 Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to avifauna

Impact			
Avifauna loss/disturbance			
Issue	Nature of Impact	Extent of Impact	No-Go Areas
Destruction, fragmentation and degradation of habitats and ecosystems	<u>Direct impacts:</u>		
	» Disturbance / degradation / loss to vegetation and habitats	Regional	Water resources and buffer area
	» Ecological corridors are disrupted		
	» Habitat fragmentation		
<u>Indirect impacts:</u>			
	» Erosion risk increases		
	» Fire risk increases		
	» Increase in invasive alien species		
Spread and/or establishment of alien and/or invasive species	<u>Direct impacts:</u>		
	» Loss of habitat due to increase in alien species	Regional	None identified at this stage
	<u>Indirect impacts:</u>		
	» Creation of infrastructure suitable for breeding activities of alien and/or invasive species		
» Spreading of potentially dangerous diseases due to invasive and pest species			
Direct mortality of fauna	<u>Direct impacts:</u>		
	» Loss of SCC species	Regional/International	None identified at this stage
	» Loss of avifauna diversity		
	<u>Indirect impacts:</u>		
» Loss of diversity and species composition in the area.			
	» Possible impact on the food chain		
Reduced dispersal/migration of avifauna	<u>Direct impacts:</u>		
	» Loss of genetic diversity	Regional/National	None identified at this stage
	» Isolation of species and groups leading to inbreeding		

	<p><u>Indirect impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Reduced seed dispersal » Loss of ecosystem services 		
Environmental pollution due to water runoff, spills from vehicles and erosion	<p><u>Direct impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Pollution in watercourses and the surrounding environment » Avifaunal mortality (direct and indirectly) <p><u>Indirect impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Ground water pollution » Loss of ecosystem services 	Local	None identified at this stage
Disruption/alteration of ecological life cycles (breeding, migration, feeding) due to noise, dust, heat radiation and light pollution.	<p><u>Direct impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Disruption/alteration of ecological life cycles due to noise » Reduced pollination and growth of vegetation due to dust » Avifaunal mortality due to light pollution (nocturnal species becoming more visible to predators) » Heat radiation could lead to the displacement of species <p><u>Indirect impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Loss of ecosystem services 	Local	None identified at this stage
Staff and others interacting directly with fauna (potentially dangerous) or poaching of animals	<p><u>Direct impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Loss of SCCs or TOPS species <p><u>Indirect impacts:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Loss of ecosystem service » Loss of genetic diversity 	Local	None identified at this stage

Description of expected significance of impact

The development of the area could result in the loss or degradation of the habitat and vegetation, most of which is still in a natural condition and supports a number of avifauna species. The construction of the solar facility could also lead to the displacement/mortalities of the avifauna and more specifically SCC avifauna species. The operation of the facility could result in the disruption of ecological life cycles. This could be as a result of a number of things, but mainly due to dust, noise, light pollution and heat radiation. Leaks, spillages or breakages from any of these could result in contamination of the receiving water resources. Contaminated water resources are likely to have an effect on the associated biota.

Gaps in knowledge & recommendations for further study

- » This is completed at a desktop level only.
- » Identification and descriptions of habitats.
- » Identification of the Site Ecological Importance.
- » Location and identification of SCCs as well as in the case of fauna their location of the nests/dens.
- » Determine a suitable buffer width for the identified features.

Recommendations with regards to general field surveys

- » Field surveys to prioritise the development areas, but also consider the 500 m PAOI.
- » Fieldwork to be undertaken during the wet season period.
- » Avifauna assessment field work to be conducted over two seasons to ensure migratory species are considered.

6.2.1 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are assessed in context of the extent of the proposed project area; other developments in the area; and general habitat loss and transformation resulting from other activities in the area.

The impacts of projects are often assessed by comparing the post-project situation to a pre-existing baseline. Where projects can be considered in isolation this provides a good method of assessing a project's impact. However, in areas where baselines have already been affected, or where future development will continue to add to the impacts in an area or region, it is appropriate to consider the

cumulative effects of development. This is similar to the concept of shifting baselines, which describes how the environmental baseline at a point in time may represent a significant change from the original state of the system. This section describes the potential impacts of the project that are cumulative for fauna and flora.

Localised cumulative impacts include the cumulative effects from operations that are close enough to potentially cause additive effects on the environment or sensitive receivers (such as nearby solar farm activities within the area). These include dust deposition, noise and vibration, disruption of corridors or habitat, groundwater drawdown, groundwater and surface water quality, and transport.

Long-term cumulative impacts due to extensive solar development footprint, powerlines and substations can lead to the loss of endemic species and threatened species, loss of habitat and vegetation types and even degradation of well conserved areas (*Table 6-4*). However due to the extensive mining activities in the area it is unlikely that the new development will contribute to the cumulative impact.

Table 6-4 Cumulative impact of the solar plant and battery system

The development of the proposed infrastructure will contribute to cumulative habitat loss within CBAs/ ESAs and the possible loss of SCCs		
	Overall impact of the proposed development considered in isolation	Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area
Extent	Moderate (3)	Medium (3)
Duration	Moderate term (3)	Moderate term (3)
Magnitude	Low (4)	Moderate (6)
Probability	Probable (3)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Medium	Low
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	High	Low
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Yes
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation:		
• This impact cannot be mitigated as the loss of vegetation is unavoidable.		
Residual Impacts:		
Will result in the loss of:		
» CBA 1, ESA1 & ESA2		
» Endemic species;		
» SCC avifauna species;		
» Portions of a NPAES; and		
» Niche habitats.		

6.3 Wetland Impact Assessment

A key consideration for the scoping level impact assessment is the presence of the water resources delineated in proximity beyond the project area. The available data also suggests the absence of drainage features and wetlands from the project area. A Zone of Regulation (ZoR) of 500 m is applicable for any wetland system that is present beyond the project boundary.

Table 6-5 Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to wetlands

Impact
Wetland disturbance / loss

Issue	Nature of Impact	Extent of Impact	No-Go Areas
Disturbance / degradation / loss to wetland soils or vegetation due to the construction of the facility and associated infrastructure, such as crossings	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Disturbance / degradation / loss to wetland soils or vegetation <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of ecosystem services	Regional	Water resources and buffer area
Increased erosion and sedimentation & contamination of resources	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Erosion and structural changes to the systems <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Sedimentation & contamination of downstream reaches	Regional	None identified at this stage
Description of expected significance of impact The development of the area could result in the encroachment into water resources and result in the loss or degradation of these system, most of which are functional and provide ecological services. Water resources are also likely to be traversed by roads and other linear infrastructure which might create a barrier to flow and biotic movement across the systems. These disturbances could also result in the infestation and establishment of alien vegetation would affect the functioning of the systems. Earthworks will expose and mobilise earth materials which could result in sedimentation of the receiving systems. A number of machines, vehicles and equipment will be required, aided by chemicals and concrete mixes for the project. Leaks, spillages or breakages from any of these could result in contamination of the receiving water resources. Contaminated water resources are likely to influence the associated biota. It is anticipated to increase stormwater runoff due to the hardened surfaces and the crossings will result in an increase in run-off volume and velocities, resulted in altered flow regimes. The changes could result in physical changes to the receiving systems caused by erosion, run-off and also sedimentation, and the functional changes could result in changes to the vegetative structure of the systems. The reporting of surface run-off to the systems could also result in the contamination of the systems, transporting (in addition to sediment) diesel, hydrocarbons and soil from the operational areas.			
Gaps in knowledge & recommendations for further study » This is completed at a desktop level only. » Identification, delineation and characterisation of water resources. » Undertake a functional assessment of systems where applicable. » Determine a suitable buffer width for the resources. Recommendations with regards to general field surveys » Field surveys to prioritise the development areas, but also consider the 500 m regulation area. » Beneficial to undertake fieldwork during the wet season period.			

6.3.1 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are assessed in context of the extent of the proposed project area; other developments in the area; and general wetland loss and transformation resulting from other activities in the area (Table 4-2).

Table 6-2 Cumulative wetland impact assessment

Impact Wetland disturbance / loss			
Issue	Nature of Impact	Extent of Impact	No-Go Areas
Disturbance / degradation / loss to wetland soils or vegetation due to the construction of the facility and associated infrastructure, such as crossings	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Disturbance / degradation / loss to wetland soils or vegetation <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of ecosystem services	Regional	Water resources and buffer area
Increased erosion and sedimentation & contamination of resources	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Erosion and structural changes to the systems <u>Indirect impacts:</u>	Regional	None identified at this stage

	» Sedimentation & contamination of downstream reaches		
Description of expected significance of impact			
The expected post-mitigation risk significance for the project is expected to be low, with limited developments in the catchment area.			
Gaps in knowledge & recommendations for further study			
» This is completed at a desktop level only.			
» Identification, delineation and characterisation of water resources.			
» Undertake a functional assessment of systems where applicable.			
» Determine a suitable buffer width for the resources.			
Recommendations with regards to general field surveys			
» Field surveys to prioritise the development areas, but also consider the 500 m regulation area.			
» Beneficial to undertake fieldwork during the wet season period.			

6.4 Soil Impact Assessment

Considering the occurrence of various soil forms that are commonly associated with high land capabilities, it is unlikely that areas with high land capability sensitivity do occur within the project area. Further to this, due to the climatic capability, the ultimate land potential is more likely to be low.

Table 6-6 Scoping evaluation table summarising the impacts identified to soils

Impact Loss of land capability			
Issue	Nature of Impact	Extent of Impact	No-Go Areas
Compaction/soil stripping/transformation of land use which leads to loss of land capability	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Loss of soil / land capability <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of land capability	Regional	None identified at this stage
Description of expected significance of impact			
The development of the area could result in the encroachment into areas characterised by high land potential properties, which can ultimately result in the loss of land capability. These disturbances could also result in the infestation and establishment of alien vegetation, which in turn can have a detrimental impact on soil resources. Earthworks will expose and mobilise earth materials which could result in compaction and/or erosion. A number of machines, vehicles and equipment will be required, aided by chemicals and concrete mixes for the project. Leaks, spillages or breakages from any of these could result in contamination of soil resources, which could affect the salinity or pH of the soil, which can render the fertility of the soil unable to provide nutrition to plants. During the operational phase, the impacts associated with the substation and collector sub will be easily managed by best "housekeeping" practices.			
Gaps in knowledge & recommendations for further study			
» This is completed at a desktop level only.			
» Identification and delineation of soil forms.			
» Determine of soil sensitivity.			
Recommendations with regards to general field surveys			
» Field surveys to prioritise the development areas.			

6.4.1 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are assessed in context of the extent of the proposed project area; other developments in the area; and general loss of high-quality land capability areas (Table 4-4).

Table 6-4 Cumulative soil impact assessment

Impact Loss of land capability			
Issue	Nature of Impact	Extent of Impact	No-Go Areas

Compaction/soil stripping/transformation of land use which leads to loss of land capability	<u>Direct impacts:</u> » Loss of soil / land capability <u>Indirect impacts:</u> » Loss of land capability	Regional	None identified at this stage
Description of expected significance of impact The expected post-mitigation risk significance is expected to be low, and the overall cumulative impact is also expected to be low.			
Gaps in knowledge & recommendations for further study » This is completed at a desktop level only. » Identification and delineation of soil forms. » Determine of soil sensitivity. Recommendations with regards to general field surveys » Field surveys to prioritise the development areas.			

7 Conclusion

7.1 Terrestrial Ecology

Based on the desktop assessment it can be said that the project area is somewhat sensitive with a moderate-high likelihood of species of conservation concern occurring. This assumption is based on the CBA1, ESA2, NPAES (priority focus area), Magaliesberg IBA and Magaliesberg Biosphere Reserve found in and around the project area.

The expectant anthropogenic activities are likely to drive habitat destruction causing displacement of fauna and flora and possibly event direct mortality. Land clearing destroys local wildlife habitat and can lead to the loss of local breeding grounds, nesting sites and wildlife movement corridors such as rivers, streams and drainage lines, or other locally important features. The removal of natural vegetation may reduce the habitat available for fauna species and may reduce animal populations and species compositions within the area.

7.2 Avifauna

The SABAP2 Data lists 346 avifauna species that could be expected to occur within the area. Fourteen (14) of these expected species are regarded as threatened. Eleven of the species have a low likelihood of occurrence due to lack of suitable habitat and food sources in the project area. *Coracias garrulous* (European Roller), *Falco biarmicus* (Lanner Falcon), *Falco vespertinus* (Red-footed Falcon) has a moderate, high and moderate, respectively. The destruction of habitat along with the risk of electrocutions and collisions is regarded as the greatest risk for avifauna associated with solar plants and associated grid lines.

7.3 Wetlands

A key consideration for the impact assessment is the presence of the identified water resources in relation to the project area. The available data also suggests the absence of features in the project area, with wetlands system expected for the 500 m regulation area.

Construction could result in the encroachment into water resources and result in the loss or degradation of these system, most of which are functional and provide ecological services. These disturbances could also result in the infestation and establishment of alien vegetation would affect the functioning of the systems. Leaks and/or spillages could result in contamination of the receiving water resources. Contaminated water resources are likely to have an effect on the associated biota. An increase in stormwater runoff could result in physical changes to the receiving systems caused by erosion, run-off and also sedimentation, and the functional changes could result in changes to the vegetative structure of the systems

7.4 Agricultural Potential

Various soil forms are expected throughout the project area, of which some are commonly associated with higher land capabilities. Even though the soil depth, texture and permeability of these soils ensure high land capability, the climatic capability of the area often reduces the land potential considerably. Areas characterised by “High” land potential are expected for selected areas.

The proposed development can result in the loss of land capability. The disturbances could further also result in the infestation and establishment of alien vegetation, which in turn can have a detrimental impact on soil resources. The development of the area could also result in compaction and/or erosion. Further to this, these activities could also cause leaks and/or spillages resulting in contamination of soil resources, which could affect the salinity or pH of the soil, which can render the fertility of the soil unable to provide nutrition to plants.

8 References

Bates, M.F., Branch, W.R., Bauer, A.M., Burger, M., Marais, J., Alexander, G.J & de Villiers, M.S. (Eds). 2014. Atlas and Red List of Reptiles of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Suricata 1. South African Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

BirdLife International. 2016a. *Afrotis afra*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T22691975A93331501. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-3.RLTS.T22691975A93331501.en>.

BGIS (Biodiversity GIS). (2017). <http://bgis.sanbi.org/>

BODATSA-POSA. (2021). Plants of South Africa - an online checklist. POSA ver. 3.0. <http://newposa.sanbi.org/>.

Boycott, R. and Bourquin, R. 2000. The Southern African Tortoise Book – A Guide to Southern African Tortoises, Terrapins and Turtles. Revised Edition. Hilton. 228 pages.

Branch, W.R. (1998). Field Guide to Snakes and Other Reptiles of Southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Du Preez, L. & Carruthers, V. (2009) A Complete Guide to the Frogs of Southern Africa. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF). 2005. A practical field procedure for identification and delineation of wetlands and riparian areas. Pretoria: Department of Water Affairs and Forestry.

EWT. (2016). Mammal Red List 2016. www.ewt.org.za

Fish, L., Mashau, A.C., Moeaha, M.J. & Nembudani, M.T. (2015). Identification Guide to Southern African Grasses: An Identification Manual with Keys, Descriptions, and Distributions. SANBI, Pretoria.

IUCN. (2021). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.iucnredlist.org

Johnson, S. & Bytebier, B. (2015). Orchids of South Africa: A Field Guide. Struik publishers, Cape Town.

Kotze, D.C., Marneweck, G.C., Batchelor, A.L., Lindley, D.C. & Collins, N.B. (2009). A Technique for rapidly assessing ecosystem services supplied by wetlands. Mondi Wetland Project.

Land Type Survey Staff. (1972 - 2006). Land Types of South Africa: Digital Map (1:250 000 Scale) and Soil Inventory Databases. Pretoria: ARC-Institute for Soil, Climate, and Water.

Macfarlane DM and Bredin IP. 2017. Part 1: technical manual. Buffer zone guidelines for wetlands, rivers and estuaries

Macfarlane, D.M., Bredin, I.P., Adams, J.B., Zungu, M.M., Bate, G.C., Dickens, C.W.S. (2014). Preliminary guideline for the determination of buffer zones for rivers, wetlands and estuaries. Final Consolidated Report. WRC Report No TT 610/14, Water Research Commission, Pretoria.

Macfarlane, D.M., Dickens, J. & Von Hase, F. (2009). Development of a methodology to determine the appropriate buffer zone width and type for developments associated with wetlands, watercourses and estuaries Deliverable 1: Literature Review. INR Report No: 400/09.

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. (Eds.). 2006. The vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Strelizia 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria, South African.

Mucina, L., Rutherford, M.C. & Powrie, L.W. (Eds.). 2007. Vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. 1:1 000 000 scale sheet maps. 2nd ed. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Nel JL, Murray KM, Maherry AM, Petersen CP, Roux DJ, Driver A, Hill L, Van Deventer H, Funke N, Swartz ER, Smith-Adao LB, Mbona N, Downsborough L and Nienaber S. 2011. Technical Report for the National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas project. WRC Report No. K5/1801.

Ollis DJ, Snaddon CD, Job NM, and Mbona N. 2013. Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa. User Manual: Inland Systems. SANBI Biodiversity Series 22. South African Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Raimonde, D. (2009). Red list of South African Plants. SANBI, Pretoria.

Rountree, M.W. and Kotze, D.M. 2013. Manual for the Rapid Ecological Reserve Determination of Inland Wetlands (Version 2.0). Joint Department of Water Affairs/Water Research Commission Study. Report No 1788/1/12. Water Research Commission, Pretoria.

SADAP (South Africa Protected Areas Database) and SACAD (South Africa Conservation Areas Database) (2021). <http://egis.environment.gov.za>

SANBI. 2013. Grasslands Ecosystem Guidelines: landscape interpretation for planners and managers. Compiled by Cadman, M., de Villiers, C., Lechmere-Oertel, R. and D. McCulloch. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria. 139 pages.

SANBI-BGIS. 2017. Technical guidelines for CBA Maps: Guidelines for developing a map of Critical Biodiversity Areas & Ecological Support Areas using systematic biodiversity planning.

Skowno, A.L., Raimondo, D.C., Poole, C.J., Fizzotti, B. & Slingsby, J.A. (eds.). 2019. South African National Biodiversity Assessment 2018 Technical Report Volume 1: Terrestrial Realm. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Smith, B. (2006). The Farming Handbook. Netherlands & South Africa: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press & CTA.

Soil Classification Working Group. (1991). Soil Classification A Taxonomic system for South Africa. Pretoria: The Department of Agricultural Development.

Soil Classification Working Group. (2018). Soil Classification A Taxonomic system for South Africa. Pretoria: The Department of Agricultural Development.

Van Deventer, H., Smith-Adao, L., Collins, N.B., Grenfell, M., Grundling, A., Grundling, P-L., Impson, D., Job, N., Lötter, M., Ollis, D., Petersen, C., Scherman, P., Sieben, E., Snaddon, K., Tererai, F. and Van der Colff D. 2019. *South African National Biodiversity Assessment 2018: Technical Report*. Volume 2b: Inland Aquatic (Freshwater) Realm. CSIR report number CSIR/NRE/ECOS/IR/2019/0004/A. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12143/6230>.

Van Deventer, H., Smith-Adao, L., Mbona, N., Petersen, C., Skowno, A., Collins, N.B., Grenfell, M., Job, N., Lötter, M., Ollis, D., Scherman, P., Sieben, E. & Snaddon, K. 2018. South African National Biodiversity Assessment 2018: Technical Report. Volume 2a: South African Inventory of Inland Aquatic Ecosystems (SAIIAE). Version 3, final released on 3 October 2019. Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) and South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI): Pretoria, South Africa.

9 Appendix Items

9.1 Appendix A – Specialist Declaration of Independence

I, Lindi Steyn, declare that:

- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- 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 applicant;
- 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 application, including knowledge of the Act, regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- 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 activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant 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 application 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.



Lindi Steyn

Biodiversity Specialist

The Biodiversity Company

April 2022