# Agricultural Potential Assessment for the proposed Wind Garden Wind Farm

# Makhanda, Eastern Cape

October 2020

**Client**

**Prepared by:**

**The Biodiversity Company**

Cell: +27 81 319 1225

Fax: +27 86 527 1965

info@thebiodiversitycompany.com

www.thebiodiversitycompany.com

| | |
|---|---|
| Report Name | **Agricultural Potential Assessment for the proposed Windfarm** |
| Submitted to | **Savannah Environment** |
| Report Reviewer | **Andrew Husted** |
| | Andrew Husted is Pr Sci Nat registered (400213/11) in the following fields of practice: Ecological Science, Environmental Science and Aquatic Science. Andrew is an Aquatic, Wetland and Biodiversity Specialist with more than 12 years' experience in the environmental consulting field. Andrew has completed numerous wetland training courses, and is an accredited wetland practitioner, recognised by the DWS, and also the Mondi Wetlands programme as a competent wetland consultant. |
| Report Writer | **Ivan Baker** |
| | Ivan Baker is Cand. Sci Nat registered (119315) in environmental science and geological science. Ivan is a wetland and ecosystem service specialist, a hydropedologist and pedologist that has completed numerous specialist studies ranging from basic assessments to EIAs. Ivan has carried out various international studies following FC standards. Ivan completed training in Tools for Wetland Assessments with a certificate of competence and completed his MSc in environmental science and hydropedology at the North-West University of Potchefstroom. |
| Declaration | The Biodiversity Company and its associates operate as independent consultants under the auspice of the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions. We declare that we have no affiliation with or vested financial interests in the proponent, other than for work performed under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2017. We have no conflicting interests in the undertaking of this activity and have no interests in secondary developments resulting from the authorisation of this project. We have no vested interest in the project, other than to provide a professional service within the constraints of the project (timing, time and budget) based on the principals of science. |

# Table of Contents

## Figures

## Tables

# Declaration

I, **Ivan Baker** declare that:

- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- all the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 71 and is punishable in terms of Section 24F of the Act.

**Ivan Baker**

**Soil Specialist**

The Biodiversity Company

October 2020

# 1 Introduction

The Biodiversity Company was appointed to conduct a pedology (agricultural potential, land capability and land use) baseline and impact assessment for the proposed Wind Garden Wind Farm. A site assessment was conducted in August 2020 to acquire baseline information regarding soil resources required for the Digital Soil Mapping exercise and to undertake the impact assessment for the project.

The approach adopted for the assessment has taken cognisance of the recently published Government Notice 320 in terms of NEMA dated 20 March 2020: "Procedures for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting on Identified Environmental Themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, when applying for Environmental Authorisation".

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

# 2 Project Area

The project area is located approximately 17 km north-west of Makhanda (previously known as Grahamstown) and 20 km east of Riebeek East, within the Eastern Cape province. The surrounding land uses include farming (crops and grazing), mountainous areas, watercourses and small portions characterised by built-up areas (residential areas, schools etc.) (see Figure 2-1). The larger project area has been assigned for the entire wind farm, with this particular assessment only focussing on the Wind Garden Farm project area within which the development footprint/project infrastructure will be placed.




*Figure 2-1 Locality map of the Wind Garden Wind Farm*

# 3 Scope of Work

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

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

# 4 Limitations

The following limitations are relevant to this agricultural compliance statement;

- It has been assumed that the extent of the properties to be assessed together with the locations of the proposed wind turbines are correct and final;

- The combined size of the project areas (west and east) is in excess of 50 000 ha, which limits the coverage during the site assessment. It is well documented by the likes of van Zijl (2018) that terrain and the size of project areas renders soil sampling impractical. Therefore, Digital Soil Mapping (DSM) was used to delineate soil resources throughout the project areas with the use of targeted ground-truthed information;
- Inaccuracies in DSMs are inevitable. Therefore, a conservative approach has been taken in regard to delineations and sensitivities; and
- The handheld GPS used potentially could have inaccuracies up to 5 m. Any and all delineations therefore could be inaccurate within 5 m.

# 5 Expertise of the Specialists

## 5.1 Andrew Husted

Mr. Andrew Husted is an aquatic ecologist, specializing in freshwater systems and wetlands, who graduated with a MSc in Zoology. He, is Pri Sci Nat registered (400213/11) in the following fields of practice: Ecological Science, Environmental Science and Aquatic Science. Mr Husted is an Aquatic, Wetland and Biodiversity Specialist with 12 years' experience in the environmental consulting field. Andrew is an accredited wetland practitioner, recognised by the relevant South African authorities, and also the Mondi Wetlands programme as a competent wetland consultant.

## 5.2 Ivan Baker

Ivan Baker is Cand. Sci Nat registered (119315) in environmental science and geological science. Ivan is a wetland and ecosystem service specialist, a hydropedologist and pedologist that has completed numerous specialist studies ranging from basic assessments to EIAs. Ivan has carried out various international studies following FC standards. Ivan completed training in Tools for Wetland Assessments with a certificate of competence and completed his MSc in environmental science and hydropedology at the North-West University of Potchefstroom.

# 6 Literature Review

## 6.1 Digital Soil Mapping

The use of the Land Type Survey (Land Type Survey Staff 1972-2006), Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Digital Elevation Models (DEM) in collaboration with ground-truthed baseline information have helped refine the ability of predictive mapping, which has paved the way for DSM (van Zijl & Botha, 2016).

Tough terrain and large project areas often render soil sampling impractical, which emphasises the need for DSM. Van Zijl (2018) mentions that sparse observation densities are often used in such cases, ranging from 74-216 $ha.obs^{-1}$. The main advantage of DSM lies within the importance of the soil-environmental correlation, which can be used to map out the distribution of soils with relatively few sampling sites.

According to van Zijl (2018), two main methodologies may be used for DSM, including the expert knowledge approach as well as the land type disaggregation approach. The latter will form part of the methodology used for the basic assessment required for this particular study. The land type disaggregation approach includes the use of land type information to digitally map out the soil units as per the dominant soil forms associated with the terrain units.

The land type disaggregation approach is commonly used for Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and has been well-documented in the past to be practical and time efficient. In addition to soil information derived from the Land Type Database (Land Type Survey Staff 1972-2006), the soil-environmental relationships observed during the site assessment will be used to improve the accuracy of the study, ultimately upholding the principle of (Botha, 2016), that in-field observations is an important addition to land type information.

## 6.2 Land Capability

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

DAFF (2017) has further modelled the land capability on a rough scale for the entire of South Africa and has divided these results into 15 classes (see Table 6-1). Terrain, climate and soil capability was used as the building blocks for this exercise to ensure a national land capability data set.

*Table 6-1 Land Capability (DAFF, 2017)*

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 13 | Very High |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |

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

# 7 Methodology

The methodology surrounding the site assessment is based on two large project areas to acquire baseline information. Given the size of these areas, a digital soil mapping approach was taken. The details surrounding this methodology is described in Apoendix D. The pedology assessment was conducted using the Provincial and National Departments of Agriculture recommendations. The assessment was broken into two phases. Phase 1 was a desktop assessment to determine the following:

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

Phase 2 of the assessment was to conduct a soil survey to determine the actual agricultural potential. During this phase the current land use was also surveyed.

## 7.1 Desktop Assessment

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

## 7.2 Agricultural Potential Assessment

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

Land capability is divided into eight classes and these may be divided into three capability groups. Table 7-1 shows how the land classes and groups are arranged in order of decreasing capability and ranges of use. The risk of use and sensitivity increases from class I to class VIII (Smith, 2006).

*Table 7-1 Land capability class and intensity of use (Smith, 2006)*

| Land Capability Class | Increased Intensity of Use | | | | | | | | | Land Capability Groups |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | W | F | LG | MG | IG | LC | MC | IC | VIC | Arable Land |
| II | W | F | LG | MG | IG | LC | MC | IC | | |
| III | W | F | LG | MG | IG | LC | MC | | | |
| IV | W | F | LG | MG | IG | LC | | | | |
| V | W | F | LG | MG | | | | | | Grazing Land |
| VI | W | F | LG | MG | | | | | | |
| VII | W | F | LG | | | | | | | |
| VIII | W | | | | | | | | | Wildlife |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| W - Wildlife | | **MG - Moderate Grazing** | | | **MC - Moderate Cultivation** | | | | | |
| F- Forestry | | **IG - Intensive Grazing** | | | **IC - Intensive Cultivation** | | | | | |
| LG - Light Grazing | | **LC - Light Cultivation** | | | **VIC - Very Intensive Cultivation** | | | | | |

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

The land potential classes are determined by combining the land capability results and the climate capability of a region as shown in Table 7-2. The final land potential results are then described in Table 7-2. These land potential classes are regarded as the final delineations subject to sensitivity, given the comprehensive addition of climatic conditions as those relevant to the DAFF (2017) land capabilities. The main contributors to the climatic conditions as per Smith (2006) is that of Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP), Mean Annual Potential Evaporation (MAPE), mean September temperatures, mean June temperatures and mean annual temperatures. These parameters will be derived from Mucina and Rutherford (2006) for each vegetation type located within the relevant project area. This will give the specialist the opportunity to consider micro-climate, aspect, topography etc.

*Table 7-2 The combination table for land potential classification*

| Land capability class | Climate capability class | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | C7 | C8 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | L1 | L1 | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 |
| II | L1 | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5 |
| III | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5 | L6 |
| IV | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5 | L5 | L6 |
| V | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei |
| VI | L4 | L4 | L5 | L5 | L5 | L6 | L6 | L7 |
| VII | L5 | L5 | L6 | L6 | L7 | L7 | L7 | L8 |
| VIII | L6 | L6 | L7 | L7 | L8 | L8 | L8 | L8 |

*Table 7-3 The Land Potential Classes.*

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

## 7.3 Climate Capability

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

*Table 7-4 Climatic capability (step 1) (Scotney et al., 1987)*

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **C6** | Severe | Moderately restricted growing season due to low temperatures, frost and/or moisture stress. Limited suitable crops that frequently experience yield loss. | 0.38-0.41 |
| **C7** | Severe to Very Severe | Severely restricted choice of crops due to heat and moisture stress. | 0.34-0.38 |
| **C8** | Very Severe | Very severely restricted choice of crops due to heat and moisture stress. Suitable crops at high risk of yield loss. | 0.30-0.34 |

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

**Step 2**

Mean September temperatures;

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

**Step 3**

Mean June temperatures;

- <9℃ = C5
- 9 - 10℃ = C4
- 10 - 11℃ = C3
- 11 - 12℃ = C2

## 7.4 Current Land Use

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

- Mining;
- Bare areas;
- Agriculture crops;
- Plantation;
- Urban;
- Built-up;

- Natural veld;
- Grazing lands;
- Forest;
- Waterbodies; and
- Wetlands.

# 8 Desktop Findings

## 8.1 Climate

The Wind Garden project area is characterised by three vegetation types, namely the AT 8 (Kowie Thicket), the NKI 4 (Albany Broken Veld) and the SVs 7 (Bhisho Thornveld) vegetation types (see Figure 8-1). The climate diagrams for these three vegetation types are illustrated in Figure 8-2 to Figure 8-4.




*Figure 8-1 Vegetation types for the Wind Garden Wind Farm*




*Figure 8-2 Climate for the Bhisho Thornveld (SVs 7) vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006)*




*Figure 8-3 Climate for the Kowie Thicket (AT 8) vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006)*




*Figure 8-4 Climate for the Albany Broken Veld Thicket (NKI 4) vegetation type (Mucina & Rutherford, 2006)*

## 8.2 Soils and Geology

According to the land type database (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006) the development falls within the Fc744, Fc 745 and Fc 747 land types. The Fc land type consists of Glenrosa and/or Mispah soil forms with the possibility of other soils occurring throughout. Lime is rare or absent within this land type in upland soils but generally present in low-lying areas.




*Figure 8-5 Illustration of land type Fc 744 terrain unit (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)*

*Table 8-1 Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Fc 744 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)*

| **Terrain Units** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1 (20%)** | | **3 (65%)** | | **4 (10%)** | | **5 (5%)** | |
| Mispah | 45% | Glenrosa | 30% | Oakleaf | 50% | Oakleaf | 45% |
| Glenrosa | 30% | Swartland | 20% | Estcourt | 15% | Valsrivier | 15% |
| Swartland | 10% | Oakleaf | 12% | Valsrivier | 10% | Dundee | 15% |
| Bare Rock | 10% | Mispah | 10% | Swartland | 10% | Kroonstad | 10% |
| Hutton | 5% | Valsrivier | 5% | Hutton | 5% | Stream Beds | 10% |
| | | Hutton | 5% | Sterkspruit | 5% | Estcourt | 5% |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Estcourt | 5% | Kroonstad | 5% | | |
| | | Sterkspruit | 5% | | | | |
| | | Kroonstad | 3% | | | | |




*Figure 8-6 Illustration of land type Fc 745 terrain unit (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)*

*Table 8-2 Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Fc 745 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)*

| **Terrain Units** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1 (75%)** | | **3 (20%)** | | **4 (4%)** | | **5 (1%)** | |
| Glenrosa | 25% | Glenrosa | 40% | Oakleaf | 45% | Oakleaf | 75% |
| Sterkspruit | 25% | Mispah | 30% | Swartland | 20% | Valsrivier | 15% |
| Mispah | 20% | Swartland | 10% | Sterkspruit | 15% | Swartland | 5% |
| Swartland | 15%% | Bare Rock | 5% | Valsrivier | 10% | Sterkspruit | 5% |
| Hutton | 10% | Hutton | 5% | Glenrosa | 5% | | |
| Bare Rock | 5% | Oakleaf | 5% | Hutton | 5% | | |
| | | Valsrivier | 5% | | | | |




*Figure 8-7 Illustration of land type Fc 747 terrain unit (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)*

*Table 8-3 Soils expected at the respective terrain units within the Fc 747 land type (Land Type Survey Staff, 1972 - 2006)*

| **Terrain Units** | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1 (30%)** | | **3 (50%)** | | **4 (15%)** | | **5 (5%)** | |
| Mispah | 45% | Glenrosa | 25% | Oakleaf | 30% | Oakleaf | 40% |
| Glenrosa | 30% | Mispah | 15% | Swartland | 25% | Katspruit | 20% |
| Bare Rock | 10% | Swartland | 15% | Hutton | 15% | Dundee | 20% |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Swartland | 10% | Bare Rock | 15% | Katspruit | 10% | Stream Beds | 10% |
| Hutton | 5% | Oakleaf | 10% | Sterkspruit | 10% | Valsrivier | 5% |
| | | Katspruit | 5% | Glenrosa | 5% | Sterkspruit | 5% |
| | | Valsrivier | 5% | Valsrivier | 5% | | |




*Figure 8-8 Land types present within the Wind Garden Wind Farm project area*

## 8.3 Terrain

The slope percentage of the project area has been calculated and is illustrated in Figure 8-9. The majority of the project area is characterised by a slope percentage between 0 and 10%, with some smaller patches within the project area characterised by a slope percentage up to 44%. This illustration indicates a non-uniform topography with a high concentration of mountainous areas and ridges. The elevation of the project area (Figure 8-10) indicates an elevation of 502– 694 Metres Above Sea Level (MASL).




*Figure 8-9 Slope percentage map for the project area*




Figure 8-10 Elevation of the project area (metres above sea level)

# 9 Results and Discussion

The following sections include results from field observations as well as the digital soil mapping exercise relevant to the agricultural potential of the project area.

## 9.1 Description of Identified Soil Profiles and Diagnostic Horizons

Soil profiles were studied up to a depth of 1.2 m to identify specific diagnostic horizons which are vital in the soil classification process as well as determining the agricultural potential and land capability. The following diagnostic horizons were identified during the site assessment:

- Orthic topsoil;
- Lithocutanic horizon;
- Pedocutanic horizon;
- Prismacutanic horizon; and
- Hard rock horizon.

### 9.1.1 Orthic Topsoil

Orthic topsoils are mineral horizons that have been exposed to biological activities and varying intensities of mineral weathering. The climatic conditions and parent material ensure a wide range of properties differing from one Orthic A topsoil to another (i.e. colouration, structure etc) (Soil Classification Working Group, 2018).

### 9.1.2 Lithocutanic Horizon

For the Lithocutanic horizon, i*n situ* weathering of rock underneath topsoil results in a well-mixed soil-rock layer. The colour, structure and consistency of this material must be directly related to the parent material of the weathered rock. The Lithocutanic horizon is usually followed by a massive rock layer at shallow depths. Hard rock, permeable rock and horizontally layered shale usually is not associated with the weathering processes involved with the formation of this diagnostic horizon.

### 9.1.3 Hard Rock Horizon

The hard rock layer disallows infiltration of water or root systems and occur in shallow profiles. Horizontally layered, hard sediments without evidence of vertical seems fall under this category.

### 9.1.4 Pedocutanic Horizon

A Pedocutanic horizon has a well-developed blocky structure as well as a high concentration of clay due to illuvial processes leaching clay particles to the horizon. For red Pedocutanic horizons, an abrupt transition between the sub soil horizon and the topsoil can be expected.

### 9.1.5 Prismacutanic Horizon

The Prismacutanic is characterised by a dense soil formation and a higher clay percentage than the overlying topsoil together with a columnar structure and abrupt transitions. These soil horizons are located throughout sub-humid to semi-arid climates and is associated with mudstone and shale as parent material. These horizons are characterised by low organic material and a high exchangeable sodium or magnesium content. Mica, smectite and kaolinite dominate the clay minerology which increase the erosion sensitivity of these soils in exposed areas.

## 9.2 Description of Soil Forms and Soil Families

During the site assessment various soil forms were identified. These soil forms have been delineated and are illustrated in Figure 9-1 and is described in Table 9-1 according to depth, clay percentage, indications of surface crusting, signs of wetness and percentage rock. The soil forms are followed by the soil family and in brackets the maximum clay percentage of the topsoil. Soil family characteristics are described in Table 9-2.




*Figure 9-1 Soil delineations within the project area*

*Table 9-1 Summary of soils identified within the project area*

| | Topsoil | | | | | Subsoil A | | | | Subsoil B | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Depth (mm)** | **Clay (%)** | **Signs of wetness** | **Rock %** | **Surface crusting** | **Depth (mm)** | **Clay (%)** | **Signs of wetness** | **Rock %** | **Depth (mm)** | **Clay (%)** | **Signs of wetness** | **Rock %** |
| **Mispah and Glenrosa 3220(15)** | 0-300 | 0-15 | None | >30 | None | N/A | | | | N/A | | | |
| **<30 cm Swartland 2222(35)** | 0-300 | 15-35 | None | 20-30 | None | N/A | | | | N/A | | | |
| **30-50 cm Swartland 2222(35)** | 0-300 | 15-35 | None | 0 | None | 300 to 500 | 0-15 | None | 0 | N/A | | | |
| **>50 cm Swartland 2222(35)** | 0-300 | 0-15 | None | 0 | None | 300 to >1200 | 0-15 | None | 0 | N/A | | | |
| **Valsrivier and Sterkspruit 2220(35)** | 0-300 | 0-15 | None | 0 | None | 300 to >1200 | 0-15 | None | 0 | N/A | | | |
| **Hydromorphic** | Wide variety of saturated systems | | | | | Wide variety of saturated systems | | | | Wide variety of saturated systems | | | |

*Table 9-2 Description of soil family characteristics*

| Soil Form/Family | Topsoil Colour | Colour and presence of vertic properties | Occurrence of Lime | Extent of Lithic Weathering |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Swartland 2222(35)** | Grey/Bleached | Brown with Vertic Properties | Calcareous Pedocutanic | Geolithic |
| **Mispah and Glenrosa 3220(15)** | Grey/Bleached | | Calcareous in Lithic/Hard Rock | Geolithic |
| **Valsrivier and Sterkspruit 2220(35)** | Grey/Bleached | Brown with Vertic Properties | Calcareous Prismacutanic | Geolithic |
| **Hydromorphic** | Signs of Wetness Throughout | | | |

## 9.3 Agricultural Potential

Agricultural potential is determined by a combination of soil, terrain and climate features. Land capability classes reflect the most intensive long-term use of land under rain-fed conditions.

The land capability is determined by the physical features of the landscape including the soils present. The land potential or agricultural potential is determined by combining the land capability results and the climate capability for the region.

### 9.3.1 Climate Capability

The climatic capability has been determined by means of the Smith (2006) methodology, of which the first step includes determining the climate capability of the region by means of the Mean Annual Precipitation (MAP) and annual Class A pan (potential evaporation) (see Figure 9-2 and Table 7-4).




*Figure 9-2 Veg type Mean Annual Precipitation/Class A-Pan ratios*

*Table 9-3 Climatic capability (step 1) (Scotney et al., 1987)*

| Central Sandy Bushveld region | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Climatic Capability Class** | Limitation Rating | Description | MAP: Class A pan Class | Applicability to site |
| **C1** | None to Slight | Local climate is favourable for good yields for a wide range of adapted crops throughout the year. | 0.75-1.00 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **C2** | Slight | Local climate is favourable for a wide range of adapted crops and a year-round growing season. Moisture stress and lower temperature increase risk and decrease yields relative to C1. | 0.50-0.75 | |
| **C3** | Slight to Moderate | Slightly restricted growing season due to the occurrence of low temperatures and frost. Good yield potential for a moderate range of adapted crops. | 0.47-0.50 | |
| **C4** | Moderate | Moderately restricted growing season due to the occurrence of low temperatures and severe frost. Good yield potential for a moderate range of adapted crops but planting date options more limited than C3. | 0.44-0.47 | |
| **C5** | Moderate to Severe | Moderately restricted growing season due to low temperatures, frost and/or moisture stress. Suitable crops at risk of some yield loss. | 0.41-0.44 | **SVs 7** |
| **C6** | Severe | Moderately restricted growing season due to low temperatures, frost and/or moisture stress. Limited suitable crops that frequently experience yield loss. | 0.38-0.41 | |
| **C7** | Severe to Very Severe | Severely restricted choice of crops due to heat and moisture stress. | 0.34-0.38 | |
| **C8** | Very Severe | Very severely restricted choice of crops due to heat and moisture stress. Suitable crops at high risk of yield loss. | 0.30-0.34 | **AT 8 and NKI 4** |

According to Smith (2006), the climatic capability of a region is only refined past the first step (Table 7-4) if the climatic capability is determined to be between climatic capability 1 and 6. Given the fact that the climatic capability has been determined to be “C8” during the first step for vegetation types NKI 4 and AT 8, no further refinements will be made.

As for the SVs 7 vegetation type, the following steps will further refine the climatic capability taking into consideration the mean annual September and June temperatures.

### Step 2- Mean Annual September Temperatures

*Table 9-4 Mean September Temperatures for SVs 7*

| Mean Temperature | Refined Climatic Capability Class | Applicability |
|---|---|---|
| **<10℃** | C6 | ✓ |
| **10-11℃** | C5 | |
| **11-12℃** | C4 | |
| **12-13℃** | C3 | |
| **>13℃** | C1 | |

### Step 3- Mean Annual June Temperatures

*Table 9-5 Mean June Temperatures for SVs 7*

| Mean Temperature | Refined Climatic Capability Class | Applicability |
|---|---|---|
| <9C | C5 | ✓ |
| 9-10℃ | C4 | |
| 10-11℃ | C3 | |
| 11-12℃ | C2 | |

Given the fact that the C6 climatic capability from the second step hasn't been upgraded by means of the third step, the second step's C6 will still apply. Therefore, the climatic capability of the AT 8 and NKI 4 vegetation types have been determined to be C8 with the SVs 7 vegetation type being C6 (see Figure 9-3).




*Figure 9-3 Climatic capability of vegetation types*

## 9.3.2 Land Capability

The land capability was determined by using the guidelines described in "The farming handbook" (Smith, 2006). The delineated soil forms were clipped into the four different slope classes (0-3%, 3-7%, 7-12% and >12%) to determine the land capability of each soil form. These land capabilities were then grouped together in five different land capability classes (land capability 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6). As per example, the Swartland (between 30 and 50 cm in depth) soil form will classify as a Land Capability (LC) 3 within the first slope class (0-3%), a LC3 in the second class (3-7), a LC4 within the third class (7-12%) and a LC6 in the fourth (>12%) slope class (see Table 9-6).

It is however worth noting, that even though the slope percentage of an area plays a considerable role in the formation and morphology of soil forms, the slope class is not the only parameter used to determine land capability. All parameters listed in Table 9-2 are also used to calculate land capability together with slope percentage. Key parameters used to determine the land capability include topsoil texture, depth and the permeability class of a soil form. The land capabilities for the project area are described in Table 9-7 and illustrated in Figure 9-5.

*Table 9-6 Land capability calculations as per the slope classes relevant to the project area for the Swartland soil form (between 30 and 50 cm in depth)*

| Soil Form | Slope Class | Calculated Land Capability |
|---|---|---|
| **Swartland (between 30 and 50 cm)** | 0-3% | LC3 |
| | 3-7% | LC3 |
| | 7-12% | LC4 |
| | >12% | LC6 |




*Figure 9-4 Four slope classes relevant to the land capability calculation methodology*

*Table 9-7 Land capability for the soils within the project area*

| Land Capability Class | Definition of Class | Conservation Need | Use-Suitability | Percentage Within Project Area | Land Capability Group | Sensitivity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2** | Slight limitations. High arable potential. Low erosion hazard | Adequate run-off control | Annual cropping with special tillage or ley (25%) | 0.2 | Arable | High |
| **3** | Moderate limitations. Some erosion hazard | Special conservation practice and tillage methods | Rotation crops and ley (50%) | 5.7 | Arable | High |
| **4** | Severe limitations. Low arable potential. | Intensive conservation practice | Long term leys (75%) | 2 | Arable | Moderate |
| **5** | Water course and land with wetness limitations | Protection and control of water table | Improved pastures, suitable for wildlife | 0.1 | Grazing | Low |
| **6** | Limitations preclude cultivation. Suitable for perennial vegetation | Protection measures for establishment, e.g. sod-seeding | Veld, pastures and afforestation | 92 | Grazing | Low |




*Figure 9-5 Land capability classes for the project area*

### 9.3.3 Land Potential

The methodology in regard to the calculations of the relevant land potential levels are illustrated in Table 9-8 and Table 9-9. From the five land capability classes, five land potential levels have been determined by means of the Guy and Smith (1998) methodology. Land capability II has been reduced to a land potential level L4 and L5 due to climatic limitations. Land capability class III has been allocated a land potential level of L4 and L6, with land capability IV being scored L5 and L6. As for the land capability 6, land potential levels of L6 and L7 were calculated. The land capability V is characterised by a "Vlei" land potential level (see Figure 9-6).

*Table 9-8 Land potential from climate capability vs land capability (Guy and Smith, 1998)*

| Land Capability Class | Climatic Capability Class | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | C7 | C8 |
| **LC1** | L1 | L1 | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 |
| **LC2** | L1 | L2 | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4* | L4 | L5* |
| **LC3** | L2 | L2 | L2 | L2 | L4 | L4* | L5 | L6* |
| **LC4** | L2 | L3 | L3 | L4 | L4 | L5* | L5 | L6* |
| **LC5** | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei | Vlei |
| **LC6** | L4 | L4 | L5 | L5 | L5 | L6* | L6 | L7* |
| **LC7** | L5 | L5 | L6 | L6 | L7 | L7 | L7 | L8 |
| **LC8** | L6 | L6 | L7 | L7 | L8 | L8 | L8 | L8 |

*Land potential level applicable to climatic and land capability

*Table 9-9 Land potential for the soils within the project area (Guy and Smith, 1998)*

| Land Potential | Percentage | Description of Land Potential Class | Sensitivity |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 4.5 | **Moderate potential**. Moderately regular and/or severe to moderate limitations due to slope, soil, rainfall and/or temperatures. Appropriate permission is required before ploughing virgin land. | Moderate |
| 5 | 1.4 | **Restricted potential.** Regular and/or moderate to severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures and/or rainfall. | Moderate |
| 6 | 39.5 | **Very restricted potential.** Regular and/or severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Non-arable. | Low |
| Vlei | 0.1 | Wetland (grazing and wildlife) | Low |
| 7 | 54.5 | **Low potential**. Severe limitations due to soil, slope, temperatures or rainfall. Non-arable. | Very Low |




*Figure 9-6 Land potential determined for the project area*

## 9.4 Current Land Use

Five different land uses have been identified within the proposed project area, namely “Crop Fields”, “Built-Up Areas”, “Dams”, “Grazing” and “Public Roads” (Figure 9-7 to Figure 9-9). The crop field areas have been provided by the DAFF (2017) national agricultural theme screening tool.




*Figure 9-7 Different land uses within the proposed project area*




*Figure 9-8 Examples of the "Bult-up", "Dams" and "Crop Fields" land use*




*Figure 9-9 Examples of the "Wetlands" and "Public Roads" land use*

# 10 Sensitivity Assessment

The agriculture theme sensitivity as indicated in the screening report indicates a combination of "Low", "Moderate" and "High" sensitivities (Figure 10-1). It is worth noting that the only two "High" sensitivity areas were identified within the project area, of which both classify as crop fields. These areas have therefore been determined to have "High" sensitivities due to land use, and not necessarily due to high agricultural potential. No development will take place within these "High" sensitivity areas.




*Figure 10-1 Agriculture theme sensitivity, DEA Screening Report*

As per the terms of reference for the project, GIS sensitivity maps are required in order to identify sensitive features in terms of the relevant specialist discipline/s within the project area. The sensitivity scores identified during the field survey for the identified land potential levels are illustrated in Figure 10-2.

The land potentials determined from baseline findings (see Table 9-9) together with the "High" sensitivity land uses determined by the DEA screening tool were used to describe the sensitivity of natural resources within the project area.




*Figure 10-2 Agriculture sensitivity of the project area*

## 10.1 Consideration of Alternatives

No alternatives have been provided for the wind turbines, the 132kV OHL, the 132kV substation and the access roads. It is worth noting that no "High" potential land potential resources are located within the extent of these activities. Therefore, it is the specialist's opinion that no alternatives are necessary, and that implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures and responses to the monitoring programme (where necessary) will be effective in conserving soil resources.

As for the 132kV collector sub and the BoP, a larger project area has been provided to determine the potential for alternative areas within the footprint's extent worth lower sensitivities.

### 10.1.1 Balance of Plant

It is the specialist's opinion that the portions within the BoP's extent characterised by "Low" sensitivities are not large enough to accommodate two separate footprint areas worth 6 and 12 ha (camp site and construction site respectively).

It is however worth noting that the "Moderate" sensitivities are not associated with high land potentials, which renders these soil resources conservable by means of the prescribed mitigation measures. If possible, these developed areas should be placed, as much as possible, within "Low" sensitivity areas.

### 10.1.2 132kV Collector Sub

A larger footprint area (approximately 7 ha in size) has been used for the project area relevant to the 132kV collector sub, to determine potential areas less sensitive to be used for development. It is the specialist's opinion that the entire project area is characterised by "Low" sensitivities. Therefore, the development of the 1 ha collector sub can proceed anywhere within the larger project area considered for the sub.

# 11 Impact Statement

The impact statement focusses on the activities occurring within the 50 m regulated area (DEA, 2020) of the “Moderate” and “High” sensitivity resources, given the fact that these areas will be most vulnerable to degradation. Regardless, various recommendations and mitigation measures will be prescribed to ensure the conservation of all resources, including those labelled as “Low” sensitivity. All proposed activities are expected to be long term (> 15 years) and have been considered “permanent” on this basis, which renders the decommissioning phase irrelevant. According to the illustration in Figure 11-1, various activities are proposed within the 50 m regulated area of “Moderate” and “High” sensitivity resources, including;

- Construction and operation of the 132kV collector sub;
- Construction and operation of the 132kV substation;
- Construction and operation of the Balance of Plant (BoP);
- Construction and operation of the wind turbines;
- Construction and operation of the 132kV Overhead Lines (OHL); and
- Construction and operation of the access roads.




*Figure 11-1 Proposed activities within project area*

## 11.1 132kV Collector Sub and 132kV Substation

The impact statement of the 132kV substation and collector sub has been combined given the association with similar sensitivities, extent and significance of impacts.

The collector sub's footprint area illustrated in Figure 11-1 comprises of approximately 7 ha, the final development footprint area will however only be 1 ha in size. The larger footprint area indicated in Figure 11-1 therefore provides the specialist the opportunity to comment on the micro-setting of the proposed sub to avoid potential high sensitivity resources. It is however worth noting that the proposed development footprint area is located within a "Low" sensitivity soil resource with the 50 m regulated area surrounding "Moderate" sensitivities being located approximately 100 m away from the proposed development area.




*Figure 11-2 Locality of 132kV Collector Sub*

The proposed 132kV substation's footprint area is proposed to be 1 ha in size, and therefore will take up the entire site illustrated in Figure 11-3. The proposed substation is located within a "Low" sensitivity area and approximately 60 m north of the 50 m regulated area surrounding the "Moderate" sensitivity resources.


*Figure 11-3 132kV Substation location*

It is the specialist's opinion that the construction and operation of the 132kV Collector Sub and tge 132kV Substation will have an acceptable impact on the agricultural production capability of the area given the fact that only "Low" and "Moderate" sensitivities are associated with the footprint areas.

## 11.2 Wind Turbines

The wind turbine locations are illustrated in Figure 11-4. Out of the 47 wind turbines proposed for the Wind Garden project area, only nine are located within 50 m of "Moderate" sensitivity resources. Therefore, the focus of this impact assessment will be on the latter, with the remainder of the turbines (that are located within "Low" sensitivity areas) being covered by general mitigation described in Section 12.




Figure 11-4 Locality of wind turbines within the areas of moderate sensitivity areas

It is the specialist's opinion that the proposed wind turbines will have an acceptable impact on the agricultural production capability of the area given the fact that only "Low" and "Moderate" sensitivities are associated with the footprint areas.

## 11.3 Linear Activities (Access Roads and 132kV OHL)

The impact assessment of the access roads and the 132kV OHL has been combined given the association with similar sensitivities, width of servitudes and significance of impacts.

The access roads and 132kV OHL's locations are illustrated in Figure 11-5. Various sections of the access roads and the majority of the OHL's extent crosses through "Moderate" sensitivity soil resources. Access roads will be used to gain access to all the construction sites (i.e. turbines) with the 132kV OHL connecting the 132kV substation and collector sub.




*Figure 11-5 Locality of access roads and the 132kV OHL*

It is the specialist's opinion that the proposed linear activities will have an acceptable impact on the agricultural production capability of the area given the fact that only "Low" and "Moderate" sensitivities are associated with the footprint areas.

## 11.4 Balance of Plant

The proposed Balance of Plant (BoP) will include a construction site as well as a camp site for staff (staff accommodation). The construction site will be utilised for storage, mixing concrete, batching etc. The camp site and construction area are proposed to be 6 ha and 12 ha in size respectively. Therefore, only 18 of the 25 ha within the BoP will be developed. The extent of the BoP footprint is characterised by a combination of "Low" and "Moderate" sensitivities (although the majority of the area comprises of "Moderate" sensitivities).




*Figure 11-6 Locality of Balance of Plant*

It is the specialist's opinion that the proposed BoP will have an acceptable impact on the agricultural production capability of the area given the fact that only "Low" and "Moderate" sensitivities are associated with the footprint areas.

## 11.5 Cumulative Impact Statement

Cumulative impacts within the Wind Garden Wind Farm project area and its surroundings have been determined to be low. The general condition of the soil resources are predominantly natural. Aside from isolated areas of erosion, limited developments and accompanying anthropogenic activities, no significant degradation of the area is notable. Additionally, considering the low sensitivity of the soil resources in the area, it is the specialist's opinion that no significant impacts are expected in the foreseeable future.

*Table 11-1 Impact assessment related cumulative impacts*

| | ***Cumulative impacts*** | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Loss of land capability** | |
| | **Without mitigation** | **With mitigation** |
| ***Extent*** | Low (2) | Low (2) |
| ***Duration*** | Permanent (5) | Permanent (5) |
| ***Magnitude*** | Minor (2) | Minor (2) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ***Probability*** | Improbable (2) | Improbable (2) |
| ***Significance*** | **Low (18)** | **Low (18)** |
| ***Status (positive or negative)*** | Negative | Negative |
| ***Reversibility*** | Moderate | Moderate |
| ***Irreplaceable loss of resources?*** | No | No |

### 11.6 Specialist Opinion

It is the specialist's opinion that the baseline findings concur with the land capabilities identified by means of the DAFF (2017) desktop findings in regard to land capability sensitivities. No "High" land capability sensitivities were identified within proximity to any of the proposed activities. Considering the lack of sensitivity and the measures put in place in regard to stormwater management and erosion control, it is the specialist's opinion that all activities will have an acceptable impact on agricultural productivity. Furthermore, no measures in regard to moving components in their micro-setting were required to avoid or minimise fragmentation and disturbances of agricultural activities.

Therefore, it is the specialist's opinion that the proposed activities should proceed as have been planned without the concern of loss of high sensitivity land capabilities or agricultural productivity.

## 12 Recommendations and Mitigation

### 12.1 General Mitigation

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

- Only the proposed access roads are to be used to reduce any unnecessary compaction;
- Prevent any spills from occurring. Machines must be parked within hard park areas and must be checked daily for fluid leaks;
- Proper invasive plant control must be undertaken quarterly;
- All excess soil (soil that are stripped and stockpiled to make way for foundations) must be stored, continuously rehabilitated to be used for rehabilitation of eroded areas; and
- If a spill occurs, it is to be cleaned up immediately and reported to the appropriate authorities.

### 12.2 Restoration of Vegetation Cover

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

### 12.2.1 Ripping Compacted Areas

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

To summarise;

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

### 12.2.2 Revegetate Degraded Areas

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

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

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

The following species are recommended for rehabilitation purposes;

- *Eragrostis teff;*
- *Cynodon species (Indigenous and altered types);*
- *Chloris gayana;*

- *Panicum maximum;*
- *Digitaria eriantha;*
- *Anthephora pubescens; and*
- *Cenchrus ciliaris.*

### 12.3 Specialist Recommendation

All aspects considered during the impact assessment has been determined to have “Low” or “Moderate” post-mitigation significance ratings. The worst-case impact scenario includes “Moderate” final significance ratings associated with “Moderate” sensitivity resources. It is the specialist’s opinion that erosion from increased overland flows following the development of various components is of most concern, given the fact that erosion could result in a direct loss of soil resources.

Various mitigation measures and monitoring activities have however been prescribed, which will remedy the potential effects that erosion might have on land capability. Therefore, it is the specialist’s opinion that all proposed activities may proceed as have been planned, and that all mitigation and monitoring activities be strictly adhered to, to ensure the conservation of soil resources.

## 13 Conclusion

Various soil forms were identified within the Wind Garden Wind Farm project area, namely Swartland, Glenrosa, Mispah, Valsrivier and Sterkspruit. These soil forms were determined to be associated with five different land capabilities, namely LCII, LCIII, LCIV, LCV and LCVI. These land capability classes were then further refined to land potential levels by comparing land capability of climatic capabilities of the project area. Five land potential levels were then calculated, namely L4, L5, L6, L7 and “Vlei”.

These land potential levels were used to determine the sensitivities of soil resources. Together with sensitive agricultural fields determined by means of the DEA screening tool, “Low”, “Moderate” and “High” sensitivities were determined. Various aspects included in the proposed wind farm are located throughout the “Low” and “Moderate” sensitivity features, with no components situated within the “High” sensitivity features.

The sensitivities were considered together with the intensity of respective project components during the site assessment. Accordingly, various “Moderate” and “Low” post-mitigation significance ratings were calculated. It is the specialist’s opinion that even though the “Moderate” sensitivity features are susceptible to erosion, that the implementation of recommended monitoring activities and the application of erosion control features will be sufficient in the conservation of resources.

## 14 References

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

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

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

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

SASA, S. A. 1999. Identification & management of the SOILS of the South African sugar industry. Mount Edgecombe: South African Sugar Association Experiment Station.

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

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

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

Van Zijl, G.M. & Botha, J.O. 2016. In pursuit of a South African national soil database: potential and pitfalls of combining different soil datasets.

Van Zijl, G.M. 2018. Digital soil mapping approaches to address real world problems in southern Africa.

# Appendix A- Eastern Sites Soil Observations

| | | | Topsoil | | | Subsoil | | | Restricting Layer | Geographic Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Observation** | **Transect** | **Soil Form** | **Type** | **Depth (cm)** | **Texture** | **Type** | **Depth (cm)** | **Texture** | **Depth (cm)** | **TMU** |
| **48** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **1** | 1 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 3 |
| **3** | 1 | Cartref | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Albic | 25 | Powdery | 30 | 4 |
| **4** | 1 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 25 | 5 |
| **47** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 25 | 5 |
| **33** | 2 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 5 | Granular | 15 | 1 |
| **32** | 2 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 15 | 1 |
| **31** | 2 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 25 | 3 |
| **30** | 2 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Granular | 20 | 4 |
| **101** | 2 | Valsrivier | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 115 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| **22** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 15 | 1 |
| **E2** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 5 | Granular | 15 | 1 |
| **E3** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 1 |
| **E4** | 3 | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 40 | Sub Angular | 60 | 5 |
| **E5** | 3 | Swartland | Orthic | 7 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 35 | 4 |
| **E6** | 3+4 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 15 | 3 |
| **E7** | 4 | Sepane | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 110 | Angular | - | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E8** | 4 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 3 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Granular | 18 | 3 |
| **34** | 4 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 25 | Angular | 35 | 3 |
| **E9** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 7 | Granular | - | - | - | 7 | 1 |
| **35** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 3 |
| **36** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Angular | 25 | 1 |
| **5** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **E10** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **6** | 5 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 15 | 3 |
| **7** | 5 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Angular | 25 | 4 |
| **8** | 5 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 30 | 5 |
| **9** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | - | 4 |
| **49** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 3 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 13 | 1 |
| **50** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Granular | 20 | 1 |
| **37** | - | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 105 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **38** | - | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 110 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **E11** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 70 | Sub Angular | 75 | 4 |
| **E12** | 6 | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 105 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **E13** | 6 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 3 |
| **E14** | 6 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |
| **E15** | 6 | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 1 |
| **E16** | 6 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 25 | 1 |
| **E17** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E18** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Angular | - | 4 |
| **E19** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 3 |
| **E20** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 30 | 3 |
| **E21** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Angular | 15 | 3 |
| **E22** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 1 |
| **E23** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 10 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |
| **E24** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 50 | Angular | 65 | 5 |
| **E25** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Angular | 35 | 4 |
| **E26** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 30 | 4 |
| **E27** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 30 | 3 |
| **102** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 110 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **103** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| **104** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 110 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |

## Appendix B- Eastern Sites Soil Observation Coordinates

| GPS | Latitude | Longitude | GPS | Latitude | Longitude |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 33°18'29.04"S | 26°23'34.66"E | 9 | 33°15'55.61"S | 26°23'53.27"E |
| 2 | 33°18'20.53"S | 26°23'36.94"E | 49 | 33°15'39.56"S | 26°24'15.85"E |
| 3 | 33°18'9.78"S | 26°23'39.95"E | 50 | 33°15'19.68"S | 26°24'24.48"E |
| 4 | 33°18'0.14"S | 26°23'42.16"E | 37 | 33°15'8.16"S | 26°23'47.17"E |
| 47 | 33°17'58.48"S | 26°23'34.36"E | 38 | 33°15'6.15"S | 26°23'54.93"E |
| 48 | 33°18'35.55"S | 26°22'1.97"E | E10 | 33°16'41.49"S | 26°23'41.46"E |
| 33 | 33°11'1.22"S | 26°26'11.73"E | E11 | 33°14'55.60"S | 26°22'34.08"E |
| 32 | 33°11'6.99"S | 26°26'9.70"E | E12 | 33°14'57.73"S | 26°22'24.88"E |
| 31 | 33°11'12.88"S | 26°26'7.25"E | E13 | 33°14'47.04"S | 26°22'23.53"E |
| 30 | 33°11'19.64"S | 26°26'4.48"E | E14 | 33°14'47.19"S | 26°22'59.42"E |
| 101 | 33°11'24.18"S | 26°26'2.64"E | E15 | 33°14'28.71"S | 26°23'24.50"E |
| 22 | 33°13'7.99"S | 26°24'19.47"E | E16 | 33°13'59.05"S | 26°23'31.24"E |
| E2 | 33°13'14.69"S | 26°24'19.68"E | E17 | 33°13'46.94"S | 26°23'17.50"E |
| E3 | 33°13'24.36"S | 26°24'52.67"E | E18 | 33°13'41.03"S | 26°22'55.57"E |
| E4 | 33°13'19.65"S | 26°25'55.79"E | E19 | 33°14'13.37"S | 26°21'22.98"E |
| E5 | 33°13'25.38"S | 26°25'52.92"E | E20 | 33°14'13.92"S | 26°21'15.69"E |
| E6 | 33°13'32.44"S | 26°25'50.29"E | E21 | 33°13'55.56"S | 26°20'56.58"E |
| E7 | 33°13'36.45"S | 26°25'59.21"E | E22 | 33°13'43.94"S | 26°21'30.72"E |
| E8 | 33°13'34.71"S | 26°25'54.37"E | E23 | 33°13'29.42"S | 26°20'33.67"E |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E9 | 33°15'12.55"S | 26°26'17.46"E | E24 | 33°12'46.35"S | 26°21'6.84"E |
| 34 | 33°15'22.95"S | 26°26'16.06"E | E25 | 33°12'44.93"S | 26°21'21.84"E |
| 35 | 33°14'58.44"S | 26°26'22.71"E | E26 | 33°12'47.39"S | 26°21'48.03"E |
| 36 | 33°14'57.49"S | 26°26'29.53"E | E27 | 33°13'4.50"S | 26°22'25.12"E |
| 5 | 33°16'36.45"S | 26°23'30.44"E | 102 | 33°11'41.68"S | 26°25'35.56"E |
| 6 | 33°16'23.64"S | 26°23'32.89"E | 103 | 33°11'42.85"S | 26°25'1.18"E |
| 7 | 33°15'56.70"S | 26°23'40.15"E | 104 | 33°14'58.16"S | 26°21'25.97"E |
| 8 | 33°15'51.25"S | 26°23'42.37"E | | | |

## Appendix C- Western Sites Soil Observations

| | | | Topsoil | | | Subsoil | | | Restricting Layer | Geographic Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observation | Transect | Soil Form | Type | Depth (cm) | Texture | Type | Depth (cm) | Texture | Depth (cm) | TMU |
| W1 | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Granular | 20 | 1 |
| W2 | - | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 115 | Angular | - | 5 |
| W3 | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 35 | Sub Angular | 45 | 3 |
| W4 | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 30 | Sub Angular | 35 | 5 |
| W5 | - | Mispah | Orthic | 15 | Granular | - | - | - | 15 | 1 |
| W6 | 1 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 50 | Sub Angular | 55 | 5 |
| W7 | 1 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 40 | Sub Angular | 45 | 4 |
| W8 | 1 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 3 |
| W9 | 1 | Mispah | Orthic | 15 | Granular | - | - | - | 15 | 3 |
| W10 | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Sub Angular | 15 | 1 |
| W11 | - | Swartland | Orthic | 7 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Angular | 27 | 3 |
| W12 | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Angular | - | 4 |
| W13 | 2 | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| W14 | 2 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 5 |
| W15 | 2 | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 3 |
| W16 | 3 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 1 |
| W17 | 3 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 1 |
| W18 | 3 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **W19** | 3 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 25 | 4 |
| **W20** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 110 | Sub Angular | - | 4 |
| **W21** | 4 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 5 |
| **W22** | 4 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Angular | 15 | 1 |
| **W23** | 4 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Sub Angular | 15 | 3 |
| **W24** | 4 | Valsrivier | Orthic | 13 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 107 | Sub Angular | - | 4 |
| **W25** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 1 |
| **W26** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 3 |
| **W27** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 30 | Sub Angular | 33 | 4 |
| **W28** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **W29** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 30 | Sub Angular | 40 | 4 |
| **W30** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 25 | Sub Angular | 30 | 3 |
| **W31** | 5 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 60 | Sub Angular | 65 | 5 |
| **W32** | 5 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 40 | Sub Angular | 45 | 4 |
| **W33** | 5 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 30 | Sub Angular | 35 | 3 |
| **W34** | 5 | Swartland | Orthic | 7 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 27 | 3 |
| **W35** | 5 | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 110 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| **W36** | - | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 110 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **W37** | 6 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 25 | Sub Angular | 30 | 3 |
| **W38** | 6 | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 30 | 3 |
| **W39** | 6 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 35 | 1 |
| **W40** | 6 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Sub Angular | 15 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **W41** | 6 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 4 |
| **W42** | 6 | Oakleaf | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Neocutanic | 115 | Sub Angular | - | 4 |
| **W43** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 25 | Sub Angular | 45 | 1 |
| **W44** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Granular | 35 | 1 |
| **W45** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Sub Angular | 15 | 3 |
| **W46** | - | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 110 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **W47** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 110 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| **W48** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 30 | Sub Angular | 55 | 3 |
| **W49** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **W50** | - | Oakleaf | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Neocutanic | 105 | Granular | - | 5 |
| **W51** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Granular | 25 | 3 |
| **W52** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| **W53** | 7 | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Sub Angular | - | 4 |
| **W54** | 7 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |
| **W55** | 7 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Subangular | 15 | 1 |
| **W56** | 7 | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 3 |
| **W57** | 7 | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Sub Angular | 20 | 1 |
| **W58** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 3 |
| **W59** | - | Sterkspruit | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Prismacutanic | 105 | Angular | - | 5 |
| **W60** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Lithic | 10 | Granular | 20 | 3 |
| **W61** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 15 | Sub Angular | 25 | 3 |
| **W62** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 5 | Granular | - | - | - | 5 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **W63** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |
| **W64** | - | Glenrosa | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Lithic | 15 | Sub Angular | 20 | 3 |
| **W65** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **W66** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **W67** | - | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **W68** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 10 | Sub Angular | 25 | 1 |
| **W69** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Sub Angular | - | 4 |
| **W70** | 8 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Angular | 30 | 4 |
| **W71** | 8 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 10 | Sub Angular | 25 | 3 |
| **W72** | 8 | Mispah | Orthic | 10 | Granular | - | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| **W73** | 8 | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 17 | Granular | 30 | 3 |
| **W74** | - | Valsrivier | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 105 | Sub Angular | - | 5 |
| **W75** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 25 | 4 |
| **W76** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 20 | Sub Angular | 30 | 3 |
| **W77** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 5 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 30 | Sub Angular | 35 | 4 |
| **W78** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 10 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 50 | Sub Angular | 70 | 4 |
| **W79** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 15 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 50 | Sub Angular | 85 | 4 |
| **W80** | - | Swartland | Orthic | 20 | Granular | Pedocutanic | 40 | Sub Angular | 75 | 5 |

# Appendix D- Site Assessment Methodology

## 14.1 Digital Soil Mapping

The following sections are relevant to the DSM approach used for this assessment.

### 14.1.1 Terrain Analyses

The first step in creating a digital soil map for a large project area is to conceptualise the landscape. To achieve this objective the national land type dataset was overlain over both project areas as seen in Figure 0-1 and Figure 0-2 respectively. The land type dataset partitions South Africa into homogenous land units. A specific land type therefore indicates specific soils found within that land type.

Figure 0-1 illustrates the land types found in the Eastern project area which contained a total of 8 different land types. Fa, Fb and Fc land types are dominated by Mispah and Glenrosa soils, with or without lime rich soils depending on the specific land type. It must be noted that the land type database was and should be used as an indication of possible soils present in the landscape. Large variation however occurs between actual soil observations and the land type soils.

Both project areas were subjected to an additional comprehensive terrain analyses which included profile curvature, slope curvature, planform curvature and digital elevation analyses using the Soil Land Inference Model (SoLIM). Figure 0-3 and Figure 0-4 illustrates an example of the type of terrain analyses generated for the Western and Eastern project areas respectively.




*Figure 0-1 Land types located within the Eastern portion of the Wind Farm project areas*




*Figure 0-2 Land types located within the Western portion of the Wind Farm project areas*




*Figure 0-3 Slope analyses of the Western project area*




*Figure 0-4 Slope analyses of the Eastern project area*

The western landscape contains 15 different land types with Fc land types once again dominating the landscape. An Ag land type also occurs which is indicative of shallow freely drained soils less than 30 cm deep. The Little Fish River also flows through the Western project area, where alluvial soils dominate the river terraces.

The land type database therefore indicates a large amount of shallow Mispah and Glenrosa soils present within the western and eastern landscapes. Each land type is further partitioned into different terrain morphological units (TMUs) namely TMU 1 (Hillcrest), TMU 3 (Mid slope), TMU 4 (Foot slope) and TMU 5 (Valley bottom). The land type database then proposes the possibility in percentage of certain soils occurring within a specific TMU. The shallow Mispah and Glenrosa soils were therefore indicated to be located within the TMU 1 and TMU 3 positions. The concave TMU 4 and TMU 5 positions were indicated to contain a wide variety of deeper soils ranging from Neocutanic subsoils to more clayey Prisma cutanic and Pedocutanic subsoils.

Once the complete terrain analyses of each study was generated, a purposive sampling method was chosen for both project areas.

### 14.1.2 Sampling Method

The specific sampling method used is based on the TMUs present within the two project areas. As one of the key soil forming factors, topography plays a large role in how and where different soils form in a landscape. Therefore, soil observations were made at TMU 1, TMU 3, TMU 4 and TMU 5 positions given the difference in profile curvature, slope and planform curvature values.

Soil observations were made in a transect fashion as well as single random observations. The transect method enabled the researcher to gain valuable insight into the soil sequence found within a specific catena. Various transects from various land types enabled the researcher to understand the distribution of different soils within the project areas as a whole, based on the above-mentioned parameters. The single random observation sites served as a valuable in-field validation method for the transects. If a random observation differed at a certain TMU from the transects, further observations and considerations were required to conceptualise the catena sequence.

### 14.1.3 Soil Observations

A study of the soils present within the project area was conducted during a field visit from the 3rd to the 15th of August 2020. The site was traversed by vehicle and on foot. A soil auger was used to determine the soil form/family and depth. The soil was hand augured to the first restricting layer or 1,2 m. Soil survey positions were recorded as waypoints using a handheld GPS. Soils were identified to the soil family level as per the “Soil Classification: A Taxonomic System for South Africa” (Soil Classification Working Group, 2018). Landscape features such as existing open trenches were also helpful in determining soil types and depth.

At each observation site the GPS coordinates were noted as well as the soil family, transect number and TMU position. Additionally, the topsoil and subsoil type, depth and texture were all noted as well as the depth of the restricting layer if present.

A total of 53 soil observations were made in the Eastern project area, which mostly consisted of random soil observations at each TMU as well as 6 major hillslope transects. A total of 80 observations were made in the Western project area with a total of 8 major hillslope transects dissected. As these two project areas do not differ greatly in various soil forming factors such as topography, climate, and organisms, key soil forming principles could be extrapolated from one project area to the next. All coordinates, physical parameters and soil morphological information relevant to all soil observations are listed from Appendix A to Appendix D.