WETLAND ASSESSMENT

Proposed Kuruman Churchill, Northern Cape Province, South Africa

Indigenous sedge *Scirpoides dioecus* at wetland depression (Pan 1) the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche

JANUARY 2020

COMPILED BY:

Reinier F. Terblanche

(M.Sc, *Cum Laude*; Pr.Sci.Nat, Reg. No. 400244/05)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I) SPECIALIST EXPERTISE

SYNOPTIC CV: REINIER. F. TERBLANCHE

Reinier is an ecologist and in particular a habitat specialist with an exceptional combination of botanical and zoological expertise which he keeps fostering, updating and improving. He is busy with a PhD for which he registered at the Department of Conservation Ecology at the University of Stellenbosch in July 2013. The PhD research focuses on the landscape ecology of selected terrestrial and wetland butterflies in South Africa. Reinier's experience includes being a lecturer in ecology and zoology at the North West University, Potchefstroom Campus (1998-2008). Reinier collaborates with a number of institutes, organizations and universities on animal, plant and habitat research.

Qualifications:

Qualification	**Main subject matter**	**University**
M.Sc *Cum Laude*, **1998:** Botany: Ecology	Quantitative study of invertebrate assemblages and plant assemblages of rangelands in grasslands.	North-West University, Potchefstroom
B.Sc Honns *Cum Laude*, **1992** Botany: Taxonomy	Distinctions in all subjects: Plant Anatomy, Taxonomy, Modern Systematics, System Modelling, Plant Ecology, Taxonomy Project. Also included: Statistics Attendance Course.	North-West University, Potchefstroom
B.Sc Botany, Zoology	Main subjects: Botany, Zoology.	North-West University, Potchefstroom
Higher Education Diploma, 1990	Numerous subjects aimed at holistic training of teachers.	North-West University, Potchefstroom

In research Reinier specializes in conservation biology, threatened butterfly species, vegetation dynamics and ant assemblages at terrestrial and wetland butterfly habitats as well as enhancing quantitative studies on butterflies of Africa. He has published extensively in the fields of taxonomy, biogeography and ecology in popular journals, peer-reviewed scientific journals and as co-author and co-editor of books (see 10 examples beneath).

Reinier practices as an ecological consultant and has been registered as a Professional Natural Scientist by SACNASP since 2005: Reg. No. 400244/05. His experience in consultation includes: Flora and fauna habitat surveys, Threatened species assessments, Riparian vegetation index surveys, Compilation of Ecological Management Plans, Biodiversity Action Plans and Status quo of biodiversity for Environmental Management Frameworks, Wetland Assessments, Management of Rare Wetland Species.

Recent activities/ awards: Best Poster Award at Oppenheimer De Beers Group Research Conference 2015, Johannesburg. One of the co-authors of Guidelines for Standardised Global Butterfly Monitoring, 2015, Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network, Leipzig, Germany (UNEP-WCMC), GEO BON Technical Series 1. Awarded the prestigious Torben Larsen Memorial Tankard in October 2017; one is awarded annually to the person responsible for the most outstanding written account on Afrotropical Lepidoptera. Lectured as Conservationist-in-Residence in the Wildlife Conservation Programme of the African Leadership University, Kigali, Rwanda, 9-23 February 2019. Reinier won a photographic competition which resulted his photograph of the Critically Endangered *Erikssonia edgei* (Waterberg Copper) being on the front cover of the Synthesis Report of the National Biodiversity Assessment (2018) prepared by SANBI. Reinier is a Research Fellow at the University of South Africa (Unisa) from 1 January 2020.

EXPERIENCE

Lecturer: Zoology 1998-2008	Main subject matter and level	Organization
Lectured subjects	- 3rd year level Ecology, Plantparasitology - 2nd year level Ethology - *Master's degree* Evolutionary Ethology, Systematics in Practice, Morphology and Taxonomy of Insect Pests, Wetlands.	North-West University, Potchefstroom and University of South Africa
Co-promoter	PhD: Edge, D.A. 2005. Ecological factors that influence the survival of the Brenton Blue butterfly	North-West University, Potchefstroom
Study leader/ assistant study leader	Six MSc students, One BSc Honn student: Various quantitative biodiversity studies (terrestrial and aquatic).	North-West University, Potchefstroom
Teacher 1994-1998	Biology and Science, Secondary School	Afrikaans Hoër Seunskool, Pretoria
Owned Anthene Ecological CC 2008 – present	- Flora and Fauna habitat surveys - Highly specialized ecological surveys - Riparian vegetation index surveys - Ecological Management Plans - Biodiversity Action Plans - Biodiversity section of Environmental Management Frameworks - Wetland assessments	Private Closed Corporation that has been subcontracted by many companies
Herbarium assistant 1988-1991	- Part-time assistant at the A.P. Goossens herbarium, Botany Department, North-West University, 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1991 (as a student).	North-West University, Potchefstroom

10 EXAMPLES OF PUBLICATIONS OF WHICH R.F. TERBLANCHE IS AUTHOR/ CO-AUTHOR
(Three books, two chapters in books and five articles are listed here as examples)

1. HENNING, G.A., **TERBLANCHE, R.F.** & BALL, J.B. (eds) **2009.** *South African Red Data Book: butterflies*. *SANBI Biodiversity Series* 13. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria. 158p. ISBN 978-1-919976-51-8
2. MECENERO, S., BALL, J.B., EDGE, D.A., HAMER, M.L., HENNING, G.A., KRÜGER, M, PRINGLE, E.L., **TERBLANCHE, R.F.** & WILLIAMS, M.C. (eds). 2013. *Conservation Assessment of Butterflies of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland: Red List and atlas.* Saftronics (Pty) Ltd., Johannesburg & Animal Demography Unit, Cape Town.
3. VAN SWAAY, C., REGAN, E., LING, M., BOZHINOVSKA, E., FERNANDEZ, M., MARINI-FILHO, O.J., HUERTAS, B., PHON, C.-K., KŐRÖSI, A., MEERMAN, J., PE'ER, G., UEHARA-PRADO, M., SÁFIÁN, S., SAM, L., SHUEY, J., TARON, D., **TERBLANCHE, R.F**. & UNDERHILL, L. 2015. Guidelines for Standardised Global Butterfly Monitoring. Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network, Leipzig, Germany. GEO BON Technical Series 1.
4. **TERBLANCHE, R.F.** & HENNING, G.A. **2009.** *A framework for conservation management of South African butterflies in practice.* In: Henning, G.A., Terblanche, R.F. & Ball, J.B. (eds). *South African Red Data Book: Butterflies. SANBI Biodiversity Series 13.* South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria. p. 68 – 71.
5. EDGE, D.A., **TERBLANCHE, R.F**., HENNING, G.A., MECENERO, S. & NAVARRO, R.A. 2013. Butterfly conservation in southern Africa: Analysis of the Red List and threats. In: Mecenero, S., Ball, J.B., Edge, D.A., Hamer, M.L., Henning, G.A., Krüger, M., Pringle, E.L., Terblanche, R.F. & Williams, M.C. (eds). *Conservation Assessment of Butterflies of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland: Red List and Atlas.* pp. 13-33. Saftronics (Pty) Ltd., Johannesburg & Animal Demography Unit, Cape Town.
6. **TERBLANCHE, R.F.**, SMITH, G.F. & THEUNISSEN, J.D. **1993.** Did Scott typify names in *Haworthia* (Asphodelaceae: Alooideae)? *Taxon* **42**(1): 91–95. (International Journal of Plant Taxonomy).
7. **TERBLANCHE, R.F.**, MORGENTHAL, T.L. & CILLIERS, S.S. **2003.** The vegetation of three localities of the threatened butterfly species *Chrysoritis aureus* (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). *Koedoe* **46**(1): 73-90.
8. EDGE, D.A., CILLIERS, S.S. & **TERBLANCHE, R.F. 2008**. Vegetation associated with the occurrence of the Brenton blue butterfly. *South African Journal of Science* **104**: 505 - 510.
9. GARDINER, A.J. & **TERBLANCHE, R.F. 2010.** Taxonomy, biology, biogeography, evolution and conservation of the genus *Erikssonia* Trimen (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae) *African Entomology* **18**(1): 171-191.
10. **TERBLANCHE, R.F.** 2016. *Acraea trimeni* Aurivillius, [1899], *Acraea stenobea* Wallengren, 1860 and *Acraea neobule* Doubleday, [1847] on host-plant *Adenia repanda* (Burch.) Engl. at Tswalu Kalahari Reserve, South Africa. *Metamorphosis* 27: 92-102.

* A detailed CV with more complete publication list is available.

II) SPECIALIST DECLARATION

I, Reinier F. Terblanche, as the appointed independent specialist, in terms of the 2014 EIA Regulations (as amended), hereby declare that I:

- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- I 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;
- regard the information contained in this report as it relates to my specialist input/study to be true and correct, and do not have and will not have any financial interest in the undertaking of the activity, other than remuneration for work performed in terms of the NEMA, the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (as amended) and any specific environmental management Act;
- 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 have no vested interest in the proposed activity proceeding;
- 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;
- I have ensured that information containing all relevant facts in respect of the specialist input/study was distributed or made available to interested and affected parties and the public and that participation by interested and affected parties was facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties were provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments on the specialist input/study;
- I have ensured that the comments of all interested and affected parties on the specialist input/study were considered, recorded and submitted to the competent authority in respect of the application;
- all the particulars furnished by me in this specialist input/study 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.

Name of Specialist: Reinier F. Terblanche

Signature of the specialist

Date: 15 January 2020

1 INTRODUCTION

A wetland assessment is required for the proposed Churchill extension, 19 km north of Kuruman in the Northern Cape Province, South Africa (elsewhere referred to as the site). If wetlands would be present at the site the assessment further focuses on the hydro-geomorphic setting, an estimate of the properties of the wetlands, an assessment of the functional aspects of wetlands and an impact assessment to wetlands, should the development be approved. If riparian zones would be present an indication of the active channel and riparian zone is given.

1.1 Wetlands in South Africa

Wetlands are defined by the National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998) as:
"land which is transitional between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems where the water table is usually at or near the surface, or the land is periodically covered with shallow water, and which land in normal circumstances supports or would support vegetation typically adapted to life in saturated soil".

According to *A practical field procedure for identification and delineation of wetlands and riparian areas* (DWAF 2005) wetlands must have one or more of the following attributes:

- Wetland (hydromorphic) soils that display characteristics resulting from prolonged saturation
- The presence, at least occasionally, of water loving plants (hydrophytes)
- A high water table that results in saturation at or near the surface, leading to anaerobic conditions developing in the top 50cm of the soil

Wetlands, according to the definition of DWAF (2005) are at the interface of aquatic systems and the terrestrial environment. As such the characteristics of the surface water or near surface water in space and time at this interface between the terrestrial and aquatic environment are fundamental to understand the functioning of a particular wetland. At the higher elevations of South Africa surface water at wetlands are characterised by considerable contrasts between seasons and periodic precipitation events. Generally accepted definitions of wetlands which focus on the wetland attributes of soil and vegetation are therefore useful because of its consistency despite seasonal fluctuations.

The Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa (Ollis *et al.*, 2013) includes wetland ecosystems defined by the National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998) as well as those "wetland sytems" defined by the Ramsar Convention. The broader definition of wetlands, according to the Ramsar Convention is that wetlands are areas of marsh, fen, peatland or water, whether natural or artificial, permanent or temporary, with water that is static or flowing, fresh, brackish or salt, including areas of marine water to the depth of which at low

tide does not exceed six metres (cited by Ramsar Convention Secretariat 2011). This Ramsar definition of "wetlands" overlaps broadly with the definition of aquatic systems according to the South African system of classifying wetlands and other aquatic ecosystems. In South Africa an aquatic ecosystem is an ecosystem that is permanently or periodically inundated by flowing or standing water, or which has soils that are permanently or periodically saturated within 0.5 m of the soil surface (Ollis *et al*., 2013). Therefore an important consideration of the Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa (Ollis *et al*., 2013) is that a wetland (narrow definition according to water act and not Ramsar definition) is taken to be a unique type of aquatic system.

1.2 Importance of wetlands

The importance of wetlands for human well-being and the conservation of biodiversity are recognised world-wide. Ecosystem services which directly or indirectly benefit human well-being are of particular importance when wetlands are considered. Wetlands play a major role to enhance supporting services such as nutrient cycling and primary production, which in turn is the basis for other ecosystem services. Wetlands are very important to regulating services such as maintaining water flow and water quality by processing water and regulating water run-off, provisioning services such as providing freshwater, cultural services such as appreciating the landscape and biodiversity. Overall wetlands play a major role in the sustainability of land use from socio-economic and biodiversity conservation perspectives. The setting and function of wetlands at each site should therefore be evaluated to inform land use management.

Wetland vegetation is of significant importance for wetlands to play a role in valuable ecosystem services. Vegetation plays an important role in natural wetland ecosystems. It holds soil together and slows down the flow of water, reducing the risk of erosion and promoting sediment deposition. Plants are the source of organic material in wetland soils, and form the organic soil in peat wetlands. Vegetation also has an impact on the quality of surface and subsurface water as it (1) provides organic soil matter required by microbes in order to assimilate nutrients and toxicants (2) provides habitat for the microbes in the soil immediately surrounding the roots, and (3) contributes through direct uptake of nutrients and toxicants and incorporation of these into plant tissues (Sieben *et al.* 2009).

1.3 Aims and objectives of the survey

A survey to investigate key elements of habitats on the site, relevant to the conservation of wetlands is conducted. The importance and significance of the site with special emphasis on the current status of biodiversity and ecological services of the wetland are evaluated. Literature investigations are integrated with field observations to identify potential ecological impacts that could occur as a result of the development and to make recommendations to reduce or minimise impacts, should the development be approved.

The objectives of the wetland habitat assessment are to provide:

- An indication of the existence of wetlands at the site and if so:
- An identification of major aspects of the hydro-geomorphic setting and terrain unit at which the wetland occur;
- An estimate of the size and roughness of the wetland
- An indication of the hydric soils at the site;
- An indication of erodability;
- An indication of the presence or absence of peat at the site;
- An outline of hydrological drivers that support the existence and character of the wetland;
- An assessment of the possible presence or absence of threatened or localised plant species, vertebrates and invertebrates of the region, at the site;
- A description of the functions provided by the wetland at the site;
- An interpretation of the priority of the wetland for local communities in the area;
- An interpretation of the priority of the wetland to biodiversity at the site;

2 STUDY AREA

The study area is at the proposed Churchill, 19 km north of Kuruman, South Africa (elsewhere referred to as the site). Site is part of the Savanna Biome which is represented by the Kuruman Thornveld vegetation type at the central and eastern parts of the site as well as the Kuruman Vaalbosveld at the eastern parts of the site (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).

To serve as local context for the landscape and vegetation at the site an outline of the Kuruman Vaalbosveld and Kuruman Thornveld from Mucina and Rutherford (2006) follows.

SVk 8 Kuruman Vaalbosveld

Distribution: North-West and Northern Cape Provinces. East of Kuruman to Lykso, south of Bendell towards Good Hope. Altitude: 1300-1500 m.

Vegetation and landscape features: Open tree layer characterised by *Acacia erioloba, Acacia karroo, Searsia lancea* and *Ziziphus mucronata*. Shrub layer poorly developed, with *Grewia flava* and *Tarchonanthus camphoratus* and grass layer open, with much bare soil in places.

Geology and soils: Carbonates and chert of the Vaalian Griqualand West Supergroup and Kalahari sediments from flat, rocky sandy plains with shallow (0.1-0.6 m) red aeolian sands, stony and underlain by rock. Dominant land types Ae and Fc, with Hutton, Clovely and Mispah soil forms common.

Climate: Summer and autumn rainfall with very dry winters. Mean annual precipitation about 350-450 mm. Frost very frequent in winter.

Important taxa: Tall Tree: *Acacia erioloba.* Small Trees: *Acacia karroo, Ziziphus mucronata, Searsia lancea.* Tall Shrubs: *Tarchonanthus camphoratus, Cadaba aphylla, Diospyros austro-africana, Diospyros lycioides* subsp. *lycioides, Grewia flava, Gymnosporia buxifolia.* Low Shrubs: *Amphiglossa triflora, Anthospermum rigidum* subsp. *pumilum, Anthospermum rigidum* subsp. *rigidum, Helichrysum zeyheri.* Geoxylic Suffrutex: *Elephantorrhiza elephantina.* Succulent Shrub*: Ebracteola wilmaniae.* Herbaceous Climber: *Rhynchosia holosericea.* Graminoids: *Anthephora pubescens, Aristida meridionalis, Eragrostis lehmanniana, Stipagrostis uniplumis, Aristida stipitata* subsp. *spicata, Cymbopogon caesius, Digitaria eriantha* subsp. *eriantha, Fingerhuthia africana, Pogonarthria squarrosa, Schmidtia pappophoroides, Themeda triandra, Tragus koelerioides.* Herbs: *Acrotome inflata, Dicoma schinzi, Geigeria ornativa, Heliotropium strigosum, Stachys spathulata, Tripteris aghillana.*

SVk 9 Kuruman Thornveld

Distribution: In South Africa the Kuruman Thornveld is found at the North West and Northern Cape Provinces. Kuruman Thornveld occurs on the flats from the vicinity of Postmasburg and Danielskuil (here west of the Kuruman Hills) in the south extending via Kuruman to Tsineng and Dewar in the north. Altitude is 1100 – 1500 m (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Vegetation and landscape features: Flat rocky plains and some sloping hills with very well-developed, closed shrub layer and well-developed open tree stratum consisting of *Acacia erioloba* (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Geology and soils: Some Campbell Group dolomite and chert and mostly younger, superficial Kalahari Group sediments, with red wind-blown (0.3 – 1.2 m deep) sand. Locally, rocky pavements are formed in places. Most important land types Ae, Ai, Ag and Ah, with Hutton soil form (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Climate: Summer and autumn rainfall with very dry winters. Mean annual precipitation (MAP) about 300-450 mm. Frost frequent in winter (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Important taxa: Tall tree: *Acacia erioloba*. Small trees: *Acacia mellifera* subsp. *detinens*, *Boscia albitrunca*. Tall Shrubs: *Grewia flava, Lycium hirsitum, Tarchonanthus camphoratus, Gymnosporia buxifolia*. Low Shrubs: *Acacia hebeclada* subsp. *hebeclada. Monechma divaricatum, Gnidia polycephala, Helichrysum zeyheri, Hermannia comosa, Pentzia calcarea, Plinthus sericeus.* Geoxylic Suffrutex: *Elephantorrhiza elephantina*. Graminoids: *Aristida meridionalis, Aristida stipitata* subsp. *stipitata, Eragrostis lehmanniana, Eragrostis echinochloidea, Melinis repens.* Herbs: *Dicoma schinzii, Gisekia africana, Harpagophytum procumbens* subsp. *procumbens, Indigofera daleoides, Limeum fenestratum, Nolletia ciliaris, Seddera capensis, Tripteris aghillana, Vahlia capensis* subsp. *vulgaris*.

Note: Though some plant species of the above listed vegetation type are present at the site, not necessarily all of the plant species listed above are present at the site.

Figure 1 Map with indication of the location of the site.

Map information were analysed and depicted on Google images with the aid of Google Earth Pro (US Dept. of State Geographer, MapLink/ Tele Atlas, Google, 2020).

3 METHODS

A desktop study comprised not only an initial phase, but also it was used throughout the study to accommodate and integrate all the data that become available during the field observations.

A survey consisted of visits by R.F. Terblanche during November 2019 to note key elements of habitats on the site and surrounding areas, relevant to the conservation of wetlands and riparian zones.

Classification of any inland wetland systems that could be present at the site is according to the Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa (Ollis *et al*., 2013). One of the major advantages of the Classification System for South Africa (Ollis *et al*., 2013) is that the functional aspects of wetlands are the focal point of the classification. Wetlands are very dynamic systems and their functionality weighs high against the often rapid changes in their appearance, as could be seen from wetland butterfly studies (Terblanche *In prep*). In this document the main guideline for the delineation and identification of wetlands where present is the practical field procedure for identification and delineation of wetlands by DWAF (2005).

The following sections highlight the materials and methods applicable to different aspects that were observed.

3.1 Classification of wetlands (SANBI: Ollis *et al*., 2013)

3.1.1 System, regional setting and landscape unit (Levels 1, 2 and 3)

Three broad types of Inlands Systems are dealt with in the Classification System namely rivers, open waterbodies and wetlands. These Inland Systems are then classified according to a six-tiered structure that includes six levels.

At the systems level (Level 1) of wetland classification, a distinction is made between Marine, Estuarine and Inland ecosystems using the level of connectivity to the open ocean as discriminator of the biophysical character of each (Ollis *et al*., 2013). Inland wetland systems are aquatic ecosystems with no no existing connection to the ocean (i.e. characterised by the complete absence of marine exchange and/ or tidal influence (Ollis *et al*., 2013). In this case if any wetland is present it obviously qualifies as an Inland wetland system.

At Level 2 the regional setting is a spatial framework that is preferred by the investigator to allow for gaining an understanding of the broad ecological context within which an aquatic system occurs (Ollis *et al*., 2013). A regional setting can be identified according to the DWA ecoregion classification of Kleynhans *et al.* (2005).

A distinction is made between four landscape units at Level 3 of the Classification System for Inland Systems on the basis of the landscape setting (i.e. topographical position) (Ollis *et al*., 2013). Four landscape units are recognized: slope, valley floor, plain and bench.

3.1.2 Hydrogeomorphic units (Level 4)

Seven primary hydrogeomorphic (HGM) units are recognised for Inland Systems at Level 4A of the Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa, on the basis of hydrology and geomorphology (Ollis *et al*., 2013). These are a River, Channeled valley-bottom wetland, Unchannelled valley-bottom wetland, Floodplain wetland, Depression, Seep and Wetland flat.

3.1.3 Hydrological regime (Level 5)

While the hydrogeomorphic unit (HGM) is influenced by the source of water and how it moves into, through and out of an Inland System, the hydrological regime (as catergorised by the Classification System) describes the behaviour fo the water within the system and, for wetlands, in the underlying soil (Ollis *et al.,* 2013). Together with the hydrogeomorphology the hydrological regime are used to describe the wetland as a functional unit (Ollis *et al*., 2013). In the case of Inland wetlands which are classified as rivers, perenniality is an important characteristic to describe the hydrological regime. For Inland Systems other than rivers, five categories relating to the frequency and duration of inundation have been provided: Permanently inundated, Seasonally inundated, Intermittently inundated, Never inundated/ rarely inundated and unknown (Ollis *et al*., 2013). Period of saturation within the upper 0.5 m of the soil is a very important discriminator that also links to the wetland delineation system of DWAF (2005). The following categories for saturation of wetland soils are recognised: Permanently saturated, Seasonally saturated, Intermittently saturated and unknown. These categories of period of saturation correspond to the permanent, seasonal and temporary zones of wetlands respectively.

3.1.4 Wetland descriptors (Level 6)

At Level 6 several “descriptors” are included for the structural/ chemical/ biological characterisation of Inland Systems (Ollis *et al.,* 2013). These descriptors are non-hierarchical to one another and can be applied in any order depending on the purpose of a study and the availability of information. Descriptors include natural vs. artificial, salinity, substratum type, pH, geology and vegetation cover (Ollis *et al*., 2013). Various definitions are given for the descriptors which are likely to increase the consistency and use of the system.

3.2 Delineation of wetland

Together with terrain unit, indirect indicators of prolonged saturation by water: wetland plants (hydrophytes) and wetland (hydromorphic) soils are identified and used to delineate the wetland (DWAF 2005). Three zones, which may not all three be present in all wetlands, namely the permanent zone of wetness, the seasonal zone and the temporary zone are identified. The temporary zone is the outer zone and is saturated for only a short period of the year that is sufficient, under normal circumstances, for the formation of hydromorphic soils and the growth of wetland vegetation (DWAF 2005). Hydromorphic soils must display signs of wetness within 50cm of the soil to qualify as wetland soil that can support hydrophytic vegetation. Grid references and altitudes are taken on site with a GPS Garmin E-trex 20 ® instrument. Map information are analysed and depicted on Google images with the aid of Google Earth Pro (US Dept. of State Geographer, MapLink/ Tele Atlas, Google, 2012).

3.3 Vegetation at and near wetland

Though vegetation is a key component of the wetland definition in the Water Act, using vegetation as a primary indicator requires undisturbed conditions and expert knowledge (DWAF 2005). Modern wetland classification systems in South Africa therefore place more emphasis on the soil wetness indicators. It remains however, that plant assemblages undergo distinct changes in species composition from the centre of a wetland to the edge, and into adjacent terrestrial areas (DWAF 2005). This change in species composition of vegetation provides valuable clues for determining the wetland boundary and wetness zones (DWAF 2005).

Apart from botanical aspects which are integrated into the description of a wetland it is imperative to note the existence or not of threatened plant species or other plant species of conservation concern, such as near-threatened, data deficient or declining species at a wetland. Floristic composition is therefore also considered during the wetland assessment. Voucher specimens of plant species are only taken where the taxonomy is in doubt or where the plant specimens are of significant relevance for invertebrate conservation. Field guides such as those by Germishuizen (2003), Manning (2003), Manning (2009), Van Oudtshoorn (1999), Van Wyk (2000), Van Wyk & Malan (1998) and Van Wyk & Van Wyk (1997) were used to confirm the taxonomy of the species. Works on specific plant groups (often genera) such as those by Goldblatt (1986), Goldblatt & Manning (1998), Jacobsen (1983), McMurtry, Grobler, Grobler & Burns (2008), Smit (2008), Van Jaarsveld (2006) and Van Wyk & Smith (2003) were also consulted to confirm the identification of species. An important source of identifications of plant species for the wetland survey is Van Ginkel, Glen, Gordon-Gray, Cilliers, Muasya & Van Deventer (2011). In this case no plant specimens were needed to be collected as voucher specimens or to be send to a herbarium for identification. For the most recent treatise of scientific plant names and broad distributions, Germishuizen, Meyer & Steenkamp (2006) or Raimondo *et al*. (2009) or updated lists on SANBI websites are followed to compile the lists of species.

3.4 Fauna at and near wetland

Species composition of fauna is not used in wetland characterization and assessments. However, it is important to note species that favour wetlands and especially whether threatened animal species are present at a wetland or not.

Mammals are noted as sight records by day. For the identification of species and observation of diagnostic characteristics Smithers (1986), Skinner & Chimimba (2005), Cillié, Oberprieler and Joubert (2004) and Apps (2000) are consulted. Sites are been walked, covering as many habitats as possible. Signs of the presence of mammal species, such as calls of animals, animal tracks (spoor), burrows, runways, nests and faeces are recorded. Walker (1996), Stuart & Stuart (2000) and Liebenberg (1990) are consulted for additional information and for the identification of spoor and signs. Trapping is only done if necessary. Habitat characteristics are also surveyed to note potential occurrences of mammals. Many mammals can be identified from field sightings but, with a few exceptions bats, rodents and shrews can only be reliably identified in the hand, and even then some species needs examination of skulls, or even chromosomes (Apps, 2000).

Birds are noted as sight records, mainly with the aid of binoculars (10x30). Nearby bird calls of which the observer was sure of the identity were also recorded. For practical skills of noting diagnostic characteristics, the identification of species and observation techniques Ryan (2001) is followed. For information on identification, biogeography and ecology Barnes (2000), Hockey, Dean & Ryan, P.G. (2005), Cillié, Oberprieler & Joubert (2004), Tarboton & Erasmus (1998) and Chittenden (2007) are consulted. Ringing of birds falls beyond the scope of this survey. Sites are walked, covering as many habitats as possible. Signs of the presence of bird species such as spoor and nests are additionally been recorded. Habitat characteristics are surveyed to note potential occurrences of birds.

Reptiles are noted as sight records in the field. Binoculars (10x30) can also be used for identifying reptiles of which some are wary. For practical skills of noting diagnostic characteristics, the identification of species and observation techniques, Branch (1998), Marais (2004), Alexander & Marais (2007) and Cillié, Oberprieler and Joubert (2004) are followed. Sites are walked, covering as many habitats as possible. Smaller reptiles are sometimes collected for identification, but this practice was not necessary in the case of this study. Habitat characteristics are surveyed to note potential occurrences of reptiles.

Frogs and toads are noted as sight records in the field or by their calls. For practical skills of noting diagnostic characteristics, the identification of species and observation techniques Carruthers (2001), Du Preez (1996), Conradie, Du Preez, Smith & Weldon (2006) and the recent complete guide by Du Preez & Carruthers (2009) are consulted. CD's with frog calls by Carruthers (2001) and Du Preez & Carruthers (2009) are used to identify species by their calls when applicable. Sites are walked, covering as many habitats as possible. Smaller frogs are often

collected by pitfall traps put out for epigeal invertebrates (on the soil), but this practice falls beyond the scope of this survey. Habitat characteristics are also surveyed to note potential occurrences of amphibians.

Invertebrates of which enough information is available to be integrated into an assessment, such as butterflies, are recorded as sight records, photographic records or voucher specimens. Voucher specimens are mostly taken of those species of which the taxa warrant collecting due to taxonomic difficulties or in the cases where species can look similar in the veldt. Many butterflies use only one species or a limited number of plant species as host plants for their larvae. Myrmecophilous (ant-loving) butterflies such as the *Aloeides*, *Chrysoritis*, *Erikssonia, Lepidochrysops* and *Orachrysops* species (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae), which live in association with a specific ant species, require a unique ecosystem for their survival (Deutschländer & Bredenkamp, 1999; Terblanche, Morghental & Cilliers, 2003; Edge, Cilliers & Terblanche, 2008; Gardiner & Terblanche, 2010). Known food plants of butterflies are therefore also recorded. Other invertebrate groups such as fruit chafer beetles and mygalomorph spiders are also investigated where relevant.

3.5 Present Ecological Status

Ecological status of wetlands are based on models such as the modified Habitat Integrity approach developed by Kleynhans (1996, 1999). Present ecological status PES methodology is then largely based on criteria for assessing the habitat integrity of floodplain wetlands and notes for allocating a score to attributes and rating the confidence level associated with each score (DWAF 1999). Such criteria are selected on the assumption that anthropogenic modification can generally be regarded as the primary causes of degradation of the ecological integrity of a wetland (see DWAF 1999). This is done by using Table W4-1 given by DWAF (1999):

- Score each attribute according to the guidelines provided in the footnote.
- Calculate a mean score for Table W4-1 using the individual scores for all attributes.
- Provide a confidence rating for each score according to the guidelines provided in the footnote to indicate the areas of uncertainty in the determination.

Table W4-2 provides guidelines for the determination of the Present Ecological Status Class (PESC), based on the mean score determined for Table W4-1. If any of the attributes scores < 2 (i.e., it is considered to be seriously or critically modified) this score and not the mean should be taken into consideration. This approach is based on the assumption that extensive degradation of any of the wetland attributes may determine the Present Ecological Status Category (PESC). In any case, the mean on which the assessment of the PESC is based should be regarded as a guideline and should also be tested against the opinion of local experts (DWAF 1999).

Biological integrity is not directly estimated through this approach though in some systems or parts of systems, information on biological integrity is available. In such cases, the information on biological integrity can be used as a

check of the PES Category determination. The mean is used to relate the ecological state of the wetland to a particular PES Category (Table W4-2) (DWAF 1999).

3.6 Ecological Importance and Sensitivity

The assessment of the ecological importance and sensitivity is according to DWAF (1999) which in turn is adapted from Kleynhans (1996) and Kelynhans (1999). "Ecological importance" of a water resource is an expression of its importance to the maintenance of ecological diversity and functioning on local and wider scales. "Ecological sensitivity" refers to the system's ability to resist disturbance and its capability to recover from disturbance once it has occurred. The Ecological Importance and sensitivity (EIS) provides a guideline for determination of the Ecological Management Class (EMC) DWAF (1999).

In the method outlined here, a series of determinants for EIS according to Table W5-1 of DWAF (1999) are assessed on a scale of 0 to 4, where 0 indicates no importance and 4 indicates very high importance. The method is used as a guideline for the professional judgement of individuals familiar with an area and its wetlands. The assessors must substantiate and document their judgement as far as possible for future reference and revision (DWAF 1999).

3.7 Limitations

Wetlands or riparian zones are very dynamic systems and owing to time constraints a glimpse of conditions at wetlands are taken, even though the hydrogeomorphological setting, soil wetness characteristics and established vegetation constitute some longer term features of a wetland. For each site visited, it should then be emphasized that surveys can by no means cover all longer terms flucations and can also not result in an exhaustive list of wetland plants and animals present on the site, because of the time constraint. A desktop study comprised not only an initial phase, but also it was used throughout the study to accommodate and integrate all the data that become available during the field observations.

The survey at the site was conducted during November 2019 to note key elements of habitats on the site, relevant to the conservation of wetlands and riparian areas. The focus of the survey remains a habitat survey that concentrates on the hydrogeomorphological, hydrological and additional descriptors to classify and assess wetlands where present and to assess for the likelihood of occurrence or not of any wetland fauna and flora of particular conservation concern.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Assessment of presence of wetlands and active channels at the site

Photo 1 View of small wetland depression, Pan 1, at site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.

Photo 2 Encroachment by terrestrial plant species such as the alien invasive *Opuntia ficus-indica* at the wetland depression, Pan 1, at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche

Photo 3 Indigenous and widespread sedge, Scirpoides dioecus, at the wetland depression, Pan 1, at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.

Photo 4 Soil at wetland soil at Pan 1 at the site. Some calcrete is found among soil at the wetland at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche

Photo 5 Poorly defined non-perennial streambed with indistinctive riparian zone at northeastern part of site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.

Photo 6 Culvert at boundary of the site where poorly defined non-perrenial streambed with indistinctive riparian zone runs through.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Figure 2 Indications of important aspects relevant to watercourses at the site.

	Light blue outline and shading	Wetlands at the site
	Blue outline and shading	Artificial waterbodies (with groundwalls; dams)

Figure 3 Indication of wetland depression, Pan 1, as well as two poorly defined narrow non-perennial streambeds with rather indistinctive riparian zones at the northeastern part and the central-eastern part of the site respectively.

Light blue outline and shading	Wetlands at the site
Blue outline and shading	Poorly defined non-perennial streambeds (rivers)
Light Orange outline	Outer edge of buffer zones



Figure 4 Indication of wetland depression, Pan 1 at the site.

Light blue outline and shading	Wetlands at the site
Light Orange outline	Outer edge of buffer zone

4.1 Assessment of presence of wetlands or rivers at the site

A wetland depression, **Pan 1**, occurs at the eastern part of the site (Figures 2-4). Two poorly defined narrow non-perennial streambeds with indistinctive riparian zones are found at the northeastern part and the central-eastern part of the site respectively (Figures 2-3).

4.1.1 Presence of poorly defined drainage lines at the site

Two poorly defined narrow non-perennial streambeds with indistinctive riparian zones are found at the northeastern part and the central-eastern part of the site respectively.

4.1.2 Assessment and classification of wetland depression, Pan 1, at the site

A small wetland depression (ephemeral pan), **Pan 1**, with a surface area of approximately 0,32 ha is found at the eastern part of the site (Table 4.1).

Typical wetland plant species are sparse at a small pan (wetland depression) at the site. The grass species *Cynodon dactylon* (Couch Grass) and the sedge *Scirpoides dioecus* are found at the pan at the site. Encroachment by terrestrial plant species such as the exotic *Opuntia ficus-indica* and *Vachellia hebeclada* subsp. *hebeclada* occurs at the pan (wetland depression). The small depression is endorheic, where the water that flows in during rainfall events mostly leaves through evapotranspiration and infiltration in a low rainfall area (Mean Annual Precipitation < 500 mm).

Present ecological status (PES) of the Pan 1 at the site is CATEGORY C which means the wetland depression is moderately modified, but with some loss of natural habitats (Table 4.2 and Table 4.3). Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) of Pan 1 at the site is Category C which is Moderate and refers to floodplains that are considered to be ecologically important and sensitive on a provincial or local scale. The biodiversity of these floodplains is not usually sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play a small role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers (Table 4.4 and Table 4.5).

Table 4.1 Classification and outline of characteristics of wetland depression **Pan 1** at the site according to the Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa (Ollis *et al.*, 2013).

CHARACTERISTIC TYPE WETLAND DISCRIMINATORS AND DESCRIPTORS	**DESCRIPTION**
System (level 1)	Inland wetland
Regional setting (level 2)	Southern Kalahari Ecoregion (Kleynhans *et al.* 2005)
Landscape unit (level 3)	Plain
Hydrogeomorphic unit (level 4)	Depression
Hydrological regime (Level 5)	Wetland occurs at plain on gentle slopes. Conspicuous inlet or outlet could not noticeable. This depression is probably endorheic, so that water that flows in during rainfall events probably leaves mostly through evaporation and infiltration.
Additional descriptors (Levels 5,6)	Greyish brown soils with some calcrete content are present in at the wetland. Typical wetland plant species are sparse at a small pan (wetland depression) at the site. Megagraminoids are absent. The grass species *Cynodon dactylon* (Couch Grass) and the sedge *Scirpoides dioecus* are found at the pan at the site. Encroachment by terrestrial plant species such as the exotic *Opuntia ficus-indica* and *Vachellia hebeclada* subsp. *hebeclada* occurs at the pan (wetland depression).

Table 4.2 Scoresheet with criteria for assessing habitat integrity of the wetland depression **Pan 1** at the site to DWAF (1999) such as adapted from Kleynhans (1996).

Criteria and attributes	**Relevance**	**Score**	**Confidence**
Hydrologic			
Flow modification	Consequence of abstraction, regulation by impoundments or increased runoff from human settlements or agricultural land. Changes in flow regime (timing, duration, frequency), volumes, velocity which affect inundation of wetland habitats resulting in floristic changes or incorrect cues to biota. Abstraction of groundwater flows to the wetland.	3	4
Permanent inundation	Consequence of impoundment resulting in destruction of natural wetland habitat and cues for wetland biota.	3	4
Water Quality			
Water quality modification	From point or diffuse sources. Measure directly by laboratory analysis or assessed indirectly from upstream agricultural activities, human settlements and industrial activities. Aggravated by volumetric decrease in flow delivered to the wetland.	3	3
Sediment load modification	Consequence of reduction due to entrapment by impoundments or increase due to land use practices such as overgrazing. Cause of unnatural rates of erosion, accretion or infilling of wetlands and change in habitats.	2	3
Hydraulic/Geomorphic			
Canalisation	Results in desiccation or changes to inundation patterns of wetland and thus changes in habitats. River diversions or drainage.	4	4
Topographic alteration	Consequence of infilling, ploughing, dykes, trampling, bridges, roads, railway lines and other substrate disruptive activities which reduce or change wetland habitat directly or through changes in inundation patterns.	3	4
Biota			
Terrestrial encroachment	Consequence of desiccation of wetland and encroachment of terrestrial plant species due to changes in hydrology or geomorphology. Change from wetland to terrestrial habitat and loss of wetland functions.	2	4
Indigenous vegetation removal	Direct destruction of habitat through farming activities, grazing or firewood collection affecting wildlife habitat and flow attenuation functions, organic matter inputs and increases potential for erosion.	2	4
Invasive plant encroachment	Affect habitat characteristics through changes in community structure and water quality changes (oxygen reduction and shading).	3	4
Alien fauna	Presence of alien fauna affecting faunal community structure.	3	4
Overutilisation of biota	Overgrazing, over-fishing etc.	2	4
TOTAL **MEAN**		**30** **x=2.7**	42 x=3.8

Scoring guidelines per attribute:
natural, unmodified = 5; Largely natural = 4, Moderately modified = 3; largely modified = 2;
seriously modified = 1; Critically modified = 0.
Relative confidence of score:
Very high confidence = 4; High confidence = 3; Moderate confidence = 2; Marginal/low confidence = 1.

Table 4.3 Interpretation of scores for determining present ecological status **(PES)** of the wetland depression **Pan 1** at the site according to DWAF (1999) such as adapted from Kleynhans (1999). Present ecological status of the wetland is indicated in blue font.

Interpretation of Mean* of Scores for all Attributes: Rating of Present Ecological Status Category (PES Category)
WITHIN GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE RANGE
CATEGORY A >4; Unmodified, or approximates natural condition.
CATEGORY B >3 and <=4; Largely natural with few modifications, but with some loss of natural habitats.
CATEGORY C **>2 and <=3; moderately modified, but with some loss of natural habitats.**
CATEGORY D =2; largely modified. A large loss of natural habitats and basic ecosystem functions has occurred.
OUTSIDE GENERAL ACCEPTABLE RANGE
CATEGORY E >0 and <2; seriously modified. The losses of natural habitats and basic ecosystem functions are extensive.
CATEGORY F 0; critically modified. Modifications have reached a critical level and the system has been modified completely with an almost complete loss of natural habitat.

* If any of the attributes are rated <2, then the lowest rating for the attribute should be taken as indicative of the PES category and not the mean.

Table 4.4 Score sheet for determining ecological importance and sensitivity for floodplains at wetland depression **Pan 1** (DWAF 1999, adapted from Kleynhans 1996, 1999).

Determinant	Score	Confidence
PRIMARY DETERMINANTS		
1. Rare & Endangered Species	0	3
2. Populations of Unique Species	0	3
3. Species/taxon Richness	1	3
4. Diversity of Habitat Types or Features	1	3
5. Migration route/breeding and feeding site for wetland species	2	3
6. Sensitivity to Changes in the Natural Hydrological Regime	2	3
7. Sensitivity to Water Quality Changes	2	3
8. Flood Storage, Energy Dissipation & Particulate/Element Removal	1	3
MODIFYING DETERMINANTS		
9. Protected Status	0	4
10. Ecological Integrity	2	4
TOTAL	**11**	32
MEAN	**1.1**	3.2

Score guideline Very high = 4; High = 3, Moderate = 2; Marginal/Low = 1; None = 0
Confidence rating Very high confidence = 4; High confidence = 3; Moderate confidence = 2; Marginal/low confidence = 1

Table 4.5 Ecological importance and sensitivity categories. Interpretation of median scores for biotic and habitat determinants (DWAF 1999, adapted from Kleynhans 1996, 1999). Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) of wetland depression **Pan 1** at the site is indicated in blue font.

Ecological Importance and Sensitivity Category (EIS)	Range of Median	Recommended Ecological Management Class
Very high Floodplains that are considered ecologically important and sensitive on a national or even international level. The biodiversity of these floodplains is usually very sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play a major role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers.	>3 and <=4	A
High Floodplains that are considered to be ecologically important and sensitive. The biodiversity of these floodplains may be sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play a role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers.	>2 and <=3	B
Moderate **Floodplains that are considered to be ecologically important and sensitive on a provincial or local scale. The biodiversity of these floodplains is not usually sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play a small role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers.**	**>1 and <=2**	**C**
Low/marginal Floodplains which are not ecologically important and sensitive at any scale. The biodiversity of these floodplains is ubiquitous and not sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play an insignificant role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers.	>0 and <=1	D

5 RISKS, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

The following potential risks, impacts and mitigation measures apply to the proposed development:

5.1 Identification of potential impacts and risks

The potential impacts identified are:

Construction Phase

- Potential impact 1: Loss of wetland/riparian habitat owing to the removal of vegetation at the proposed footprint for development.
- Potential impact 2: Loss of sensitive wetland/riparian species (Threatened, Near-Threatened, Rare, Declining or Protected species) during the construction phase.
- Potential impact 3: Loss of wetland/riparian connectivity and conservation corridor networks in the landscape.
- Potential impact 4: Contamination of wetland/riparian soil during construction in particular by hydrocarbon spills.

Operational Phase

- Potential impact 5: An increased infestation of exotic or alien invasive plant species at wetland/riparian zones owing to disturbances associated with the proposed development.

5.2 Potential impacts and risks during the construction phase

Classes of impacts for this study: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low

Aspect/Activity	Clearance of vegetation at part of the site for the development
Type of Impact (i.e. Impact Status)	Direct
Potential Impact	Clearing of wetland/riparian vegetation at the proposed development.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	Poorly defined active channels (non-perennial streambeds) with indistinctive riparian zones with 10 m buffer zones are excluded from the development. A wetland depression, Pan 1, is excluded from the developments. The outer-edge of the 30 m bufferzone at the wetland depression, Pan 1, should be fenced of during the construction phase with appropriate material as a no-go zone.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	High
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISK	Following the mitigation measures a low risk of impact is expected.

Aspect/Activity	Removal of sensitive species
Type of Impact (i.e. Impact Status)	Direct
Potential Impact	Sensitive species: Loss of Threatened or Near-Threatened Plants, Mammals, Reptiles, Amphibians and Invertebrates at the proposed footprint appears to be unlikely. No threatened wetland/riparian species are anticipated to occur at the site.
Status	Neutral.
Mitigation Required	No mitigation measures specific to sensitive wetland/riparian species apply directly at the site. As a pre-caution and owing to the importance of watercourses, riparian zones and the bufferzones of watercourses at the site as possible movement and dispersal links of threatened species in the larger area, these watercourses and bufferzones are excluded from the developments apart from where road crossings are to be constructed.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISK	A low risk of impact is anticipated if the mitigations relevant to connectivity and biodiversity corridors are upheld.

Aspect/Activity	Fragmentation of corridors of particular conservation concern
Type of Impact (i.e. Impact Status)	Direct
Potential Impact	Wetland and other watercourses at the site are part of corridors of particular conservation concern in the larger area. These wetlands, watercourses and buffer zones could be impacted by the developments.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	Poorly defined active channels (non-perennial streambeds) with indistinctive riparian zones with 10 m buffer zones are excluded from the development. A wetland depression, Pan 1, is excluded from the developments. The outer-edge of the 30 m bufferzone at the wetland depression, Pan 1, should be fenced of during the construction phase with appropriate material as a no-go zone.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	High
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Moderate
RISK	Following mitigation, a moderate impact risk is expected.

Aspect/Activity	Contamination of soil by leaving rubble/ waste or spilling petroleum fuels or any pollutants on soil which could infiltrate the soil
Type of Impact (i.e. Impact Status)	Direct
Potential Impact	Rubble or waste could lead to infiltration of unwanted pollutants into the soil. Spilling of petroleum fuels and unwanted chemicals onto the soils that infiltrate these soils could lead to pollution of soils.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	Rubble or waste that could accompany the construction effort, if the development is approved, should be removed during and after construction. Measures should be taken to avoid any spills and infiltration of petroleum fuels or any chemical pollutants into the soil during construction phase.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISKS	A low risk is expected following mitigation.

5.3 Potential impacts during the operational phase

Aspect/Activity	An increased infestation of exotic or alien invasive plant species owing to clearance or disturbance where the footprint took place.
Type of Impact (i.e. Impact Status)	Direct
Potential Impact	Infestation by alien invasive species could replace indigenous vegetation or potential areas where indigenous vegetation could recover. Once established combatting these alien invasive plant species may become very expensive in the long term.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	Continued monitoring and eradication of alien invasive plant species are imperative.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISKS	Following mitigation, a low risk is anticipated.

5.4 Risk and impact assessment summary for the Construction Phase

Aspect/ Impact Pathway	Nature of Potential Impact/ Risk	Status	Spatial Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Reversibility of Impact	Irreplaceability	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance of Impact and Risk		Confidence Level
										Without Mitigation/ Management	With Mitigation/ Management (Residual Impact/ Risk)	
Clearing of vegetation	Habitat loss, loss of indigenous species	Negative	Part of site	Long-Term	Substantial	Very likely	Low	Low	Poorly defined active channels (non-perennial streambeds) with indistinctive riparian zones with 10 m buffer zones are excluded from the development. A wetland depression, Pan 1, is excluded from the developments. The outer-edge of the 30 m bufferzone at the wetland depression, Pan 1, should be fenced of during the construction phase with appropriate material as a no-go zone.	High	Low	High
Loss of sensitive species	Loss of sensitive species	Negative	Site	Long-Term	Low (No Threatened species anticipated)	Unlikely	Not applicable	Not applicable	No mitigation measures specific to sensitive wetland species apply directly at the site. As a pre-caution and owing to the importance of watercourses at the site as possible movement and dispersal links of threatened species in the larger area, these watercourses and bufferzones are excluded from the developments apart from where road crossings are to be constructed.	Moderate	Low	High

Loss of corridors of particular conservation concern	Fragmentation of landscape and loss of connectivity	Negative	Site	Long-Term	Moderate	Unlikely	Moderate	Moderate	Poorly defined active channels (non-perennial streambeds) with indistinctive riparian zones with 10 m buffer zones are excluded from the development. A wetland depression, Pan 1, is excluded from the developments. The outer-edge of the 30 m bufferzone at the wetland depression, Pan 1, should be fenced of during the construction phase with appropriate material as a no-go zone.	High	Moderate	High
Contamination of soil by spilling pollutants on soil which could infiltrate the soil	Soil contamination	Negative	Site	Long-Term	Moderate	Unlikely	Moderate	Moderate	Rubble and waste removal. Measures that avoid hydrocarbon (petroleum) spills to get into contact with the soil.	Moderate	Low	High

5.5 Risk/ Impact assessment summary for the Operational Phase

Aspect/ Impact Pathway	Nature of Potential Impact/ Risk	Status	Spatial Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Reversibility of Impact	Irreplaceability	Potential Mitigation Measures	Significance of Impact and Risk		Confidence Level
										Without Mitigation/ Management	With Mitigation/ Management (Residual Impact/ Risk)	
Increased infestation of exotic or alien invasive plant species	Loss of habitat quality	Negative	Site	Long-Term	Substantial	Likely	Moderate	Moderate	Monitoring and eradication of alien invasive plant species.	Moderate	Low	High

5.6 Summary of risks and impacts

Two poorly defined narrow non-perennial streambeds with indistinctive riparian zones are found at the northeastern part and the central-eastern part of the site respectively.

The narrow poorly defined non-perennial streambeds should be viewed as important conservation corridors in the larger area. If the development is approved careful planning should take place to conserve the functioning of non-perennial streambeds. The riparian areas are likely to be degraded by overgrazing and are overall largely indistinctive. The scope for large buffer zones at the site is small and probably not practical. A 10 m buffer zone from the outer edge of the active channels are recommended. Proper planning of stormwater as well as the cultivation of indigenous tree species are key to sustainable functioning of the active channels and riparian zones.

A small wetland depression (ephemeral pan), **Pan 1**, with a surface area of approximately 0,32 ha is found at the eastern part of the site (Table 4.1). Typical wetland plant species are sparse at a small pan (wetland depression) at the site. Present ecological status (PES) of the Pan 1 at the site is CATEGORY C which means the wetland depression is moderately modified, but with some loss of natural habitats (Table 4.2 and Table 4.3). Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) of Pan 1 at the site is Category C which is moderate and refers to floodplains that are considered to be ecologically important and sensitive on a provincial or local scale. The biodiversity of these floodplains is not usually sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play a small role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers (Table 4.4 and Table 4.5).

Impacts to the wetland depression, Pan 1, as well as the poordly defined drainage lines at the site are anticipated to comprise a low\ moderate risk. If the development is approved the surface flow and erosion of the wetland are likely to be limited. There is no distinct indication that interflow play of the wetlands would be impacted significantly by the proposed developments. The geomorphological setting and flow regime likely to be similar post development, if the development is approved according to the mitigation measures stated. Loss of any wetland animal or plant species of particular conservation importance are not expected.

A key issue at the site that emerged from the risk and impact assessment is the implementation of efficient control of alien invasive plant species. Following the mitigations which will be upheld and planned footprint for development all the impact risks listed above are moderate or low.

6 CONCLUSION

- Two poorly defined narrow non-perennial streambeds with indistinctive riparian zones are found at the northeastern part and the central-eastern part of the site respectively.
- A small wetland depression (ephemeral pan), Pan 1, with a surface area of approximately 0,32 ha is found at the eastern part of the site (Table 4.1).
- Typical wetland plant species are sparse at the small Pan 1 (wetland depression) at the site. The grass species *Cynodon dactylon* (Couch Grass) and the sedge *Scirpoides dioecus* are found at the pan at the site. Encroachment by terrestrial plant species such as the exotic *Opuntia ficus-indica* and *Vachellia hebeclada* subsp. *hebeclada* occurs at the pan (wetland depression). The small depression is endorheic, where the water that flows in during rainfall events mostly leaves through evapotranspiration and infiltration in a low rainfall area (Mean Annual Precipitation < 500 mm).
- Present ecological status (PES) of the Pan 1 at the site is CATEGORY C which means the wetland depression is moderately modified, but with some loss of natural habitats (Table 4.2 and Table 4.3). Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) of Pan 1 at the site is CATEGORY C which is Moderate and refers to floodplains that are considered to be ecologically important and sensitive on a provincial or local scale. The biodiversity of these floodplains is not usually sensitive to flow and habitat modifications. They play a small role in moderating the quantity and quality of water of major rivers (Table 4.4 and Table 4.5).
- Site is situated at the Lower Vaal Water Management Area (WMA 10). Site falls outside any FEPA (Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area) (Nel et al., 2011a, 2011b). The site is part of an Upstream Management Area which are sub-quaternary catchments in which human activities need to be managed to prevent degradation of downstream river FEPAs and Fish Support Areas.
- The narrow poorly defined non-perennial streambeds should be viewed as important conservation corridors in the larger area. If the development is approved careful planning should take place to conserve the functioning of non-perennial streambeds. The riparian areas are likely to be degraded by overgrazing and are overall largely indistinctive. The scope for large buffer zones at the site is small and probably not practical. A 10 m buffer zone from the outer edge of the active channels are recommended. Proper planning of stormwater as well as the cultivation of indigenous tree species are key to sustainable functioning of the active channels and riparian zones.
- The small Pan 1, a wetland depression, at the site is part of a stepping stone corridor system of conservation importance. Pan 1, is excluded from the developments. The outer-edge of the 30 m bufferzone at the wetland depression, Pan 1, should be fenced of during the construction phase with appropriate material as a no-go zone.

- Impacts to the wetland depression, Pan 1, as well as the poordly defined drainage lines at the site are anticipated to comprise a low\ moderate risk. If the development is approved the surface flow and erosion of the wetland are likely to be limited. There is no distinct indication that interflow play of the wetlands would be impacted significantly by the proposed developments. The geomorphological setting and flow regime likely to be similar post development, if the development is approved according to the mitigation measures stated. Loss of any wetland animal or plant species of particular conservation importance are not expected.
- A key issue at the site that emerged from the risk and impact assessment is the implementation of efficient control of alien invasive plant species. Following the mitigations which will be upheld and planned footprint for development all the impact risks listed above are moderate or low.

7 REFERENCES

Alexander, G. & Marais, J. 2007. A guide to the reptiles of Southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Anderson, M.D. & Anderson, T.A. 2001. Too much, too quickly? Doubts about the sustainability of the camelthorn wood harvest. African Wildlife 55(3): 21-23.

Apps, P. 2012. Smithers' mammals of Southern Africa 4th ed: A field guide, revised and updated by Peter Apps. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Armstrong, A.J. 1991. On the biology of the marsh owl, and some comparisons with the grass owl. Honeyguide 37:148-159.

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

Branch, B. 1998. Field guide to snakes and other reptiles of southern Africa. 3rd ed. Struik, Cape Town.

Branch, B. 2008. Tortoises, Terrapins & Turtles of Africa. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Branch, W.R. & Patterson, R.W. 1975. Notes on the ecology of the Giant Girdled Lizard, Cordylus giganteus. Journal of Herpetology 9(4): 364-366.

Branch, W.R., Tolley, K.A., Cunningham, M., Bauer, A.M., Alexander, G., Harrison, J.A., Turner, A.A. & Bates, M.F. eds. 2006. A plan for phylogenetic studies of southern African reptiles: proceedings of a workshop held at Kirstenbosch, February 2006. Biodiversity Series 5. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Bronner, G. 2011. Mammals. In: Picker, M. & Griffiths, C. 2011. Alien & Invasive animals: a South African perspective. Struik Nature, Cape Town, p 22-35.

Bromilow, C. 2010. Problem plants and alien weeds of South Africa. Briza Publications, Pretoria.

Carruthers, V. & Du Preez, 2011. Frogs and froging in southern Africa 2nd ed. Struik, Cape Town.

Cillié, B., Oberprieler, U. & Joubert, C. 2004. Animals of Pilanesberg: an identification guide. Game Parks Publishing, Pretoria.

Coetzee, N. & Monadjem, A. 2008. Mystromys albicaudatus. In: IUCN 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>.

Conradie, W., Du Preez, L.H., Smith, K. & Weldon, C. 2006. Field guide to the frogs and toads of the Vredefort Dome World Heritage Site. School of Environmental Sciences and Development, Potchefstroom.

Court, D. 2010. Succulent Flora of Southern Africa. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Crouch, N.R., Klopper, R.R., Burrows, J.E. & Burrows, S.M. 2011. Ferns of Southern Africa: a comprehensive guide. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Deutschländer, M.S. & Bredenkamp, C.J. 1999. Importance of vegetation analysis in the conservation management of the endangered butterfly Aloeides dentatis subsp. dentatis (Swierstra) (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). Koedoe 42(2): 1-12.

Dippenaar-Schoeman, A.S. 2002. Baboon and trapdoor spiders in southern Africa: an identification manual. Plant Protection Research Institute Handbook No. 13. Agricultural Research Council, Pretoria.

Dippenaar-Schoeman, A.S. & Jocqué, R. 1997. African spiders: an identification manual. Plant Protection Research Institute Handbook No. 9. Agricultural Research Council, Pretoria.

Drinkwater, T.W., Bate, R. & Du Toit, H.A. 1998. A field guide for identification of maize pests in South Africa. Agricultural Research Council: Grain-crops Institute, Potchefstroom.

Du Preez, L.H. 1996. Field guide and key to the frogs and toads of the Free State. Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.

Du Preez, L.H. & Carruthers, V. 2009. A complete guide to the frogs of southern Africa. Struik Nature, Cape Town. CD with calls included.

DWAF (Department of Water Affairs and Forestry). 1997. South African Water Quality Guidelines for Aquatic Ecosystems.

DWAF (Department of Water Affairs and Forestry). 1999. Resource Directed Measures for Protection of Water Resources: Wetland Ecosystems: W4. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, Pretoria.

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

Edge, D.A. 2005. Ecological factors influencing the survival of the Brenton Blue butterfly, Orachrysops niobe (Trimen) (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa (Thesis - D.Phil.).

Edge, D.A., Cilliers, S.S. & Terblanche, R.F. 2008. Vegetation associated with the occurrence of the Brenton blue butterfly. South African Journal of Science 104: 505 - 510.

Ellery, W., Grenfell, M., Grenfell, S., Kotze, D., McCarthy, T., Tooth, S., Grundling, P-L., Beckedahl, H., Le Maitre, D. & Ramsay, L. 2009. WET-origins: controls on the distribution and dynamics of wetlands in South Africa.

Fahrig, L. 2003. Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. Annual review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics, 34: 487 -515.

Gardiner, A.J. & Terblanche, R.F. 2010. Taxonomy, biology, biogeography, evolution and conservation of the genus Erikssonia Trimen (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). African Entomology 18(1): 171 – 191.

Germishuizen, G. 2003. Illustrated guide to the wildflowers of northern South Africa. Briza, Pretoria.

Germishuizen, G., Meyer, N.L. & Steenkamp (eds) 2006. A checklist of South African plants. Southern African Botanical Diversity Network Report No. 41. SABONET, Pretoria.

Goldblatt, P. 1986. The Moraeas of Southern Africa. Annals of Kirstenbosch Botanic Gardens, Volume 14. National Botanic Gardens, Cape Town.

Goldblatt, P. & Manning, J. 1998. Gladiolus in Southern Africa.

Henderson, L. 2001. Alien weeds and alien invasive plants: a complete guide to the declared weeds and invaders in South Africa. Plant Protection Research Institute Handbook No. 12. ARC: Plant Protection Research Institute, Pretoria.

Henderson, L. & Cilliers, C.J. 2002. Invasive aquatic plants: a guide to the identification of the most important and potentially dangerous invasive aquatic and wetland plants in South Africa. Plant Protection Research Handbook No. 16. Agricultural Research Council, Pretoria.

Henning, G.A., Terblanche, R.F. & Ball, J.B. (eds) 2009. South African Red Data Book: butterflies. SANBI Biodiversity Series No 13. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Henning, S.F. & Henning, G.A. 1989. South African Red Data Book: butterflies. South African National Scientific Programmes Report No. 158. CSIR, Pretoria.

Herman, P.P.J. 2002. Revision of the Tarchonanthus camphoratus complex (Asteraceae-Tarchonantheae) in southern Africa. Bothalia 32,1: 21-28.

Hernandez, R.R., Easter, S.B., Murphy-Mariscal, M.L., Maestre, F.T., Tavassoli, M., Allen, E.B., Barrows, C.W., Belnap, J., Ochoa-Hueso, R., Ravi, S. & Allen, M.F. 2014. Environmental impacts of utility-scale Solar Energy. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 29: 766-779.

Hill, C.J. 1995. Conservation corridors and rainforest insects. (In Watt, A.D., Stork, N.E. & Hunter, M.D. (eds.), Forests and Insects. Chapman & Hall, London. p. 381-393.)

Holm, E. & Marais, E. 1992. Fruit chafers of southern Africa. Ekogilde, Hartebeespoort.

IUCN. 2001. IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria: Version 3.1. IUCN Species
Survival Commission. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

IUCN. 2012. IUCN Red list of Threatened Species. Version 2012.1)

Jacobsen, W.B.G. 1983. The ferns and fern allies of Southern Africa. Butterworths, Durban.

Kemper, N.P. 2001. RVI: Riparian Vegetation Index, final report, WRC Report No. 850/3/1.
Institute for Water Research, Pretoria.

Kleynhans, C.J. 1999. A procedure for the determination of the ecological reserve for the purposes of the national water balance model for South African River. Institute of Water Quality Studies, Department of Water Affairs & Forestry, Pretoria.

Kleynhans, C.J., Thirion, C. & Moolman, J. 2005. A level 1 ecoregion classification system for South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Report No. N/0000/00/REQ0104. Resource Quality Services, Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, Pretoria.
Kok, J.C. 1998. Vrystaatse bome, struike en klimplante Kontak-uitgewers, Pretoria.

Kotze, D., Marneweck, G., Batchelor, A., Lindley, D. and Collins, N. 2008. WET-EcoServices: A technique for rapidly assessing ecosystem services supplied by wetlands. Wetland Management Series. Water Research Commission Report TT339/08, Water Research Commission, Pretoria.

Kyalangalilwa, B., Boatwright, J.S., Daru, B.H., Maurin, O. & van der Bank, M. 2013. Phylogenetic position and revised classification of Acacia s.l. (Fabaceae: Mimosoideae) in Africa, including new combinations in Vachellia and Senegalia. Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society 172: 500–523.

Liebenberg, L. 1990. A field guide to the animal tracks of Southern Africa. David Philip Publishers, Cape Town.

Leeming, J. 2003. Scorpions of southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Leroy, A. & Leroy, J. 2003. Spiders of southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Low, A.B. & Rebelo, A.G. (Eds.) 1996. Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Pretoria.

Lubke, R.A., Hoare, D., Victor, J. & Ketelaar, R. 2003. The vegetation of the habitat of the Brenton Blue Butterfly, Orachrysops niobe (Trimen), in the Western Cape, South Africa. South African Journal of Science 99: 201-206.

Manning, J. 2003. Photographic guide to the wild flowers of South Africa. Briza, Pretoria. .

Manning, J. 2009. Field guide to the wild flowers of South Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Marneweck, G.C. & Batchelor, A. 2002. Wetland inventory and classification. In: Ecological and economic evaluation of wetlands in the upper Olifants River catchment. Palmer, R.W., Turpie, J., Marneweck, G.C. and Batchelor, A. (eds). Water Research Commission Report No. 1162/02.

McMurtry, D., Grobler, L., Grobler, J. & Burns, S. 2008. Field guide to the orchids of northern South Africa and Swaziland. Umdaus Press, Hatfield.

Mecenero, S., Ball, J.B., Edge, D.A., Hamer, M.L., Henning, G.A., Krüger, M, Pringle, E.L., Terblanche, R.F. & Williams, M.C. 2013. Conservation Assessment of Butterflies of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland: Red List and Atlas. Saftronics, Johannesburg & Animal Demography Unit, Cape Town.

Minter, L.R., Burger, M., Harrison, J.A., Braack, H.H., Bishop, P.J. & Kloepfer, D. eds. 2004. Atlas and Red Data Book of the Frogs of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SI/MAB series 9, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC.

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

Mucina, L., Rutherford, M.C., and Powrie, L.W. eds. 2005. Vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland, 1:1 000 000 scale sheet maps. Pretoria: South African National Biodiversity Institute.

Nel, J.L., Driver, A., Strydom, W.F., Maherry, A.M., Petersen, C.P., Hill, L., Roux, D.J., Nienaber, S., Van Deventer, H., Swartz, E.R. & Smith-Adao, L.B. 2011. Atlas of Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas in South Africa: Maps to support sustainable development of water resources. WRC Report No. TT 500/11. Water Research Commission, Pretoria.

Nel, J.L., Murray, K.M., Maherry, A.M., Petersen, C.P., Roux, D.J., Driver, A., Hill, L., Van Deventer, H., Funke, N., Swartz, E.R., Smith-Adao, L.B., Mbona, N., Downsborough, L. & Nienaber, S. 2011. Technical Report for the Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas Project. WRC Report No. TT 1801/2/11. Water Research Commission, Pretoria.

Ollis, D.J., Snaddon, C.D., Job, N.M. & Mbona, N. 2013. Classification System for Wetlands and other Aquatic Ecosystems in South Africa. User Manual: Inland Systems. SANBI Biodiversity Series 22. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Pfab, M.F. & Victor, J.E. 2002. Threatened plants of Gauteng, South Africa. South African Journal of Botany (68): 370-375.

Picker, M. & Griffiths, C. 2011. Alien & Invasive animals: a South African perspective. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Picker, M., Griffiths, C. & Weaving, A. 2004. Field guide to insects of South Africa. 2nd ed. Cape Town: Struik.

Pooley, E. 1998. A field guide to wild flowers of KwaZulu-Natal and the eastern region. Natal Flora Publications Trust, Durban.

Pringle, E.L., Henning, G.A. & Ball, J.B. eds. 1994. Pennington's Butterflies of Southern Africa. Struik Winchester, Cape Town.

Pryke, S.R. & Samways, M.J. 2001. Width of grassland linkages for the conservation of butterflies in South African afforested areas. Biological Conservation 101: 85-96.

Pullin, A.S. ed. 1995. Ecology and conservation of butterflies. Chapman & Hall, London.

Rautenbach, I.L. 1982. The mammals of the Transvaal. Ecoplan monograph 1: 1-211.

Retief, E. & Herman, P.P.J. 1997. Plants of the northern provinces of South Africa: keys and diagnostic characteristics. Strelitzia 6. National Botanical Institute, Pretoria.

Rutherford, M.C. & Westfall, R.H. 1994. Biomes of southern Africa: An objective categorisation, 2nd ed. Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa, Vol. 63, pp. 1-94. National Botanical Institute, Pretoria.

Samways, M.J. 2005. Insect diversity conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

SANBI. 2017. Technical guidelines for CBA Maps: Guidelines for developing a map of Critical Biodiversity Areas & Ecological Support Areas using systematic biodiversity planning. First Edition (Beta Version), June 2017. Compiled by Driver, A., Holness, S. & Daniels, F. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria .

Saunders, D.A., Hobbs, R.J. & Margules, C.R. 1991. Biological consequences of ecosystem fragmentation: A review. Conservation Biology 5(1): 18-32.

Shackleton, R.T., le Maitre, D.C., van Wilgen, B.W. & Richardson, D.M. 2015a. The impact of invasive alien Prosopis species (mesquite) on native plants in different environments in South Africa. South African Journal of Botany, 97: 25-31.

Shackleton, R.T., le Maitre, D.C. & Richardson, D.M. 2015b. Stakeholder perceptions and practices regarding Prosopis (mesquite) invasions and management in South Africa. Ambio: A Journal of the Human Environment, 44: 569-581.

Shackleton, R.T., le Maitre, D.C. & Richardson, D.M. 2015c. Prosopis invasions in South Africa: Population structures and impacts on native tree population stability. Journal of Arid Environments, 114: 70 – 78.

Sieben, E.E., Kotze, D.C., Ellery, W.N. & Russell, W.B. 2009. Chapter 6: Using vegetation in wetland rehabilitation. In: Russel, W. 2009. WET-RehabMethods: National guidelines and methods for wetland rehabilitation. WRC Report TT 341/09, Water Research Commission, Pretoria, pp. 54-94.

Skelton, P. 2001. A complete guide to the freshwater fishes of Southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Skelton, P. & Weyl, O. 2011. Fishes. In: Picker, M. & Griffiths, C. 2011. Alien & Invasive animals: a South African perspective. Struik Nature, Cape Town, p 36-44.

Skinner, J.D. & Chimimba, C.T. 2005. The mammals of the southern African subregion. Cambridge University Press, Cape Town.

Sliwa, A. 2008. Felis nigripes. In: IUCN 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.

Smith, G.F., Crouch, N.R. & Figueiredo, E. 2017. Field guide to the Succulents in Southern Africa. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Smithers, R.H.N. 1986. South African Red Data Book: Terrestrial mammals. South African National Scientific Programmes Report No. 125. CSIR, Pretoria.

South Africa. 2004. National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act No. 10 of 2004. Government Printer, Pretoria.

Stuart, C. & Stuart, T. 2006. Field guide to the larger mammals of Africa 3rd ed. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Stuart, C. & Stuart, T. 2013. A field guide to the tracks and signs of Southern, Central and East African wildlife 4th ed. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

Terblanche, R.F. & Edge, D.A. 2007. The first record of an Orachrysops in Gauteng. Metamorphosis 18(4): 131-141.

Terblanche, R.F. 1994. The little hairtail from the Kalahari. Metamorphosis 5(4): 173-174.

Terblanche, R.F., Morgenthal, T.L. & Cilliers, S.S. 2003. The vegetation of three localities of the threatened butterfly species Chrysoritis aureus (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). Koedoe 46(1): 73-90.

Terblanche, R.F. & Taylor, J.C. 2000. Notes on the buttterflies of Witsand – a unique terrestrial island in the Northern Cape Province, South Africa – with special reference to two RED DATA BOOK butterfly species. Metamorphosis 11(3): 122-131.

Terblanche, R.F. & Van Hamburg, H. 2003. The taxonomy, biogeography and conservation of the myrmecophilous Chrysoritis butterflies (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae) in South Africa. Koedoe 46(2): 65-81.

Terblanche, R.F. & Van Hamburg, H. 2004. The application of life history information to the conservation management of Chrysoritis butterflies (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae) in South Africa. Koedoe 47(1): 55-65.

Van Ginkel, C.E., Glen, R.P., Gordon-Gray, K.D., Cilliers, C.J., Muasya, M. & van Deventer, P.P. 2011. Easy identification of some South African Wetland Plants. WRC Report No TT 479/10. Water Research Commission, Gezina.

Van Jaarsveld, E.J. 2006. The Southern African Plectranthus and the art of turning shade to glade.

Van Oudtshoorn, F. 2012. Guide to grasses of southern Africa, 3rd ed. Briza, Pretoria.

Van Wyk, B. 2000. A photographic guide to wild flowers of South Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

Van Wyk, B. & Malan, S. 1998. Field Guide to the Wild Flowers of the Highveld. Struik, Cape Town.

Van Wyk, A.E. & Smith, G.F. 2001. Regions of floristic endemism in Southern Africa: a review with emphasis on succulents, Umdaus Press, Pretoria.

Van Wyk, B.E. & Smith, G.F. 2014. Guide to the aloes of South Africa. 3rd ed. Briza, Pretoria.

Van Wyk, B. & Van Wyk, P. 2013. Field guide to trees of southern Africa 2nd ed. Struik, Cape Town.

Walker, C. 1996. Signs of the Wild. 5th ed. Struik, Cape Town.