

ECOLOGICAL FAUNA AND FLORA HABITAT SURVEY

Area 15 km south of Ottosdal, North West Province



The widespread herbaceous plant species *Gazania krebsiana* at the site.

Photo: Reinier F. Terblanche.

DECEMBER 2022

Compiled by:

Reinier F Terblanche

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

ANTHENE ECOLOGICAL CC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. STUDY AREA	7
3. METHODS	10
4. RESULTS	14
5. DISCUSSION	33
6. RISKS, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION	42
7. CONCLUSION	50
8. REFERENCES	53
9. ANNEXURE 1 LIST OF PLANT SPECIES	62

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. 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, 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.

EXPERIENCE

Lecturer: Zoology 1998-2008	Main subject matter and level	Organization
Lectured subjects	- <u>3rd year level</u> Ecology, Plantparasitology - <u>2nd year level</u> Ethology - <u>Master's degree</u> 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*. Saffronics (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. Saffronics (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: 14 December 2022

1 INTRODUCTION

An ecological habitat survey is required for an area 15 km south of Ottosdal in the North West Province, South Africa (elsewhere referred to as the site). Survey focused on the possibility that threatened fauna or flora known to occur in North West Province are likely to occur within the proposed development or which could have likely occurred at an area which had been developed. Species of known high conservation priority that do not qualify for threatened status also received attention in the survey.

1.1 Objectives of the habitat study

- Surveys to investigate key elements of habitats on the site, relevant to the conservation of fauna and flora.
- Recording of any sightings and/or evidence of existing fauna and flora.
- The selective and careful collecting of voucher specimens of invertebrates where deemed necessary.
- An evaluation of the conservation importance and significance of the site with special emphasis on the current status of threatened species.
- Recording of possible host plants or foodplants of fauna such as butterflies.
- Literature investigation of possible species that might occur on site.
- Integration of the literature investigation and field observations to identify potential ecological impacts that could occur as a result of the development.
- Integration of literature investigation and field observations to make recommendations to reduce or minimise impacts, should the development be approved.

2 STUDY AREA

The study area is approximately 15 km south of Ottosdal in the North West Province, South Africa (elsewhere referred to as the site). Grassland at the site is represented by the Klerksdorp Thornveld (Gh 13) vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006).

Klerksdorp Thornveld (Gh 13)

Distribution: In South Africa the Klerksdorp Thornveld is present in the North West Province in two sets of patches, one in the Wolmaransstad, Ottosdal and Hartbeesfontein region, and the other from the Botsalano Game Park north of Mafikeng in the vicinity of Madibogo in the south. Altitude for the entire vegetation type is 1260 – 1580 m (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).

Vegetation and landscape features: Plains or slightly irregular undulating plains with open to dense *Acacia karroo* bush clumps in dry grasslands (Mucina & Rutherford 2006). Geology and soils: Shale, slate and quartzite of the Pretoria Group with interlaid diabase sills and Hekpoort lava supporting relatively shallow and rocky soils (Glenrosa and Mispah forms). Equally represented are eutrophic red plinthic soils (Hutton form) derived mainly from a thick succession of volcanics and sediments of the Ventersdorp Supergroup (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).

Climate: Warm-temperate, summer-rainfall region, with overall mean annual precipitation of 533 mm. Summer temperatures are high. Frequent frosts occur in winter (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).

Important taxa of the Klerksdorp Thornveld listed by Mucina & Rutherford (2006): Small Trees: *Acacia karroo*, *Acacia caffra*, *Celtis africana*, *Searsia lancea*, *Ziziphus mucronata*. Tall Shrubs: *Acacia hebeclada*, *Diospyros lycioides* subsp. *lycioides*, *Ehretia rigida*, *Grewia flava*, *Gymnosporia buxifolia*, *Searsia pyroides*, *Tarchonanthus camphoratus*. Woody Climber: *Asparagus africanus*. Low Shrubs: *Asparagus laricinus*, *Asparagus suaveolens*, *Felicia muricata*, *Anthospermum hispidulum*, *Anthospermum rigidum* subsp. *pumilum*, *Aptosimum elongatum*, *Gnidia capitata*, *Gomphocarpus fruticosus* subsp. *fruticosus*, *Helichrysum dregeanum*, *Leucas capensis*, *Pavonia burchellii*, *Pentzia globosa*, *Solanum supinum* var. *supinum*, *Triumfetta sonderi*, *Ziziphus zeyheriana*. Graminoids: *Aristida congesta*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Eragrostis lehmanniana*, *Eragrostis trichophora*, *Microcloa caffra*, *Panicum coloratum*, *Sporobolus fimbriatus*, *Themeda triandra*, *Andropogon shirensis*, *Antheophora pubescens*, *Aristida junciformis* subsp. *galpinii*, *Aristida stipitata* subsp. *graciliflora*, *Brachiaria nigropedata*, *Brachiaria serrata*, *Bulbostylis burchellii*, *Cymbopogon pospischilii*, *Digitaria eriantha*, *Diheteropogon amplexans*, *Elionurus muticus*, *Eragrostis curvula*, *Eragrostis obtusa*, *Eragrostis racemosa*, *Eragrostis superba*, *Eustachys paspaloides*, *Heteropogon contortus*, *Setaria sphacelata*,

Sporobolus africanus, *Tragus berteronianus*, *Trichoneura grandiglumis*, *Triraphis andropogonoides*. Herbs: *Acalypha angustata*, *Acanthospermum australe*, *Berkheya onopordifolia* var. *onopordifolia*, *Berkheya setifera*, *Blepharis integrifolia* var. *clarkei*, *Chamaesyce inaequilatera*, *Chascanum adenostachyum*, *Dicoma macrocephala*, *Helichrysum nudifolium* var. *nudifolium*, *Hermannia lancifolia*, *Hibiscus pusillus*, *Jucticia anagalloides*, *Lippia scaberima*, *Nidorella microcephala*, *Nolletia ciliaris*, *Pollichia campestris*, *Rhyncosia adenodes*, *Salvia radula*, *Selago densiflora*, *Teucrium trifidum*, *Tolpis capensis*. Geophytic Herbs: *Bulbine narcissifolia*, *Ledebouria marginata*, *Ornithogalum tenuifolium* subsp. *tenuifolium*, *Raphionacme hirsuta*. Herbaceous Climber: *Rhyncosia venulosa*.




Figure 1 Map with an indication of the location of the site (yellow marker).

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, 2022).

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.

Surveys by R.F. Terblanche during December 2022 were conducted to note key elements of habitats on the site, relevant to the conservation of fauna and flora. The main purpose of the site visits was ultimately to serve as a habitat survey that concentrated on the possible presence or not of threatened species and other species of high conservation priority.

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

3.1 Habitat characteristics and vegetation

The habitat was investigated by noting habitat structure (rockiness, slope, plant structure/ physiognomy) as well as floristic composition. Voucher specimens of plant species were only taken where the taxonomy was in doubt and where the plant specimens were of significant relevance for invertebrate conservation. In this case no plant specimens were needed to be collected as voucher specimens or to be send to a herbarium for identification. A wealth of guides and detailed works of plant identifications, ecology and conservation is fortunately available and very useful. Field guides, biogeographic works, species lists, diagnostic outlines, conservation statuses and detail on specific plant groups were sourced from Boon (2010), Court (2010), Germishuizen (2003), Germishuizen, Meyer & Steenkamp (2006), Goldblatt (1986), Goldblatt & Manning (1998), Jacobsen (1983), Manning (2003), Manning (2009), McMurtry, Grobler, Grobler & Burns (2008), Pooley (1998), Retief & Herman (1997), Smit (2008), Van Ginkel, Glen, Gordon-Gray, Cilliers, Muasya & Van Deventer (2011), Van Jaarsveld (2006), Van Oudtshoorn (1999), Van Wyk (2000), Van Wyk & Smith (2001), Van Wyk & Smith (2003), Van Wyk & Malan (1998) and Van Wyk & Van Wyk (1997). Lists of species, species names and the conservation status of species were mainly sourced from Raimondo, von Staden, Victor, Helme, Turner, Kamundi & Manyama (2009) and updated versions of red lists and species from the Threatened Species Programme of SANBI and the Red List of South African Plants (sanbi.org.za).

3.2 Mammals

Mammals were 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 have 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 were recorded. Walker (1996), Stuart & Stuart (2000) and Liebenberg (1990) were consulted for additional information and for the identification of spoor and signs. Trapping was not done since it proved not necessary in the case of this study. Habitat characteristics were 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 then some species need examination of skulls, or even chromosomes (Apps, 2000).

3.3 Birds

Birds were 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, Davies & Weiersbye (2016) were consulted. Ringing of birds fell beyond the scope of this survey and was not deemed necessary. Sites have been walked, covering as many habitats as possible. Signs of the presence of bird species such as spoor and nests have additionally been recorded. Habitat characteristics were surveyed to note potential occurrences of birds.

3.4 Reptiles

Reptiles were 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) were followed. Sites were 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.

3.5 Amphibians

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.

3.6 Butterflies

Butterflies were noted as sight 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, Morgenthal & Cilliers, 2003; Edge, Cilliers & Terblanche, 2008; Gardiner & Terblanche, 2010). Known food plants of butterflies were therefore also recorded. After the visits to the site and the identification of the butterflies found there, a list was also compiled of butterflies that will most probably be found in the area in all the other seasons because of suitable habitat. The emphasis is on a habitat survey.

3.7 Fruit chafer beetles

Different habitat types in the areas were explored for any sensitive or special fruit chafer species. Selection of methods to find fruit chafers depends on the different types of habitat present and the species that may be present. Fruit bait traps would probably not be successful for capturing *Ichnestoma* species in a grassland patch (Holm & Marais 1992). Possible chafer beetles of high conservation priority were noted as sight records accompanied by the collecting of voucher specimens with grass nets or containers where deemed necessary.

3.8 Rock scorpions

Relatively homogenous habitat / vegetation areas were identified and explored to identify any sensitive or special species. Selected stones that were lifted to search for Arachnids were put back very carefully resulting in the least disturbance possible. All the above actions were accompanied by the least disturbance possible.

3.9 Limitations

For each site visited, it should be emphasized that surveys can by no means result in an exhaustive list of the plants and animals present on the site, because of the time constraint. Surveys were conducted during December 2022 which includes an optimal time of the year to find signs of animals such as invertebrates, signs of habitat sensitive plant species and vertebrate animal species high conservation priority. Weather conditions during the surveys were favourable for recording fauna and flora. The focus of the survey remains a habitat survey that concentrates on the possibility that species of particular conservation priority occur on the site or not. It is unlikely that any more visits would reveal information that would change the outcome of this assessment both in terms of ecosystems of special conservation concern or suitable habitats of species of particular conservation concern. Visits that were conducted therefore appear to be sufficient to address the objectives of this study.

4 RESULTS

Table 4.1 Outline of main landscape and habitat characteristics of the site.

HABITAT FEATURE	DESCRIPTION
Topography	The area proposed for the development or that had been cleared, is on gentle slopes to almost moderate in a slightly undulating larger area.
Rockiness	Rocky ridges are absent at the site.
Presence of wetlands	Wetlands and riparian zones appear to be absent at the site.
Vegetation	<p>There is an area that had been cleared and an area where grassland remained at the site. At the area that had been cleared there is some recovery of vegetation and a conspicuous presence of pioneer plant species. Both these areas, the cleared area and the area which is the remainder of the grassland, are at one terrain unit, a plain with gentle slopes in a slightly undulating larger area. The plain with gentle slopes, to almost moderate slopes, at the site is adjacent to a shallow valley outside the site, where a non-perennial river runs through.</p> <p>Vegetation at the remainder of the grassland at the site consists of a moderately disturbed grassland which contains indigenous grass species, some indigenous shrub species and few trees. The grass layer is well-developed and indigenous grass species such as <i>Elionurus muticus</i> is conspicuous. Other indigenous grass species include <i>Aristida congesta</i>, <i>Eragrostis lehmanniana</i>, <i>Eragrostis superba</i>, <i>Cynodon dactylon</i>, <i>Eragrostis curvula</i>, <i>Chloris virgata</i> and <i>Themeda triandra</i>. The shrub <i>Seriphium plumosum</i> (bankrupt bush) is conspicuous at some parts of the remaining grassland. Indigenous forb species include <i>Berkheya onopordifolia</i>, <i>Ursinia nana</i>, <i>Cyanotis speciosa</i>, <i>Hibiscus pusillus</i>, <i>Senecio consanguineus</i>, <i>Bulbine narcissifolia</i>, <i>Pollichia campestris</i>, <i>Selago densiflora</i> and <i>Lippia scaberrima</i>. Alien invasive herbaceous weed species are conspicuous at disturbed areas at the site and include <i>Argemone ochroleuca</i>, <i>Tagetes minuta</i>, <i>Bidens bipinnata</i>, <i>Bidens pilosa</i>, <i>Gomphrena celosioides</i>, <i>Schkuhria pinnata</i>, <i>Conyza bonariensis</i>, <i>Chenopodium album</i>, <i>Guileminea densa</i>, <i>Alternanthera pungens</i> and <i>Verbena aristigera</i>.</p> <p>Vegetation at the riparian zone north of the site, at artificial waterbody Dam 1, artificial waterbody Dam 2 and the active channel of the Boesmanspruit non-perennial river in between, consists of covers of sedges and some other plant species mixed in between. Indigenous sedge species at the riparian zone include <i>Cyperus fastigiatus</i>, <i>Pycnus nitidus</i>, <i>Cyperus laevigatus</i>, <i>Schoenoplectus decipiens</i> and <i>Eleocharis limosa</i>. A rush species, <i>Juncus rigidus</i>, is also present. Herbaceous species include the alien invasive <i>Rumex crispus</i> and the indigenous <i>Rumex lanceolatus</i>. The indigenous herb <i>Berkheya radula</i> and the alien invasive <i>Cirsium vulgare</i> are present at the seasonal and temporary zones of the wetland and into some parts of the terrestrial zone.</p>
Signs of disturbances	Vegetation at a part of the site has recently been cleared. Remainder of the grassland at the site is moderately disturbed. Diggings are present at the southeastern corner of the site. Buildings, fences and other infrastructure in general associated with a farming area, are present at the site. Alien invasive herbaceous weeds are conspicuous, especially where vegetation has hitherto been cleared.
Connectivity	There is little scope for the site to be part of a corridor of particular conservation importance. Outside the site, towards the north, a watercourse, the non-perennial Boesmanspruit river, is present, which is a corridor of particular conservation importance.



Photo 1 View of part of the site where vegetation has hitherto been cleared (foreground) and where the remainder of the grassland (background) is present.

Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 2 View of part of the site where vegetation has hitherto been cleared (right-hand side) and where the remainder of the grassland (left-hand side) is present.

View of part of the site.

Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 3 The remainder of the site where moderately disturbed grassland is present. At the time of the surveys the indigenous grass species, *Elionurus muticus*, was conspicuous.

Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 4 The remainder of the grassland at the site. The shrub *Seriphium plumosum* (bankrupt bush) is noticeable at some parts of the site, such as in the picture (greyish shrubs).

Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 5 A damwal, where the alien invasive *Populus x canescens* (poplar) grows, is present northwest of the site. The damwall is broken or open at places. Covers of mainly sedges have formed where some water gathers from time to time at the artificial waterbody (Dam 1).

Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 6 Terrestrial zone and riparian zone (right-hand side of the picture) along the Bamboesspruit non-perennial river north of the site.

Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 7 Damwall and area where water gathers from time to time at artificial waterbody, Dam 2, north of the site. Covers of mainly sedges have formed where the water gathers at times, at the artificial waterbody.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 8 Wet area where sedges are visible, at artificial waterbody, Dam 2, north of the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 9 The widespread indigenous herbaceous plant species, *Gazania krebsiana*, at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 10 The widespread indigenous herbaceous plant species, *Ursinia nana*, at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 11 The widespread indigenous grass species, *Elionurus muticus*, at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 12 Few trees are present at the site. The widespread indigenous tree, *Vachellia karroo* (Sweet Thorn) is sparingly present at the site (such as in the picture) and visibly more frequent in some of the surrounding areas.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 13 The widespread indigenous herb *Lippia scaberrima* at the remainder of the grassland at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 14 The widespread indigenous herb *Berkheya onopordifolia*, at the remainder of the grassland at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 15 The alien invasive *Cirsium vulgare* (spear thistle) at the riparian zone north of the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 16 The indigenous sedge species, *Cyperus fastigiatus*, at the riparian zone north of the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche



Photo 17 The alien invasive tree, *Prosopis glandulosa*, northeast of the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche.



Photo 18 The widespread butterfly species, *Vanessa cardui* (painted lady) feeding on nectar from the flower of *Gazania krebsiana* at the site.
Photo: R.F. Terblanche

4.2 ASSESSMENT OF PLANT SPECIES OF PARTICULAR CONSERVATION PRIORITY

4.2.1 Plant species of particular conservation concern according to the red list of plants

Table 4.2 Threatened plant species of the North West Province which are listed in the **Critically Endangered** category. The list here follows the most recent updated red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Status: Global status or national status indicated	Resident at the site
<i>Brachystelma canum</i>	Critically Endangered	No
<i>Brachystelma gracillimum</i>	Critically Endangered	No

Table 4.3 Threatened plant species of the North West Province which are listed in the **Endangered** category. The list here follows the most recent updated red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Status: Global status or national status indicated	Resident at the site
<i>Aloe peglerae</i>	Endangered	No
<i>Brachystelma discoideum</i>	Endangered	No

Table 4.4 Threatened plant species of the North West Province which are listed in the **Vulnerable** category. The list here follows the most recent updated red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Status: Global status or national status indicated	Resident at the site
<i>Brachycorythis conica</i> subsp. <i>transvaalensis</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Brachystelma incanum</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Ceropegia decidua</i> subsp. <i>pretoriensis</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Ceropegia stentiae</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Ledebouria atrobrunnea</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Marsilea farinosa</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Melolobium subspicatum</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Prunus africana</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Rennera stellata</i>	Vulnerable	No
<i>Searsia maricoan</i>	Vulnerable	No

Table 4.5 Near Threatened plant species of the North West Province. The list here follows the most recent updated red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Status: Global status or national status indicated	Resident at the site
<i>Adromischus umbraticola</i> subsp. <i>umbraticola</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Ceropegia turricula</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Cineraria austrotransvaalensis</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Cleome conrathii</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Delosperma leendertziae</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Drimia sanguinea</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Elaeodendron transvaalense</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Kniphofia typhoides</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Lithops leslei</i> subsp. <i>leslei</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Nerine gracilis</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Sporobolus oxyphyllus</i>	Near Threatened	No
<i>Stenostelma umbelluliferum</i>	Near Threatened	No

Table 4.6 Plant species of the North West Province which are not threatened and not near threatened but which are of particular conservation concern and listed in the **Critically Rare** category (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). The list here follows the most recent red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Conservation status	Resident at the site
<i>Gladiolus filiformis</i>	Critically Rare	No

Table 4.7 Plant species of the North West Province which are not threatened and not near threatened but of which are of particular conservation concern and listed in the **Rare** category (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). The list here follows the most recent red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Status: Global status or national status indicated	Resident at the site
<i>Brachystelma dimorphum</i> subsp. <i>gratum</i>	Rare	No
<i>Ceropegia insignis</i>	Rare	No
<i>Frithia pulchra</i>	Rare	No
<i>Gnaphalium nelsonii</i>	Rare	No
<i>Habenaria culveri</i>	Rare	No

Table 4.8 Plant species of the North West Province which are not threatened and not near threatened but which are of particular conservation concern and listed in the **Declining** category (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). The list here follows the most recent red list of South African plant species (Raimondo *et al.* 2009). No = Plant species is unlikely to be a resident at the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Status: Global status or national status indicated	Resident at the site
<i>Boophone disticha</i>	Declining	No
<i>Crinum bulbispermum</i>	Declining	No
<i>Crinum macowanii</i>	Declining	No
<i>Drimia altissima</i>	Declining	No
<i>Eucomis autumnalis</i>	Declining	No
<i>Gunnera perpensa</i>	Declining	No
<i>Ilex mitis</i>	Declining	No
<i>Pelargonium sidoides</i>	Declining	No

4.2.2 Plant species of particular conservation concern: protected species

Table 4.9 Tree species of the North West Province which are listed as **Protected Species** under the National Forests Act No. 84 of 1998, Section 15(1). No = Plant species is not a resident on the site; Yes = Plant species is a resident at the site.

Species	Conservation status	Resident at the site
<i>Boscia albitrunca</i> (Sheppard's tree)	Protected	No
<i>Combretum imberbe</i> (Leadwood)	Protected	No
<i>Sclerocarya birrea</i> (Marula)	Protected	No
<i>Securidaca longepedunculata</i> (Violet Tree)	Protected	No
<i>Vachellia erioloba</i> (Camel Thorn Tree)	Protected	No

4.3 ASSESSMENT OF VERTEBRATE SPECIES OF PARTICULAR HIGH CONSERVATION PRIORITY

4.3.1 Mammals of particular high conservation priority

Table 4.10 Threatened mammal species of the North West Province. Literature sources: Friedman & Daly, (2004), Skinner & Chimimba (2005), Wilson & Reeder (2005). With mammal species which normally needs a large range their residential status does not implicate that they are exclusively dependent on the site or use the site as important shelter or for reproduction. No = Not recorded at site/ Unlikely to be resident at the site. Yes: Recorded at the site/ Likely to be resident at the site.

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be found based on habitat assessment
<i>Chrysospalax villosus</i> Rough-haired golden mole	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Cloeotis percivali</i> Short-eared Trident Bat	Vulnerable/ Near-threatened	No	No
<i>Diceros bicornis</i> Black rhinoceros	Critically Endangered	No	No
<i>Lycaon pictus</i> African wild dog	Endangered	No	No
<i>Loxodonta africana</i> African elephant	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Mystromys albicaudatus</i> White-tailed mouse	Endangered	No	No
<i>Neamblysomus julianae</i> Juliana's Golden Mole	Critically Endangered	No	No
<i>Panthera leo</i> Lion	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Rhinolophus blasii</i> Blasi's Horseshoe Bat	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Smutsia temminckii</i> Ground Pangolin	Vulnerable	No	No

Table 4.11 Near Threatened mammal species known to occur in the North West Province. Literature sources: Skinner & Chimimba (2005). No = Not recorded at site/ unlikely to be resident at the site. Yes: Recorded at the site/ Likely to be resident at the site.

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be found based on habitat assessment
<i>Ceratotherium simum</i> White Rhinoceros	Near threatened	No	No

Table 4.12 Data deficient (or uncertain) mammal species of the North West Province. Literature sources: Skinner & Chimimba (2005). No = Not recorded at site/ unlikely to be resident at the site. Yes: Recorded at the site/ Likely to be resident at the site.

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely be a resident at the site
<i>Myosorex varius</i> Forest shrew	Uncertain	No	No

4.3.2 Birds of particular high conservation priority

Table 4.13 Threatened bird species of the North West Province. Literature sources Barnes (2000), Hockey, Dean & Ryan, P.G. (2005) and Chittenden (2007). No = Not recorded at site/ Unlikely to use site as breeding area or particular habitat on which the species depends. Yes = Recorded at site/ Likely to use site as breeding area or particular habitat on which the species depends.

Species	Common name	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to use site as breeding area or habitat
<i>Aegypius tracheliotos</i>	Lappet-faced Vulture	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Anthropoides paradiseus</i>	Blue Crane	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Aquila rapax</i>	Tawny Eagle	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Ardeotis kori</i>	Kori Bustard	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Balearica regulorum</i>	Grey Crowned Crane (Mahem)	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Botaurus stellaris</i>	Eurasian Bittern	Critically Endangered	No	No
<i>Circus ranivorus</i>	African Marsh- Harrier	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Crex crex</i>	Corn Crake	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Eupodotis senegalensis</i>	White-bellied Korhaan	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Falco naumanni</i>	Lesser Kestrel	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Geronticus calvus</i>	Southern Bald Ibis	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Gorsachius leuconotus</i>	White-backed Night-heron	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Gypaetus barbatus</i>	Bearded Vulture	Endangered	No	No
<i>Gyps africanus</i>	White-backed Vulture	Vulnerable	No	No

<i>Gyps coprotheres</i>	Cape Vulture	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Pelecanus rufescens</i>	Pink-backed Pelican	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i>	Martial Eagle	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Rhynchops flavirostris</i>	African Skimmer	Endangered	No	No
<i>Sagittarius serpentarius</i>	Secretarybird	Vulnerable	No	No
<i>Tyto capensis</i>	African Grass-Owl	Vulnerable	No	No

* Though some of the above bird species that roam over large areas may occasionally be found at the site, the site does not appear to be a habitat of particular importance to these birds, and these birds also do not use the site as breeding area.

Table 4.14 Near Threatened bird species of the North West Province. Literature sources Barnes (2000), Hockey, Dean & Ryan, P.G. (2005) and Chittenden (2007). No = Not recorded at site/ Unlikely to be particularly dependent on the site as breeding area or habitat. Yes = Recorded at site/ Likely to be particularly dependant on the site as breeding area or habitat.

Species	Common name	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to use site breeding area or habitat
<i>Certhilauda chuana</i>	Short-clawed Lark	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Charadrius pallidus</i>	Chestnut-banded Plover	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Ciconia nigra</i>	Black Stork	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Circus macrourus</i>	Pallid Harrier	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Eupodotis caerulea</i>	Blue Korhaan	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Falco biarmicus</i>	Lanner Falcon	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	Peregrine Falcon	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Glareola nordmanni</i>	Black-winged Pratincole	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Leptoptilos crumeniferus</i>	Marabou Stork	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Mirafra cheniana</i>	Melodious lark	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Mycteria ibis</i>	Yellow-billed Stork	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Phoenicopus minor</i>	Lesser Flamingo	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Phoenicopus ruber</i>	Greater Flamingo	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Rostratula benghalensis</i>	Greater Painted-snipe	Near threatened	No	No
<i>Sterna caspia</i>	Caspian Tern	Near threatened	No	No

* Though some of the above bird species that roams over large areas may occasionally be found at the site, the site does not appear to be a habitat of particular importance to these birds, and these birds also do not use the site as breeding area.

4.3.3 Reptiles of particular high conservation priority

The following tables list possible presence or absence of threatened reptile or near threatened reptile species in the study area. The Atlas and Red List of Reptiles of South Africa, Lesotho and South Africa (Bates, Branch, Bauer, Burger, Marais, Alexander & de Villiers, 2014) has been used as the main source to compile the list for assessment.

Table 4.15 Threatened reptile species in North West Province. Main Source: (Bates, Branch, Bauer, Burger, Marais, Alexander & de Villiers, 2014). No = Reptile species is not a resident on the site; Yes = Reptile species is found to be resident on the site.

Species	Threatened Status	Resident at site	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be found based on habitat assessment
<i>Crocodylus niloticus</i> Nile Crocodile	Vulnerable	No	No	No

Table 4.16 Near threatened reptile species in North West Province. Main Source: Bates, Branch, Bauer, Burger, Marais, Alexander & de Villiers (2014). Though *Homoroselaps dorsalis* has not yet been recorded from the North West Province, its presence in some areas or the Province is anticipated. No = Reptile species is not a resident on the site; Yes = Reptile species is found to be resident on the site.

Species	Threatened Status	Resident at site	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be found based on habitat assessment
<i>Homoroselaps dorsalis</i> Striped Harlequin Snake	Near threatened	No	No	No

4.3.4 Amphibian species of particular high conservation priority

Table 4.17 Amphibian species which is of particular conservation concern in the North West Province. No = Amphibian species is not a resident on the site; Yes = Amphibian species is found to be resident on the site.

Species	Threatened Status	Resident at site	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be found based on habitat assessment
<i>Pyxicephalus adspersus</i> Giant Bullfrog	Least Concern (IUCN) Remains a species of particular conservation concern.	No	No	No

4.4 ASSESSMENT OF INVERTEBRATE SPECIES OF PARTICULAR CONSERVATION PRIORITY

4.4.1 Butterflies of particular conservation priority

Table 4.18 Threatened butterfly species in North West Province and Gauteng Province (Mecenero *et al.* 2020). Sources of information: Henning, Terblanche & Ball (2009), Mecenero *et al.* (2013), Mecenero *et al.* (2020). Invertebrates such as threatened butterfly species are often very habitat specific and residential status imply a unique ecosystem that is at stake.

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Residential status at the site: Yes confirmed, Highly likely, Likely, Medium possibility, Unlikely, Highly unlikely
<i>Aloeides dentatis dentatis</i> Roodepoort Toothed Russet	Endangered	No	Highly unlikely
<i>Chrysoritis aureus</i> Golden Opal/ Heidelberg Copper	Endangered	No	Highly unlikely
<i>Lepidochrysops praeterita</i> Highveld Giant Cupid/ Highveld Blue	Endangered	No	Highly unlikely
<i>Orachrysops mijburghii</i> Heilbron Cupid	Endangered	No	Highly unlikely

Table 4.19 Butterfly species of the North West Province and Gauteng Province that are Near Threatened (Mecenero *et al.*, 2020). No = Butterfly species is unlikely to be a resident at the study area; Yes = Butterfly species is a resident at the study area. Sources of information Henning, Terblanche & Ball (2009), Mecenero *et al.* (2013), Mecenero *et al.* (2020).

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Residential status at the site: Yes confirmed, Highly likely, Likely, Medium possibility, Unlikely, Highly unlikely
<i>Metisella meninx</i> Marsh Sylph	Near Threatened	No	Highly unlikely

4.4.2 Beetles of particular conservation priority

Table 4.20 Fruit chafer species (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Cetoniinae) in the Gauteng Province and North-West Province which are of known high conservation priority.

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be resident based on habitat assessment
<i>Ichnestoma stobbiai</i>	Uncertain	No	No
<i>Trichocephala brincki</i>	Uncertain	No	No

4.4.3 Scorpion species of particular conservation priority

Table 4.21 Rock scorpion species (Scorpiones: Ischnuridae) species that are of known high conservation priority in the Gauteng Province and North-West Province.

Species	Threatened Status	Recorded at site during survey	Likely to be resident at site based on habitat assessment
<i>Hadogenes gracilis</i>	Uncertain	No	No
<i>Hadogenes gunningi</i>	Uncertain	No	No

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Habitat and vegetation characteristics

An outline of the habitat and vegetation characteristics is given in Table 4.1.

5.2 Plants

Extinct, threatened, near threatened and other plant species of high conservation priority in North West Province are listed in Tables 4.2 – 4.8. Protected tree species are listed in Table 4.9. The presence or not of all the species listed in the tables were investigated during the survey. None of the Threatened and Near Threatened plant species are likely to occur on the site. No other plant species of particular conservation concern appears to be present at the site.

5.3 Vertebrates

5.3.1 Mammals

Table 4.10, Table 4.11 and Table 4.12 list the possible presence or absence of threatened mammal species, near threatened mammal species and mammal species of which the status is uncertain, respectively, at the site. Literature sources that were used are Friedman & Daly (2004), Skinner & Chimimba (2005) and Wilson & Reeder (2005). Since the site falls outside reserves, threatened species such as the black rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis*) and the African wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*) are obviously not present. No smaller mammals of particular high conservation significance are likely to be found on the site as well.

5.3.2 Birds

Table 4.13 and Table 4.14 list the possible presence or absence of threatened bird species and near threatened bird species at the site. With bird species which often have a large distributional range, their presence does not imply that they are particularly dependent on a site as breeding location. Therefore the emphasis in the right hand columns of Table 4.12 and Table 4.13 are on the particular likely dependance or not of bird species on the site. Literature sources that were mainly consulted are Barnes (2000), Hockey, Dean & Ryan, P.G. (2005) and Chittenden (2007). No threat to any threatened bird species or any bird species of particular conservation importance are foreseen.

5.3.3 Reptiles

Table 4.15 and Table 4.16 list the possible presence or absence of Threatened and Near Threatened reptile species on the site. Main Source used for the conservation status and identification of reptiles are Bates, Branch, Bauer, Burger, Marais, Alexander & de Villiers (2014). Alexander & Marais (2007) as well as Tolley & Burger 2007) give useful indications of distributions, habitats and identification of the reptile species. There appears to be no threat to any reptile species of particular high conservation importance if the site is developed.

5.3.4 Amphibians

No frog species that occur in the North West are listed as Threatened species (Vulnerable, Endangered or Critically Endangered) or Near Threatened species according to IUCN Amphibian Specialist Group (2013). Table 4.17 lists *Pyxicephalus adspersus* (Giant Bullfrog) as Least Concern globally. According to the Biodiversity Management Directorate of GDARD (Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development) (2014) there are no amphibians in Gauteng that qualify for red listed status (red listed here indicates a category of special conservation concern such as threatened or near threatened). Suitable habitat for Giant Bullfrog at site appears to be absent.

5.4 Invertebrates

5.4.1 Butterflies

Studies about the vegetation and habitat of threatened butterfly species in South Africa showed that ecosystems with a unique combination of features are selected by these localised threatened butterfly species (Deutschländer and Bredenkamp 1999; Edge 2002, 2005; Terblanche, Morgenthal & Cilliers 2003; Lubke, Hoare, Victor & Ketelaar 2003; Edge, Cilliers & Terblanche, 2008). Threatened butterfly species in South Africa can then be regarded as bio-indicators of rare ecosystems.

Four species of butterfly in Gauteng Province and North West Province combined are listed as threatened in the recent butterfly conservation assessment of South Africa (Mecenero *et al.*, 2013). The expected presence or not of these threatened butterfly species as well as species of high conservation priority that are not threatened, at the site (Table 4.18 and Table 4.19) follows.

5.4.1.1 Assessment of threatened butterfly species

***Aloeides dentatis dentatis* (Roodepoort Toothed Russet)**

The proposed global red list status for *Aloeides dentatis dentatis* according to the most recent IUCN criteria and categories is Endangered (Mecenero *et al.*, 2020). *Aloeides dentatis dentatis* colonies are found where one of its host plants *Hermannia depressa* or *Lotononis eriantha* is present. Larval ant association is with *Lepisiota capensis* (S.F. Henning 1983; S.F. Henning & G.A. Henning 1989). The habitat requirements of *Aloeides dentatis dentatis* are complex and not fully understood yet. See Deutschländer and Bredenkamp (1999) for the description of the vegetation and habitat characteristics of one locality of *Aloeides dentatis* subsp. *dentatis* at Ruimsig, Roodepoort,

Gauteng Province. There is not an ideal habitat of *Aloeides dentatis* subsp. *dentatis* on the site and it is unlikely that the butterfly is present at the site.

***Chrysoritis aureus* (Golden Opal/ Heidelberg Copper)**

The proposed global red list status for *Chrysoritis aureus* according to the most recent IUCN criteria and categories is Endangered (Mecenero *et al.*, 2020). *Chrysoritis aureus* (Golden Opal/ Heidelberg Copper) is a resident where the larval host plant, *Clusia pulchella* is present. However, the distribution of the butterfly is much more restricted than that of the larval host plant (S.F. Henning 1983; Terblanche, Morgenthal & Cilliers 2003). One of the reasons for the localised distribution of *Chrysoritis aureus* is that a specific host ant *Crematogaster liengmei* must also be present at the habitat. Fire appears to be an essential factor for the maintenance of suitable habitat (Terblanche, Morgenthal & Cilliers 2003). Research revealed that *Chrysoritis aureus* (Golden Opal/ Heidelberg Copper) has very specific habitat requirements, which include rocky ridges with a steep slope and a southern aspect (Terblanche, Morgenthal & Cilliers 2003). Owing to a lack of habitat requirements and ideal habitat the presence of the taxon is highly unlikely.

***Lepidochrysops praeterita* (Highveld Blue)**

The proposed global red list status for *Lepidochrysops praeterita* according to the most recent IUCN criteria and categories is Endangered (G.A. Henning, Terblanche & Ball, 2009; Mecenero *et al.*, 2020). *Lepidochrysops praeterita* is a butterfly that occurs where the larval host plant *Ocimum obovatum* (= *Becium obovatum*) is present (Pringle, G.A. Henning & Ball, 1994), but the distribution of the butterfly is much more restricted than the distribution of the host plant. *Lepidochrysops praeterita* is found on selected rocky ridges and rocky hillsides in parts of Gauteng, the extreme northern Free State and the south-eastern Gauteng Province. No ideal habitat appears to be present for the butterfly on the site. It is unlikely that *Lepidochrysops praeterita* would be present on the site and at the footprint proposed for the development.

***Orachrysops mijburghi* (Mijburgh's Blue)**

The proposed global red status for *Orachrysops mijburghi* according to the most recent IUCN criteria and categories is Endangered (Mecenero *et al.*, 2020). *Orachrysops mijburghi* favours grassland depressions where specific *Indigofera* plant species occur (Terblanche & Edge 2007). The Heilbron population of *Orachrysops mijburghi* in the Free State uses *Indigofera evansiana* as a larval host plant (Edge, 2005) while the Suikerbosrand population in Gauteng uses *Indigofera dimidiata* as a larval host plant (Terblanche & Edge 2007). There is no suitable habitat for *Orachrysops mijburghi* on the site and it is unlikely that *Orachrysops mijburghi* would be present on the site.

Conclusion on threatened butterfly species

There appears to be no threat to any threatened butterfly species if the site is developed.

5.4.1.2 Assessment of butterfly species that are Near Threatened

Metisella meninx (Marsh Sylph)

Henning and Henning (1989) in the first South African Red Data Book of Butterflies, listed *Metisella meninx* as threatened under the former IUCN category Indeterminate. Even earlier in the 20th century Swanepoel (1953) raised concern about vanishing wetlands leading to habitat loss and loss of populations of *Metisella meninx*. According to the second South African Red Data Book of butterflies (Henning, Terblanche & Ball, 2009) the proposed global red list status of *Metisella meninx* has been Vulnerable. During a recent large scale atlassing project the *Conservation Assessment of Butterflies of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland: Red List and Atlas* (Mecenero *et al.*, 2013) it was found that more *Metisella meninx* populations are present than thought before. Based on this valid new information, the conservation status of *Metisella meninx* is now regarded as Near Threatened (Mecenero *et al.*, 2020). Though *Metisella meninx* is more widespread and less threatened than perceived before, it should be regarded as a localised rare habitat specialist of conservation priority, which is dependent on wetlands with suitable patches of grass at wetlands (Terblanche In prep.). Another important factor to keep in mind for the conservation of *Metisella meninx* is that based on very recent discoveries of new taxa in the group the present *Metisella meninx* is species complex consisting of at least three taxa (Terblanche In prep., Terblanche & Henning In prep.). The ideal habitat of *Metisella meninx* is treeless marshy areas where *Leersia hexandra* (rice grass) is abundant (Terblanche In prep.). The larval host plant of *Metisella meninx* is wild rice grass, *Leersia hexandra* (G.A. Henning & Roos, 2001). There is no ideal habitat for the butterfly at the site and the butterfly species is likely to be absent at the site.

5.4.2 Fruit chafer beetles

Table 4.20 lists the fruit chafer beetle species (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Cetoniinae) that are of known high conservation priority in the North West Province. No *Ichnestoma stobbiai* or *Trichocephala brincki* were found during the surveys. There appears to be no suitable habitat for *Ichnestoma stobbiai* or *Trichocephala brincki* at the site. There appears to be no threat to any of the fruit chafer beetles of particular high conservation priority if the site were developed.

5.4.3 Scorpions

Table 4.21 lists the rock scorpion species (Scorpiones: Ischnuridae) that are of known high conservation priority in the North West Province. None of these rock scorpions have been found at the site and the habitat does not appear to be optimal.

5.5 Screening tool (DFFE) and groundtruthing

Possible ecological sensitivities at the site were indicated by a report generated from the screening tool of DFFE. These ecological sensitivities that could possibly/ are present at the site, follow.

Animal species theme sensitivity

Relative animal species theme sensitivity is listed as low for the site. Following the groundtruthing such a listing is upheld. There is no distinct indication of the presence of any threatened animal species that is resident at the site or could have been resident at the site prior to a recent clearing of vegetation at the site. The relative animal species theme sensitivity is confirmed to be low.

Aquatic biodiversity theme sensitivity

Relative aquatic biodiversity theme sensitivity at the site is listed low for part of the site and high for part of the site. The high listing is because of a non-perennial river that is present north of the site. The site is as well as the watercourse north of the site is not part of a Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area or Fish Support Area. The riparian zone is a substantial distance from the site and current developments at the site, are unlikely to have a discernable impact on the watercourse north of the site if mitigation measures such as avoiding pollutants or spills from entering the soil and ultimately soil water. No wetlands or riparian zones are present at the site and the relatively aquatic biodiversity theme sensitivity at the site is likely to be low for the entire site.

Plant species theme sensitivity

Relative plant species theme sensitivity is currently listed as medium. Possible sensitive plant species of which the likely presence or absence have been investigated are listed in Tables 4.2 – 4.9 and include plant species on a local and provincial scale which could be prone to harvesting also the plant species listed for the screening. None of the threatened plant species of the North West Province or any other plant species of particular conservation concern such as those prone to harvesting has been found at the site. It is unlikely that any plant species of particular conservation concern occurs at the site or has occurred at the site prior to a recent clearing of vegetation at part of the site.

Terrestrial biodiversity theme sensitivity

Relative terrestrial biodiversity at the site is very high. This high sensitivity that is ascribed to the site area, is because of the presence of Critical Biodiversity Area 2, Ecological Support Area 2 and Protected Areas Expansion Strategy. The vegetation type at the site, the Klerksdorp Thornveld (Gh 13), is not listed as a Nationally Threatened Ecosystem. During surveys at the site, it was found that the scope for the remaining moderately disturbed grassland patch at the site to serve as part of a protected area or corridor of particular conservation concern is small. Following the groundtruthing a medium sensitivity for the terrestrial biodiversity theme is suggested.

5.6 Ecological Sensitivity at the site

Ecological sensitivity at the site is medium at the remainder of the grassland. Following the assessment of ecological sensitivity at the same terrain unit of which the current remainder of grassland as well as the area where the vegetation has recently been cleared, a medium ecological sensitivity is also expected at the recently cleared area at the site (Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4).



Figure 2 Some ecological features at the site. The area where vegetation has not been hitherto cleared is referred to as the remainder of the grassland.

— Red outline

Boundaries of the site




Figure 3 Modified riparian area that contains two artificial waterbodies, Dam 1 and Dam 2, north of the site. Parts of the damwall of Dam 1 are open or broken.

— Red outline	Boundaries of the site
— Blue outline	Route of active channel of a non-perennial river (Boesmanspruit)
— Green outline	Outer edge of riparian zone
— Dark blue outline	Artificial waterbodies (dams)



Figure 4 Indications of ecological sensitivity at the site. The remainder of the grassland adjacent to the area where the vegetation has recently been cleared, is medium

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| — | Red outline | Boundaries of the site |
| — | Orange yellow outline
and shading | Medium sensitivity |

Grid references and altitudes were taken at site with a GPS Garmin E-trex 20 © instrument.

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, 2022).

6 RISKS, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Background:

Habitats of threatened plants are in danger most often due to urban developments such as is the case for the Gauteng Province (Pfab & Victor, 2002). Habitat conservation is the key to the conservation of invertebrates such as threatened butterflies (Deutschländer and Bredenkamp 1999; Edge 2002, 2005; Terblanche, Morgenthal & Cilliers 2003; Lubke, Hoare, Victor & Ketelaar 2003; Edge, Cilliers & Terblanche, 2008). Furthermore, corridors and linkages may play a significant role in insect conservation (Pryke & Samways, 2003, Samways, 2005).

Urbanisation is a major additional influence on the loss of natural areas (Rutherford & Westfall 1994). In the South Africa the pressure to develop areas are high since its infrastructure allows for improvement of human well-being. Urban nature conservation issues in South Africa are overshadowed by the goal to improve human well-being, which focuses on aspects such as poverty, equity, redistribution of wealth and wealth creation (Cilliers, Müller & Drewes 2004). Nevertheless, the conservation of habitats is the key to invertebrate conservation, especially for those threatened species that are very habitat specific. This is also true for any detailed planning of corridors and buffer zones for invertebrates. Though proper management plans for habitats are not in place, setting aside special ecosystems is in line with the recent Biodiversity Act (2004) of the Republic of South Africa.

Corridors are important to link ecosystems of high conservation priority. Such corridors or linkages are there to improve the chances of survival of otherwise isolated populations (Samways, 2005). How wide should corridors be? The answer to this question depends on the conservation goal and the focal species (Samways, 2005). For an African butterfly assemblage this is about 250m when the corridor is for movement as well as being a habitat source (Pryke and Samways 2003). Hill (1995) found a figure of 200m for dung beetles in tropical Australian forest. In the agricultural context, and at least for some common insects, even small corridors can play a valuable role (Samways, 2005). Much more research remains to be done to find refined answers to the width of grassland corridors in South Africa. The width of corridors will also depend on the type of development, for instance the effects of the shade of multiple story buildings will be quite different from that of small houses.

To summarise: In practice, as far as developments are concerned, the key would be to prioritise and plan according to sensitive species and special ecosystems.

In the case of this study:

There is an area that had been cleared and an area where grassland remained at the site. At the area that had been cleared there is some recovery of vegetation and a conspicuous presence of pioneer plant species. Both these areas, the cleared area and the area which is the remainder of the grassland, are at one terrain unit, a plain

with gentle slopes in a slightly undulating larger area. The plain with gentle slopes, to almost moderate slopes, at the site is adjacent to a shallow valley outside the site, where a non-perennial river runs through.

Vegetation at the remainder of the grassland at the site consists of a moderately disturbed grassland which contains indigenous grass species, some indigenous shrub species and few trees. The grass layer is well-developed and indigenous grass species such as *Elionurus muticus* is conspicuous. Other indigenous grass species include *Aristida congesta*, *Eragrostis lehmanniana*, *Eragrostis superba*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Eragrostis curvula*, *Chloris virgata* and *Themeda triandra*. The shrub *Seriphium plumosum* (bankrupt bush) is conspicuous at some parts of the remaining grassland. Indigenous forb species include *Berkheya onopordifolia*, *Ursinia nana*, *Cyanotis speciosa*, *Hibiscus pusillus*, *Senecio consanguineus*, *Bulbine narcissifolia*, *Pollichia campestris*, *Selago densiflora* and *Lippia scaberrima*. Alien invasive herbaceous weed species are conspicuous at disturbed areas at the site and include *Argemone ochroleuca*, *Tagetes minuta*, *Bidens bipinnata*, *Bidens pilosa*, *Gomphrena celosioides*, *Schkuhria pinnata*, *Conyza bonariensis*, *Chenopodium album*, *Guileminea densa*, *Alternanthera pungens* and *Verbena aristigera*.

Vegetation at the riparian zone north of the site, at artificial waterbody Dam 1, artificial waterbody Dam 2 and the active channel of the Boesmanspruit non-perennial river in between, consists of covers of sedges and some other plant species mixed in between. Indigenous sedge species at the riparian zone include *Cyperus fastigiatus*, *Pycreus nitidus*, *Cyperus laevigatus*, *Schoenoplectus decipiens* and *Eleocharis limosa*. A rush species, *Juncus rigidus*, is also present. Herbaceous species include the alien invasive *Rumex crispus* and the indigenous *Rumex lanceolatus*. The indigenous herb *Berkheya radula* and the alien invasive *Cirsium vulgare* are present at the seasonal and temporary zones of the wetland and into some parts of the terrestrial zone.

No Threatened or Near Threatened plant or animal species appear to be resident at the site. No other plant- or animal species of particular conservation concern appear to be present at the site.

The vegetation type at the site, the Klerksdorp Thornveld, is not listed as a Threatened Ecosystem according to the National List of Threatened Ecosystems (2019).

There is little scope for the site to be part of a corridor of particular conservation importance. Outside the site, towards the north, a watercourse, the non-perennial Boesmanspruit river, is present, which is a corridor of particular conservation importance.

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

6.1 Identification of potential impacts and risks

The potential impacts identified are:

Construction Phase

- Potential impact 1: Loss of habitat owing to the removal of vegetation at the proposed development.
- Potential impact 2: Loss of sensitive species (Threatened, Near Threatened, Rare, Declining or Protected species) during the construction phase.
- Potential impact 3: Loss of connectivity and conservation corridor networks in the landscape.
- Potential impact 4: Contamination of soil during construction in particular by hydrocarbon spills.
- Potential impact 5: Killing of vertebrate fauna during the construction phase.

Operational Phase

- Potential impact 6: An increased infestation of exotic or alien invasive plant species owing to disturbance.

* Note: Though mentioned again in the mitigation measures for the sake of completeness, the active channel and riparian zone, including the artificial waterbodies, outside the site, are avoided in the planned proposed footprint and has been avoided in the recent development where an area has been cleared of vegetation.

6.2 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	Direct
Potential Impact	Clearing of vegetation at the proposed development. This will entail the destruction of habitat of medium ecological sensitivity.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	Planting of indigenous vegetation at the site is imperative during and following the development.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Moderate
RISK	Following the mitigation measures a moderate risk of impact is expected.

Aspect/Activity	Removal of sensitive species
Type of Impact	Direct
Potential Impact	Sensitive species: Presence of Threatened or Near Threatened plant- or animal species appear to be unlikely. No other plant or animal species of particular conservation concern appears to be present at the proposed footprint at the site.
Status	Neutral.

Mitigation Required	No specific mitigation measures for Threatened or Near Threatened sensitive species apply at the site.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Low
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISK	A low risk of threat to any sensitive species at the site is anticipated.

Aspect/Activity	Fragmentation of corridors of particular conservation concern
Type of Impact	Direct
Potential Impact	The scope for the site to be a corridor of particular conservation concern is small.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	Planting of indigenous vegetation at the site is imperative.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISK	Following mitigation, a low 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	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.

Aspect/Activity	Possible disturbance, trapping, hunting and killing of vertebrates during construction phase
Type of Impact	Direct
Potential Impact	During the construction phase animal species could be disturbed, trapped, hunted or killed.
Status	Negative
Mitigation Required	If the development is approved, contractors must ensure that no animal species are disturbed, trapped, hunted or killed during the construction phase.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISKS	Following mitigation a low risk is anticipated.

6.3 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	Direct
Potential Impact	Infestation by alien invasive species could replace indigenous vegetation or potential areas where indigenous vegetation could recover. It is in particular declared alien invasive species such as <i>Prosopis glandulosa</i> (Mesquite), <i>Melia azedarach</i> (Syringa) or alien invasive Australian <i>Acacia</i> species (Australian Wattles) that should not be allowed to establish. Once established these 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. It is in particular declared alien invasive species such as <i>Prosopis glandulosa</i> (Mesquite), <i>Melia azedarach</i> (Syringa) and alien invasive Australian <i>Acacia</i> species (Australian wattles) that should not be allowed to establish.
Impact Significance (Pre-Mitigation)	Moderate
Impact Significance (Post-Mitigation)	Low
RISKS	Following mitigation, a low risk is anticipated.

6.4 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	Clearance of vegetation of medium sensitivity will take place if the development is approved.	Moderate	Moderate	High
Loss of sensitive species	Loss of sensitive species (Note no Threatened species or Near-threatened species)	Neutral	Site	Long-Term	Very low (No threatened species anticipated to be impacted)	Unlikely	Not applicable	Not applicable	No specific mitigation measures apply to Threatened and Near Threatened sensitive species at the site, or any other plant- or animal species of particular conservation concern at the site.	Low	Low	High
Loss of corridors of particular conservation concern	Fragmentation of landscape and loss of connectivity	Negative	Site	Long-Term	Moderate	Unlikely	Moderate	Moderate	The scope for the site to be part of a corridor of particular conservation concern is small. Planting of indigenous vegetation in the area is imperative.	Medium	Low	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

Disturbance or killing of vertebrates	Disturbance or killing of species	Negative	Site	Long-Term	Moderate	Unlikely	Moderate	Moderate	If the development is approved, contractors must ensure that no animal species are disturbed, trapped, hunted or killed during the construction phase.	Moderate	Low	High
---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------	------	-----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--	----------	-----	------

6.5 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

6.6 Summary of risks and impacts

Ecological sensitivity at the site is medium at the remainder of the grassland. Following the assessment of ecological sensitivity at the same terrain unit of which the current remainder of grassland as well as the area where the vegetation has recently been cleared, a medium ecological sensitivity is also expected at the recently cleared area at the site.

Following the mitigations which will be upheld and planned footprint for development all the impact risks listed above are moderate or low.

7 CONCLUSION

- There is an area that had been cleared and an area where grassland remained at the site. At the area that had been cleared there is some recovery of vegetation and a conspicuous presence of pioneer plant species. Both these areas, the cleared area and the area which is the remainder of the grassland, are at one terrain unit, a plain with gentle slopes in a slightly undulating larger area. The plain with gentle slopes, to almost moderate slopes, at the site is adjacent to a shallow valley outside the site, where a non-perennial river runs through.
- Vegetation at the remainder of the grassland at the site consists of a moderately disturbed grassland which contains indigenous grass species, some indigenous shrub species and few trees. The grass layer is well-developed and indigenous grass species such as *Elionurus muticus* is conspicuous. Other indigenous grass species include *Aristida congesta*, *Eragrostis lehmanniana*, *Eragrostis superba*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Eragrostis curvula*, *Chloris virgata* and *Themeda triandra*. The shrub *Seriphium plumosum* (bankrupt bush) is conspicuous at some parts of the remaining grassland. Indigenous forb species include *Berkheya onopordifolia*, *Ursinia nana*, *Cyanotis speciosa*, *Hibiscus pusillus*, *Senecio consanguineus*, *Bulbine narcissifolia*, *Pollichia campestris*, *Selago densiflora* and *Lippia scaberrima*. Alien invasive herbaceous weed species are conspicuous at disturbed areas at the site and include *Argemone ochroleuca*, *Tagetes minuta*, *Bidens bipinnata*, *Bidens pilosa*, *Gomphrena celosioides*, *Schkuhria pinnata*, *Conyza bonariensis*, *Chenopodium album*, *Guilleminea densa*, *Alternanthera pungens* and *Verbena aristigera*.
- Vegetation at the riparian zone north of the site, at artificial waterbody Dam 1, artificial waterbody Dam 2 and the active channel of the Boesmanspruit non-perennial river in between, consists of covers of sedges and some other plant species mixed in between. Indigenous sedge species at the riparian zone include *Cyperus fastigiatus*, *Pycnus nitidus*, *Cyperus laevigatus*, *Schoenoplectus decipiens* and *Eleocharis limosa*. A rush species, *Juncus rigidus*, is also present. Herbaceous species include the alien invasive *Rumex crispus* and the indigenous *Rumex lanceolatus*. The indigenous herb *Berkheya radula* and the alien invasive *Cirsium vulgare* are present at the seasonal and temporary zones of the wetland and into some parts of the terrestrial zone.
- No Threatened or Near Threatened plant or animal species appear to be resident at the site. No other plant- or animal species of particular conservation concern appear to be present at the site.
- The vegetation type at the site, the Klerksdorp Thornveld, is not listed as a Threatened Ecosystem according to the National List of Threatened Ecosystems (2019).
- There is little scope for the site to be part of a corridor of particular conservation importance. Outside the site, towards the north, a watercourse, the non-perennial Boesmanspruit river, is present, which is a corridor of particular conservation importance.

- Possible ecological sensitivities at the site were indicated by a report generated from the screening tool of DFFE. These ecological sensitivities that could possibly/ are present at the site, follow.

Animal species theme sensitivity

Relative animal species theme sensitivity is listed as low for the site. Following the groundtruthing such a listing is upheld. There is no distinct indication of the presence of any threatened animal species that is resident at the site or could have been resident at the site prior to a recent clearing of vegetation at the site. The relative animal species theme sensitivity is confirmed to be low.

Aquatic biodiversity theme sensitivity

Relative aquatic biodiversity theme sensitivity at the site is listed low for part of the site and high for part of the site. The high listing is because of a non-perennial river that is present north of the site. The site is as well as the watercourse north of the site is not part of a Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area or Fish Support Area. The riparian zone is a substantial distance from the site and current developments at the site, are unlikely to have a discernable impact on the watercourse north of the site if mitigation measures such as avoiding pollutants or spills from entering the soil and ultimately soil water. No wetlands or riparian zones are present at the site and the relatively aquatic biodiversity theme sensitivity at the site is likely to be low for the entire site.

Plant species theme sensitivity

Relative plant species theme sensitivity is currently listed as medium. Possible sensitive plant species of which the likely presence or absence have been investigated are listed in Tables 4.2 – 4.9 and include plant species on a local and provincial scale which could be prone to harvesting also the plant species listed for the screening. None of the threatened plant species of the North West Province or any other plant species of particular conservation concern such as those prone to harvesting has been found at the site. It is unlikely that any plant species of particular conservation concern occurs at the site or has occurred at the site prior to a recent clearing of vegetation at part of the site.

Terrestrial biodiversity theme sensitivity

Relative terrestrial biodiversity at the site is very high. This high sensitivity that is ascribed to the site area, is because of the presence of Critical Biodiversity Area 2, Ecological Support Area 2 and Protected Areas Expansion Strategy. The vegetation type at the site, the Klerksdorp Thornveld (Gh 13), is not listed as a Nationally Threatened Ecosystem. During surveys at the site, it was found that the scope for the remaining moderately disturbed grassland patch at the site to serve as part of a protected area or corridor of particular conservation concern is small. Following the groundtruthing a medium sensitivity for the terrestrial biodiversity theme is suggested.

- Ecological sensitivity at the site is medium at the remainder of the grassland. Following the assessment of ecological sensitivity at the same terrain unit of which the current remainder of grassland as well as the area

where the vegetation has recently been cleared, a medium ecological sensitivity is also expected at the recently cleared area at the site.

- Continued monitoring and eradication of alien invasive plant species are imperative. Declared alien invasive species such as *Prosopis glandulosa* (Mesquite), *Melia azedarach* (Syringa) and alien invasive Australian *Acacia* species (Australian wattles) should not be allowed to establish.
- Following the mitigations which will be upheld and planned footprint for development all the impact risks listed above are moderate or low. The impacts owing to the recent clearing of vegetation at part of the site are likely to be moderate or low as well, if the mitigation measures that are stipulated are upheld.

8 REFERENCES

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

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.

Barnes, K.N. ed. 2000. The Eskom Red Data Book of birds of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg.

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.

Boon, R. 2010. *Pooley's trees of eastern South Africa: a complete guide* 2nd ed. Flora and Fauna Publications Trust, Durban.

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.

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 frogging in southern Africa 2nd ed. Struik, Cape Town.

Child, M.F., Roxburgh, L., Do Linh San, E., Raimondo, D. & Davies-Mostert, H.T. (eds.). 2017. The 2016 Red List of Mammals of South Africa, Swaziland and Lesotho. South African National Biodiversity Institute and Endangered Wildlife Trust, South Africa.

Chittenden, H., Davies, G. & Weiersbye, I. 2016. Roberts Bird Guide. 2nd ed. John Voelcker Book Fund, Cape Town.

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

Cilliers, S.S., Müller, N. & Drewes, E. 2004. Overview on urban nature conservation: situation in the western-grassland biome of South Africa. *Urban forestry and urban greening* 3: 49-62.

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.

Del Hoyo, J., Elliot, J. & Sargatal, J. 1992. Handbook of the birds of the world, Vol. 1. Lynx Editions, Barcelona.

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. 2014. Field guide to the spiders of South Africa. LAPA, 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.

Duncan, G. 2016. The Amaryllidaceae of southern Africa. Umdaus Press, Hatfield.

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.

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.

Fish, L., Mashau, A.C., Moeaha, M.J. & Nembudani, M.T. 2015. Identification guide to southern African grasses. An identification manual with keys, descriptions and distributions. *Strelitzia* 36. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

Filmer, M.R. 1991. Southern African spiders: an identification guide. Struik, Cape Town.

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. 1989. The genus *Watsonia*. *Annals of Kirstenbosch Botanic Gardens, Volume 19*. 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, S.F. & Henning, G.A. 1989. South African Red Data Book: butterflies. *South African National Scientific Programmes Report* No. 158. CSIR, 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.

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.)

Hockey, P. 2011. *Birds*. In: Picker, M. & Griffiths, C. 2011. *Alien & Invasive animals: a South African perspective*. Struik Nature, Cape Town, p 36-44.

Hockey, P.A.R., Dean, W.J.R. & Ryan, P.G. (eds.). 2005. *Roberts Birds of Southern Africa*. John Voelcker Bird Book Fund, Cape Town.

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)

Johnson, S & Bytebier, B. 2015. *Orchids of South Africa*. Struik Nature, Cape Town.

- Kemper, N.P. 2001. RVI: Riparian Vegetation Index, final report, WRC Report No. 850/3/1. Institute for Water Research, Pretoria.
- Kok, J.C. 1998. Vrystaatse bome, struik en klimplante Kontak-uitgewers, Pretoria.
- 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.
- 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.
- Marais, J. 2004. A complete guide to the snakes of southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.
- McMurtry, D., Grobler, L., Grobler, J. & Burns, S. 2008. Field guide to the orchids of northern South Africa and Swaziland. Umदाus 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*. Safronics, 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.

New, T.R. 1993. ed. Conservation biology of *Lycaenidae* (butterflies). *Occasional paper of the IUCN Species Survival Commission* No. 8.

Peacock, F. 2006. Pipits of Southern Africa. Published by the author, Pretoria. www.pipits.co.za.

Pfab, M.F. 2002. Priority ranking scheme for Red Data plants in Gauteng, South Africa. *South African Journal of Botany* (68): 299-303.

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.

Raimondo, D., von Staden, L., Foden, W., Victor, J.E., Helme, N.A., Turner, R.C., Kamundi, D.A. & Manyama, P.A. (eds.). 2009. Red list of South African plants 2009. *Strelitzia* 25. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.

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.

Ryan, P. 2001. Practical Birding: A guide to birdwatching in southern Africa. Struik, Cape Town.

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.

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

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.

Smit, N. 2008. Field guide to the *Acacias* of South Africa. Briza, Pretoria.

Smith, G.F., Crouch, N.R. & Figueiredo, E. 2017. Field guide to 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.

- Tarboton, W. & Erasmus, R. 1998. Owls and owling in southern Africa. Struik, 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., 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. & 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.
- Terblanche, R.F. *In Prep.* Functional land ethic for butterfly conservation in South Africa. Unpublished PhD *In Prep.* Stellenbosch University, South Africa.
- Van den Berg, J. & Drinkwater, T.W. 1998. Field guide to identification of sorghum pests in South Africa. Agricultural Research Council: Grain-crops Institute, Potchefstroom.
- 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.E., van Oudtshoorn, B. & Gericke, N. 2009. Medical plants of South Africa. Briza, Pretoria.

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

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

Watt, A.D., Stork, N.E. & Hunter, M.D. (*eds.*), Forests and Insects. London: Chapman & Hall. (p. 381-393.)

ANNEXURE 1

List of plant species recorded at the site.

Plant species marked with an asterisk (*) are exotic.

Sources: Bromilow (2010); Crouch, Klopper, Court (2010); Duncan (2016); Fish, Mashau, Moeaha & Nembudani (2015); Germishuizen (2003), Goldblatt (1986); Goldblatt & Manning (1998); Johnson & Bytebier (2015); Manning (2007), Manning (2009), McMurtry, Grobler, Grobler & Burns (2008); Smith, Crouch. & Figueiredo (2017); Van Ginkel *et al.* (2011); Van Jaarsveld (2006); Van Oudtshoorn (2012); Van Wyk (2000); Van Wyk & Gericke (2000); Van Wyk & Malan (1998); Van Wyk & Van Wyk (2013); Van Wyk & Smith (2014); Van Wyk, van Oudtshoorn & Gericke (2009)

TAXON	COMMON NAMES	FAMILY
ANGIOSPERMAE: MONOCOTYLEDONS		
<i>Albuca setosa</i>		HYACINTHACEAE
<i>Aristida adscensionis</i>		POACEAE
<i>Aristida congesta</i>	Tassel Three-awn	POACEAE
<i>Asparagus laricinus</i>	Common Wild Asparagus	ASPARAGACEAE
<i>Brachiaria eruciformis</i>		POACEAE
<i>Bulbine narcissifolia</i>		ASPHODELACEAE
<i>Chloris virgata</i>		POACEAE
<i>Cyanotis speciosa</i>		COMMELINACEAE
<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>	Couch Grass	POACEAE
<i>Digitaria eriantha</i>	Common Finger Grass	POACEAE
<i>Eleusine coracana</i>		POACEAE
<i>Elionurus muticus</i>		POACEAE
<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>		POACEAE
<i>Eragrostis lehmanniana</i>		POACEAE
<i>Eragrostis superba</i>	Saw-toothed Love Grass	POACEAE
<i>Heteropogon contortus</i>	Spear Grass	POACEAE
<i>Melinis repens</i>	Natal Red-top	POACEAE

<i>Themeda triandra</i>	Red Grass	POACEAE
<i>Urochloa mocambicensis</i>	Bushveld Signal Grass	POACEAE
ANGIOSPERMS: DICOTYLEDONS		
* <i>Alternanthera pungens</i>	Dubbeltjie	AMARANTHACEAE
<i>Berkheya onopordifolia</i>		ASTERACEAE
* <i>Bidens bipinnata</i>	Spanish Black Jack	ASTERACEAE
* <i>Bidens pilosa</i>	Black Jack	ASTERACEAE
* <i>Chenopodium album</i>	White Goosefoot	CHENOPODIACEAE
<i>Convolvulus sagittatus</i>	Wild Bindweed	CONVOLVULACEAE
* <i>Conyza bonariensis</i>		ASTERACEAE
* <i>Datura ferox</i>	Thorn Apple	SOLANACEAE
<i>Felicia muricata</i>		ASTERACEAE
<i>Gazania krebsiana</i> subsp. <i>krebsiana</i>		ASTERACEAE
<i>Gomphocarpus fruticosus</i>	Cotton Milkbush	APOCYNACEAE
* <i>Gomphrena celosioides</i>	Bachelor's Button	AMARANTHACEAE
* <i>Guilleminea densa</i>	Matweed	AMARANTHACEAE
<i>Helichrysum argyrosphaerum</i>	Wild Everlasting	ASTERACEAE
<i>Hibiscus pusillus</i>		MALVACEAE
<i>Hilliardiella oligocephala</i>		ASTERACEAE
<i>Lepidium africanum</i>	Pepperweed	BRASSICACEAE
* <i>Lepidium bonariense</i>	Pepperweed	BRASSICACEAE
<i>Lippia scaberrima</i>		VERBENACEAE
* <i>Malva parviflora</i>	Cheeseweed	MALVACEAE
* <i>Melia azedarach</i>	Syringa Berrytree	MELIACEAE
<i>Osteospermum scariosum</i>		ASTERACEAE
<i>Pollichia campestris</i>		CARYOPHYLLACEAE
* <i>Portulaca oleracea</i>		PORTULACACEAE
* <i>Schkuhria pinnata</i>	Dwarf Marigold	ASTERACEAE
<i>Seriphium plumosum</i>	Bankrupt Bush	ASTERACEAE
<i>Searsia pyroides</i>		ANACARDIACEAE

<i>Selago densiflora</i>		SELAGINACEAE
<i>Senecio consanguineus</i>		ASTERACEAE
* <i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>		ASTERACEAE
* <i>Tagetes minuta</i>		ASTERACEAE
<i>Tribulus terrestris</i>	Devil's Thorn	ZYGOPHYLLACEAE
<i>Ursinia nana</i>		ASTERACEAE
<i>Vachellia karroo</i>	Sweet Thorn	FABACEAE
* <i>Verbena aristigera</i>	Fine-leaved Verbena	VERBENACEAE
* <i>Verbena bonariensis</i>	Purple Top	VERBENACEAE