

ARCHAEOLOGICAL WALK-DOWN SURVEY FOR

THE PROPOSED ARIES 50KV POWER LINE NEAR KENHART, KAI! GARIB
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY OF ZF MGCAWU DISTRICT, NORTHERN CAPE

(Required as a condition of authorisation).

Type of development:

Power Line

Client:

Aecom

Client info:

Willie Vermaak

E – mail: willie.vermaak@aecom.com

Developer: Transnet SOC and Eskom Holdings SOC Limited (Eskom)



HCAC - Heritage Consultants

Private Bag X 1049

Suite 34

Modimolle

0510

Tel: 082 373 8491

Fax: 086 691 6461

E-Mail: jaco.heritage@gmail.com

Project Reference:
HCAC Project number 2170615
Report date:
June 2017

Project Name	Aries Power Line
Report Title	Heritage walk down Aries Power Line
Authority Reference Number	DEA Reference 14/12/16/3/31/1243
Report Status	Final Report
Applicant Name	Transnet SOC and Eskom Holdings SOC Limited (Eskom)

INDEMNITY AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO THIS REPORT

The findings, results, observations, conclusions and recommendations given in this report are based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. The report is based on survey and assessment techniques which are limited by time and budgetary constraints relevant to the type and level of investigation undertaken and HCAC reserves the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations if and when new information becomes available from ongoing research or further work in this field, or pertaining to this investigation.

Although HCAC exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, HCAC accepts no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies HCAC against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by HCAC and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This report must not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of this report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports, including main reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must make reference to this report. If these form part of a main report relating to this investigation or report, this report must be included in its entirety as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright on all documents, drawings and records, whether manually or electronically produced, which form part of the submission and any subsequent report or project document, shall vest in HCAC.

The client, on acceptance of any submission by HCAC and on condition that the client pays to HCAC the full price for the work as agreed, shall be entitled to use for its own benefit:

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

Should the applicant wish to utilise any part of, or the entire report, for a project other than the subject project, permission must be obtained from HCAC to do so. This will ensure validation of the suitability and relevance of this report on an alternative project.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An Archaeological Impact Assessment (Magoma 2014) was conducted for the proposed Aries power Line. HCAC was subsequently appointed by Aecom to conduct a Heritage Walk Down of the proposed power line in fulfilment of the conditions of the EMPr.

Several CRM surveys for renewable energy projects provides surrounding the Aries substation provide some insight as to the occupation of the area, e.g. Jonathan Kaplan (2011), Halkett & Orton (2011), Webley & Halkett (2012), Anton Pelser (2012). These studies recorded a widespread distribution of Early and Middle Stone Age material with a few Later Stone Age sites. Similar findings were made during the walkthrough, with several Stone Age artefacts noted and ascribed as background scatter. Systematic sampling of surface samples by Beaumont and Pelser means that stone artefacts from the study area have been analysed and recorded and indicates the presence of humans in the area for the last two million years.

Due to the localised impact of the proposed towers on the widely scattered archaeological material the impact of the proposed project on heritage resources is considered low and it is recommended that the proposed project can commence (subject to approval from SAHRA) on the condition that a chance find procedure is implemented.

Abbreviations

AIA: Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BGG Burial Ground and Graves
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CFPs: Chance Find Procedures
CMP: Conservation Management Plan
CRR: Comments and Response Report
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
DEA: Department of Environmental Affairs
EA: Environmental Authorisation
EAP: Environmental Assessment Practitioner
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMP: Environmental Management Programme
ESA: Early Stone Age
ESIA: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
GIS Geographical Information System
GPS: Global Positioning System
GRP Grave Relocation Plan
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, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998)
NHRA National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999)
NID Notification of Intent to Develop
NoK Next-of-Kin
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)

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	8
2. Project description	12
2.1. Terms of reference	12
2.2. Scope and purpose of the report.....	12
2.3. Specialist Qualifications	12
2.4. Physical surveying.....	12
3. HERITAGE LEGISLATION.....	1
3.1. Site Significance and Field Rating	1
3.2. Impact Assessment Methodology	3
4. Project History	4
4.1. Stone Age.....	4
4.2. Historical Information.....	5
5. FINDINGS OF THE WALK DOWN SURVEY	6
5.1. Built Environment (Section 34 of the NHRA)	7
5.2. Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources (Section 35 of the NHRA)	7
5.3. Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36 of the NHRA)	12
5.4. Cultural Landscapes, Intangible and Living Heritage.....	12
5.5. Battlefields and Concentration Camps.....	12
6. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	13
7. IMPACT ASSESSMENT	13
7.1. Potential Impact.....	13
7.1.1. Pre-Construction phase:	13
7.1.2. Construction Phase.....	13
7.1.3. Operation Phase:	13
8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
8.1. Chance Find Procedures.....	16
9. References	17
APPENDIX 1 – Curriculum Vitae	19

Figures

Figure 1: Provincial locality map.....9
Figure 2. Locality map indicating the study area in blue.10
Figure 3. Google Earth image indicating the study area in blue.11
Figure 4. Track logs of the survey.13

1. INTRODUCTION

HCAC was appointed by Aecom to conduct a Heritage Walk Down for the Aries power line in the Northern Cape (Figure 1 – 3). This is in fulfilment of the requirements of one of the Environmental Authorisation conditions. The aim of the study is to survey the proposed development footprint 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, review of the HIA/AIA for the Aries power line by Magoma (2014); Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations, and site descriptions.




Figure 1: Provincial locality map.




Figure 2. Regional locality map indicating the study area in blue.



Figure 3. Google Earth image indicating the study area in blue.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

It is proposed to construct a 50-kV power line that will run in a north-easterly to south-westerly direction for approximately 5km between the Aries Substation, southwest of Kenhart, and the proposed Transnet Aries Traction Feeder Substation to be located alongside the Sishen-Saldanha Railway Line. Excluding structures within the limits of the existing Aries Substation, the proposed line would require a total of twenty-five pylon structures.

2.1. Terms of reference

This Heritage Walk Down report was compiled by HCAC for the proposed development and construction of the Aries Power Line based on the requirements of the NHRA (no 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (no 107 of 1998).

The process consisted of three phases:

- Phase 1, review of the existing HIA/AIA for the Aries power line;
- Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle;
- Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

2.2. Scope and purpose of the report

The report is intended to report on any heritage resources that might occur within the final footprint of the proposed power line and make recommendations for any mitigation measures that may need to be implemented prior to construction.

2.3. Specialist Qualifications

Jaco van der Walt has been practising as a CRM archaeologist for 15 years. He obtained an MA degree in Archaeology from the University of the Witwatersrand focussing on the Iron Age in 2012 and is a PhD candidate at the University of Johannesburg focussing on Stone Age Archaeology with specific interest in the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Later Stone Age (LSA). Jaco is an accredited member of ASAPA (#159) and have conducted more than 500 impact assessments in Limpopo, Mpumalanga, North West, Free State, Gauteng, KZN as well as he Northern and Eastern Cape Provinces in South Africa.

Jaco has worked on various international projects in Zimbabwe, Botswana, Mozambique, Lesotho, DRC Zambia and Tanzania. Through this he has a sound understanding of the IFC Performance Standard requirements, with specific reference to Performance Standard 8 – Cultural Heritage.

2.4. Physical surveying

The proposed power line measures approximately 5km. Due to the nature of cultural remains, with the majority of artefacts occurring below surface, an intensive foot-survey that covered the study area was conducted (Figure 8). A non-intrusive pedestrian survey was conducted during the week of 19th June by a professional archaeologist. Identified sites are plotted on 1:50 000 maps and their GPS co-ordinates documented. In addition, digital photographs were used to document the area.




Figure 4. Track logs of the survey.

3. HERITAGE LEGISLATION

The identification, evaluation and assessment of any cultural heritage site, artefact or find in the South African context is required and governed by the following legislation:

- i. National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), Act 107 of 1998
- ii. National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Act 25 of 1999
- iii. Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), Act 28 of 2002

The following sections in each Act refer directly to the identification, evaluation and assessment of cultural heritage resources.

- i. National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) Act 107 of 1998:
 - a. Basic Environmental Assessment (BEA) – Section (23) (2)(d)
 - b. Environmental Scoping Report (ESR) – Section (29) (1)(d)
 - c. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) – Section (32) (2)(d)
 - d. Environmental Management Plan (EMP) – Section (34) (b)
- ii. National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) Act 25 of 1999:
 - a. Protection of Heritage Resources – Sections 34 to 36; and
 - b. Heritage Resources Management – Section 38
- iii. Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA) Act 28 of 2002:

3.1. Site Significance and Field Rating

Section 3 of the NHRA 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.

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 project 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 with cognisance of Section 3 of the NHRA:

- 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; and
- Potential to answer present research questions.

In addition to this criteria field ratings prescribed by SAHRA (2006), and acknowledged 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 10 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

3.2. Impact Assessment Methodology

The criteria below are used to establish the impact rating on sites:

- 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).

4. PROJECT HISTORY

This section of the report relates to the brief desktop study and establishes what is already known about heritage resources in the vicinity of the study area. What was found during the field survey may then be compared with what is already known in order to gain an improved understanding of the significance of the newly reported resources.

An AIA (Magoma 2014) was conducted for the Aries Power Line and found: “*Several archaeological sites with high significance, and dating to the Stone Age were noted along the area proposed for the power line. In fact, the entire section of the area proposed for power line is scattered by Stone Age artefacts*” (Magoma 2014). In the report, they describe three sites although some of the photographs in the report are not stone tools. A Heritage Walk Down of the final power line and specifically the pylon positions prior to construction was recommended.

CRM reports on the area together with secondary source material, primary sources, maps and online sources the study area was contextualised. CRM surveys in the area (such as Portions 14 and 15 of Olyven Kolk 187 (Halkett & Orton 2011), Olyvenkolk 187/3 (Kaplan 2011), Portion 1 of Klein Swart Bast 118 (Pelser 2011), remainder of Klein Swart Bast 118 (Webley & Halkett 2012), and in the wider region (Beaumont *et al* 1995), provides a good basis for understanding the local archaeology. Collection of surface samples by Beaumont and Pelser means that stone artefacts from the study area have been analysed and indicates the presence of humans in the area for the last two million years.

4.1. Stone Age

South Africa has a long and complex Stone Age sequence of more than 2 million years. The broad sequence includes the Later Stone Age, the Middle Stone Age and the Earlier Stone Age. Each of these phases contains sub-phases or industrial complexes, and within these we can expect regional variation regarding characteristics and time ranges. For Cultural Resources Management (CRM) purposes it is often only expected/ possible to identify the presence of the three main phases.

Yet sometimes the recognition of cultural groups, affinities or trends in technology and/or subsistence practices, as represented by the sub-phases or industrial complexes, is achievable (Lombard 2011). The three main phases can be divided as follows:

- Later Stone Age: associated with Khoi and San societies and their immediate predecessors. Recently to ~30 thousand years ago
- Middle Stone Age: associated with *Homo sapiens* and archaic modern humans. 30-300 thousand years ago.
- Earlier Stone Age: associated with early *Homo* groups such as *Homo habilis* and *Homo erectus*. 400 000-> 2 million years ago.

The archaeology of the last 10 000 years of the interior of the Northern Cape Province (Kakamas, Gordonia and Kenhart Districts) falls within the Later Stone Age of southern Africa. The Later Stone Age is subdivided into several technocomplexes (Lombard *et al.*, 2012), three of which are represented on the landscape surrounding the study area. The most recent technocomplex is the informally named ceramic final Later Stone Age dating to \leq 2000 years. This techno complex is often associated with herding communities who also hunted; examples of such sites are Melkboom, Bokvasmaak, Biesjespoort (Beaumont *et al* 1995; Parsons 2008), Renosterkop 1 (Morris & Beaumont 1991), Augrabies (Smith 1986) and Bloubos (Parsons 2000 & 2004). Animals were never domesticated in southern Africa, but were probably brought in with migrating pastoralists from East Africa (e.g., Breton *et al* 2014) from about 2000 years ago (Sadr 2015). During the same time, but starting from ~ 4000 years ago, bona fide hunter-gatherers also inhabited the landscape, represented by the final Later Stone Age, of which the site of Jagtpan 7 (Beaumont *et al.* 1995; Parsons 2008) is an example. The Wilton technocomplex, found at a site such as Springbokoog (Beaumont & Morris 1990), dates to roughly 4000 to 8000 years ago, and is also associated with hunter-gatherers.

A lithic analysis on material from Klein Zwart Bast was conducted by Prof. Marlize Lombard who concluded that the area probably represented a rich source of rocks for knapping and identified an Earlier to Middle Stone Age transitional phase that may include the Fauresmith Industry (Lombard 2012: 4) in the study area.

4.2. Historical Information

Evidence has been found that the predecessors of today's Khoi-San Bushmen lived in the area thousands of years ago. According to Hocking (1938), the Khoikhoi, nomadic cattle herders, had their forbears in East Africa and lived in the Northern Cape for at least 3000 years and dominated the region until the eighteenth century when the Tswana tribe arrived from the west. The Tswana tribe settled around the present day Kuruman. Evidence of the Khoikhoi's existence in the Cape can for instance be seen in the form of Bushmen drawings at the Damfontein and Brandfontein sites in the Karoo. (Hocking 1983: 2; Marais 1977: 1)

It was in the early nineteenth century that the Griqua frontiersmen of the old Cape Colony crossed the Orange River from the south. The Griquas were half white and half Khoikhoi. These people dressed like Europeans and lived aboard wagons, much like the *Trekboere* who migrated northward from the Cape Colony. (Hocking 1983: 2).

The *Trekboer* movement had already begun by the end of the seventeenth century, as the quest for land, grazing and hunting inspired farmers to move into the central spaces of South Africa. These people were semi-nomadic, moving from fountain to fountain by ox wagon, without any desire to build a house or improve the land in which they were living. For more than a generation before the Great Trek, the first migration led to settlement across the Orange River. Trekboer families were however discouraged by the scarcity of surface water in the Northern Cape, and therefore advancement into the area was slow. The first Europeans to settle in the Northern Cape were missionaries, but there was a larger influx of white men into the province during the 1860s and 1870s when diamonds were discovered in Griqualand. (Wagenaar 1984: 122, 128; Hocking 1983: 2)

When Willem Adriaan van der Stel issued grazing licences to stock farmers and lifted the ban on the bartering of cattle in the early eighteenth century, this opened up a new world of possibilities for white farmers. A new attitude was acquired among the stock farmers; he was able to occupy greater areas of land, and would need more land to obtain farms for his children. (Wagenaar 1984: 122, 125)

By the late 1820's, a mass-movement of Dutch speaking people in the Cape Colony started advancing into the northern areas. This was due to feelings of mounting dissatisfaction caused by economical and other circumstances in the Cape. This movement later became known as the Great Trek. This migration resulted in a massive increase in the extent of that proportion of modern South Africa dominated by people of European descent. (Ross 2002: 39).

5. FINDINGS OF THE WALK DOWN SURVEY

The proposed line will follow an existing line (Figure 5) between the Aries substation (Figure 8) and the Transnet railway line. The area is rugged and falls within the bioregion described by Mucina et al (2006) as the Bushmanland Bioregion with the vegetation described as Bushmanland basin shrub land. The knee high bushy vegetation is sparse (Figure 6) and there is numerous exposed gravel pavements (Figure 8) with pockets of sand (Figure 7) visible along the line. Apart from widespread occurrences of Stone Age material no other heritage resources were noted (Table 1).



Figure 5: Existing power line that the new proposed line will follow.



Figure 6: General site conditions.



Figure 7: Pockets of sand between gravel pavements



Figure 8: Aries substation in the background with gravel pavements visible in the front.

Table 1: Tower locations and observations

Tower/ Feature No	Longitude	Latitude	Observation
ARI/12TRA 1	20° 47' 29.5480" E	29° 29' 39.2054" S	Gravel pavement widespread artefacts mostly MSA flakes and blades
ARI/12TRA 2	20° 47' 25.1121" E	29° 29' 41.9221" S	Gravel pavement widespread artefacts mostly MSA flakes and blades
ARI/12TRA 3	20° 47' 23.0291" E	29° 29' 47.8874" S	Gravel pavement widespread artefacts mostly MSA flakes and blades
ARI/12TRA 4	20° 47' 20.6787" E	29° 29' 54.6182" S	Gravel pavement widespread artefacts mostly MSA flakes and blades
ARI/12TRA 5	20° 47' 18.2760" E	29° 30' 01.4983" S	Gravel pavement widespread artefacts mostly MSA flakes and blades
ARI/12TRA 6	20° 47' 15.8771" E	29° 30' 08.3673" S	Gravel pavement widespread artefacts mostly MSA flakes and blades
ARI/12TRA 7	20° 47' 13.4849" E	29° 30' 15.2171" S	Calcrete (granular) substrata with some gravel
ARI/12TRA 8	20° 47' 11.0853" E	29° 30' 22.0875" S	Pockets of sand covering substrata
ARI/12TRA 9	20° 47' 08.6128" E	29° 30' 29.1665" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 10	20° 47' 06.3175" E	29° 30' 35.7379" S	Slightly elevated location with gravel pavement
ARI/12TRA 11	20° 47' 04.1336" E	29° 30' 41.9901" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 12	20° 47' 01.8501" E	29° 30' 48.5271" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 13	20° 46' 59.1798" E	29° 30' 56.1713" S	Pockets of sand covering substrata
ARI/12TRA 14	20° 46' 56.6088" E	29° 31' 03.5309" S	Pockets of sand covering substrata
ARI/12TRA 15	20° 46' 54.3168" E	29° 31' 10.0916" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 16	20° 46' 51.9343" E	29° 31' 16.9109" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 17	20° 46' 50.5115" E	29° 31' 23.3871" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 18	20° 46' 49.2493" E	29° 31' 29.1325" S	Several blades possibly MSA
ARI/12TRA 19	20° 46' 47.5806" E	29° 31' 36.7274" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 20	20° 46' 45.8053" E	29° 31' 44.8074" S	Pockets of sand covering substrata
ARI/12TRA 21	20° 46' 44.2739" E	29° 31' 51.7769" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 22	20° 46' 42.8624" E	29° 31' 58.2007" S	Gravel pavement no artefacts noted
ARI/12TRA 23	20° 46' 45.5280" E	29° 32' 01.2583" S	Miscellaneous flake on blue quartzite
ARI/12TRA 24	20° 46' 48.7187" E	29° 32' 04.9181" S	Large flake and core with single removal of large flake on blue quartzite
ARI/12TRA 25	20° 46' 54.9333" E	29° 32' 04.5611" S	Area disturbed by construction of the railway line
Aries 1	20° 47' 07.6273" E	29° 30' 32.1552" S	Lower Grinder with several blades/flakes with convergent flake scars on the dorsal surface

5.1. Built Environment (Section 34 of the NHRA)

No standing structures older than 60 years occur in the study area.

5.2. Archaeological and Palaeontological Resources (Section 35 of the NHRA)

This area is characterised by extensive gravel pavements (Figure 5) that provides a rich source of raw material for the manufacturing of stone tools and Early, Middle and Later Stone Age are on record from the area. An

Analysis of artefacts from this area by Lombard (2012) indicated that LSA material was made mainly from Jasper, CCS and chert. MSA and ESA artefacts are mainly from quartzite.



Figure 9. Gravel pavements.

During the walkthrough numerous stone artefacts were found scattered along the proposed power line on extensive gravel pavements (Figure 9). In some areas density appeared higher but it would be difficult to define individual sites and scatters. The survey focused on the tower positions and at some locations no artefacts were observed. No surface evidence was found that would suggest deeply stratified material anywhere on the site. No associated organic remains (such as bone or ostrich eggshell) were noted with any of the stone scatters.

Although no classic bifaces were recorded some large flakes were recorded that could tentatively be classified as Early Stone Age (ESA) (Large artefacts from Figure 10 a, b, c). They are made on grey quartzite and while occasional flakes and cores may occur, there is no evidence of ESA knapping sites. Most of the material recorded can probably be ascribed to the Middle Stone Age (MSA) (Smaller artefacts from Figure 10b, c, d) consisting mostly of flakes, blades, chunks and cores. Very little retouch was noted. Most of the artefacts are made from pale grey/white quartzite and quartz.

A Single lower grinder with several flakes/blades with convergent flake scars on the dorsal surface (Figure 11) was noted and recorded as Site Aries 1. No other cultural material like ostrich eggshell were noted at this location. This lower grinder is associated with the Later Stone Age (LSA) and is located between towers 9 & 10 and no direct impact is foreseen on the site (Figure 12).

The site lies within an area of moderate palaeontological sensitivity (Figure 13). The study area is underlain by glacial-related sediments of the Dwyka Group that are generally of low palaeontological sensitivity.




Figure 10: Range of artefacts and raw material recorded along the line.




Figure 11: Lower grinder (A), core and flakes (B).




Figure 12: Location of site Aries 1 in relation to towers 9 & 10.




Figure 13: Extract from the SAHRIS Palaeontological sensitivity map showing the study area (red line) to be of moderate palaeontological sensitivity (green shading).

5.3. Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36 of the NHRA)

In terms of Section 36 of the Act no burial sites were recorded.

5.4. Cultural Landscapes, Intangible and Living Heritage.

The landscape in the immediate area is largely natural and has been fallow for a number of years, possibly used for grazing in the past. Several intrusive modern infrastructural components (gravel roads, railway lines, power lines, substation) do occur and the new line will run parallel to an existing line. This landscape is not sensitive and therefore long-term impact on the cultural landscape is considered to be negligible.

5.5. Battlefields and Concentration Camps

There are no battlefields or concentration camp sites close to the study area.

6. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Due to the subsurface nature of archaeological artefacts, the possibility exists that some features or artefacts may not have been discovered/recorded during the survey and the possible occurrence of unmarked graves and other cultural material cannot be excluded. Similarly, the depth of the deposit of heritage sites cannot be accurately determined due its subsurface nature. This report only deals with the footprint area of the proposed development and consisted of non-intrusive surface surveys. This study did not assess the impact on palaeontology, medicinal plants and intangible heritage as it is assumed that these components would have been highlighted through the public consultation process if relevant. It is possible that new information could come to light in future, which might change the results of this Impact Assessment.

7. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

7.1. Potential Impact

The chance of impacting on unknown archaeological sites in the study area is considered to be negligible. Any direct impacts that did occur would be during the construction phase only and would be of low significance. Cumulative impacts occur from the combination of effects of various impacts on heritage resources. The importance of identifying and assessing cumulative impacts is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. In the case of the development, it will, with the recommended mitigation measures and management actions, not impact any heritage resources directly. However, this and other projects in the area could have an indirect impact on the larger heritage landscape. The lack of any significant heritage resources in the immediate area and the extensive railroad activities minimises additional impact on the landscape.

7.1.1. Pre-Construction phase:

It is assumed that the pre-construction phase involves the removal of topsoil and vegetation as well as the establishment of infrastructure needed for the construction phase. These activities can have a negative and irreversible impact on heritage sites. Impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

7.1.2. Construction Phase

During this phase, the impacts and effects are similar in nature but more extensive than the pre-construction phase. These activities can have a negative and irreversible impact on heritage sites. Impacts include destruction or partial destruction of non-renewable heritage resources.

7.1.3. Operation Phase:

No impact is envisaged during this phase.

Table 2. Impact Assessment table.

<p>Nature: During the construction phase activities resulting in disturbance of surfaces and/or sub-surfaces may destroy, damage, alter, or remove from its original position archaeological material or objects.</p>		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation (Preservation/ excavation of site)
Extent	Local (1)	Local (1)
Duration	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
Magnitude	Low (2)	Low (2)
Probability	Not probable (2)	Not probable (2)
Significance	16 (Low)	16 (Low)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Not reversible	Not reversible
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No resources were recorded	No resources were recorded.
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes, a chance find procedure should be implemented.	Yes
<p>Mitigation: A Chance Find Procedure should be implemented for the project should any stratified deposits be exposed during the construction process.</p>		

8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Widely distributed scatters of MSA artefacts and possibly ESA artefacts were noted along the proposed power line, mainly on extensive gravel pavements. Some of the scatters (which lack discrete boundaries) will be impacted on by construction of the tower positions. Construction activities relating to the tower positions will be limited to a relatively small area and other areas will remain relatively undisturbed and the impact to archaeological material is considered to be low.

No discrete knapping sites or living sites were recognised and no organic remains such as bone or ostrich eggshell was recorded with these scatters. Beaumont *et al.* (1995:240) note that “thousands of square kilometres of Bushmanland are covered by a low density lithic scatter” and indicates that these stone artefact scatters are common in this part of Bushmanland. These scatters are therefore given a field rating of Generally Protected C.

In addition, Beaumont *et al.* 1995 have undertaken a systematic collection of material on the broader Olyven Kolk Farm and a lithic analysis on material from Klein Zwart Bast was conducted by Prof. Marlize Lombard (2012). A collection and analysis of stone artefacts from this area therefore exists and further mitigation of the material is considered unnecessary in view of the existing collections. According to the SAHRIS palaeontological sensitivity map the area is of moderate palaeontological sensitivity. Palaeontological impact assessments for the area (e.g., Pether 2012) found that the area is of low fossil potential. Therefore, no further mitigation is recommended prior to the construction phase, however a chance find procedure should be implemented for the construction phase.

In terms of the built environment of the area (Section 34), no standing structures older than 60 years occur within the study area. In terms of Section 36 of the Act no burial sites were recorded. However, if any graves are located in future they should ideally be preserved *in-situ* or alternatively relocated according to existing legislation. No public monuments are located within or close to the study area. The study area is surrounded by gravel roads, power lines and railroad infrastructure and the proposed development will not impact negatively on significant cultural landscapes or views.

The impact of the proposed project on heritage resources is considered low and it is recommended that the proposed project can commence (subject to approval from SAHRA) on the condition that the following chance find procedure must be implemented by the ECO for the project.

8.1. Chance Find Procedures

The possibility of the occurrence of subsurface finds cannot be excluded. Therefore, 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 and therefore chance find procedures should be put in place as part of the EMP. A short summary of chance find procedures is discussed below.

This procedure applies to the developer's permanent employees, its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, and service providers. The aim of this procedure is to establish monitoring and reporting procedures to ensure compliance with this policy and its associated procedures. Construction crews must be properly inducted to ensure they are fully aware of the procedures regarding chance finds as discussed below.

- If during the pre-construction phase, construction, operations or closure phases of this project, any person employed by the developer, one of its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, or service provider, finds any artefact of cultural significance or heritage site, this person must cease work at the site of the find and report this find to their immediate supervisor, and through their supervisor to the senior on-site manager.
- It is the responsibility of the senior on-site Manager to make an initial assessment of the extent of the find, and confirm the extent of the work stoppage in that area.
- The senior on-site Manager will inform the ECO of the chance find and its immediate impact on operations. The ECO will then contact a professional archaeologist for an assessment of the finds who will notify the SAHRA.

9. REFERENCES

- Anon. 1991. Myndorp in Noord-Kaap ontwikkel vir volkstaters. *Die Burger*, 16 November 1991, p. 2.
- Beaumont, P.B., Smith, A.B. & Vogel, J.C. 1995. Before the Einiqua: the archaeology of the frontier zone. In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) *Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier*: 236-264. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Beaumont, P.B. & Morris, D. 1990. *Guide to archaeological sites in the Northern Cape*. Kimberley: McGregor Museum
- Breton, G., Schlebusch, C. M., Lombard, M., Sjödin, P., Soodyall, H. & Jakobsson, M. (2014). Lactase persistence alleles reveal partial East African ancestry of southern African Khoe pastoralists. *Current Biology*, 24(8), 852–858.
- Du Preez, S. J. 1977. *Peace attempts during the Anglo Boer War until March 1901*. Magister Artium thesis in History. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Gaigher, S. 2012. HIA Proposed Establishment of Several Electricity Distribution Lines within the Northern Cape Province
- Halkett, D & Orton, J. 2011. Heritage Impact assessment proposed Olyven Kolk Solar Plant. Unpublished report.
- Hocking, A. 1983. *Kaias and cocopans: the story of mining in South Africa's Northern Cape*. Johannesburg: Hollards Publishers.
- Kaplan, J. 2011. Archaeological Impact Assessment The Proposed Solar Cape 100 Mw Photovoltaic Energy Generation Facility Near Kenhardt Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report.
- Lombard, M. 2011. Background to the Stone Age of the Kakamas/Keimoes area for CRM purposes. Unpublished report.
- Lombard, M. 2012. Phase 2 Mitigation Of An Open-Air Stone Age Site To Be Impacted On By The Aries Solar Energy Plant On Portion 1 Of The Farm Klein Zwart Bast 188 Kenhardt District, Northern Cape. Unpublished report.
- Lombard, M., Wadley, L., Deacon, J., Wurz, S., Parsons, I., Mohapi, M., Swart, J. & Mitchell, P. (2012). South African and Lesotho Stone Age sequence updated (I). *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 67(195), 123–144.
- Magoma, M. 2014. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report For The Proposed Construction Of Transnet 5km 50kv Power Line From Eskom Aries Substation To The Proposed New Transnet Aries Traction Feeder Substation Within The Jurisdiction Of Kai! Garib Local Municipality Of Zf Mgcawu District, Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report.
- Marais, J. J. 1977. *De Aar, Stad in wording 1902-1977*. De Aar: Feeskomitee.
- Morris, D. 1994. An ostrich eggshell cache from the Vaalbos National Park, Northern Cape, South Africa. *Southern African Field Archaeology* 3: 55-58.
- Morris, A.G. 1995a. The Einiqua: an analysis of the Kakamas skeletons. In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) *Einiqualand: Studies of the Orange River Frontier*: 110-164. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Morris, D. 2004. *Archaeological Resources at Geel Vloer, Bushmanland. A Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment*
- Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. *The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. Strelitzia 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute. Pretoria.
- National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999)
- Ndlovu, N & Magoma, M. 2013. Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Specialist Study Report For The Proposed Development Of Prospecting Rights Of Zink On Portion 5, Of The Farm Karabee 50, Portions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 13, 14, 16, 17 And Remaining Extent Of The Farm Prieska Poorts 51 In The Magisterial District Of Prieska, Within The Siyathemba Local Municipality Of Northern Cape. Unpublished report.
- Parsons, I. 2000. Later Stone Age open-air sites on Bloubos, Northern Cape. *Southern African Field Archaeology* 9: 55-67.

- Parsons, I. 2003. Lithic expressions of Later Stone Age lifeways in the Northern Cape. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 58: 33-37.
- Parsons, I. 2004. Stone circles in the Bloubos landscape, Northern Cape. *Southern African Humanities* 16: 59-69.
- Parsons, I. 2007. Hunter-gatherers or herders? Reconsidering the Swartkop and Doornfontein Industries, Northern Cape Province, South Africa. *Before Farming* 2007/4: Article 3.
- Parsons, I. 2008. Five Later Stone Age artefact assemblages from the interior Northern Cape Province. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 63: 51-60.
- Pelser, A.J. 2011. A Report on an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) for the proposed Solar Energy Plant on Klein Zwart Bast 188, Kenhardt District, Northern Cape. Unpublished Report Archaetnos AE1104. January 2011. For Robert de Jong & Associates
- Pelser, A. 2012. Final Report On The Archaeological Phase 2 Mitigation Of An Open-Air Stone Age Site To Be Impacted On By The Aries Solar Energy Plant On Portion 1 Of The Farm Klein Zwart Bast 188 Kenhardt District, Northern Cape
- Ross, R. 2002. *A concise history of South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009
- Smith, A.B. 1995. Archaeological observations along the Orange River and its hinterland. In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) *Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier*: 236-264. Rondebosch: UCT Press.
- Van Deventer, P. 2017. Palaeontology Of The Brypaal Site. Unpublished report.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2008. LoR for Exemption from Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Salt River Resources Prospecting Program, Kenhardt
- Wagenaar, E. J. C. 1984. A Forgotten frontier zone: settlements and reactions in the Stormberg area between 1820-60. Pretoria: Government Printer, 1984.
- Webley, L & Halkett, D. 2012. Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Kenhardt Photo-Voltaic Solar Power Plant On Remainder Of The Farm Klein Zwart Bast 188, Northern Cape Province. Unpublished report.

APPENDIX 1 – Curriculum Vitae

Jaco van der Walt
Archaeologist

jaco.heritage@gmail.com
+27 82 373 8491
+27 86 691 6461

Education:

Particulars of degrees/diplomas and/or other qualifications:

Name of University or Institution:	:	University of Pretoria
Degree obtained	:	BA Heritage Tourism & Archaeology
Year of graduation	:	2001
Name of University or Institution:	:	University of the Witwatersrand
Degree obtained	:	BA Hons Archaeology
Year of graduation	:	2002
Name of University or Institution	:	University of the Witwatersrand
Degree Obtained	:	MA (Archaeology)
Year of Graduation	:	2012
Name of University or Institution	:	University of Johannesburg
Degree	:	PhD
Year	:	Currently Enrolled

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

2011 – Present:	Owner – HCAC (Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC).
2007 – 2010 :	CRM Archaeologist , Managed the Heritage Contracts Unit at the University of the Witwatersrand.
2005 - 2007:	CRM Archaeologist , Director of Matakoma Heritage Consultants
2004:	Technical Assistant , Department of Anatomy University of Pretoria
2003:	Archaeologist , Mapungubwe World Heritage Site
2001 - 2002:	CRM Archaeologists , For R & R Cultural Resource Consultants, Polokwane
2000:	Museum Assistant , Fort Klapperkop.

Countries of work experience include:

Republic of South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Tanzania, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lesotho and Zambia.

SELECTED PROJECTS INCLUDE:

Archaeological Impact Assessments (Phase 1)

Heritage Impact Assessment Proposed Discharge Of Treated Mine Water Via The Wonderfontein Spruit Receiving Water Body. Specialist as part of team conducting an Archaeological Assessment for the Mmamabula mining project and power supply, Botswana

Archaeological Impact Assessment Mmamethlake Landfill

Archaeological Impact Assessment Libangeni Landfill

Linear Developments

Archaeological Impact Assessment Link Northern Waterline Project At The Suikerbosrand Nature Reserve

Archaeological Impact Assessment Medupi – Spitskop Power Line,

Archaeological Impact Assessment Nelspruit Road Development

Renewable Energy developments

Archaeological Impact Assessment Karoshoek Solar Project

Grave Relocation Projects

Relocation of graves and site monitoring at Chloorkop as well as permit application and liaison with local authorities and social processes with local stakeholders, Gauteng Province.

Relocation of the grave of Rifle Man Maritz as well as permit application and liaison with local authorities and social processes with local stakeholders, Ndumo, Kwa Zulu Natal.

Relocation of the Magolwane graves for the office of the premier, Kwa Zulu Natal

Relocation of the OSuthu Royal Graves office of the premier, Kwa Zulu Natal

Phase 2 Mitigation Projects

Field Director for the Archaeological Mitigation For Booyendal Platinum Mine, Steelpoort, Limpopo Province. Principle investigator Prof. T. Huffman

Monitoring of heritage sites affected by the ARUP Transnet Multipurpose Pipeline under directorship of Gavin Anderson.

Field Director for the Phase 2 mapping of a late Iron Age site located on the farm Kameelbult, Zeerust, North West Province. Under directorship of Prof T. Huffman.

Field Director for the Phase 2 surface sampling of Stone Age sites effected by the Medupi – Spitskop Power Line, Limpopo Province

Heritage management projects

Platreef Mitigation project – mitigation of heritage sites and compilation of conservation management plan.

MEMBERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

- Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists. Member number 159
Accreditation:
 - Field Director Iron Age Archaeology
 - Field Supervisor Colonial Period Archaeology, Stone Age Archaeology and Grave Relocation
- Accredited CRM Archaeologist with SAHRA
- Accredited CRM Archaeologist with AMAFA
- Co-opted council member for the CRM Section of the Association of Southern African Association Professional Archaeologists (2011 – 2012)

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

- A Culture Historical Interpretation, Aimed at Site Visitors, of the Exposed Eastern Profile of K8 on the Southern terrace at Mapungubwe.
 - J van der Walt, A Meyer, WC Nienaber
 - Poster presented at Faculty day, Faculty of Medicine University of Pretoria 2003
- 'n Reddingsondersoek na Anglo-Boereoorlog-ammunisie, gevind by Ifafi, Noordwes-Provinsie. South-African Journal for Cultural History 16(1) June 2002, with A. van Vollenhoven as co-writer.
- Fieldwork Report: Mapungubwe Stabilization Project.
 - WC Nienaber, M Hutten, S Gaigher, J van der Walt
 - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2004
- A War Uncovered: Human Remains from Thabantšho Hill (South Africa), 10 May 1864.
 - M. Steyn, WS Boshoff, WC Nienaber, J van der Walt
 - Paper read at the 12th Congress of the Pan-African Archaeological Association for Prehistory and Related Studies 2005
- Field Report on the mitigation measures conducted on the farm Bokfontein, Brits, North West Province.
 - J van der Walt, P Birkholtz, W. Fourie
 - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2007
- Field report on the mitigation measures employed at Early Farmer sites threatened by development in the Greater Sekhukhune area, Limpopo Province. J van der Walt
 - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2008
- Ceramic analysis of an Early Iron Age Site with vitrified dung, Limpopo Province South Africa.
 - J van der Walt. Poster presented at SAFA, Frankfurt Germany 2008

- Bantu Speaker Rock Engravings in the Schoemanskloof Valley, Lydenburg District, Mpumalanga (*In Prep*)
 - J van der Walt and J.P Celliers
- Sterkspruit: Micro-layout of late Iron Age stone walling, Lydenburg, Mpumalanga. W. Fourie and J van der Walt. A Poster presented at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2011
- Detailed mapping of LIA stone-walled settlements' in Lydenburg, Mpumalanga. J van der Walt and J.P Celliers
 - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2011
- Bantu-Speaker Rock engravings in the Schoemanskloof Valley, Lydenburg District, Mpumalanga. J.P Celliers and J van der Walt
 - Paper read at the Southern African Association of Archaeologists Biennial Conference 2011
- Pleistocene hominin land use on the western trans-Vaal Highveld ecoregion, South Africa, Jaco van der Walt.
 - J van der Walt. Poster presented at SAFA, Toulouse, France. Biennial Conference 2016

REFERENCES:

1. Prof Marlize Lombard Senior Lecturer, University of Johannesburg, South Africa
E-mail: mlombard@uj.ac.za
2. Prof TN Huffman Department of Archaeology Tel: (011) 717 6040
University of the Witwatersrand
3. Alex Schoeman University of the Witwatersrand
E-mail: Alex.Schoeman@wits.ac.za