

Johann Lanz
Soil Scientist (Pr.Sci.Nat.)
Reg. no. 400268/12

Cell: 082 927 9018
e-mail: johann@johannlanz.co.za

1A Wolfe Street
Wynberg
7800
Cape Town
South Africa

**SITE SENSITIVITY VERIFICATION
AND
AGRICULTURAL COMPLIANCE STATEMENT
FOR
PROPOSED KLIPKRAAL WIND ENERGY FACILITY (WEF) 1, BESS AND ASSOCIATED
INFRASTRUCTURE NEAR FRASERBURG IN THE NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

**Report by
Johann Lanz**

15 november 2022

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Introduction.....	3
2 Project description	4
3 Terms of reference.....	4
4 Methodology of study	5
4.1 Methodology for assessing the agro-ecosystem	5
5 Assumptions, uncertainties or gaps in knowledge or data	6
6 Applicable legislation and permit requirements.....	6
7 Site sensitivity verification.....	7
8 Baseline description of the agro-ecosystem	8
9 Assessment of agricultural impact.....	9
9.1 What constitutes an agricultural impact?.....	9
9.2 The significance of agricultural impact and the factors that determine it	10
9.3 Impact identification and discussion	11
9.4 Cumulative impacts.....	12
9.5 Impacts of the no-go alternative	12
9.6 Comparative assessment of alternatives.....	12
9.7 Micro-siting to minimize fragmentation and disturbance of agricultural activities	13
9.8 Confirmation of linear activity impact.....	13
9.9 Impact footprint	13
9.10 Impact assessment and statement.....	13
10 Environmental Management Programme Inputs.....	15
11 Conclusions	20
12 References.....	21
Appendix 1: Specialist Curriculum Vitae	23
Appendix 2: Details of the specialist, declaration of interest and undertaking under oath ...	24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the agricultural component in the Environmental Authorisation process is to ensure that South Africa balances the need for development against the need to ensure the conservation of the natural agricultural resources, including land, required for agricultural production and national food security.

An agricultural impact is a temporary or permanent change to the future production potential of land. The proposed development poses no threat in terms of decreasing the future production potential of the site. Instead it offers a valuable opportunity for a Wind Energy Facility (renewable energy) development with insignificant loss of future agricultural production potential.

This is substantiated by the following points:

- The proposed development will exclude only a very small proportion of the land (<2%) from agricultural production. All agricultural activities are able to continue unaffectedly on all parts of the farmland other than this small agricultural footprint and the impact on production potential will therefore be insignificant.
- Furthermore, the proposed development will occupy land that is of very limited land capability, which is totally insufficient for crop production. There is not a scarcity of such agricultural land in South Africa and its conservation for agricultural production is not therefore a priority.
- The amount of agricultural land use by the development is well within (approximately 8 times smaller than what is allowed by) the allowable development limits prescribed by the agricultural protocol. These limits reflect the national need to conserve valuable agricultural land and therefore to steer, particularly renewable energy developments, onto land with low agricultural production potential.
- The proposed development offers positive impact on agriculture by way of improved financial security for farming operations, as well as security benefits against stock theft and other crime.
- The proposed development poses a low risk in terms of causing soil degradation because degradation can be adequately and fairly easily managed by standard, best practice mitigation actions.
- The proposed development will also have the wider societal benefits of generating additional income and employment in the local economy.
- In addition, the proposed development will contribute to the country's need for energy generation, particularly renewable energy that has much lower environmental and agricultural impact than existing, coal powered energy generation.
- All renewable energy development in South Africa will contribute to reducing the large

agricultural impact that open cast coal mining has on highly productive agricultural land throughout the coal mining areas of the country.

The impact of the proposed development on the agricultural production capability of the site is assessed as being acceptable because of the above factors. Therefore, from an agricultural impact point of view, **it is recommended that the development be approved.**

1 INTRODUCTION

Environmental authorisation is being sought for the proposed Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility (WEF) 1 near Fraserburg in the Northern Cape Province (see location in Figure 1). In terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 107 of 1998) (NEMA), an application for environmental authorisation requires an agricultural assessment. In this case, based on the verified sensitivity of the site, the level of agricultural assessment required is an Agricultural Compliance Statement.




Figure 1. Locality map of the proposed energy facility (blue outline) south-east of the town of Fraserburg.

Johann Lanz was appointed as an independent agricultural specialist to conduct the agricultural assessment. The objective and focus of an agricultural assessment is to assess whether or not the proposed development will have an unacceptable agricultural impact, and based on this, to make a recommendation on whether or not it should be approved.

The purpose of including an agricultural component in the Environmental Authorisation process is to ensure that South Africa balances the need for development against the need to ensure the conservation of the natural agricultural resources, including land, required for agricultural production and national food security. The aim of the agricultural protocol of NEMA is primarily to preserve the agricultural production potential of scarce arable land by ensuring that development does not exclude agricultural production from such land or impact it to the extent that the crop production potential is reduced.

However, all land that is excluded from potential future agricultural use by this development is not suitable for crop production and therefore does not have high priority for being conserved as agricultural production land.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed facility will consist of the standard infrastructure of a wind energy facility including, up to 60 turbines with foundations; crane pads per turbine; internal access roads; operations and maintenance building; battery storage; on-site substation; and temporary laydown areas and will have a total generating capacity of up to 300 MW. The grid connection infrastructure is subject to a separate assessment and EA.

The exact nature of the different components making up a wind energy facility has absolutely no bearing on the significance of agricultural impacts. All that is of relevance is simply the layout and extent of the total footprint of the facility that excludes agricultural land use or impacts agricultural land, referred to as the agricultural footprint. Whether that footprint comprises a turbine, a road or a substation is irrelevant to agricultural impact.

Furthermore, in a low agricultural potential environment like the one being assessed, the actual position of the facility and infrastructure in the landscape also has no real bearing on the significance of the agricultural impact.

3 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference for this study is to fulfill the requirements of the *Protocol for the specialist assessment and minimum report content requirements of environmental impacts on agricultural resources*, gazetted on 20 March 2020 in GN 320 (in terms of Sections 24(5)(A) and (H) and 44 of NEMA, 1998).

The level of agricultural assessment required in terms of the agricultural protocol for sites of less than high sensitivity, as this site was verified to be, is an Agricultural Compliance Statement. The protocol also requires that a Site Sensitivity Verification be done.

The terms of reference for such an assessment, as stipulated in the protocol, are listed below, and the section number of this report which fulfils each stipulation is given after it in brackets.

1. The Agricultural Compliance Statement must be prepared by a soil scientist or agricultural specialist registered with the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (SACNASP) (**Appendix 1**).
2. The compliance statement must:

1. be applicable to the preferred site and proposed development footprint;
 2. confirm that the site is of “low” or “medium” sensitivity for agriculture (**Section 7**); and
 3. indicate whether or not the proposed development will have an unacceptable impact on the agricultural production capability of the site (**Section 9.11**).
3. The Agricultural Compliance Statement must contain, as a minimum, the following information:
1. details and relevant experience as well as the SACNASP registration number of the soil scientist or agricultural specialist preparing the statement including a curriculum vitae (**Appendix 1**);
 2. a signed statement of independence by the specialist (**Appendix 2**);
 3. a map showing the proposed development footprint (including supporting infrastructure) with a 50 m buffered development envelope, overlaid on the agricultural sensitivity map generated by the screening tool (**Figure 2**);
 4. calculations of the physical development footprint area for each land parcel as well as the total physical development footprint area of the proposed development including supporting infrastructure (**Section 9.9**);
 5. confirmation that the development footprint is in line with the allowable development limits contained in Table 1 of the protocol (**Section 9.9**);
 6. confirmation from the specialist that all reasonable measures have been taken through micro-siting to avoid or minimize fragmentation and disturbance of agricultural activities (**Section 9.7**);
 7. a substantiated statement from the soil scientist or agricultural specialist on the acceptability, or not, of the proposed development and a recommendation on the approval, or not of the proposed development (**Section 9.11**);
 8. any conditions to which this statement is subjected (**Section 11**);
 9. in the case of a linear activity, confirmation from the agricultural specialist or soil scientist, that in their opinion, based on the mitigation and remedial measures proposed, the land can be returned to the current state within two years of completion of the construction phase (**Section 9.8**);
 10. where required, proposed impact management outcomes or any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr (**Section 10**); and
 11. a description of the assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge or data (**Section 5**).

4 METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

4.1 Methodology for assessing the agro-ecosystem

As per the protocol requirement, the assessment was based on a desktop analysis of existing soil and agricultural potential data for the site. The following sources of information were used:

- Soil data was sourced from the land type data set, of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). This data set originates from the land type survey that was conducted from the 1970's until 2002. It is the most reliable and comprehensive national database of soil information in South Africa and although the data was collected some time ago, it is still entirely relevant as the soil characteristics included in the land type data do not change within time scales of hundreds of years.
- Land capability data was sourced from the 2017 National land capability evaluation raster data layer produced by the DAFF, Pretoria.
- Field crop boundaries were sourced from Crop Estimates Consortium, 2019. *Field Crop Boundary data layer, 2019*. Pretoria. Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.
- Rainfall and evaporation data was sourced from the SA Atlas of Climatology and Agrohydrology (2009, R.E. Schulze) available on Cape Farm Mapper.
- Grazing capacity data was sourced from the 2018 DAFF long-term grazing capacity map for South Africa, available on Cape Farm Mapper.
- Satellite imagery of the site and surrounds was sourced from Google Earth.

These sources of information are considered entirely adequate and comprehensive for the purposes of this assessment.

5 ASSUMPTIONS, UNCERTAINTIES OR GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE OR DATA

There are no specific assumptions, uncertainties or gaps in knowledge or data that affect the findings of this study.

6 APPLICABLE LEGISLATION AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

A renewable energy facility requires approval from the National Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD) if the facility is on agriculturally zoned land. There are two approvals that apply. The first is a No Objection Letter for the change in land use issued by the Deputy Director General (Agricultural Production, Health and Food Safety, Natural Resources and Disaster Management). This letter is one of the requirements for receiving municipal rezoning. It is advisable to apply for this as early in the renewable development process as possible because not receiving this DALRRD approval is a fatal flaw for a project. Note that a positive EA does not assure DALRRD's approval of this. This application requires a motivation backed by good evidence that the development will not significantly compromise the future agricultural production potential of the development site.

The second required approval is a consent for long-term lease in terms of the Subdivision of

Agricultural Land Act (Act 70 of 1970) (SALA). If DALRRD approval for the development has already been obtained in the form of the No Objection letter, then SALA approval should be easy and not present any difficulties. Note that SALA approval is not required if the lease is over the entire farm portion. SALA approval (if required) can only be applied for once the Municipal Rezoning Certificate and EA is in hand.

Rehabilitation after disturbance to agricultural land is managed by the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (Act 43 of 1983) (CARA). A consent in terms of CARA is required for the cultivation of virgin land. Cultivation is defined in CARA as “any act by means of which the topsoil is disturbed mechanically”. The purpose of this consent for the cultivation of virgin land is to ensure that only land that is suitable as arable land is cultivated. Therefore, despite the above definition of cultivation, disturbance to the topsoil that results from the construction of a renewable energy facility and its associated infrastructure does not constitute cultivation as it is understood in CARA. This has been corroborated by Anneliza Collett (Acting Scientific Manager: Natural Resources Inventories and Assessments in the Directorate: Land and Soil Management of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD)). The construction and operation of the facility will therefore not require consent from the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development in terms of this provision of CARA.

7 SITE SENSITIVITY VERIFICATION

In terms of the gazetted agricultural protocol, a site sensitivity verification must be submitted that:

1. confirms or disputes the current use of the land and the environmental sensitivity as identified by the screening tool, such as new developments or infrastructure, the change in vegetation cover or status etc.;
2. contains a motivation and evidence (e.g. photographs) of either the verified or different use of the land and environmental sensitivity.

Agricultural sensitivity, as used in the national web-based environmental screening tool, is a direct function of the capability of the land for agricultural production. The general assessment of agricultural sensitivity that is employed in the national web-based environmental screening tool, identifies all arable land that can support viable crop production, as high (or very high) sensitivity. This is because there is a scarcity of arable production land in South Africa and its conservation for agricultural use is therefore a priority. Land which cannot support viable crop production is much less of a priority to conserve for agricultural use, and is rated as medium or low agricultural sensitivity.

The screening tool classifies agricultural sensitivity according to only two independent criteria – the land capability rating and whether the land is used for cropland or not. All cropland is classified

as at least high sensitivity, based on the logic that if it is under crop production, it is indeed suitable for it, irrespective of its land capability rating.

The screening tool sensitivity categories in terms of land capability are based upon the Department of Agriculture's updated and refined, country-wide land capability mapping, released in 2016. The data is generated by GIS modelling. Land capability is defined as the combination of soil, climate and terrain suitability factors for supporting rain fed agricultural production. It is an indication of what level and type of agricultural production can sustainably be achieved on any land, based on its soil, climate and terrain. The higher land capability values (≥ 8 to 15) are likely to be suitable as arable land for crop production, while lower values are only likely to be suitable as non-arable grazing land.

A map of the proposed development area overlaid on the screening tool sensitivity is given in Figure 2. Because none of the land is classified as cropland, agricultural sensitivity is purely a function of land capability. The land capability of the site on the screening tool is predominantly 4 to 5, but varies from 2 to 6. The small scale differences in the modelled land capability across the project area are not very accurate or significant at this scale and are more a function of how the data is generated by modelling, than actual meaningful differences in agricultural potential on the ground. Values of 2 to 5 translate to a low agricultural sensitivity and values of 6 translate to a medium agricultural sensitivity, although there is little real difference between low and medium agricultural sensitivity on the ground.

The agricultural sensitivity, as identified by the screening tool, is confirmed by this assessment. The motivation for confirming the sensitivity is predominantly that the climate data (low rainfall of approximately 168 to 179 mm per annum and high evaporation of approximately 1,320 to 1,360 mm per annum) (Schulze, 2009) proves the area to be very arid, and therefore of limited land capability.

This site sensitivity verification verifies the entire site as being of less than high agricultural sensitivity with a land capability value of 4 to 5. The land capability value is in keeping with the climate limitations that make the site totally unsuitable for dryland crop production. The required level of agricultural assessment is therefore confirmed as an Agricultural Compliance Statement.

8 BASELINE DESCRIPTION OF THE AGRO-ECOSYSTEM

The arid climate (low rainfall of approximately 168 to 179 mm per annum and high evaporation of approximately 1,320 to 1,360 mm per annum) (Schulze, 2009) is the limiting factor for land capability, regardless of the soil capability and terrain. Moisture availability is insufficient for crop production without irrigation and the potential agricultural land use of the site is therefore limited to grazing. The land is used for the grazing of sheep and game. The land has a low long-term

grazing capacity of 32 hectares per large stock unit (DAFF, 2018). Because climate is the limiting factor that controls production potential, it is the only aspect of the agro-ecosystem description that is required for assessing the agricultural impact of this development.




Figure 2. The proposed development overlaid on agricultural sensitivity, as given by the screening tool (green = low; yellow = medium; red = high).

9 ASSESSMENT OF AGRICULTURAL IMPACT

9.1 What constitutes an agricultural impact?

An agricultural impact is a temporary or permanent change to the future production potential of land. If a development will not change the future production potential of the land, then there is no agricultural impact. A decrease in future production potential is a negative impact and an increase is a positive impact. The significance of the agricultural impact is directly proportional to the extent of the change in production potential.

9.2 The significance of agricultural impact and the factors that determine it

The purpose of the agricultural component in the Environmental Authorisation process is to ensure that South Africa balances the need for development against the need to ensure the conservation of the natural agricultural resources, including land, required for agricultural production and national food security. Impacts such as erosion that degrade the agricultural resource base, pose a threat to production potential and therefore are within the scope of an agricultural impact assessment.

When the agricultural impact of a development involves the permanent or long term non-agricultural use of potential agricultural land, as it does in this case, the focus and defining question of the agricultural impact assessment is to determine the importance, from an agricultural production point of view, of that land not being utilised for the development and kept solely for agriculture.

In other words, the significance of an agricultural impact should be evaluated by asking the question: Does the extent of the loss of future agricultural production potential that will result from this development, justify keeping the land solely for agricultural production and therefore not approving the development? If the loss is small, then it is unlikely to justify non approval. If the loss is big, then it is likely to justify it.

In the case of wind farms, the first factor, amount of land loss, is so small that the total extent of the loss of future agricultural production potential is insignificantly small, regardless of how much production potential the land has. This is because the required spacing between turbines means that the amount of land actually excluded from agricultural use is extremely small in relation to the surface area over which a wind farm is distributed. Wind farm infrastructure (including all associated infrastructure and roads) typically occupies less than 2% of the surface area, according to the typical surface area requirements of wind farms in South Africa (DEA, 2015). Most wind energy facilities, for which I have recently done assessments, occupy less than 1% of the surface area. All agricultural activities are able to continue unaffectedly on all parts of the farmland other than this small agricultural footprint and the actual loss of production potential is therefore insignificant.

In this case, the second factor, the production potential of the land, is also very low which means that the loss of future agricultural production potential as a result of the proposed development is entirely insignificant.

It is also important to note that renewable energy facilities have both positive and negative affects on the production potential of land (see Section 9.3) and so it is the net sum of these positive and negative affects that determines the extent of the change in future production potential.

Another aspect to consider is the scale at which the significance of the agricultural impact is assessed. The change in production potential of a farm or significant part of a farm is likely to be highly significant at the scale of that farm, but may be much less so at smaller scales. This assessment considers a regional and national scale to be the most appropriate one for assessing the significance of the loss of agricultural production potential because, as has been discussed above, the purpose is to ensure the conservation of agricultural land required for national food security.

9.3 Impact identification and discussion

Three potential negative agricultural impacts have been identified, that are direct impacts:

1. **Loss of agricultural potential by occupation of land** - Agricultural land directly occupied by the development infrastructure will become restricted for agricultural use, with consequent potential loss of agricultural productivity for the duration of the project lifetime. As has been discussed above, the small and widely distributed nature of the agricultural footprint of the facility means that only an insignificant proportion of the available agricultural land is impacted in this way.
2. **Loss of agricultural potential by soil degradation** – This impact only occurs during the construction and decommissioning phases, but only becomes relevant once the land is returned to agricultural land use after decommissioning. Soil can be degraded by impacts in three different ways: erosion; topsoil loss; and contamination. Erosion can occur as a result of the alteration of the land surface run-off characteristics, which can be caused by construction related land surface disturbance, vegetation removal, and the establishment of hard surface areas including roads. Loss of topsoil can result from poor topsoil management during construction related excavations. Hydrocarbon spillages from construction activities can contaminate soil. Soil degradation will reduce the ability of the soil to support vegetation growth. Although the site is susceptible to soil erosion, it can be fairly easily and effectively prevented by standard best practice soil degradation control measures, as recommended and included in the EMP.
3. **Loss of agricultural potential by dust generation** – The disturbance of the soil surface, particularly during construction, will generate dust that can negatively impact surrounding veld and farm animals.

Two positive agricultural impacts have been identified, that are indirect impacts and lead to enhanced agricultural potential through:

1. **increased financial security for farming operations** - Reliable income will be generated by the farming enterprises through the lease of the land to the energy facility. This is likely to

increase their cash flow and financial security and could improve farming operations and productivity through increased investment into farming.

- 2. improved security against stock theft and other crime** due to the presence of security infrastructure and security personnel at the energy facility.

Considering what is detailed in Section 9.2 above, the extent to which any of these mechanisms is likely to actually affect levels of agricultural production is small and the overall impact of a change in agricultural production potential is therefore small.

9.4 Cumulative impacts

The most important concept related to a cumulative impact is that of an acceptable level of change to an environment. A cumulative impact only becomes relevant when the impact of the proposed development will lead directly to the sum of impacts of all developments causing an acceptable level of change to be exceeded in the surrounding area. If the impact of the development being assessed does not cause that level to be exceeded, then the cumulative impact associated with that development is not significant.

The potential cumulative agricultural impact of importance is a regional loss (including by degradation) of future agricultural production potential. The defining question for assessing the cumulative agricultural impact is this:

What loss of future agricultural production potential is acceptable in the area, and will the loss associated with the proposed development, when considered in the context of all past, present or reasonably foreseeable future impacts, cause that level in the area to be exceeded?

Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) requires compliance with a specified methodology for the assessment of cumulative impacts. This is positive in that it ensures engagement with the important issue of cumulative impacts. However, the required compliance has some limitations and can, in the opinion of the author, result in an over-focus on methodological compliance, while missing the more important task of effectively answering the above defining question.

DFFE compliance for this project requires quantifying the impact of all renewable energy applications within a 35 km radius. There are a total of three renewable energy project applications within 35 km of the proposed site. These are the three associated Klipkraal WEFs 1 to 3.

In quantifying the cumulative impact, the area of land taken out of grazing as a result of the three

developments (total generation capacity of 900 MW) will amount to a total of approximately 270 hectares. This is calculated using the industry standards of 2.5 and 0.3 hectares per megawatt for solar and wind energy generation respectively, as per the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) Phase 1 Wind and Solar Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) (2015). As a proportion of the total area within a 35 km radius (approximately 384,800 ha), this amounts to 0.07% of the surface area. That is well within an acceptable limit in terms of loss of low potential agricultural land which is only suitable for grazing, and of which there is no scarcity in the country. This is particularly so when considered within the context of the following point.

In order for South Africa to develop the renewable energy generation that it urgently needs, agriculturally zoned land will need to be used for renewable energy generation. It is far more preferable to incur a cumulative loss of agricultural land that is of limited agricultural potential in a region such as the one being assessed, which has no crop production potential, and low grazing capacity, than to lose agricultural land that has a higher potential, and that is much scarcer, to renewable energy development elsewhere in the country.

Due to all of the considerations discussed above, the cumulative impact of loss of future agricultural production potential is assessed as low. It will not have an unacceptable negative impact on the agricultural production capability of the area and it is therefore recommended that it be approved.

9.5 Impacts of the no-go alternative

The no-go alternative considers impacts that will occur to the agricultural environment in the absence of the proposed development. The one identified potential such impact is that due to non-regular rainfall in the area, which is likely to be exacerbated by climate change, agriculture in the area will come under increased pressure in terms of economic viability.

The development compliments agriculture by providing an additional income source, without excluding agriculture from the land, or decreasing production. Therefore, the negative agricultural impact of the no-go alternative is more significant than that of the development, and so, purely from an agricultural impact perspective, the proposed development is the preferred alternative between the development and the no-go. In addition, the no-go option would prevent the proposed development from contributing to the environmental, social and economic benefits associated with the development of renewable energy in South Africa.

9.6 Comparative assessment of alternatives

No alternatives are being considered at this stage because a pre-application screening was undertaken. However, due to the low agricultural sensitivity of the site, and the effectively uniform

agricultural conditions across the site, there will be absolutely no material difference between the agricultural impacts of any alternative layouts on the site and any alternatives will almost definitely be acceptable.

9.7 Micro-siting to minimize fragmentation and disturbance of agricultural activities

The agricultural protocol requires confirmation that all reasonable measures have been taken through micro-siting to minimize fragmentation and disturbance of agricultural activities. However, as noted above, the exact position of the footprint and all infrastructure within it will not make any material difference to agricultural impacts and disturbance.

9.8 Confirmation of linear activity impact

Confirmation of the linear activity impact is not applicable in this case.

9.9 Impact footprint

The agricultural protocol stipulates allowable development limits for renewable energy developments of > 20 MW. Allowable development limits refer to the area of a particular agricultural sensitivity category that can be directly impacted (i.e. taken up by the physical footprint) by a renewable energy development. The agricultural footprint is defined in the protocol as the area that is directly occupied by all infrastructures, including roads, hard standing areas, buildings etc., that are associated with the renewable energy facility during its operational phase, and that result in the exclusion of that land from potential cultivation or grazing. It excludes all areas that were already occupied by roads and other infrastructure prior to the establishment of the energy facility but includes the surface area required for expanding existing infrastructure (e.g. widening existing roads). It therefore represents the total land that is actually excluded from agricultural use as a result of the renewable energy facility (the agricultural footprint).

The allowable development limit for the verified sensitivity of the project area is 2.5 ha per MW. This is designed to allow solar PV developments on such land. Solar PV developments have agricultural footprints that are typically eight times the size of wind farm ones. It can therefore be confirmed that the agricultural footprint of this wind farm development will be well within the allowable limit. It will in fact be approximately eight times smaller than what the development limits allow.

9.10 Impact assessment

An Agricultural Compliance Statement is not required to formally rate agricultural impacts. It is only required to indicate whether or not the proposed development will have an unacceptable

impact on the agricultural production capability of the site. Nevertheless, the agricultural impact of this proposed development is assessed here as being of low significance because of both the small area of impacted land and the low agricultural capability of that land.

10 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME INPUTS

The environmental management programme inputs for the protection of soil resources for the PV facility are presented in the tables below for each phase of the development.

Table 1: Management plan for the planning and design phase

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
Aspect: Protection of soil resources					
Erosion	That disturbance and existence of hard surfaces causes no erosion on or downstream of the site.	Design an effective system of stormwater run-off control, where it is required - that is at any points where run-off water might accumulate. The system must effectively collect and safely disseminate any run-off water from all accumulation points and it must prevent any potential down slope erosion. This is included in the stormwater	Ensure that the stormwater run-off control is included in the engineering design.	Once-off during the design phase.	Holder of the EA

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
		management plan.			

Table 2: Management plan for the construction phase

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
Aspect: Protection of soil resources					
Erosion	That disturbance and existence of hard surfaces causes no erosion on or downstream of the site.	Implement an effective system of stormwater run-off control, where it is required - that is at any points where run-off water might accumulate. The system must effectively collect and safely disseminate any run-off water from all accumulation points and it must prevent any potential down slope erosion.	Undertake a periodic site inspection to verify and inspect the effectiveness and integrity of the stormwater run-off control system and to specifically record the occurrence of any erosion on site or downstream. Corrective action must be implemented to the run-off control system in the event of any erosion occurring.	Every 2 months during the construction phase	Environmental Control Officer (ECO)
Erosion	That vegetation clearing does not pose a high	Maintain where possible all vegetation cover	Undertake a periodic site inspection to	Every 4 months during the construction	Environmental Control Officer (ECO)

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
	erosion risk.	and facilitate re-vegetation of denuded areas throughout the site, to stabilize disturbed soil against erosion.	record the occurrence of and re-vegetation progress of all areas that require re-vegetation.	the phase	
Topsoil loss	That topsoil loss is minimised	If an activity will mechanically disturb the soil below surface in any way, then any available topsoil should first be stripped from the entire surface to be disturbed and stockpiled for re-spreading during rehabilitation. During rehabilitation, the stockpiled topsoil must be evenly spread over the entire disturbed surface.	Record GPS positions of all occurrences of below-surface soil disturbance (e.g. excavations). Record the date of topsoil stripping and replacement. Check that topsoil covers the entire disturbed area.	As required, whenever areas are disturbed.	Environmental Control Officer (ECO)

Table 3: Management plan for the operational phase

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
Aspect: Protection of soil resources					
Erosion	That existence of hard surfaces causes no erosion on or downstream of the site.	Maintain the stormwater run-off control system. Monitor erosion and remedy the stormwater control system in the event of any erosion occurring.	Undertake a periodic site inspection to verify and inspect the effectiveness and integrity of the stormwater run-off control system and to specifically record the occurrence of any erosion on site or downstream. Corrective action must be implemented to the run-off control system in the event of any erosion occurring.	Bi-annually	Facility Environmental Manager
Erosion	That denuded areas are re-vegetated to stabilise soil against erosion	Facilitate re-vegetation of denuded areas throughout the site	Undertake a periodic site inspection to record the progress of all areas that require re-vegetation.	Bi-annually	Facility Environmental Manager

Table 4: Management plan for the decommissioning phase

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
Aspect: Protection of soil resources					
Erosion	That disturbance and existence of hard surfaces causes no erosion on or downstream of the site.	Implement an effective system of stormwater run-off control, where it is required - that is at any points where run-off water might accumulate. The system must effectively collect and safely disseminate any run-off water from all accumulation points and it must prevent any potential down slope erosion.	Undertake a periodic site inspection to verify and inspect the effectiveness and integrity of the stormwater run-off control system and to specifically record the occurrence of any erosion on site or downstream. Corrective action must be implemented to the run-off control system in the event of any erosion occurring.	Every 2 months during the decommissioning phase, and then every 6 months after completion of decommissioning, until final sign-off is achieved.	Environmental Control Officer (ECO)
Erosion	That vegetation clearing does not pose a high erosion risk.	Maintain where possible all vegetation cover and facilitate re-vegetation of denuded areas throughout the site, to stabilize disturbed soil against erosion.	Undertake a periodic site inspection to record the occurrence of and re-vegetation progress of all areas that require re-vegetation.	Every 4 months during the decommissioning phase, and then every 6 months after completion of decommissioning, until final sign-off is achieved.	Environmental Control Officer (ECO)
Topsoil loss	That topsoil loss	If an activity will	Record GPS	As required,	Environmental

Impact	Mitigation / management objectives and outcomes	Mitigation / management actions	Monitoring		
			Methodology	Frequency	Responsibility
	is minimised	mechanically disturb the soil below surface in any way, then any available topsoil should first be stripped from the entire surface to be disturbed and stockpiled for re-spreading during rehabilitation. During rehabilitation, the stockpiled topsoil must be evenly spread over the entire disturbed surface.	positions of all occurrences of below-surface soil disturbance (e.g. excavations). Record the date of topsoil stripping and replacement. Check that topsoil covers the entire disturbed area.	whenever areas are disturbed.	Control Officer (ECO)

11 CONCLUSIONS

The entire site was verified in this assessment as being of less than high sensitivity for impacts on agricultural resources with a land capability value of 4 to 5. The agricultural production potential of the site is completely limited by the aridity of the climate and it is therefore only suitable as grazing land.

Three potential negative agricultural impacts were identified, loss of agricultural land use, land degradation, and dust generation. Two positive agricultural impact were identified as enhanced agricultural potential through increased financial security for farming operations, and improved security against stock theft and other crime. All of these are likely to have low impact on future agricultural production potential and are therefore assessed as having low significance.

The conclusion of this assessment is that the proposed development offers a valuable opportunity

for renewable energy development with insignificant loss of future agricultural production potential.

This is substantiated by the following points:

- The proposed development will exclude only a very small proportion of the land (<2%) from agricultural production. All agricultural activities are able to continue unaffectedly on all parts of the farmland other than this small agricultural footprint and the impact on production potential will therefore be insignificant.
- Furthermore, the proposed development will occupy land that is of very limited land capability, which is totally insufficient for crop production. There is not a scarcity of such agricultural land in South Africa and its conservation for agricultural production is not therefore a priority.
- The amount of agricultural land use by the development is well within (approximately 8 times smaller than what is allowed by) the allowable development limits prescribed by the agricultural protocol. These limits reflect the national need to conserve valuable agricultural land and therefore to steer, particularly renewable energy developments, onto land with low agricultural production potential.
- The proposed development offers positive impact on agriculture by way of improved financial security for farming operations, as well as security benefits against stock theft and other crime.
- The proposed development poses a low risk in terms of causing soil degradation because degradation can be adequately and fairly easily managed by standard, best practice mitigation actions.
- The proposed development will also have the wider societal benefits of generating additional income and employment in the local economy.
- In addition, the proposed development will contribute to the country's need for energy generation, particularly renewable energy that has much lower environmental and agricultural impact than existing, coal powered energy generation.
- All renewable energy development in South Africa will contribute to reducing the large agricultural impact that open cast coal mining has on highly productive agricultural land throughout the coal mining areas of the country.

The impact of the proposed development on the agricultural production capability of the site is assessed as being low and therefore acceptable because of the above factors. From an agricultural impact point of view, it is recommended that the development be approved.

The conclusion of this assessment on the acceptability of the proposed development and the recommendation for its approval is not subject to any conditions, other than recommended

mitigation.

12 REFERENCES

Crop Estimates Consortium, 2019. *Field Crop Boundary data layer, 2019*. Pretoria. Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, 2018. Long-term grazing capacity map for South Africa developed in line with the provisions of Regulation 10 of the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act, Act no 43 of 1983 (CARA), available on Cape Farm Mapper. Available at: <https://gis.elsenburg.com/apps/cfm/>

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 2017. National land capability evaluation raster data layer, 2017. Pretoria.

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, 2002. National land type inventories data set. Pretoria.

DEA, 2015. Strategic Environmental Assessment for wind and solar photovoltaic development in South Africa. CSIR Report Number CSIR: CSIR/CAS/EMS/ER/2015/001/B. Stellenbosch.

Schulze, R.E. 2009. SA Atlas of Climatology and Agrohydrology, available on Cape Farm Mapper. Available at: <https://gis.elsenburg.com/apps/cfm/>

APPENDIX 1: SPECIALIST CURRICULUM VITAE

Johann Lanz Curriculum Vitae

Education

M.Sc. (Environmental Geochemistry)	University of Cape Town	1996 - 1997
B.Sc. Agriculture (Soil Science, Chemistry)	University of Stellenbosch	1992 - 1995
BA (English, Environmental & Geographical Science)	University of Cape Town	1989 - 1991
Matric Exemption	Wynberg Boy's High School	1983

Professional work experience

I have been registered as a Professional Natural Scientist (Pr.Sci.Nat.) in the field of soil science since 2012 (registration number 400268/12) and am a member of the Soil Science Society of South Africa.

Soil & Agricultural Consulting Self employed 2002 - present

Within the past 5 years of running my soil and agricultural consulting business, I have completed more than 170 agricultural assessments (EIAs, SEAs, EMPRs) in all 9 provinces for renewable energy, mining, electrical grid infrastructure, urban, and agricultural developments. I was the appointed agricultural specialist for the nation-wide SEAs for wind and solar PV developments, electrical grid infrastructure, and gas pipelines. My regular clients include: Zutari; CSIR; SiVEST; SLR; WSP; Arcus; SRK; Environamics; Royal Haskoning DHV; ABO; Enertrag; WKN-Windcurrent; JG Afrika; Mainstream; Redcap; G7; Mulilo; and Tiptrans. Recent agricultural clients for soil resource evaluations and mapping include Cederberg Wines; Western Cape Department of Agriculture; Vogelfontein Citrus; De Grendel Estate; Zewenwacht Wine Estate; and Goedgedacht Olives.

In 2018 I completed a ground-breaking case study that measured the agricultural impact of existing wind farms in the Eastern Cape.

Soil Science Consultant Agricultural Consultants International (Tinie du Preez) 1998 - 2001

Responsible for providing all aspects of a soil science technical consulting service directly to clients in the wine, fruit and environmental industries all over South Africa, and in Chile, South America.

Contracting Soil Scientist De Beers Namaqualand Mines July 1997 - Jan 1998

Completed a contract to advise soil rehabilitation and re-vegetation of mined areas.

Publications

- Lanz, J. 2012. Soil health: sustaining Stellenbosch's roots. In: M Swilling, B Sebitosi & R Loots (eds). *Sustainable Stellenbosch: opening dialogues*. Stellenbosch: SunMedia.
- Lanz, J. 2010. Soil health indicators: physical and chemical. *South African Fruit Journal*, April / May 2010 issue.
- Lanz, J. 2009. Soil health constraints. *South African Fruit Journal*, August / September 2009 issue.
- Lanz, J. 2009. Soil carbon research. *AgriProbe*, Department of Agriculture.
- Lanz, J. 2005. Special Report: Soils and wine quality. *Wineland Magazine*.

I am a reviewing scientist for the *South African Journal of Plant and Soil*.



environmental affairs

Department:
Environmental Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

APPENDIX 2: DETAILS OF THE SPECIALIST, DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND UNDERTAKING UNDER OATH

(For official use only)

File Reference Number:

NEAS Reference Number:

Date Received:

DEA/EIA/

Application for authorisation in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014, as amended (the Regulations)

PROJECT TITLE

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed development of the Klipkraal Wind Energy Facility (WEF) 1, BESS and associated infrastructure near Fraserburg in the Northern Cape Province

Kindly note the following:

- This form must always be used for applications that must be subjected to Basic Assessment or Scoping & Environmental Impact Reporting where this Department is the Competent Authority.
- This form is current as of 01 September 2018. It is the responsibility of the Applicant / Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to ascertain whether subsequent versions of the form have been published or produced by the Competent Authority. The latest available Departmental templates are available at <https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms>.
- A copy of this form containing original signatures must be appended to all Draft and Final Reports submitted to the department for consideration.
- All documentation delivered to the physical address contained in this form must be delivered during the official Departmental Officer Hours which is visible on the Departmental gate.
- All EIA related documents (includes application forms, reports or any EIA related submissions) that are faxed; emailed; delivered to Security or placed in the Departmental Tender Box will not be accepted, only hardcopy submissions are accepted.

Departmental Details

Postal address: Department of Environmental Affairs, Attention: Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations, Private Bag X447, Pretoria, 0001

Physical address: Department of Environmental Affairs, Attention: Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations, Environment House, 473 Steve Biko Road, Arcadia

Queries must be directed to the Directorate: Coordination, Strategic Planning and Support at:
Email: EIAAdmin@environment.gov.za


1. SPECIALIST INFORMATION

Specialist Company Name:	Johann Lanz – Soil Scientist		
B-BBEE	Contribution level (indicate 1 to 8 or non-compliant)	4	Percentage Procurement recognition
			100%
Specialist name:	Johann Lanz		
Specialist Qualifications:	M.Sc. (Environmental Geochemistry)		
Professional affiliation/registration:	Registered Professional Natural Scientist (Pr.Sci.Nat.) Reg. no. 400268/12 Member of the Soil Science Society of South Africa		
Physical address:	1a Wolfe Street, Wynberg, Cape Town, 7800		
Postal address:	1a Wolfe Street, Wynberg, Cape Town, 7800		
Postal code:	7800	Cell:	082 927 9018
Telephone:	082 927 9018	Fax:	Who still uses a fax? I don't
E-mail:	johann@johannlanz.co.za		

2. DECLARATION BY THE SPECIALIST

I, **Johann Lanz**, 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 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.



Signature of the Specialist

Johann Lanz - Soil Scientist (sole proprietor)


Name of Company:

Date 15/11/2022

Details of Specialist, Declaration and Undertaking Under Oath

3. UNDERTAKING UNDER OATH/ AFFIRMATION

I, **Johann Lanz**, swear under oath / affirm that all the information submitted or to be submitted for the purposes of this application is true and correct.




Signature of the Specialist

Johann Lanz - Soil Scientist (sole proprietor)

Name of Company

Date 15/11/2022



Signature of the Commissioner of Oaths

Date 2022-11-15

