



AGRICULTURAL COMPLIANCE STATEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED SOLINK SOLAR AND BATTERY PROJECT (SCSC)

Northam, Limpopo & North West Provinces

May 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




| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Report Name | Agricultural Compliance Statement for the proposed SOLINK Solar and Battery Project (SCSC) |
| Submitted to |  |
| Report Reviewer | <p style="text-align: center;">Andrew Husted</p>  <p>Mr. Andrew Husted is an aquatic ecologist, specializing in freshwater systems and wetlands, who graduated with a MSc in Zoology. He, is Pr Sci Nat registered (400213/11) in the following fields of practice: Ecological Science, Environmental Science and Aquatic Science. Mr Husted is an Aquatic, Wetland and Biodiversity Specialist with 12 years' experience in the environmental consulting field. In addition to his ecological working experience, Andrew has experience in agricultural and soil assessments, this includes the consideration of land uses and land cover.</p> |
| Report Reviewer | <p style="text-align: center;">Ivan Baker</p>  <p>Ivan Baker is Pr. Sci Nat registered (119315) in environmental science with Cand. Sci. Nat recognition in geological science. Ivan is a wetland and soil specialist with vast experience in wetlands, pedology, hydrogeology and land contamination and has completed numerous specialist studies ranging from basic assessments to EIAs. Ivan has carried out various international studies following FC standards. Ivan completed training in Tools for Wetland Assessments with a certificate of competence and completed his MSc in environmental science and hydrogeology at the North-West University of Potchefstroom. Ivan is also affiliated with the Fertiliser Society of South Africa after the acquiring a certificate of competence following the completion of the FERTASA training course.</p> |
| Report Writer | <p style="text-align: center;">Michael Douglas</p>  <p>Michael Douglas is a soil scientist with experience in soil classification. Michael completed his BSc Honours in environmental science and geological science at the North-West University of Potchefstroom. Michael has been part of various agricultural potential, land capability and pedology studies as part of Environmental Impact Assessments and Basic Assessments.</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> |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1 | Introduction..... | 5 |
| 1.1 | Project Description | 5 |
| 1.1.1 | SBPM PV RE project, Limpopo Province | 5 |
| 1.2 | Scope of Work..... | 9 |
| 1.3 | Limitations | 9 |
| 2 | Expertise of the Specialists | 10 |
| 2.1 | Andrew Husted..... | 10 |
| 2.2 | Ivan Baker | 10 |
| 2.3 | Michael Douglas..... | 10 |
| 3 | Literature Review | 11 |
| 3.1 | Land Capability | 11 |
| 4 | Methodology..... | 12 |
| 4.1 | Desktop Assessment | 12 |
| 4.2 | Agricultural Potential Assessment..... | 12 |
| 4.3 | Climate Capability | 14 |
| 4.4 | Current Land Use | 15 |
| 5 | Desktop Findings | 16 |
| 5.1 | Climate | 16 |
| 5.2 | Soils and Geology | 16 |
| 5.3 | Terrain | 18 |
| 6 | Results and Discussion | 20 |
| 6.1 | Baseline Findings | 20 |
| 6.2 | Sensitivity Verification | 21 |
| 7 | Specialist Management Plan..... | 23 |
| 7.1 | Recommendations and Mitigation Measures | 24 |
| 7.1.1 | General Mitigation | 24 |
| 7.1.2 | Restoration of Vegetation Cover | 24 |
| 7.2 | Specialist Recommendation..... | 25 |
| 8 | Conclusion..... | 26 |
| 9 | References | 27 |

Figures

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Figure 2-1 | Map illustrating the location of the proposed project area in relation to nearby features Error! Bookmark not defined. | |
| Figure 8-1 | Climate for the Central Free State Grassland (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006) | 16 |
| Figure 8-2 | Illustration of land type Ca 1 terrain units (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 – 2006) | 16 |
| Figure 8-3 | Illustration of land type Dc 7 terrain units (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 – 2006) Error! Bookmark not defined. | |
| Figure 8-4 | Slope percentage map for the project area..... | 18 |
| Figure 8-5 | Elevation of the project area (metres above sea level)..... | 19 |
| Figure 9-1 | Example of an Avalon soil form..... | 20 |
| Figure 9-2 | Land Capability Sensitivity (DAFF, 2017) and Crop Boundary Sensitivity (DEA, 2022).. | 22 |

Tables

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Table 6-1 | Land Capability (DAFF, 2017)..... | 11 |
| Table 7-1 | Land capability class and intensity of use (Smith, 2006) | 12 |
| Table 7-2 | The combination table for land potential classification..... | 13 |
| Table 7-3 | The Land Potential Classes. | 13 |
| Table 7-4 | Climatic capability (step 1) (Smith, 2006) | 14 |
| Table 8-1 | Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Ea 70 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006) | 17 |
| Table 8-2 | Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Ae 64 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006) | 17 |
| Table 11-1 | Mitigation measures including requirements for timeframes, roles and responsibilities | 23 |

Declaration

I, **Michael Douglas** 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.



Michael Douglas

Soil Specialist

The Biodiversity Company

May 2022

1 Introduction

The Biodiversity Company was appointed to undertake an agricultural potential assessment for the proposed SCSC Solar Facility for Siyanda Bakgatla Platinum Mine in Northam, Limpopo Province. The project infrastructure is located in both the Limpopo and also North West provinces. The project is located 6.5 km west from Northam. The scoping assessment comprises of terrestrial (fauna & flora) and freshwater (wetlands) ecology, and also agricultural potential. The Northam focus area has been identified by the potential development area for the construction and operation of solar and battery facilities consisting of 273 Ha (**Error! Reference source not found.**).

The approach adopted for the assessment has taken cognisance of the recently published Government Notice 320 in terms of NEMA dated 20 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, when applying for Environmental Authorisation".

This report aims to present and discuss the findings from the soil resources identified on-site, the agricultural and land potential of these resources, the land uses within the project area as well as the risks associated with the proposed PV facility.

1.1 Project Description

1.1.1 SCSC PV RE project, Limpopo Province

Main Street 1887 Proprietary Limited proposes the development of the Solar Photovoltaic (PV) facility and associated infrastructure on a site bordering the eastern end of the Siyanda Bakgatla Platinum Mine area near Northam. The solar PV facility will comprise several arrays of PV panels, a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), and associated infrastructure with a contracted capacity of up to 100MW.

The purpose of the proposed project is to generate electricity for exclusive use by the Siyanda Mine, following which any excess power produced will be distributed to the national grid, if applicable. The construction of the PV facility aims to reduce the Siyanda Mine's dependency on direct supply from Eskom's national grid for operation activities, while simultaneously decreasing the mine's carbon footprint.

A preferred project site with an extent of ~1138 ha and a development area of 574 ha has been identified by Main Street 1886 Proprietary Limited as a technically suitable area for the development of the Solar PV Facility. The study area is located on Portion 4 of Farm Grootkuil 409. The project site falls within the Thabazimbi Local Municipality within the Waterberg District Municipality in the Limpopo Province. The site is located ~6.5 km west of the town of Northam and is accessible via the Swartklip Road which branches off the R510 provincial route.

Infrastructure associated with the solar PV facility will include:

- 100MW Solar PV array comprising PV modules and mounting structures.
- Inverters and transformers.
- Cabling between the project components.
- Battery Energy Storage System.
- On-site facility substation and power lines between the solar PV facility and the Mine and Eskom substation.
- Site offices, Security office, operations and control, and maintenance and storage laydown areas.

- Access roads, internal distribution roads.

Grid connection solution.

To evacuate the generated power to the Siyanda Mine, the grid connection solution consisting of the following is proposed:

The power generated by the solar PV facility will be transferred to the three step up transformers at the on-site/plant substation. Power will then be delivered from each step-up transformer as follows:

- two 6.6 km, 33 kV transmission lines to the Mortimer substation with four step down transformers (33/6.6 kV; 10 MVA).
- two 4.7 km, 33 kV transmission lines to the Fridge substation with two step down transformers (33/6.6 kV; 10 MVA).
- two 2.9 km, 33 kV transmission lines to the Ivan substation with three step down transformers (33/11 kV; 10 MVA).

The grid connection is proposed on the following properties:

- Portion 3 of Farm Grootkuil 409.
- Portion 4 of Farm Grootkuil 409.
- Portion 5 of Farm Grootkuil 409.

The development area of 574ha is larger than the area needed for the construction of a 100MW PV facility and will provide the opportunity for the optimal placement of the infrastructure, ensuring avoidance of major identified environmental sensitivities by the development footprint of ~240 ha¹.

¹ The development footprint is the defined area (located within the development area) where the PV panel array and other associated infrastructure for Solar PV will be planned to be constructed. This will be the actual footprint of the facility, and the area which would be disturbed. The extent of the development footprint will be determined in the EIA Phase.

SOLINK PV - SCSC




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

SOLINK PV - SCSC




Figure 1-2 The various components of the project

1.2 Scope of Work

The following tasks were completed in fulfilment of the terms of reference for this assessment:

- To conduct a soil assessment which includes a description of the physical properties which characterise the soil within the proposed area of development of the relevant portions of the affected properties;
- Using the findings from the soil assessment to determine the existing land capability/potential and current land use of the entire surface area of the relevant portions of the project area;
- To delineate soil resources;
- To determine the sensitivity of the baseline findings;
- The soil classification was done according to the Taxonomic Soil Classification System for South Africa, 1991. The following attributes must be included at each observation:
 - Soil form and family (Taxonomic Soil Classification System for South Africa, 1991);
 - Soil depth;
 - Estimated soil texture;
 - Soil structure, coarse fragments, calcareousness;
 - Buffer capacities;
 - Underlying material;
 - Current land use; and
 - Land capability.
- To complete an impact statement;
- Discussing the feasibility of the proposed activities;
- Confirmation that no agricultural segregation will take place and that all options have been considered to avoid segregation; and
- Recommend relevant mitigation measures to limit all associated impacts.

1.3 Limitations

The following limitations are relevant to this agricultural compliance statement;

- It has been assumed that the extent of the properties to be assessed together with the locations of the proposed components are correct and final; and
- The handheld GPS used potentially could have inaccuracies up to 5 m. Any and all delineations therefore could be inaccurate within 5 m.

2 Expertise of the Specialists

2.1 Andrew Husted

Mr. Andrew Husted is an aquatic ecologist, specializing in freshwater systems and wetlands, who graduated with a MSc in Zoology. He is Pr Sci Nat registered (400213/11) in the following fields of practice: Ecological Science, Environmental Science and Aquatic Science. Mr Husted is an Aquatic, Wetland and Biodiversity Specialist with 12 years' experience in the environmental consulting field. In addition to his ecological working experience, Andrew has experience in agricultural and soil assessments, this includes the consideration of land uses and land cover.

2.2 Ivan Baker

Ivan Baker is Pr. Sci Nat registered (119315) in environmental science with Cand. Sci. Nat recognition in geological science. Ivan is a wetland and soil specialist with vast experience in wetlands, pedology, hydrogeology and land contamination and has completed numerous specialist studies ranging from basic assessments to EIAs. Ivan has carried out various international studies following FC standards. Ivan completed training in Tools for Wetland Assessments with a certificate of competence and completed his MSc in environmental science and hydrogeology at the North-West University of Potchefstroom. Ivan is also affiliated with the Fertiliser Society of South Africa after the acquiring a certificate of competence following the completion of the FERTASA training course.

2.3 Michael Douglas

Michael Douglas is a soil scientist with experience in soil classification. Michael completed his BSc Honours in environmental science and geological science at the North-West University of Potchefstroom. Michael has been part of various agricultural potential, land capability and pedology studies as part of Environmental Impact Assessments and Basic Assessments.

3 Literature Review

3.1 Land Capability

According to Smith (2006), the capability of land concerns the wise use of land to ensure economical production on a sustained basis, under specific uses and treatments. The object of land classification is the grouping of different land capabilities, to indicate the safest option for use, to indicate permanent hazards and management requirements. These land capability classes decrease in capability from I to VIII and increase in risk from I to VIII. DAFF (2017) further defines land capability as “*the most intensive long-term use of land for purposes of rainfed farming, determined by the interaction of **climate, soil and terrain.***”

DAFF (2017) has further modelled the land capability on a rough scale for the entire of South Africa and has divided these results into 15 classes (see Table 3-1). Terrain, climate and soil capability was used as the building blocks for this exercise to ensure a national land capability data set.

Table 3-1 Land Capability (DAFF, 2017)

| Land Capability Class (DAFF, 2017) | Description of Capability |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | Very Low |
| 2 | |
| 3 | Very Low to Low |
| 4 | |
| 5 | Low |
| 6 | Low to Moderate |
| 7 | |
| 8 | Moderate |
| 9 | Moderate to High |
| 10 | |
| 11 | High |
| 12 | High to Very High |
| 13 | |
| 14 | Very High |
| 15 | |

It is worth noting that this nation-wide data set has some constraints of its own. According to DAFF (2017), inaccuracies and the level of detail of these datasets are of concern. Additionally, the scale used to model these datasets are large (1:50 000 to 1:100 000) and is not suitable for farm level planning. Furthermore, it is mentioned by DAFF (2017) that these datasets should not replace any site-based assessments given the accuracies perceived.

4 Methodology

The pedology assessment was conducted using the Provincial and National Departments of Agriculture recommendations. The assessment was broken into two phases. Phase 1 was a desktop assessment to determine the following:

- Historic climatic conditions;
- The base soils information from the land type database (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006); and
- The geology for the proposed project site.

4.1 Desktop Assessment

As part of the desktop assessment, baseline 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.

4.2 Agricultural Potential Assessment

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 4-1 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 4-1 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 | | | | | | | |
| VIII | W | | | | | | | | | Wildlife |
| W - Wildlife MG - Moderate Grazing MC - Moderate Cultivation | | | | | | | | | | |
| F - Forestry IG - Intensive Grazing IC - Intensive Cultivation | | | | | | | | | | |
| LG - Light Grazing LC - Light Cultivation VIC - Very Intensive Cultivation | | | | | | | | | | |

Land capability has been classified into 15 different categories by DAFF (2017) which indicates the national land capability category and associated sensitivity related to soil resources. Given the fact that ground truthing and DSM exercises have indicated anomalies in the form of high sensitivity soil resources (which was not indicated by the DAFF (2017) raster file), the ground-truthed baseline delineations and sensitivities were used for this assessment rather than that of DAFF (2017).

The land potential classes are determined by combining the land capability results and the climate capability of a region as shown in Table 4-2. The final land potential results are then described in Table 4-3. These land potential classes are regarded as the final delineations subject to sensitivity, given the comprehensive addition of climatic conditions as those relevant to the DAFF (2017) land capabilities. The main contributors to the climatic conditions as per Smith (2006) is that of Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP), Mean Annual Potential Evaporation (MAPE), mean September temperatures, mean June temperatures and mean annual temperatures. These parameters will be derived from Mucina and Rutherford (2006) for each vegetation type located within the relevant project area. This will give the specialist the opportunity to consider micro-climate, aspect, topography etc.

Table 4-2 The combination table for land potential classification

| Land capability class | Climate capability class | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | C7 | C8 |
| I | L1 | L1 | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 |
| II | L1 | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5 |
| III | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5 | L6 |
| IV | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5 | L5 | L6 |
| V | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei |
| VI | L4 | L4 | L5 | L5 | L5 | L6 | L6 | L7 |
| VII | L5 | L5 | L6 | L6 | L7 | L7 | L7 | L8 |
| VIII | L6 | L6 | L7 | L7 | L8 | L8 | L8 | L8 |

Table 4-3 The Land Potential Classes.

| Land potential | Description of land potential class |
|----------------|---|
| L1 | Very high potential: No limitations. Appropriate contour protection must be implemented and inspected. |
| L2 | High potential: Very infrequent and/or minor limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Appropriate contour protection must be implemented and inspected. |
| L3 | Good potential: Infrequent and/or moderate limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Appropriate contour protection must be implemented and inspected. |
| L4 | Moderate potential: Moderately regular and/or severe to moderate limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Appropriate permission is required before ploughing virgin land. |
| L5 | Restricted potential: Regular and/or severe to moderate limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. |
| L6 | Very restricted potential: Regular and/or severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Non-arable |
| L7 | Low potential: Severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Non-arable |
| L8 | Very low potential: Very severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Non-arable |

4.3 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 Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) to Class A-pan ratio.

Table 4-4 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;

- $<10^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C6;
- $10 - 11^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C5;
- $11 - 12^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C4;
- $12 - 13^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C3; and
- $>13^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C1.

Step 3

Mean June temperatures;

- $<9^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C5;
- $9 - 10^{\circ}\text{C}$ = C4;

SOLINK PV - SCSC

- 10 - 11 °C = C3; and
- 11 - 12 °C = C2.

4.4 Current Land Use

A generalised land-use will be derived for the larger project area considering agricultural productivity.

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

5 Desktop Findings

5.1 Climate

The SVcb 1 vegetation type is characterised by a summer rainfall with a Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) that ranges between 500 mm and 600 mm (see Figure 5-1). Of the savanna vegetation units that are located outside Kalahari bioregions, this unit has the highest mean annual potential evaporation. In the winter season frost is frequent (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).




Figure 5-1 Climate for the Dwaalboom Thornveld (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006)

5.2 Soils and Geology

According to the land type database (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006) the development falls within the Ea 70 and Ae 64 land types.

The Ea land type consists of one or more of the following soils: Vertic, Melanic, and red structured diagnostic horizons, of which these soils are all undifferentiated. The Ea 70 land type terrain units and expected soils are illustrated in Figure 5-2 and Table 5-1 respectively.




Figure 5-2 Illustration of land type Ea 70 terrain units (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 – 2006)

Table 5-1 Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Ea 70 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)

| Terrain units | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|------------|-----|------------|-----|-----------|-----|
| 1 (20%) | | 3 (40%) | | 4 (31%) | | 5 (9%) | |
| Arcadia | 60% | Arcadia | 74% | Arcadia | 76% | Rensburg | 34% |
| Bare Rock | 15% | Shortlands | 9% | Swartland | 11% | Arcadia | 33% |
| Hutton | 8% | Bare Rock | 6% | Shortlands | 6% | Dundee | 22% |
| Shortlands | 7% | Hutton | 5% | Hutton | 5% | Bonheim | 6% |
| Glenrosa | 7% | Glenrosa | 4% | Bonheim | 2% | Swartland | 5% |
| Milkwood | 5% | Milkwood | 2% | | | | |

The Ae land type consists of red-yellow apedal soils which are freely drained. The soils tend to have a high base status and is deeper than 300 mm. The Ae 64 land type terrain units and expected soils are illustrated in Figure 5-2 and Table 5-1 respectively.




Figure 5-3 Illustration of land type Ae 64 terrain units (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 – 2006)

Table 5-2 Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Ae 64 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)

| Terrain units | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|
| 1 (2%) | | 3 (7%) | | 4 (87%) | | 5 (4%) | |
| Mispah | 40% | Hutton | 59% | Hutton | 70% | Willowbrook | 38% |
| Hutton | 35% | Mispah | 31% | Shortlands | 17% | Valsrivier | 37% |
| Bare Rock | 25% | Bare Rock | 7% | Willowbrook | 4% | Bonheim | 25% |
| | | Shortlands | 3% | Valsrivier | 4% | | |
| | | | | Mispah | 2% | | |
| | | | | Bonheim | 1% | | |
| | | | | Milkwood | 1% | | |
| | | | | Bare Rock | 1% | | |

The Rustenburg Layered Suite as well as the Bushveld Igneous Complex are present in this region with a lot of mafic intrusive rocks present. The underlying geology of this region is a granite-gneiss terrane (Archaean) and it is covered partly with chemical and clastic sediments and volcanics derived from Rayton

and Silverton formation which both form part of the Pretoria Group. Vertic clays had developed in the area due to the presence of norite and gabbro rocks. The land types Ea and Ae are mostly present in these areas (Mucina and Rutherford, 2006).

5.3 Terrain

The slope percentage of the project area has been calculated and is illustrated in Figure 5-4. The majority of the project area is characterised by a slope percentage between 0 and 10%, with some very small patches within the project area characterised by a slope percentage up to 38%. This illustration indicates a non-uniform undulating topography. The elevation of the project area (Figure 5-5) indicates an elevation of 978 to 1 045 Metres Above Sea Level (MASL).




Figure 5-4 Slope percentage map for the project area




Figure 5-5 Elevation of the project area (metres above sea level)

6 Results and Discussion

6.1 Baseline Findings

Three soil forms were identified throughout the 50 m regulated area namely Arcadia, Clovelly and Glenrosa with the Glenrosa soil form being the most dominant soil form over the regulated area.

The Glenrosa and Clovelly soil forms are regarded to be most important in the study area as it demonstrates the most sensitive land capabilities. The Glenrosa soil form consists of a vertic topsoil on top of a thick pedocutanic horizon. The Clovelly soil form consists of an orthic topsoil on top of a yellow-brown apedal horizon, which in turn is underlain by a lithic horizon. The different soil horizons are illustrated in Figure 6-1.

The most sensitive land capability of the above mentioned soils have been determined to be class "II". A climate capability level 8 has been assigned to the area given the low Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) and the high Mean Annual Potential Evapotranspiration (MAPE) rates. By using the determined land capability for the most sensitive soil and the determined climate capability a land potential of "L5" was calculated. According to Smith (2006), the "L5" land potential level is characterised by restricted potential. Regular and/or moderate to severe limitations are expected due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall.




Figure 6-1 Different soil horizons

6.2 Sensitivity Verification

The following land potential levels has been determined;

- Land potential level 5 (This land potential level is characterised by restricted potential. Regular and/or moderate to severe limitations are expected due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall);
- Land potential level 6 (This land potential level is characterised by very restricted potential. Regular and/or severe limitations are expected due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. It is non-arable).
- Land potential level 7 (This land potential is characterised by very low potential. Very severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures pr rainfall. It is non-arable).

Fifteen land capabilities have been digitised by DAFF (2017) across South Africa, of which five potential land capability classes are located within the proposed footprint area's assessment corridor, including;

- Land Capability 1 to 5 (Very Low to Low);
- Land Capability 6 to 8 (Moderately Low to Moderate); and
- Land Capability 9 to 10 (Moderately high).

The baseline findings and the sensitivities as per the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF, 2017) national raster concur well with one another.

In addition, some crop boundary areas have been identified by means of the DEA Screening Tool (2022). These areas have been classified as having high sensitivity. It is worth noting that these sensitivities are not associated with the potential of soil resources but rather the presence of crop field land uses. By the use of aerial satellite imagery as well as field work observation it is evident that there are no active crops present in the proposed project area.

SOLINK PV - SCSC




Figure 6-2 Land Capability Sensitivity (DAFF, 2017) and Crop Boundary Sensitivity (DEA, 2022).

7 Specialist Management Plan

Error! Reference source not found. presents the recommended mitigation measures and the respective timeframes, targets and performance indicators. The mitigations within this section have been taken into consideration during the impact assessment in cases where the post-mitigation environmental risk is lower than that of the pre-mitigation environmental risk. Additionally, the implementation of these strategies will improve the possibility of restoring degraded soil resources, which are likely to be impacted upon during the operational phase especially.

Table 7-1 Mitigation measures including requirements for timeframes, roles and responsibilities

| Action plan | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Phase | Management action | Timeframe for implementation | Responsible party for implementation | Responsible party for monitoring/audit/review |
| Planning phase | Investigate the possibility of avoiding large concrete areas | At least 6 months prior to the implementation of soil stripping or any other disturbances | Developer | Developer's Environmental Officer (dEO) |
| | Develop and implement a rehabilitation management and monitoring plan | At least 2 months prior to the implementation of soil stripping | Developer Specialist | dEO |
| | Demarcate all access routes | This activity should be finished at least two weeks prior to any construction activities | Developer Contractor | Environmental Control Officer (ECO) |
| | Vegetate all stockpiles after stripping/removing soils | During construction phase | Contractor | ECO |
| | Storage of potential contaminants in bunded areas | During construction phase | Contractor | ECO |
| | All contractors must have spill kits available and be trained in the correct use thereof. | During construction phase | Contractor | ECO |
| Construction | All contractors and employees should undergo induction which is to include a component of environmental awareness. The induction is to include aspects such as the need to avoid littering, the reporting and cleaning of spills and leaks and general good "housekeeping". | During construction phase | Contractor | ECO |
| | No cleaning or servicing of vehicles, machines and equipment in water resources. | During construction phase | Contractor | ECO |
| | Have action plans on site, and training for contractors and employees in the event of spills, leaks and other impacts to the aquatic systems. | During construction phase | Contractor | ECO |
| | Continuously monitor erosion on site | During the timeframe assigned for the life of the PV plant | Operator | dEO |
| Operation | Monitor compaction on site | During the timeframe assigned for the life of the PV plant | Operator | dEO |

7.1 Recommendations and Mitigation Measures

7.1.1 General Mitigation

General mitigations will ensure the conservation of all soil resources, regardless of the sensitivity of resources and the intensity of impacts.

- Prevent any spills from occurring. Machines must be parked within hard park areas and must be checked daily for fluid leaks;
- Proper invasive plant control must be undertaken quarterly; and
- All excess soil (soil that are stripped and stockpiled to make way for foundations) must be stored, continuously rehabilitated to be used for rehabilitation of eroded areas.

7.1.2 Restoration of Vegetation Cover

Restoring vegetation cover is the first step to successful rehabilitation. Vegetation cover decreases flow velocities and minimises erosion.

7.1.2.1 Ripping Compacted Areas

All areas outside of the footprint areas that will be degraded (by means of vehicles, laydown yards etc.) must be ripped where compaction has taken place. According to the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development (Agriculture and Food) (2017), ripping tines must penetrate to just below the compacted horizons (approximately 300 – 400 mm) with soil moisture being imminent to the success of ripping. Ripping must take place within 1-3 days after seeding, and also following a rain event to ensure a higher moisture content. To summarise;

- Rip all compacted areas outside of the developed areas that have been compacted;
- This must be done by means of a commercial ripper that has at least two rows of tines; and
- Ripping must take place between 1 and 3 days after seeding and following a rainfall event (seeding must therefore be carried out directly after a rainfall event).

7.1.2.2 Revegetate Degraded Areas

Vegetation within the footprint areas will be cleared to accommodate the excavation activities coupled with the proposed footprint areas' foundations. This impact will degrade soil resources, ultimately decreasing the land capability of resources and increasing erosion. According to Russell (2009), areas characterised by a loss of soil resources should be revegetated by means of vegetation with vigorous growth, stolons or rhizomes that more or less resembles the natural vegetation in the area.

It is recommended that all areas surrounding the development footprint areas that have been degraded by traffic, laydown yards etc. must be ripped and revegetated by means of indigenous grass species. Mixed stands or monocultures will work sufficiently for revegetation purposes. Mixed stands tend to blend in with indigenous vegetation species and are more natural. Monocultures however could achieve high productivity. In general, indigenous vegetation should always be preferred due to various reasons including the aesthetical presence thereof as well as the ability of the species to adapt to its surroundings.

Plant phase plants which are characterised by fast growing and rapid spreading conditions. Seed germination, seed density and seed size are key aspects to consider before implementing revegetation activities. The amount of seed should be limited to ensure that competition between plants are kept to a minimum. During the establishment of seed density, the percentage of seed germination should be taken into consideration. *E curvula* is one of the species recommended due to the ease of which it germinates. This species is also easily sown by means of hand propagation and hydro seeding.

SOLINK PV - SCSC

The following species are recommended for rehabilitation purposes;

- *Eragrostis teff*;
- *Cynodon species (Indigenous and altered types)*;
- *Chloris gayana*;
- *Panicum maximum*;
- *Digitaria eriantha*;
- *Anthehora pubescens*; and
- *Cenchrus ciliaris*.

7.2 Specialist Recommendation

The proposed activities may proceed as have been planned without the concern of loss of high sensitivity land capabilities or agricultural productivity. It is also expected that no segregation of high production agricultural resources will occur.

8 Conclusion

During the baseline assessment three soil forms were identified throughout the 50 m regulated area namely Glenrosa, Arcadia and Clovelly. The Glenrosa and Clovelly soil forms are of most importance in the study area as it demonstrates the most sensitive land capabilities.

Both the Glenrosas' and the Clovellies' land capabilities have been determined to be class "II" and a climate capability level 8 has been assigned to the area given the low Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) and the high Mean Annual Potential Evapotranspiration (MAPE) rates. The combination between the most sensitive determined land capabilities and climate capability resulted in a land potential level "L5". According to Smith (2006), the "L5" land potential level is characterised by restricted potential. Regular and/or moderate to severe limitations are expected due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall.

The land potential level, mentioned above, was used to determine the sensitivities of soil resources. "Moderately Low" sensitivities were determined throughout the project area by means of baseline findings. These baseline findings concur well with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF, 2017) which also indicated "Very Low" sensitivities as well as "Moderate" sensitivities.

Considering the low sensitivities associated with land potential resources, it is the specialist's opinion that the proposed activities will have an acceptable impact on soil resources and that the proposed activities should proceed as have been planned as no loss of land capability is evident. It is also expected that no segregation of high production agricultural resources will occur.

9 References

Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. 2017. Deep ripping for soil compaction. <https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/soil-compaction/deep-ripping-soil-compaction>.

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.

Mucina, L., & Rutherford, M. C. 2006. The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho, and Swaziland. Strelitzia 19. Pretoria: National Biodiversity Institute.

Russell, W. 2009. WET-RehabMethods. National guidelines and methods for wetland rehabilitation.

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.