

Archaeological Impact Assessment

For the proposed Hertzogville (15MW) photovoltaic plant on Albert and Wigt farm No 1036 Free State Province

Prepared For
Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd
By



HERITAGE

Contracts and Archaeological Consulting

TEL: +27 82 373 8491. E-MAIL JACO.HERITAGE@GMAIL.COM

VERSION 1.0
16 February 2012

CLIENT: Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd
CONTACT PERSON: Umeshree Naicker
Cell: 082 775 5628
Tel: 011 234 6621
Fax: 086 684 0547
Unit 606, 1410 Eglin Office Park, 14 Eglin Road, Sunninghill
PO Box 148, Sunninghill, 2157

SIGNATURE: _____

LEADING CONSULTANT: Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC

CONTACT PERSON: Jaco van der Walt
Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting
Professional Member of the Association of Southern African
Professional Archaeologist (#159)

I, Jaco van der Walt as duly authorised representative of Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC, hereby confirm my independence as a specialist and declare that neither I nor the Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC have any interest, be it business, financial, personal or other, in any proposed activity, application or appeal in respect of which the client was appointed as Environmental Assessment practitioner, other than fair remuneration for work performed on this project.



SIGNATURE: _____

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Site name and location: SunCorp/Solar Reserve JV (as joint venture between Solar Reserve South Africa (Pty) Ltd and SunCorp) is proposing to establish a 15MW solar energy facility as well as associated infrastructure on the farms Wigt 1036 and the Farm Albert 986 located approximately 12 km south of Hertzogville in the Free State Province. Two alternatives were assessed as per figure 1.

Purpose of the study: Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment to determine the presence of cultural heritage sites and the impact of the proposed project on these resources within the areas demarcated for the solar development.

1:50 000 Topographic Map: 2825 BA

EIA Consultant: Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd

Developer: SunCorp/Solar Reserve JV (as joint venture between Solar Reserve South Africa (Pty) Ltd and SunCorp)

Heritage Consultant: Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC (HCAC).

Contact person: Jaco van der Walt Tel: +27 82 373 8491

E-mail jaco.heritage@gmail.com.

Date of Report: 16 February 2012

Findings of the Assessment:

Three sites of heritage significance were identified during the survey. The demolished remains of two residential dwellings (Site 2 and 3), are located outside the study area approximately 85 m to the east of PV plant option 1, and no direct impact is foreseen on these sites. Site 1 consists of the foundations of a rectangular cattle kraal and is associated with the residential complex (Site 2 and 3) and is located in the south eastern corner of PV plant option 1 and if this option gets the go ahead it will be negatively impacted. No sites of significance were identified in the area earmarked for PV plant option 2. Based on these findings the following recommendations are made:

- Since no heritage sites or features have been recorded in PV plant option 2 this is from a heritage point of view the preferred option for the PV plant.
- If PV plant option 1 is earmarked for the development it is recommended that the footprint is moved to the south west to facilitate the preservation of Site 1 in situ. Site 1, 2 and 3 will have to be fenced off with danger tape during the construction phase of the development to protect them, against accidental impacts.
- If, during construction, any archaeological finds are made (e.g. stone tools, skeletal material), the operations must be stopped, and the archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the finds.

From an archaeological point of view, there is no reason why the development cannot commence work, if the developers adhere to the recommendations made under Section 7 of this report.

If any possible finds such as tool scatters, bone or fossil remains are exposed or noticed during construction, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted to assess the find.

General

Due to extensive sand cover, ground visibility was low on portions of the site during survey. The possible occurrence of unmarked or informal graves and subsurface finds can thus not be excluded. If during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find.

Disclaimer: *Although all possible care is taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of study areas, it is always possible that hidden or sub-surface sites could be overlooked during the study. Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC and its personnel will not be held liable for such oversights or for costs incurred as a result of such oversights.*

Copyright: Copyright of all documents, drawings and records – whether manually or electronically produced – that form part of the submission, and any subsequent reports or project documents, vests in Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC. None of the documents, drawings or records may be used or applied in any manner, nor may they be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means whatsoever for or to any other person, without the prior written consent of Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC. The Client, on acceptance of any submission by Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC and on condition that the Client pays to Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit and for the specified project only:

- The results of the project;
- The technology described in any report;
- Recommendations delivered to the Client.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
ABBREVIATIONS	7
GLOSSARY.....	7
1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	8
1.1 Terms of Reference.....	9
1.2. Archaeological Legislation And Best Practice.....	9
1.3 Description of Study Area	10
1.3.1 Location Data	10
1.3.2. Location Map	11
1.3.3. Google Maps	12
2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	13
2.1 Phase 1 - Desktop Study	13
2.1.1 Literature Search	13
2.1.2 Information Collection	13
2.1.3 Consultation.....	13
2.1.4 Google Earth and Mapping Survey.....	13
2.1.5 Genealogical Society of South Africa.....	13
2.2 Phase 2 - Physical Surveying.....	13
2.3. Restrictions.....	13
3 NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT	14
4. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AREA.....	14
4.1 Databases Consulted.....	14
4.2 Archaeological and Historical Information Available on the Study Area.....	15
5. HERITAGE SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND MITIGATION MEASURES	16
--	17
5.1. Field Rating of Sites	17
5.2 Impact Rating of Assessment	18
6. BASELINE STUDY-DESCRIPTION OF SITES	20
6.3.1. Cattle Kraal (Site 1), and labourer dwelling (Site2 and 3) in the south eastern area of option 1	23
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	26
8. CONCLUSIONS.....	26
9. PROJECT TEAM.....	26
10. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY	27
11. REFERENCES.....	28

FIGURES

Figure 1: Location map provided by Savannah also indicating the alternative options that was surveyed. 11

Figure 2: Google Image showing the two alternatives in (yellow and light blue) and track log of the areas that were covered during the survey. 12

Figure 3: Showing the location of the identified sites in relation to the proposed PV panel area option 1. 20

Figure 4: Western view of the Hertzogville substation that the photovoltaic plant will feed into 21

Figure 5: General Site conditions in option 1, viewed from the South. 21

Figure 6: Option 1 viewed from the East. 21

Figure 7: General site conditions in Option 2. 21

Figure 4: Western view of Site 1. 24

Figure 5: Eastern view of ruin at Site 2. 24

Figure 6: Rectangular foundation at Site 2. 24

Figure 7: Rectangular foundations at Site 3. 24

ABBREVIATIONS

AIA: Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMP: Environmental Management Plan
ESA: Early Stone Age
GPS: Global Positioning System
HIA: Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA: Late Iron Age
LSA: Late Stone Age
MEC: Member of the Executive Council
MIA: Middle Iron Age
MPRDA: Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act
MSA: Middle Stone Age
NEMA: National Environmental Management Act
PRHA: Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SADC: Southern African Development Community
SAHRA: South African Heritage Resources Agency

**Although EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age both are internationally accepted abbreviations and must be read and interpreted in the context it is used.*

GLOSSARY

Archaeological site (remains of human activity over 100 years old)

Early Stone Age (~ 2.6 million to 250 000 years ago)

Middle Stone Age (~ 250 000 to 40-25 000 years ago)

Later Stone Age (~ 40-25 000, to recently, 100 years ago)

The Iron Age (~ AD 400 to 1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Kind of study</i>	Archaeological Impact Assessment
<i>Type of development</i>	Photovoltaic solar energy facilities
<i>Rezoning/subdivision of land</i>	Rezoning
<i>Developer:</i>	SunCorp/Solar Reserve JV (as joint venture between Solar Reserve South Africa (Pty) Ltd and SunCorp)
<i>Consultant:</i>	Savannah Environmental
<i>Farm owner:</i>	Johan Roos

A heritage scoping report was conducted by Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC (2012), for an EIA on the same farm. The company was then also contracted by Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd to conduct an Archaeological Impact Assessment for the proposed commercial photovoltaic solar energy facility as well as associated infrastructure on the farms Wigt 1036 and the Farm Albert 986. The scoping is attached in Appendix A.

The study area is located approximately 12 km south of Hertzogville in the Free State Province. The topography of the area is relatively flat and the farm used to be used for agricultural purposes. A 132Kv power line runs roughly from east to west through the property.

The Archaeological Impact Assessment report forms part of the BIA for the proposed project.

The aim of the study is to identify cultural heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within local, provincial and national context. It serves to assess the impact of the proposed project on non-renewable heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner. It is also conducted to protect, preserve, and develop such resources within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).

The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized before and during the survey, which includes: Phase 1, a review of the heritage scoping report that includes collection from various sources and consultations; Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey three heritage sites were identified. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations, and site descriptions. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report.

This report must also be submitted to the appropriate SAHRA provincial office for peer review.

1.1 Terms of Reference

Field study

Conduct a field study to: a) systematically survey the proposed project area to locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest; b) record GPS points of identified as significant areas; c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area.

Reporting

Report on the identification of anticipated and cumulative impacts the operational units of the proposed project activity may have on the identified heritage resources for all 3 phases of the project; i.e., construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Consider alternatives, should any significant sites be impacted adversely by the proposed project. Ensure that all studies and results comply with the relevant legislation and the code of ethics and guidelines of ASAPA.

To assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, and to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).

1.2. Archaeological Legislation and Best Practice

Phase 1 of an AIA or a HIA is a pre-requisite for development in South Africa as prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by legislation. The overall purpose of a heritage specialist input is to:

- » Identify any heritage resources, which may be affected;
- » Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources;
- » Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;
- » Assess the negative and positive impact of the development on these resources;
- » Make recommendations for the appropriate heritage management of these impacts.

The AIA or HIA, as a specialist sub-section of the EIA, is required under the National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999), Section 38(1), Section 38(8) of the NEMA and the MPRDA.

The AIA should be submitted, as part of the EIA, BIA or EMP, to the PHRA if established in the province or to SAHRA. SAHRA will be ultimately responsible for the professional evaluation of Phase 1 AIA reports upon which review comments will be issued. 'Best practice' requires Phase 1 AIA reports and additional development information, as per the EIA, BIA/EMP, to be submitted in duplicate to SAHRA after completion of the study. SAHRA accepts Phase 1 AIA reports authored by professional archaeologists, accredited with ASAPA.

Minimum accreditation requirements include an Honours degree in archaeology or related discipline and 3 years post-university CRM experience (field supervisor level).

Minimum standards for reports, site documentation and descriptions are set by ASAPA in collaboration with SAHRA. ASAPA is a legal body, based in South Africa, representing professional archaeology in the SADC region. ASAPA is primarily involved in the overseeing of ethical practice and standards regarding the archaeological profession. Membership is based on proposal and secondment by other professional members.

Phase 1 AIAs are primarily concerned with the location and identification of sites situated within a proposed development area. Identified sites should be assessed according to their significance. Relevant conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations should be made. Recommendations are subject to evaluation by SAHRA.

Conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations, as approved by SAHRA, are to be used as guidelines in the developer's decision making process.

Phase 2 archaeological projects are primarily based on salvage/mitigation excavations preceding development destruction or impact on a site. Phase 2 excavations can only be conducted with a permit, issued by SAHRA to the appointed archaeologist. Permit conditions are prescribed by SAHRA and includes (as minimum requirements) reporting back strategies to SAHRA and deposition of excavated material at an accredited repository.

In the event of a site conservation option being preferred by the developer, a site management plan, prepared by a professional archaeologist and approved by SAHRA, will suffice as minimum requirement.

After mitigation of a site, a destruction permit must be applied for from SAHRA by the client before development may proceed.

Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act, with reference to Section 36. Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983), and are the jurisdiction of SAHRA. The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36[5]) of Act 25 of 1999) is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in this age category, located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority, require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years, in addition to SAHRA authorisation. If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery, but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws, set by the cemetery authority, must be adhered to.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected under Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance no. 7 of 1925), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983), and are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial MEC for Local Government and Planning; or in some cases, the MEC for Housing and Welfare.

Authorisation for exhumation and reinterment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. To handle and transport human remains, the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of Act 65 of 1983 (Human Tissues Act).

1.3 Description of Study Area

1.3.1 Location Data

The study area is located approximately 12 km south of Hertzogville in the Free State Province. The topography of the area is relatively flat and the farm used to be used for agricultural purposes. A 132Kv power line runs roughly from east to west through the property.

The study area falls within the bioregion described by Mucina *et al* (2006) as a Grassland Biome and the vegetation type is classified as Western Free State Clay Grassland. Land use in the general area is characterized by agriculture, dominated by cattle farming. The study area is characterised by deep sandy to loamy soils.

1.3.2. Location Map




Figure 1: Location map provided by Savannah also indicating the alternative options that were surveyed.

1.3.3. Google Maps



Figure 2: Google Image showing the two alternatives in (yellow and light blue) and track log of the areas that were covered during the survey.

2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The aim of the study is to cover archaeological databases and historical sources to compile a background history of the study area followed by field verification; this was accomplished by means of the following phases.

2.1 Phase 1 - Desktop Study

The first phase comprised a desktop study, gathering data to compile a background history of the area in question. It included scanning existing records for archaeological sites, historical sites, graves, architecture, oral history and ethnographical information on the inhabitants of the area. This phase included a heritage scoping report done by Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC (attached as Appendix A) (van der Walt 2012).

2.1.1 Literature Search

See Appendix A for the full Heritage Scoping Report. In addition to the information from the scoping study (App. A) the actions indicated below were also taken.

2.1.2 Information Collection

The SAHRA report mapping project (Version 1.0) was consulted to collect data from previously conducted CRM projects in the region to provide a comprehensive account of the history of the study area.

2.1.3 Consultation

Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC conducted brief consultations with the farm owner's son Mr Roos jnr.

2.1.4 Google Earth and Mapping Survey

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where sites of heritage significance might be located.

2.1.5 Genealogical Society of South Africa

The database of the Genealogical Society was consulted to collect data on any known graves in the area.

2.2 Phase 2 - Physical Surveying

Due to the nature of cultural remains, the majority of which occurs below surface, a field survey of the study area of 600 ha was conducted; focusing on drainage lines, hills and outcrops, high lying areas and disturbances in the topography. The study area was surveyed by means of vehicle and extensive surveys on foot by professional archaeologists during the week of the 17 January 2012.

All sites discovered inside the proposed development area was plotted on 1:50 000 maps and their GPS co-ordinates noted. Digital photographs were taken at all the sites.

2.3. Restrictions

Due to the fact that most cultural remains may occur below surface, the possibility exists that some features or artefacts may not have been discovered/ recorded during the survey. Low ground visibility of parts of the study area is due to sand cover, and the possible occurrence of unmarked graves and other cultural material cannot be excluded. Only the surface infrastructure footprint areas were surveyed as indicated in the location map, and not the entire farm. This study did not assess the impact on the palaeontological component of the project. Although Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC surveyed the area as thoroughly as possible, it is incumbent upon the developer to stop operations and inform the relevant heritage agency should further cultural remains, such as stone tool scatters, artefacts, bones or fossils, be exposed during the process of development.

3 NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The PV solar energy facilities are proposed to accommodate an array of photovoltaic (PV) panels with a generating capacity of up to 15MW referred to as Hertzogville PV 1.

Other infrastructure associated with the PV facility will include:

- » Upgrade of the Hertzogville 132/22kV substation which is located on the Farm Albert 986;
- » Mounting structure to be either rammed steel piles or piles with pre-manufactured concrete footings to support the PV panels;
- » Cabling between the project components, to be laid underground where practical;
- » Internal access roads; fencing and
- » Workshop area for maintenance storage, office, toilets and small water treatment unit

4. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AREA

4.1 Databases Consulted

Wits and McGregor Museum Archaeological Data Bases

No previously recorded sites are on record for the study area at the Wits database. Various requests have been made to the McGregor Museum for information contained in their archaeological database but have gone unanswered.

SAHRA Report Mapping Project

The SAHRA report mapping project has no sites on record close to the study area.

Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

Neither the Genealogical Society nor the monuments database at Google Earth (Google Earth also include some archaeological sites and historical battlefields) have any recorded sites in the study area.

Public Consultation

The farm owner's son Mr Roos jnr was consulted regarding the presence of any heritage and archaeological sites. He is not aware of any sites or burials on the farm.

4.2 Archaeological and Historical Information Available on the Study Area

Unfortunately, a search in the National Archives of South Africa did not yield any results for either the farms Wigt No. 1036 or Albert No. 986. The only references to the farm Wigt related to a different farm in the Klerksdorp district. Information on neighbouring farms can sometimes be relevant for the history of a certain property. Therefore, a database search was also conducted on the farms surrounding these two properties. Searches on the farms Wolvepan No. 375, Aangekocht No. 570, Kouter No. 568, Groot Vrede No. 1630 and Rustplaats No. 185 did not produce any results.

Though not much data could be found that specifically refers to the farms Wigt No. 1036 or Albert No. 986 it was established that the farms seems to have been established prior to 1960. The scoping study revealed that a range of heritage sites occur in the larger region and similar sites that have not been documented can be expected within the study area. These sites range from the Middle, Late Stone Age, engravings and Historical period. It was however determined that none of these sites occur within the study area.

Please refer to the scoping study (Appendix A) for a background study on the area

5. HERITAGE SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The presence and distribution of heritage resources define a 'heritage landscape'. In this landscape, every site is relevant. In addition, because heritage resources are non-renewable, heritage surveys need to investigate an entire project area, or a representative sample, depending on the nature of the project. In the case of the proposed PV Solar Facility the local extent of its impact necessitates a representative sample and only the footprint of the areas demarcated for development were surveyed. In all initial investigations, however, the specialists are responsible only for the identification of resources visible on the surface.

This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. The following criteria were used to establish site significance:

- » The unique nature of a site;
- » The integrity of the archaeological/cultural heritage deposits;
- » The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site;
- » The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features;
- » The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined/is known);
- » The preservation condition of the sites;
- » Potential to answer present research questions.

Furthermore, The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No 25 of 1999, Sec 3) distinguishes nine criteria for places and objects to qualify as 'part of the national estate' if they have cultural significance or other special value. These criteria are:

- » Its importance in/to the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- » Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- » Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- » Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- » Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- » Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- » Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- » Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa;

Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

--

5.1. Field Rating of Sites

Site significance classification standards prescribed by SAHRA (2006), and approved by ASAPA for the SADC region, were used for the purpose of this report. The recommendations for each site should be read in conjunction with section 9 of this report.

FIELD RATING	GRADE	SIGNIFICANCE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; national site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; provincial site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High significance	Conservation; mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High significance	Mitigation (part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP.A)	-	High/medium significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP.B)	-	Medium significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	-	Low significance	Destruction

5.2 Impact Rating of Assessment

The criteria below are used to establish the impact rating of a site. as provided by the client:

- » The **nature**, which shall include a description of what causes the effect, what will be affected and how it will be affected.
- » The **extent**, wherein it will be indicated whether the impact will be local (limited to the immediate area or site of development) or regional, and a value between 1 and 5 will be assigned as appropriate (with 1 being low and 5 being high):
- » The **duration**, wherein it will be indicated whether:
 - * the lifetime of the impact will be of a very short duration (0-1 years), assigned a score of 1;
 - * the lifetime of the impact will be of a short duration (2-5 years), assigned a score of 2;
 - * medium-term (5-15 years), assigned a score of 3;
 - * long term (> 15 years), assigned a score of 4; or
 - * permanent, assigned a score of 5;
- » The **magnitude**, quantified on a scale from 0-10 where; 0 is small and will have no effect on the environment, 2 is minor and will not result in an impact on processes, 4 is low and will cause a slight impact on processes, 6 is moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way, 8 is high (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease), and 10 is very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes.
- » The **probability of occurrence**, which shall describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring. Probability will be estimated on a scale of 1-5 where; 1 is very improbable (probably will not happen), 2 is improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood), 3 is probable (distinct possibility), 4 is highly probable (most likely) and 5 is definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures).
- » The **significance**, which shall be determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above and can be assessed as low, medium or high; and
- » the **status**, which will be described as either positive, negative or neutral.
- » the degree to which the impact can be reversed.
- » the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.

the *degree* to which the impact can be mitigated.

The **significance** is calculated by combining the criteria in the following formula:

$$S=(E+D+M)P$$

S = Significance weighting

E = Extent

D = Duration

M = Magnitude

P = Probability

The **significance weightings** for each potential impact are as follows:

- » < 30 points: Low (i.e., where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),
- » 30-60 points: Medium (i.e., where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated),
- » > 60 points: High (i.e., where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

6. BASELINE STUDY-DESCRIPTION OF SITES

It is important to note that the entire farm was not surveyed but only the footprint of the proposed phases for the PV layout area, power line for connection to the grid and access routes as indicated in Figure 1. Three sites were identified during the survey all of them located at PV panel option 1.

6.1 Site Distribution Map




Figure 3: Showing the location of the identified sites in relation to the proposed PV panel area option 1.



Figure 4. Western view of the Hertzogville substation that the photovoltaic plant will feed into



Figure 5. General Site conditions in option 1, viewed from the South.



Figure 6. Option 1 viewed from the East.



Figure 7. General site conditions in Option 2.

6.2. Sites with Coordinates

Site Number	Landscape	Type Site	Cultural Markers	Co ordinate
Site 1	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Historic/recent	Rectangular stone wall foundations	S28 14 01.4 E25 34 47.3
Site 2	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Historic/recent	Rectangular stone wall foundations	S28 14 01.9 E25 34 54.0
Site3	Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Historic/recent	Rectangular stone wall foundations	S28 14 04.7 E25 34 53.9

6.3. Site Descriptions

6.3.1. Cattle Kraal (Site 1), and labourer dwelling (Site2 and 3) in the south eastern area of option 1

Site Number	Site 1, 2 and Site 3	1:50 000 map nr	2825 BA
Site Data	Description:		
Type of site	Open site		
Site categories	Possible recent or historic dwelling		
Context	<p>Site 1 consists of the rectangular stone foundations of a large kraal that is located within the proposed development footprint of option 1. To the East of Site 1 are the associated dwellings (site 2 and 3) that are located just outside of the proposed development footprint of option 1. Site 2 and 3 consists of the demolished remains of two separate homesteads and all that remain is the rectangular stone wall foundations. This is presumably old farm labourer dwellings. Both these sites are located outside of the development footprint and will not be directly impacted by the development. Site 2 consists of the calcrete foundations of a structure of at least 5 rooms. Site 3 also consists of calcrete foundations of a 5 room dwelling. It must be kept in mind that sites like these might contain unmarked graves.</p>		
Cultural affinities, approximate age and significant features of the site;	<p>Based on what's left of the structures, it is not possible to determine if the sites are older than 60 years. The scoping study also did not reveal the presence or the age of these structures. Site 2 and 3 are, however, indicated on the latest edition of the 1:50 000 map series of the area and is presumably more recent and not older than 60 years.</p>		
Description of artefacts	<p>Modern industrial artefacts, such as wire, glass and cans, are scattered over the site.</p>		
Estimation or measurement of the extent	<p>The cattle kraal (Site 1) measures 12 x 34 meters. Site 2 and 3 cover an area of 0.141 ha each.</p>		
Depth and stratification of the site	<p>Not known</p>		

Photographs



Figure 8: Western view of Site 1.



Figure 9: Eastern view of ruin at Site 2.



Figure 10: Rectangular foundation at Site 2.



Figure 11: Rectangular foundations at Site 3.

Field Rating
(Recommended grading or field significance) of the site:

Generally Protected B

Statement of Significance (Heritage Value)

Low to Medium Significance if the sites are older than 60 years.

Impact evaluation of the proposed project on heritage resources

Site 1

Nature: During the operation of the project an indirect visual impact is expected for the site.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Local (2)	Local (1)
Duration	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
Magnitude	High (8)	Low (2)
Probability	Probable (4)	Probable (3)
Significance	60 (Medium)	24 (Low)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Not reversible	Not reversible
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Yes
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation: If option 2 is chosen the development can continue as it will not impact on the site. However if the development continues as per Option 1 the site can be mitigated by preserving it in situ and fencing it off during construction. (Please refer to section 7 for full details on recommendations).		
Cumulative impacts: Archaeological and cultural sites are non-renewable and impact on any archaeological context or material will be permanent and destructive.		
Residual Impacts: N.A		

Site 2 and 3

Nature: During the operation of the project an indirect visual impact is expected for the site.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Local (2)	Local (1)
Duration	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
Magnitude	High (8)	Low (2)
Probability	Probable (3)	Probable (3)
Significance	45 (Medium)	24 (Low)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Not reversible	Not reversible
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	Yes	Yes
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation: The sites are located outside of the development footprint and no further action is necessary but some management actions might be necessary (Please refer to section 7).		
Cumulative impacts: Archaeological and cultural sites are non-renewable and impact on any archaeological context or material will be permanent and destructive.		
Residual Impacts: N.A		

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Three sites of heritage significance were identified during the survey. The demolished remains of two residential dwellings (Site 2 and 3), are located outside the study area approximately 85 m to the east of PV plant option 1, and no direct impact is foreseen on these sites. Site 1 consists of the foundations of a rectangular cattle kraal and is associated with the residential complex (Site 2 and 3) and is located in the south eastern corner of PV plant option 1 and if this option is preferred by the developer the sites will be negatively impacted. No sites of significance were identified in the area earmarked for PV plant option 2. Based on these findings the following recommendations are made:

- Since no heritage sites or features have been recorded in PV plant option 2 this is from a heritage point of view, the preferred option for the PV plant.
- If PV plant option 1 is earmarked for the development it is recommended that the footprint is moved to the south west to facilitate the preservation of Site 1 in situ. Site 1, 2 and 3 will have to be fenced off with danger tape during the construction phase of the development to protect them, against accidental impacts.
- If, during construction, any archaeological finds are made (e.g. stone tools, skeletal material), the operations must be stopped, and the archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the finds.

8. CONCLUSIONS

From an archaeological point of view, there is no reason why the development cannot commence work, if the developers adhere to the recommendations made under section 7 of this report.

If any possible finds such as tool scatters, bone or fossil remains are exposed or noticed during construction, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted to assess the find.

9. PROJECT TEAM

Jaco van der Walt, Project Manager

10. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY

I (Jaco van der Walt) am a member of ASAPA (no 159), and accredited in the following fields of the CRM Section of the association: Iron Age Archaeology, Colonial Period Archaeology, Stone Age Archaeology and Grave Relocation. This accreditation is also valid for/acknowledged by SAHRA and AMAFA.

Currently, I serve as Council Member for the CRM Section of ASAPA, and have been involved in research and contract work in South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Tanzania; having conducted more than 300 AIAs since 2000.

11. REFERENCES

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. The vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. SANBI, Pretoria.

SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009

Van der Walt, J. 2012. Heritage Scoping Report for the proposed photovoltaic plant on Albert and Wigt farm No 1036 Free State Province . Unpublished report submitted to SAHRA.

ARCHIVAL SOURCES (National Archive, Pretoria)

Free State Archives Repository. 1958. *VAB_PAO_1/1/853_W8638. Provincial Secretary's Office. Orange Free State. Superintendent of Roads, and Local Works. Sluiting van publieke pad. Zuid Driefontein - Rusplaas deur CJ Kramer. Hertzogville.* (Free State Archives Repository 1958)

National Archives of South Africa. 1961. *SAB_URU_4173_607. Grondbrief: Onderverdeling 2 van die plaas Zuid Driefontein Nr 481 Dist Boshof, OVS CJ Kramer.*