MARALLA EAST WIND ENERGY FACILITY NEAR SUTHERLAND, SUTHERLAND & LAINGSBURG MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS, NORTHERN & WESTERN CAPE: PALAEONTOLOGICAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

John E. Almond PhD (Cantab.)
***Natura Viva* cc, PO Box 12410 Mill Street,**
Cape Town 8010, RSA
naturaviva@universe.co.za

December 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The company BioTherm Energy (Pty) Ltd (BioTherm) is proposing to develop a wind energy facility (WEF) with a total generation capacity of up to 140 MW, to be known as the Maralla East WEF, on a site located some 40 km to the SE of Sutherland, Sutherland and Laingsburg Districts, Northern and Western Cape. The project area involves the following land parcels: Remainder of Farm 180 Drie Roode Heuvels, Remainder of Farm 204 Schalkwykskraal and Remainder of Farm 268 Welgemoed.

The Maralla East WEF project area is underlain by fluvial and lacustrine sediments assigned to the lower part of the Abrahamskraal Formation (Lower Beaufort Group, Karoo Supergroup) that are of Middle Permian age. The lower portion of the Abrahamskraal Formation succession in this part of the SW Karoo is characterised by very rare tetrapod (four-legged vertebrate) remains, vertebrate burrows, vascular plants and other fossils of the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone.

Fossil material recorded within the Maralla East WEF study area mainly comprises poorly-preserved, transported woody plant material (including petrified wood) associated with channel sandstones, casts of reedy plant stems and low-diversity invertebrate burrow assemblages. These fossil taxa occur widely within the region and are therefore not of exceptional conservation significance. The only vertebrate skeletal remains recorded consist of a few dark bony fragments that might be of amphibian affinity. They were found in the vicinity of a rippled sandstone palaeosurface showing several well-preserved tetrapod trackways that are of considerable scientific interest and conservation value. It is recommended that this tetrapod trackway site (Loc. 036 on Welgemoed 268) be protected by a 20 m-radius buffer zone during the planning stage and safeguarded from disturbance during the construction phase of the WEF using security tape. A previously identified uranium ore anomaly at 32 45 33.0 S, 20 47 13.0 E on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Anomaly 190 of Cole & Vorster 1999) might be associated with fossil plant material which often played a key role in uranium mineralisation, but this association is unconfirmed. A 20 m–radius buffer for this site is recommended as a precautionary measure.

Given the rarity of scientifically-important, well-preserved fossil material here, is concluded that the Middle Permian bedrocks in the Maralla East WEF study area are generally of low palaeontological sensitivity. The same applies to a range of Late Caenozoic superficial sediments (alluvium, colluvium, calcretes, soils, surface gravels *etc*) overlying the Palaeozoic bedrocks; only isolated float blocks of downwasted petrified wood were found in these younger deposits during field assessment.

The overall impact significance of the construction phase of the proposed wind energy project is assessed as LOW (negative) in terms of palaeontological heritage resources. This is a consequence of (1) the paucity of irreplaceable, unique or rare fossil remains within the study area as well as (2) the extensive superficial sediment cover overlying most potentially-fossiliferous bedrocks here. This assessment applies to the proposed layout for the wind turbines, laydown area, access and internal roads, on-site IPP substation and associated WEF infrastructure within the study area. A comparable low impact significance is inferred for all project infrastructure alternatives and layout options under consideration, including different options for routing of access and internal roads, turbine layouts and siting of the on-site substation and associated Operations and Maintenance Building. Significant further impacts during the operational and de-commissioning phases of the WEF are not anticipated. There are therefore no preferences on palaeontological heritage grounds for any particular layout among the various options under consideration, including alternative sites for the on-site IPP substation. No significant further impacts on fossil heritage are anticipated during the planning, operational and de-commissioning phases of the WEF. The no-go alternative (*i.e.* no WEF development) will have a low (neutral) impact on palaeontological heritage.

Cumulative impacts on palaeontological heritage resources that are anticipated as a result of the numerous alternative energy developments currently proposed or authorised for the Klein-Roggeveldberge region, including the Maralla East WEF, are predicted to be low (negative), *provided that* the proposed monitoring and mitigation recommendations made for these various projects are followed through. Unavoidable residual negative impacts may be partially offset by the improved understanding of Karoo palaeontology resulting from appropriate professional mitigation. This is regarded as a *positive* impact for Karoo palaeontological heritage. *Without* mitigation, cumulative impacts resulting from the large number of WEF projects in the Klein-Roggeveld region are anticipated to be of medium significance.

There are no fatal flaws in the Maralla East WEF development proposal as far as fossil heritage is concerned. *Provided that* the recommendations for palaeontological monitoring and mitigation outlined below are followed through, there are no objections on palaeontological heritage grounds to authorisation of the Maralla East WEF project. It is noted that borrow pit sites will only be identified if and when the proposed WEF wins preferred bidder status. In this case, a separate palaeontological assessment of all borrow pit sites will be necessary in the pre-construction phase.

Two highly sensitive “no-go” areas within the proposed Maralla East WEF study area have been identified in this study and should be safeguarded by a 20 m-radius buffer zone. These include the tetrapod trackway site on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036) and the uranium ore anomaly site on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Anomaly 120 of Cole & Vorster 1999). Pending the potential discovery of substantial new fossil remains during construction, further specialist palaeontological mitigation is not recommended for this project. The following general recommendations concerning conservation and management of palaeontological heritage resources apply.

The Environmental Control Officer (ECO) responsible for the WEF development should be made aware of the potential occurrence of scientifically-important fossil remains within the development footprint. During the construction phase all major clearance operations (*e.g.* for new access roads, turbine placements) and deeper (> 1 m) excavations should be monitored for fossil remains on an on-going basis by the ECO. Should substantial fossil remains - such as vertebrate bones and teeth, or petrified logs of fossil wood - be encountered at surface or exposed during construction, the ECO should safeguard these, preferably *in situ*. They should then alert the relevant provincial heritage management authority as soon as possible - *i.e.* SAHRA for the Northern Cape (Contact details: Dr Ragna Redelstorff, SAHRA, P.O. Box 4637, Cape Town 8000. Tel: 021 202 8651. Email: rredelstorff@sahra.org.za) and Heritage Western Cape for the Western Cape (Contact details: Protea

Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town 8000. Private Bag X9067, Cape Town 8001. Tel: 086-142 142. Fax: 021-483 9842. Email: hwc@pgwc.gov.za). This is to ensure that appropriate action (*i.e.* recording, sampling or collection of fossils, recording of relevant geological data) can be taken by a professional palaeontologist at the developer's expense.

These mitigation recommendations should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) for the Maralla East WEF alternative energy project. Please note that:

- All South African fossil heritage is protected by law (South African Heritage Resources Act, 1999) and fossils cannot be collected, damaged or disturbed without a permit from the relevant Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (in this case SAHRA or HWC);
- The palaeontologist concerned with potential mitigation work will need a valid fossil collection permit from SAHRA / HWC and any material collected would have to be curated in an approved depository (*e.g.* museum or university collection);
- All palaeontological specialist work should conform to international best practice for palaeontological fieldwork and the study (*e.g.* data recording fossil collection and curation, final report) should adhere as far as possible to the minimum standards for Phase 2 palaeontological studies developed by Heritage Western Cape (2016) and SAHRA (2013).

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Scope of Work

The brief for the present report is to provide an authoritative, reasoned assessment of the palaeontological heritage resources within the Maralla East Wind Energy Facility (WEF) project area near Sutherland, Northern and Western Cape, based on desktop studies and a short field survey. Known fossil sites are mapped in relation to the proposed WEF infrastructure layout. The palaeontological sensitivity of the area and the inferred impact significance of the proposed WEF development are then assessed. Recommendations for any necessary palaeontological mitigation or management measures during the construction phase of the WEF are made.

1.2. Objectives of the report

The Maralla West WEF study area is located in a region that is underlain by potentially fossiliferous sedimentary rocks of Late Palaeozoic and younger, Late Tertiary or Quaternary, age (These are described in more detail in Section 3 of this report). The construction phase of the proposed WEF will entail extensive surface clearance as well as excavations into the superficial sediment cover and underlying bedrock. The development may adversely affect legally-protected fossil heritage within the study area by destroying, disturbing or permanently sealing-in fossils preserved at or beneath the surface of the ground that are then no longer available for scientific research or other public good. The planning, operational and de-commissioning phases of the WEF are unlikely to involve further adverse impacts on local palaeontological heritage.

A short desktop palaeontological heritage scoping phase report for the Maralla West and Maralla East WEFs has been submitted previously by the author (Almond 2016e). The present combined desktop and field-based palaeontological heritage assessment of the Maralla East WEF project area has been commissioned as part of the EIA Phase for this development that is being co-ordinated on behalf of Biotherm Energy (Pty) Ltd (Biotherm) by WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff, Environment & Energy, Africa (Contact details: Ms Ashlea Strong. WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff, Environment & Energy, Africa. WSP

House, Bryanston Place, 199 Bryanston Drive, Bryanston, 2191, South Africa. Tel: +27 11 361 1392. Mob: +27 82 786 7819. Fax: +27 11 361 1381. E-mail: Ashlea.Strong@WSPGroup.co.za).

1.3. Legislative Framework

The present palaeontological heritage assessment report contributes to the consolidated heritage impact assessment for the proposed Maralla East WEF and falls under the South African Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999). It will also inform the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) for this alternative energy project.

The various categories of heritage resources recognised as part of the National Estate in Section 3 of the National Heritage Resources Act include, among others:

- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- palaeontological sites; and
- palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens.

According to Section 35 of the National Heritage Resources Act, dealing with archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites:

(1) The protection of archaeological and palaeontological sites and material and meteorites is the responsibility of a provincial heritage resources authority.

(2) All archaeological objects, palaeontological material and meteorites are the property of the State.

(3) Any person who discovers archaeological or palaeontological objects or material or a meteorite in the course of development or agricultural activity must immediately report the find to the responsible heritage resources authority, or to the nearest local authority offices or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority—

> *(a)* destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;
>
> *(b)* destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;
>
> *(c)* trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or
>
> *(d)* bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.

(5) When the responsible heritage resources authority has reasonable cause to believe that any activity or development which will destroy, damage or alter any archaeological or palaeontological site is under way, and where no application for a permit has been submitted and no heritage resources management procedure in terms of section 38 has been followed, it may—

> *(a)* serve on the owner or occupier of the site or on the person undertaking such development an order for the development to cease immediately for such period as is specified in the order;

(b) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not an archaeological or palaeontological site exists and whether mitigation is necessary;

(c) if mitigation is deemed by the heritage resources authority to be necessary, assist the person on whom the order has been served under paragraph *(a)* to apply for a permit as required in subsection (4); and

(d) recover the costs of such investigation from the owner or occupier of the land on which it is believed an archaeological or palaeontological site is located or from the person proposing to undertake the development if no application for a permit is received within two weeks of the order being served.

Minimum standards for the palaeontological component of heritage impact assessment reports (PIAs) have been published by Heritage Western Cape, HWC (2016) and the South African Heritage Resources Agency, SAHRA (2013).

1.4. Study approach and methodology

In preparing a palaeontological desktop study the potentially fossiliferous rock units (groups, formations *etc.*) represented within the study area are determined from geological maps and satellite images. The known fossil heritage within each rock unit is inventoried from the published scientific literature, previous palaeontological impact studies in the same region, and the author's field experience (Consultation with professional colleagues as well as examination of institutional fossil collections may play a role here, or later following field assessment during the compilation of the final report). This data is then used to assess the palaeontological sensitivity of each rock unit to development (provisional tabulations of palaeontological sensitivity of all formations in the Western, Eastern and Northern Cape have already been compiled; *e.g.* Almond & Pether 2008a, 2008b and SAHRIS website). The likely impacts of the proposed development on local fossil heritage are then determined on the basis of (1) the palaeontological sensitivity of the rock units concerned and (2) the nature and scale of the development itself, most significantly the extent of fresh bedrock excavation envisaged. When rock units of moderate to high palaeontological sensitivity are present within the development footprint, a Phase 1 field-based assessment study by a professional palaeontologist is usually warranted to identify any palaeontological hotspots and make specific recommendations for any mitigation or monitoring required before or during the construction phase of the development.

On the basis of the desktop and Phase 1 field assessment studies, the likely impact of the proposed development on local fossil heritage and any need for specialist mitigation are then determined. Adverse palaeontological impacts normally occur during the construction rather than the planning, operational or de-commissioning phases. Phase 2 mitigation by a professional palaeontologist – normally involving the recording and sampling of fossil material and associated geological information (*e.g.* sedimentological data) may be required (a) in the pre-construction phase where important fossils are already exposed at or near the land surface and / or (b) during the construction phase when fresh fossiliferous bedrock has been exposed by excavations. To carry out mitigation, the palaeontologist involved will need to apply for a palaeontological collection permit from the relevant heritage management authorities, *i.e.* SAHRA for the Northern Cape (Contact details: Dr Ragna Redelstorff. Heritage Officer Archaeology, Palaeontology & Meteorites Unit, SAHRA. 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town, 8001. Tel: +27 (0)21 202 8651. Fax: +27 (0)21 202 4509 E-mail:rredelstorff@sahra.org.za) and Heritage Western Cape for the Western Cape (Contact details: Heritage Western Cape. Protea Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town 8000. Private Bag X9067, Cape Town 8001. Tel: 086-142 142. Fax: 021-483 9842. Email: hwc@pgwc.gov.za). It should be emphasized that, *providing appropriate mitigation is carried out*, the majority of developments involving bedrock excavation can make a *positive* contribution to our understanding of local palaeontological heritage.

In summary, the approach to a Phase 1 palaeontological heritage study is as follows. Fossil bearing rock units occurring within the broader study area are determined from geological maps and relevant geological sheet explanations as well as satellite images. Known fossil heritage in each rock unit is inventoried from scientific literature, previous palaeontological assessments of the broader study region, and the author's field experience and palaeontological database. Based on this data as well as field examination of representative exposures of all major sedimentary rock units present, the impact significance of the proposed development is assessed, in this case using the methodology selected by WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff, Environment & Energy, Africa. Recommendations for any further palaeontological studies or mitigation considered necessary are specified.

The present combined desktop and field-based PIA study was undertaken in line with the HWC (2016) and SAHRA (2013) Minimum Standards for the palaeontological component of heritage impact assessment. It was largely based on the following sources of information:

1. A brief project outline, maps and kmz files provided by WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff, Environment & Energy, Africa;
2. Relevant geological maps and sheet explanations (*e.g.* Theron 1983, Theron *et al.* 1991, Cole & Vorster 1999) as well as Google earth© satellite imagery;
3. Several palaeontological heritage assessment reports by the present author for proposed developments in the Klein-Roggeveldberge regions between Sutherland and Matjiesfontein. These include palaeontological impact assessments (PIAs) for the Eskom Gamma – Omega 765 kV transmission line (Almond 2010a) and those for several alternative energy facilities in the Klein-Roggeveld and Sutherland regions (*e.g.* Almond 2010a-d, 2011, 2014, 2015a-g, Almond 2016b-h, Miller 2010, Rossouw 2012).
4. A four-day palaeontological field assessment of the combined Maralla West and Maralla East WEF study area (February 2016) by the author and between one and three experienced field assistants;
5. The author's previous experience with the formations concerned and their palaeontological heritage (*cf* Almond & Pether 2008a-b and references listed above).

GPS data and brief descriptive notes for all numbered geological or palaeontological localities mentioned in the text are provided in the Appendix. Fossil localities that were recorded during fieldwork are shown in relation to relevant major components of the proposed development footprint on the satellite image provided in Figure 44. Please note that this map does *not* show all fossils that are present at surface within the study area. Additional, unrecorded fossil occurrences (the majority) are to be expected in the subsurface, where they may be impacted during the construction phase of the development. Areas on the map that do not contain known fossil sites are therefore not necessarily fossil-free or palaeontologically insensitive.

1.5. Assumptions

Since most fossils are buried beneath the surface, their nature and distribution cannot be directly assessed during field surveys of the development footprint. Palaeontological assessments therefore rely on extrapolating palaeontological sensitivities within the footprint from desktop data and field surveys of well-exposed sedimentary rocks, mostly from sites *outside,* and often well away from, the footprint itself. This approach assumes that the rock exposures seen are representative - in palaeontological terms - of the rock units (formations, members *etc*) that will be impacted by the proposed development.

1.6. Limitations of this study

The accuracy and reliability of palaeontological specialist studies as components of heritage impact assessments are generally limited by the following constraints:

1. Inadequate database for fossil heritage for much of the RSA, given the large size of the country and the small number of professional palaeontologists carrying out fieldwork here. Most development study areas have never been surveyed by a palaeontologist.

2. Variable accuracy of geological maps which underpin these desktop studies. For large areas of terrain these maps are largely based on aerial photographs alone, without ground-truthing. The maps generally depict only significant ("mappable") bedrock units as well as major areas of superficial "drift" deposits (alluvium, colluvium) but for most regions give little or no idea of the level of bedrock outcrop, depth of superficial cover (soil *etc*), degree of bedrock weathering or levels of small-scale tectonic deformation, such as cleavage. All of these factors may have a major influence on the impact significance of a given development on fossil heritage and can only be reliably assessed in the field.

3. Inadequate sheet explanations for geological maps, with little or no attention paid to palaeontological issues in many cases, including poor locality information.

4. The extensive relevant palaeontological "grey literature" - in the form of unpublished university theses, impact studies and other reports (*e.g*. of commercial mining companies) - that is not readily available for desktop studies.

5. Absence of a comprehensive computerized database of fossil collections in major RSA institutions which can be consulted for impact studies. A Karoo fossil vertebrate database is now accessible for impact study work.

In the case of palaeontological desktop studies without supporting Phase 1 field assessments these limitations may variously lead to either:

a) *underestimation* of the palaeontological significance of a given study area due to ignorance of significant recorded or unrecorded fossils preserved there, or

b) *overestimation* of the palaeontological sensitivity of a study area, for example when originally rich fossil assemblages inferred from geological maps have in fact been destroyed by tectonism or weathering, or are buried beneath a thick mantle of unfossiliferous "drift" (soil, alluvium *etc*).

Since most areas of the RSA have not been studied palaeontologically, a palaeontological desktop study usually entails *inferring* the presence of buried fossil heritage within the study area from relevant fossil data collected from similar or the same rock units elsewhere, sometimes at localities far away. Where substantial exposures of bedrocks or potentially fossiliferous superficial sediments are present in the study area, the reliability of a palaeontological impact assessment may be significantly enhanced through field assessment by a professional palaeontologist.

In the case of the Maralla East WEF study area near Sutherland in the Western Cape, preservation of potentially fossiliferous bedrocks is favoured by the semi-arid climate and sparse vegetation. However, bedrock exposure is highly constrained by extensive superficial deposits, especially in areas of low relief, as well as pervasive Karoo *bossieveld* vegetation (Central Mountain Shale Renosterveld, Koedoesberg – Moordenaars Karoo, Tanqua Wash Riviere). The study area is very extensive and much of it is hilly or mountainous with few access roads, especially in rugged upland areas (Figs. 2 to 4). However, sufficient bedrock exposures were examined during the course of the four-day field study to assess the palaeontological heritage sensitivity of the main rock units represented within the study area (See Appendix for locality data). Comparatively few academic palaeontological studies have been carried out hitherto in the region, so any reliable new palaeontological data from field-based impact studies here are of scientific interest. Palaeontological and geological data from the recent field study is usefully supplemented by those from several other field-based fossil heritage impact studies carried out in the Klein-Roggeveldberge region by the author and others in recent years (See reference list). Confidence levels for this impact assessment are consequently rated as medium, despite the unavoidable constraints of limited exposure, time and access.

1.7. Declaration of independence

I, John E. Almond, declare that I am an independent consultant and have no business, financial, personal or other interest in the proposed development project, application or appeal in respect of which I was appointed other than fair remuneration for work performed in connection with the activity, application or appeal. There are no circumstances that compromise the objectivity of my performing such work.

Dr John E. Almond (**Palaeontologist**, ***Natura Viva* cc)**

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The company BioTherm Energy (Pty) Ltd (BioTherm) is proposing to develop a wind energy facility (WEF) with a total generation capacity of up to 140 MW, to be known as the Maralla East WEF, on a site located some 35 km to the SSE of Sutherland, Sutherland and Laingsburg Districts, Northern and Western Cape. The project area involves the following land parcels: Remainder of Farm 180 Drie Roode Heuvels, Remainder of Farm 204 Schalkwykskraal and Remainder of Farm 268 Welgemoed (Figs. 1 & 44).

The main infrastructural components of the proposed WEF (Fig. 44) include:

- Up to 70 wind turbine generators with a generating capacity of between 2 and 4 MW each. The turbines will have a hub height of up to 120 m and rotor diameter of up to 150 m.

- Concrete foundations to support the turbines.

- An onsite 132/400 kV substation (IPP) with transformers for voltage step-up from medium voltage to high voltage. The IPP substation will occupy an area of 150 m x 150 m. Two locations for the on-site substation are under consideration (Fig 44. The site indicated here in red is the preferred alternative). The IPP substation will occupy a common substation area together with an Eskom Substation that will connect to the national grid *via* a 400 kV powerline (to be assessed separately).

- A medium voltage collector system consisting of underground 1 to 33 kV cables (except where technical assessment suggests that overhead lines are more suitable) connecting the turbines to the onsite substation.

- A laydown area (max. 4 ha) for the temporary storage of materials during construction.

- Temporary site compound for contractors,

- Sewage disposal facility and septic tanks.

- Borrow pits.

- Access roads and internal roads.

- Car park and security fencing

- Administration, control and warehouse buildings.

- Operations and Maintenance compound including O&M buildings, car park and storage area.

Borrow pit sites will only be identified if and when the proposed WEF wins preferred bidder status. In this case, a separate palaeontological assessment of all borrow pit sites will be necessary.



Figure 1. Google earth© satellite image of the SW Karoo showing the location of the proposed Maralla East WEF project area, situated beneath the Great Escarpment in the Klein-Roggeveldberge region, *c*. 40 km SE of Sutherland, Western and Northern Cape (red polygon).

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1. Maralla East WEF study area – general description

The Maralla East WEF project area is situated in semi-arid, hilly to mountainous terrain of the Klein-Roggeveldberge region. It forms part of the foothills below the main Roggeveld - Komsberg Escarpment in the south-western part of the Great Karoo. The area lies on the eastern side of the unpaved road between Matjiesfontein and Sutherland *via* Haashoogte and the Komsberg Pass and some 40 km SE of Sutherland, spanning the Western and Northern Cape boundary (Figs. 1 & 44). To the north of the dust road that traverses the study area between Komsberg Pass and Laingsburg rise the steep slopes of the Komsberg escarpment. The main portion of the study area is dominated by several broadly north-south trending upland ridges rising to elevations of 1375 m amsl at Mieliekop, 1391 m amsl at Ruiter se Kop, and from 1490 m to 1600 m amsl along its eastern margins. The ridges are defined by south-flowing tributary valleys of the Buffelsrivier drainage network, including the Komsbergrivier, Ventersrivier and Brandhoek stream. Levels of bedrock exposure within the study region are highly constrained by extensive superficial deposits, especially in areas of low relief but also along the escarpment (scree), as well as by pervasive Karoo *bossieveld* vegetation (Central Mountain Shale Renosterveld, Koedoesberg – Moordenaars Karoo, Tanqua Wash Riviere) (Figs. 2 to 4).



Figure 2. View eastwards from Mieliekop showing north-south trending ridge and valley terrain on Welgemoed 268.

Figure 3. View north-eastwards across the Komsbergrivier valley on Schalkwykskral 204 showing the typical stepped hillslopes and lack of bedrock exposure in the Klein-Roggeveld study region.

Figure 4. Closer view of the Komsbergrivier on Schalkwykskral 204 showing riverbank exposures of Abrahamskraal Formation mudrocks and modern coarse river gravels.

3.2. Geological context

The geology of the Maralla East WEF study area is outlined on the 1: 250 000 geology sheet 3220 Sutherland (Council for Geoscience, Pretoria; Theron 1983, Cole & Vorster 1999) (See map Fig. 6 and stratigraphic column Fig. 7). The area lies on the gently-folded northern margin of the Permo-Triassic Cape Fold Belt (CFB) and is dominated by bedrocks of the Karoo Supergroup within the Main Karoo Basin (Johnson *et al.* 2006). Gentle folding along west-east trending fold axes of Lower Beaufort Group bedrocks is apparent within the study area, especially along the south-facing slopes of the Komsberg Escarpment. In general bedding dips are not high, however (2-45 degrees on geological map), and levels of tectonic deformation are usually low, with little cleavage development. Dykes and sills associated with the Karoo Dolerite Suite of Early Jurassic age are not mapped within the study area, but are represented elsewhere within the Klein-Roggeveld region. Only one mappable sedimentary bedrock unit or formation is represented within the study area, namely:

- Fluvial and lacustrine mudrocks and sandstones of the **Abrahamskraal Formation** (**Lower Beaufort Group / Adelaide Subgroup**) of Middle Permian age. These beds crop out over the entire study area, including beneath almost all proposed wind turbine positions (Pa, pale green in Fig. 6).

Levels of bedrock exposure in the Klein-Roggeveldberge region are generally very low due to the pervasive mantle of **Late Caenozoic superficial deposits** such as alluvium, colluvium (scree, hillwash), surface gravels, pedocretes (*e.g.* calcrete) and soils, as well as karroid bossiveld vegetation (Figs. 2 to 4). Most of these deposits are of Quaternary to Holocene age. They have not been separately mapped at 1: 250 000 scale within the Maralla East WEF project area.

Illustrated descriptions of Lower Beaufort Group bedrocks as well as various superficial sediments have been given in previous PIAs by the author for the Klein-Roggeveld region (see References). The following geological account is in part based on recent PIA reports by Almond (2015d, 2015g, 2016h) which deal with WEF study areas on the southwestern and northern borders of the Maralla East WEF project (Soetwater WEF and Gunsfontein WEF respectively). A separate field-based PIA report is being submitted for the Biotherm Maralla West WEF situated immediately to the east of the present study area (Almond 2016h). It is noted that a field-based palaeontological assessment has not been submitted for the Great Karoo WEF that is situated immediately to the south of the present project area and will be traversed by the proposed powerline connection between the Maralla East WEF and Komsberg Substation (*cf* desktop palaeontological assessment Rossouw 2012).



Figure 6. Extracts from 1: 250 000 scale geology sheet 3220 Sutherland showing the location of the proposed Maralla East WEF study area, *c*. 40 km SE of Sutherland, Western and Northern Cape Province (yellow polygon) (Abstracted from geological map published by Council for Geoscience, Pretoria). The main mappable rock unit (fm = formation) represented within the study area is the Abrahamskraal Formation (Pa, pale green) (Lower Beaufort Group, Karoo Supergroup) of Middle Permian age. There are no dykes or sills of the Karoo Dolerite Suite mapped in the area. Various Late Caenozoic superficial deposits that are not mapped at 1: 250 000 scale include alluvium, colluvium (scree deposits, hillwash), downwasted surface gravels, pedocretes (calcretes) and soils.



Figure 7. Schematic stratigraphic column for the Western Cape, the red box indicating the position of the Abrahamskraal Formation (Lower Beaufort Group) that crops out within the Maralla East WEF study area (Modified from original figure by H. de V. Wickens). *N.B.* The sedimentary bedrocks within the study area are all Middle Permian in age, in contrast to the time scale shown here.

3.2.1. Abrahamskraal Formation

The Abrahamskraal Formation is a very thick (*c*. 2.5 km) succession of fluvial and lacustrine deposits laid down in the Main Karoo Basin by meandering rivers and in shallow lakes on an extensive, low-relief floodplain during the Mid Permian Period, some 266-260 million years ago (Rossouw & De Villiers 1952, Johnson & Keyser 1979, Turner 1981, Theron 1983, Smith 1979, 1980, 1990, 1993a, 1993b, Smith & Keyser 1995a, Loock *et al*., 1994, Cole & Vorster 1999, McCarthy & Rubidge 2005, Johnson *et al*., 2006, Day 2013a, Day & Rubidge 2014, Wilson *et al.* 2014). These sediments include (a) lenticular to sheet-like channel sandstones, often associated with thin, impersistent intraformational breccio-conglomerates (larger clasts mainly of reworked mudflakes, calcrete nodules, *plus* sparse rolled bones, teeth, petrified wood), (b) well-bedded to laminated, grey-green, blue-grey to purple-brown or maroon floodplain mudrocks with sparse to common pedocrete horizons (calcrete nodules formed in ancient soils), (c) thin, sheet-like crevasse-splay sandstones, as well as more (d) localized playa lake deposits (*e.g.* wave-rippled sandstones, laminated mudrocks, limestones, evaporites). A number of greenish to reddish weathering, silica-rich "chert" horizons are also found. Many of these appear to be secondarily silicified mudrocks or limestones but at least some contain reworked volcanic ash (tuffs, tuffites). A wide range of sedimentological and palaeontological observations point to deposition under seasonally arid climates. These include, for example, the abundance of pedogenic calcretes and evaporites (silicified gypsum pseudomorphs or "desert roses"), reddened mudrocks, sun-cracked muds, "flashy" river systems, sun-baked fossil bones, vertebrate burrowing behavior, well-developed seasonal growth rings in fossil wood, rarity of fauna, and little evidence for substantial bioturbation or vegetation cover (*e.g.* root casts / rhizoturbation) on floodplains away from the river banks.

The 1: 250 000 Sutherland geological sheet 3220 (Theron 1983) shows a large area of undifferentiated Abrahamskraal Formation beds in the Sutherland area (Fig. 6). There have since been a number of attempts, only partially successful, to subdivide the very thick Abrahamskraal Formation succession in both lithostratigraphic (rock layering) and biostratigraphic (fossil) terms (*cf* Day & Rubidge 2010, 2014, Day 2013a). The benchmark study by Loock *et al.* (1994) in the Moordenaarskaroo area north of Laingsburg led to the identification of six lithologically-defined members within the Abrahamskraal Formation (Fig. 30). Several of these members have since been mapped in the Sutherland area by Cole and Vorster (1999). Very brief descriptions of these stratigraphic members are given by Loock *et al.* (1994) but the interested reader should refer to earlier works by Le Roux (1985) and Jordaan (1990) for detailed sedimentological data that is beyond the scope of the present palaeontological heritage study.

Based on the abundance of maroon mudrocks as well as the apparent absence or rarity of fossil vertebrate remains in the stratigraphically lower-lying beds (Section 4), it is tentatively inferred that the Maralla East WEF study area is underlain by the Leeuvlei and Koornplaats Members of the lower Abrahamskraal Formation (red bar in Fig. 30). According to Loock *et al.* (1995) the *c*. 860 m-thick **Leeuvlei Member** (Figs. 10, 12 to 13) is characterized by:

- Grey overbank mudrocks with calcrete concretions and thin pyritic horizons;
- Maroon mudrocks, locally with abundant equisetalean (arthrophyte) plant debris;
- Sheet-like channel sandstone bodies composed of very fine- to fine-grained sandstone showing horizontal lamination and ripple cross-lamination. Sandstone bases are erosional and in the upper part of the member they feature lag breccio-conglomerates composed of mudflake intraclasts, reworked calcrete nodules and fossil material (rolled tetrapod bone, arthrophyte stems);
- Well-developed palaeosurfaces on sharp upper sandstone surfaces showing ripple marks, ponds, rill marks *etc*;

- Heavy mineral laminations towards the tops of sandstone packages.
- Occasional thick channel packages with a multi-storey architecture and trough cross-bedding. These packages are locally associated with accumulations of plant debris and secondary uranium mineralization (*koffieklip*).

A series of several thicker, yellowish-weathering sandstone packages that build the higher ground in the central and eastern portions of the project area (Schalkwykskraal 204, Welgemoed 268), probably belong to the *c*. 260 m-thick **Koornplaats Member** of the Abrahamskraal Formation (Figs. 3, 9, 17, 23 to 25). According to Loock *et al.* (1995) this is characterized by:

- Yellow-weathering sheet-like channel sandstone packages with heavy mineral laminations (up to 2 cm thick) towards the top and basal lag breccio-conglomerates. A prominent, laterally-persistent package of five yellowish fine-grained sandstone units marks the upper part of the member in the Roggeveld – Nuweveld Escarpment area. The sandstones are associated with fossil tetrapod material and reworked plant material, including silicified wood (rarely with exotic extra-basinal pebbles) and *Vertebraria* glossopterid roots. Uranium mineralization may be associated with transported plant material.
- Grey and maroon overbank mudrocks with calcrete horizons, tetrapod fossils.

However, more detailed geological mapping is required to confidently relate the lower Abrahamskraal Formation successions represented in the present study area to the more refined lithostratigraphic scheme of Day and Rubidge (2014) (Fig. 8)..

The Abrahamskraal Formation in the Klein-Roggeveld study region is a succession of continental fluvial rocks characterized by numerous lenticular to sheet-like sandstones with intervening, more recessive-weathering mudrocks (Stear 1980, Le Roux 1985, Loock *et al.* 1994, Cole & Vorster 1999, Wilson *et al.* 2014) (Figs. 9 to 25). The channel sandstone units are up to several (5 m or more) meters thick and vary in geometry from extensive, subtabular sheets to single-storey lenticles or multi-storey channel bodies with several partially superimposed, cross-cutting lenticular subunits, often demarcated at the base by thin mudrocks and / or basal breccio-conglomerates. Obliquely side-steeping, successively higher channel bodies of laterally-migrating river systems are also seen within some intervals. The prominent, laterally-persistent sandstone ledges generate a distinctive stepped or terraced topography on hill slopes in the area (Figs. 2, 3, 9). The sheet sandstones are generally pale-weathering (enhanced by epilithic lichens), fine- to medium-grained, well-sorted and variously massive or structured by horizontal lamination (flaggy, with primary current lineation), or more rarely tabular to trough cross-bedding. Greyish hues of some freshly broken sandstone surfaces suggest an “impure” clay-rich mineralogy (*i.e.* wackes). Current ripple cross-lamination is common towards the tops of the sandstone beds which may also feature undulose bars and swales. The lower contacts of the channel sandstones are gradational to erosive on a small scale, and only occasionally associated with lenticular basal breccias that may infill small-scale erosive gullies. The breccias may also occur within the body of the channel sandstone unit and are almost entirely composed of reworked mudflake intraclasts. Reworked small calcrete nodules and occasional rolled (reworked) bones have been observed locally in the Klein-Roggeveldberge region. Heterolithic, thinly-interbedded sandstone and mudrock packages associated with some channel sandstones may represent delta-like levee deposits.

Channel sandstones higher in the Abrahamskraal Formation succession – such as those within the Koornplaats Member - tend to be thicker-bedded (up to several meters), massive, with a distinctive large-scale, rounded corestone and crusty weathering pattern. They are variously tabular to lenticular in geometry. Grain-size is medium to coarse, with a slightly crumbly, only moderately well-consolidated texture (perhaps due to high feldspar content), and frequently speckled or clotted in appearance. Weathering hues vary from yellowish to brown (though often lichen-covered). Fabrics are variously massive, horizontally-laminated (*e.g.* flaggy, with primary current lineation), ripple cross-laminated to occasionally trough cross-bedded. Cannonball-sized spheroidal concretions of ferruginous carbonate are of diagenetic origin. The channel bases are moderately to markedly erosional and gullied. They are often associated with laterally-persistent, prominent-weathering, well-consolidated basal breccias up to 70-100 cm thick of reworked mudflakes and calcrete nodules, and occasionally also plant debris, including occasional petrified wood (Figs. 39 to 43). Basal breccia lenses may be incorporated towards as well as at the base of the channel sandstone package and are often ferruginised. Flaggy sandstones within these successions may show well-developed, laterally-persistent, fine-scale heavy mineral banding.

Although general mudrock exposure levels within the Maralla East WEF study area are low to very low, there are in fact numerous small exposures available along stream banks and steeper hillslopes, both along the Komsberg Escarpment as well as the valleys at its foot (Figs. 10, 12 to 13, 17 to 24). A high proportion of the Abrahamskraal overbank mudrocks within the study area are purple-brown to maroon, while non-reddish mudrocks may be more blue-green than greenish-grey, especially lower down in the succession. Horizons of small to large pedogenic calcrete are moderately common within the overbank mudrock packages at all stratigraphic levels. Larger-scale pedogenic calcretes are usually ferruginous, rusty brown, and often lenticular to irregular in form, while smaller sphaeroidal calcrete nodules are usually pale grey. Well-developed downward-tapering, sandstone-infilled mudcracks (sometimes calcretised) witness periods of aridity on the Middle Permian floodplain (Fig. 17).

Several sedimentological features suggest that a significant portion of the lower Abrahamskraal Formation succession was deposited in extensive playa lakes on the Middle Permian floodplain or inner delta platform. These include the highly-tabular, laterally-continuous character of beds within both mudrock and sandstone facies, frequent horizons of large (m-scale), ferruginous carbonate diagenetic concretions (some showing septarian cracking) indicating high water tables, common bedding surfaces with small-scale symmetrical wave ripples that are often associated with invertebrate traces, amphibian trackways, possible amphibian bones, dense stands of reedy swamp vegetation and sphenophyte debris, horizons of gypsum pseudomorphs (following desiccation of saline ponds), and common upward-coarsening mudrock to fine sandstone packages with transitional, occasionally loaded sandstone bases.



Figure 8. Revised subdivision of the Abrahamskraal Formation of Day and Rubidge (2014). The red bar indicated members that are probably represented within the Maralla East WEF study area.

Figure 9. View westwards towards the Mieliekop ridge on Welgemoed 268. The tabular-bedded sandstone package in the background is the Koornplaats Member of the Abrahamskraal Formation.

Figure 10. Streambank exposure of thin, upward-coarsening mudrock- sandstone packages within the Abrahamskraal Formation (Leeuvlei member) on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 319). These may represent lacustrine deposits.

Figure 11. Extensive streambed exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm sandstone channel top on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 037). Such exposures do not usually show rippled palaeosurfaces.

Figure 12. Good exposures of grey-green Lower Abrahamskraal Formation (Leeuvlei Member) mudrocks along the banks of the Ventersrivier, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 032).

Figure 13. Large-scale lenticular cross-bedding within Abrahamskral Formation channel sandstones on the banks of the Ventersrivier (Loc. 311).

Figure 14. Upper surface of a channel sandstone showing small-scale wave ripples generated in a shallow pond, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 330).

Figure 15. Close-up of the sandstone palaeosurface seen above showing wave ripples as well as polygonal sand-cast mudcracks in the foreground (Loc. 330) (Scale = 15 cm).

Figure 16. Sandstone palaeosurface on Welgemoed 268 showing the wave-rippled bed of a shallow water body with a raised margin on the right (Loc. 036).

Figure 17. Hillslope exposure of purple-brown and grey-green mudrocks of the Koornplaats Member (Abrahamskraal Formation) on the north-western slopes of Mieliekop, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 031).



Figure 18. Extensive exposure of Abrahamskraal Formation overbank mudrocks on the north-eastern slopes of Mieliekop, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 335).

Figure 19. Interbedded distal floodplain deposits with thin crevasse-splay sandstones and purple-brown mudrocks showing numerous wedge-shaped sandstone casts of mudcracks, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 337) (Hammer = 30 cm).

Figure 20. Proximal floodplain deposits of the Abrahamskraal Formation with numerous thin sandstone interbeds, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 333).

Figure 21. Gentle hillslope exposures of Abrahamskraal Formation mudrocks to the north of Mieleikop, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 328). Such exposures are a prime target for recording vertebrate fossils.

Figure 22. Roadside gulley exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm (Koornplaats Member) showing horizon of large lenticular ferruginous carbonate concretions, probably indicative of high water tables on the Permian floodplain, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 334) (Hammer = 30 cm).

Figure 23. Good overbank mudrock exposures of the lower Koornplaats Member on lower hillslopes and in stream gullies, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 314).

Figure 24. Close-up of a stream gulley exposure of tabular-bedded Koornplaats Member bedrocks seen in the previous figure (Loc. 315).

Figure 25. Horizontally-laminated, pale yellowish channel sandstone of the Koornplaats Member with a rusty-brown, lenticular channel breccio-conglomerate at the base (below hammer), Schalkwykskraal 204 (Loc. 322) (Hammer = 30 cm).

3.2.2. Late Caenozoic superficial sediments

A broad spectrum of Late Caenozoic superficial deposits mantle the Karoo Supergroup bedrocks (and perhaps hidden dolerite intrusions) in the Maralla East WEF study area. Most of these younger sediments are unconsolidated to partially consolidated and probably of Quaternary to Recent age. A wide range of well-bedded to massive, semi-consolidated, sandy to gravelly alluvial deposits are exposed in river bank sections (Figs. 4, 26 & 27), while unconsolidated sandy to bouldery alluvium, the latter dominated by clasts of Karoo wackes, lines modern water courses. Lowland areas are largely covered by sandy and gravelly soils that are up to several meters thick and mainly of alluvial origin; they are well-exposed in the walls of erosion gullies or *dongas*. Sheetwash processes have locally concentrated thin gravels at the soil surface. Upland slopes and plateau – where most of the wind turbine infrastructure will be placed - are generally covered with sandy and rubbly colluvial deposits that are principally composed of downwasted Beaufort Group sandstones and wackes (Figs. 28 & 29).

Figure 26. Semi-consolidated, poorly-sorted coarse alluvial gravels ("High Level Gravels") perched several meters above modern stream level, Komsbergrivier on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Loc. 327).

Figure 27. Stream bank section through thick, semi-consolidated, poorly-sorted colluvial and alluvial rubble overlying Abrahamskraal Fm bedrocks, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 313) (Hammer = 30 cm).

Figure 28. Typical coarse rocky rubble of downwasted sandstone mantling upland areas in the Maralla East study area, here on Mieliekop, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 337).

Figure 29. Surface gravels dominated by brownish concretionary material of diagenetic origin, Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 318) (Hammer = 30 cm).

4. PALAEONTOLOGICAL FINDINGS

In this section of the report the principal palaeontological heritage findings within the Maralla East WEF project area are outlined and illustrated. GPS co-ordinates and associated field data for each of the numbered geological and palaeontological sites are given in the Appendix. The principal fossil sites recorded are indicated on the satellite image of the project area in Fig. 44. Please note that this is *not* a distribution map of *all* fossil occurrences within the project area – most of which are not exposed at the surface – but only a representative sample of the better-preserved fossils encountered during the field assessment. Further, unrecorded fossil occurrences are to be expected elsewhere at the ground surface or in the subsurface (the majority), where they may be impacted during the construction phase of the development. Areas on the map that do not contain known fossil sites are therefore not necessarily fossil-free or palaeontologically-insensitive. With the notable exception of the important new tetrapod trackway surface at Loc. 036 (Welgemoed 268), all the fossils observed during the recent field study are of widely-occurring forms and are not considered to be of exceptional scientific or conservation value; for this reason, no specialist palaeontological mitigation of the other recorded sites is recommended here, although they all lie within or close to the development footprint.

The Great Karoo is world-famous for its rich record of terrestrial vertebrates and other fossils from the Permian, Triassic and Early Jurassic Periods in Gondwana (MacRae 1999, McCarthy & Rubidge 2005, Smith *et al.* 2012). The fossil record of the Klein-Roggeveld region is very poorly known by Karoo standards – as shown by the paucity of fossil vertebrate sites recorded in maps compiles by Keyser and Smith (1977-1978) and Nicolas (2007) - but our knowledge has been improved in recent years through several palaeontological impact assessments in the area (See References).



Figure 30. Chart showing the subdivision of the Abrahamskraal Formation in the western Karoo region with stratigraphic distribution of the major fossil vertebrate groups (Loock *et al*. 1994). The Maralla East WEF study area is probably underlain by sediments within the Leeuvlei and Koornplaats Members.

4.1. Fossils in the lower part of the Abrahamskraal Formation

A chronological series of mappable fossil biozones or assemblage zones (AZ), defined mainly on their characteristic tetrapod faunas, has been established for the Main Karoo Basin of South Africa (Rubidge 1995, 2005, Van der Walt *et al.* 2010, Smith *et al.* 2012). Maps showing the distribution of the Beaufort Group assemblage zones within the Main Karoo Basin have been provided by Keyser and Smith (1977-1978) and Rubidge (1995, 2005). A recently updated version is now available (Nicolas 2007, Van der Walt *et al.* 2010).

Rare to moderately abundant fossil vertebrates from the upper portion of the Leeuvlei Member and the overlying Koornplaats Member of the Abrahamskraal Formation are assigned to the Middle Permian ***Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone** (Fig. 30). The main categories of fossils recorded within the *Tapinocephalus* fossil biozone (Keyser & Smith 1977-78, Anderson & Anderson 1985, Smith & Keyser 1995a, MacRae 1999, Rubidge 2005, Nicolas 2007, Almond 2010a, Smith *et al.* 2012, Day 2013a, Day 2013b, Day *et al.* 2015b) (Fig. 31) include:

- isolated petrified bones as well as rare articulated skeletons of tetrapods (*i.e.* air-breathing terrestrial vertebrates) such as true **reptiles** (notably large herbivorous pareiasaurs like *Bradysaurus*, small insectivorous millerettids), rare pelycosaurs, and diverse **therapsids** or "mammal-like reptiles" (*e.g.* numerous genera of large-bodied dinocephalians, herbivorous dicynodonts, flesh-eating biarmosuchians, gorgonopsians and therocephalians);

- aquatic vertebrates such as large **temnospondyl amphibians** (*Rhinesuchus*, usually disarticulated), and **palaeoniscoid bony fish** (*Atherstonia*, *Namaichthys*, often represented by scattered scales rather than intact fish);

- freshwater **bivalves** (*Palaeomutela*);

- **trace fossils** such as worm, arthropod and tetrapod burrows and trackways, coprolites (fossil droppings) and plant root casts;

- **vascular plant remains** (usually sparse and fragmentary), including leaves, twigs, roots and petrified woods ("*Dadoxylon*") of the *Glossopteris* Flora, especially glossopterid trees and arthrophytes (horsetail ferns).

In general, tetrapod fossil assemblages in the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone are dominated by a wide range of dinocephalian genera and small therocephalians *plus* pareiasaurs while relatively few dicynodonts can be expected (Day & Rubidge 2010, Jirah & Rubidge 2010 and refs. therein). Vertebrate fossils in this zone are generally much rarer than seen in younger assemblage zones of the Lower Beaufort Group (Loock *et al.* 1994).

Fossils in the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone occur in association with both mudrocks and sandstones, most notably in thin intraformational conglomerates (*beenbreksie*) at the base of channel sandstones (Rossouw & De Villiers 1952, Turner 1981, Smith & Keyser 1995a). Tetrapod bones actually occur in a wide range of taphonomic settings in the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone (Almond 2010a). For example they are recorded as:

1. Disarticulated bones within thin intraformational conglomerates at the base of shallow (unistorey) channel sandstones. The bones are often impregnated with secondary iron and manganese minerals (coffee brown and black respectively). They vary from highly-weathered and rounded fragments to intact and well-preserved specimens. Bones occur at the base of, within, or floating at the top of the conglomerates in association with calcrete nodules, mudflakes, petrified wood and gypsum pseudomorphs. Bones in these channel lags were variously eroded out of riverbanks or washed into drainage channels from upland areas, riverine areas and floodplains during floods or episodes of landscape denudation.

2. Disarticulated bones within or at the top of channel sandstones.

3. Bones coated with calcrete or embedded within calcrete nodules associated with arid climate palaeosols (ancient soils). These bones are often suncracked, showing that lay exposed on the land surface for a long time before burial.

4. Isolated bones or articulated skeletons (possible mummies) embedded within levee or floodplain mudrocks.

5. Well-articulated skeletons preserved within fossil burrows.



Figure 31. Skulls of two key large-bodied tetrapods of the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone: A – the dinocephalian therapsid *Tapinocephalus*; B – the pareiasaur *Bradysaurus* (From Smith & Keyser 1995b).

The most significant fossil site recorded during the field assessment of the Maralla East WEF is a channel sandstone surface bearing several well-preserved trackways of a small-bodied tetrapod (Figs. 32 to 38). The site lies some 50 m east of the river and close to an existing farm track in the Ventersrivier Valley on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036; see map Fig. 43). It is inferred to lie stratigraphically within the upper part of the Leeuvlei Member of the Abrahamskraal Formation. The currently exposed area of the tracked surface measures some 17 x 11 m in maximum dimensions. It features fine-scale sedimentary structures such as small ripples and rill marks indicating a shallow, pond-like depositional setting with fluctuating water levels. The tetrapod trackways, preserving features such as digital impressions of the hands and feet, tail drag marks as well as belly drag impressions, were initially (Almond 2016e) attributed to a small temnospondyl amphibian comparable to the trackway ichnogenus *Episcopopus* that was recently re-described by Marsicano *et al.* (2014). However, this original interpretation may require revision in the light of subsequent observations by Dr Claudia Marsicano (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina) and Professor Roger Smith (Wits University, Johannesburg) (Pers. com. 2016). The rippled palaesurface also shows several paired sets of parallel drag marks attributable to trailing tetrapod digits as well as finer-scale traces such as possible comb-like fish swimming trails (*Undichna*) and invertebrate burrows. Broadly comparable tetrapod trackways associated with fish swimming trails are also known from a somwhat younger, undescribed site in the Moordenaars Member of the Abrahamskraal Formation on the outskirts of Sutherland. These rare trackway sites are of considerable palaeontological interest since they provide new information on the biology and behaviour of extinct amphibious tetrapods inhabiting the early Main Karoo Basin that are not well-represented by skeletal material. Since the Welgemoed 268 trackway site lies close to the Maralla East WEF footprint (cable and internal road alignments; Figs. 43 and 44) it is recommended that it is protected by a 20 m radius buffer during planning and demarcated by security tape during the construction phase of the WEF.

Fragments of very dark bone were observed close to the tetrapod trackway site on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036) by Dr Roger Smith of Wits University, Johannesburg, during a recent field visit. The cancellous texture and poorly-developed cortex of the bones suggests that they might be of amphibian (or perhaps fish) affinity (Fig. 37). No further tetrapod skeletal fossils (*e.g.* bones, teeth) were recorded from the Abrahamskraal Formation in the Maralla East WEF study area during the recent field study. This was despite a careful search of several good exposures showing well-developed palaeosols as well as of the calcrete-dominated breccio-conglomerates that elsewhere in the Karoo may contain reworked disarticulated bones and teeth (See Appendix for locality details). The scarcity of vertebrate fossil remains would support the contention that beds from the fossil-poor lower part of the Abrahamskraal Formation are represented here. The scarcity of terrestrial vertebrates may in part reflect the swampy to lacustrine palaeoenvironments of the time.

Invertebrate trace fossils recorded from the Maralla East WEF study area include several occurrences of small (*c*. 8 mm wide) meniscate back-filled burrows assigned to the ichnogenus *Scoyenia* and characteristic of damp substrates, such as the sandy margins of ponds and rivers *(cf* Almond 2016g). Small-scale invertebrate burrows are also seen on the tetrapod trackway surface.

Mudrock and sandstone bedding planes with dense assemblages of narrow, vertical, subcylindrical structures are commonly seen in the Abrahamskral Formation (*e.g.* Loc. 311). They are interpreted as the sand-infilled moulds of reedy plants - probably sphenophyte ferns (horsetails) - that colonised extensive swampy settings along river banks and floodplain lakes. Finely-ridged, segmented stem compressions and moulds of sphenophyte stems occur abundantly in some mudrock horizons. Local concentrations of woody plant stem compressions (often ferruginised) as well as blocks of poorly-preserved silicified wood occur towards the base of some yellow-weathering channel sandstones of the Koornplaats Member (Figs. 39 to 41). The transported plant debris is often associated with ferruginous, calcrete-rich channel basal breccias and diagenetic ferruginous carbonate bodies (*koffieklip*). Fragments of petrified wood occur as float on the underlying slopes (Fig. 42). Several plant fossil occurrences on Roode Heuwels 180 (Locs. 321, 324, 325) lie close to but outside the development footprint (See map Fig. 44) and therefore do not warrant special mitigation.

It is notable that occurrences of sandstone-hosted uranium ore bodies picked up by aerial surveys of the Sutherland sheet area are often associated with fossil plant material and *koffieklip*. Decomposition of rotting plant material embedded within channel sandstones often played a key role in the precipitation of uranium minerals (See detailed discussion in Cole & Vorster 1999, Cole & Wipplinger 2001). It is possible that the uranium anomaly mapped on Schalkwykskraal 204 by Cole and Voster (1999; their U-anomaly No. 190) may be associated with fossil plants, though this particular point was *not* addressed during recent fieldwork. On precautionary palaeontological heritage, as well as economic geological and general geoscientific, grounds it is therefore recommended that a 20 m-radius buffer zone be designated around the U-190 site (green triangle in Fig. **) whose co-ordinates are 32 45 33 S, 20 47 13 E.

4.2. Fossils in the Late Caenozoic superficial sediments

The wide spectrum of Late Caenozoic superficial sediments overlying the Palaeozoic and Mesozoic bedrocks in the study area are generally fossil-poor. Important occurrences of bones, teeth and horn cores may occasionally be found in better-consolidated Quaternary alluvial deposits, while finer-grained sediments and calcretes may contain fossilised burrows (*e.g.* termitaria), freshwater molluscs and plant root casts (*e.g*. Skead 1980, Klein 1984, Bousman *et al.* 1988, Brink & Rossouw 2000, Churchill *et al.* 2000, Cole *et al.* 2004, Rossouw 2006). Surface gravels on the footslopes of the Klein-Roggeveld escarpment to the southwest of the present study area as well as in nearby valleys contain locally common blocks of silicified wood that have probably been reworked from petrified logs within the Waterford Formation outcrop area (Almond 2016b, 2016c). Occasional blocks of poorly-preserved Lower Beaufort Group petrified wood were recorded from the gravel float in the Maralla East WEF study area where they have clearly been downwasted from the base of channel sandstones up-slope (See above and Fig. 42).

Figure 32. Setting of the important new trackway site in the Ventersrivier Valley on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036). The sandstone surface bearing the trackways is indicated by arrows. The rippled palaeosurface shown in Fig. 16 lies just above the low cliff behind the tracked surface.

Figure 33. Rippled sandstone bed top showing parallel "tram lines" composed of multiple digit drag marks (centre) as well as a well-preserved tetrapod trackway (on right hand side), Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036).

Figure 34. Close-up of part of the tetrapod trackway showing digital impressions of the hands and feet as well as the central belly drag and arcuate tail impressions (Loc. 036). The trackway is approximately 30 cm wide in total. Parallel digit drag marks are visible top right.

Figure 35. The same palaeosurface as above showing a second tetrapod trackway with an intermittent but straight median tail drag mark (Loc. 036) (Scale in cm).



Figure 36. Detail of the tetrapod trackways surface showing dendritic rill marks as well as delicate, comb-like scratches that were possibly generated by the fins of swimming fish (*Undichna*) (Scale in cm).

Figure 37. Fragments of dark, cancellous fossil bone from mudrocks overlying the tetrapod trackway surface and possibly of amphibian or fish provenance, Welgemoed 286 (Observed by Dr R. Smith close to Loc. 036) (Wide end of bone is 2.5 cm across)



Figure 38. The Welgemoed 268 trackway palaeosurface with reconstructions of swimming temnospondyl amphibians and an *Episcopopus* trackway generated by a walking individual (Schneider & Marais 2004, Marsicano *et al.* 2014). The WElgemoed 286 trackway may have in fact been made by a swimming tetrapod that was not a temnospondyl amphibian.

Figure 39. Koornplaats Member channel sandstone containing a lens rich in rusty-brown reworked fossil plant debris, Drie Roode Heuwels 180 (Loc. 321) (Hammer = 30 cm).

Figure 40. Sandstone bedding plane at the locality shown above with rusty-brown compressions and moulds of transported plant material associated with mudflake intraclasts (Loc. 321) (largest stem is *c*. 4 cm across).



Figure 41. Bloaks of poorly-preserved petrified wood (arrowed) weathering out of the base of a Koornplaats Member channel sandstone, Drie Roode Heuwels 180 (Loc. 321).

Figure 42. Piece of poorly-preserved, ferruginised petrified wood (*c*. 4 cm thick) within a float block of channel sandstone, Koornplaats Member, Schalkwykskraal 204 (Loc. 325).



Figure 43. Google earth© satellite image showing the location of the tetrapod trackway site (red triangle) close to a proposed WEF internal road (yellow) and cable alignment (pink) on Welgemoed 268. It is proposed that the trackway site be protected by a 20-m radius buffer zone during planning and construction.



1/18/2011
332
036
311
321
324
325
4.00 km
Image © 2016 DigitalGlobe
Imagery Date: 1/18/2011

Figure 44 (Previous page). Google earth© satellite image of the Maralla East WEF project area (red polygon) showing the dissected, mountainous terrain in the Klein-Roggeveldberge region. Also shown here are the 70 proposed wind turbine sites (white dots), internal roads (yellow), cables (pink), alternative sites for the on-site IPP substation and associated Operations and Maintenance Building (red – preferred; blue – alternative) as well as the 132 kV powerline corridor connecting the Maralla East and Maralla East IPP substations (pale blue). Fossil sites recorded in the field survey are shown by red and blue numbered triangles. The red triangle 036 refers to scientifically important vertebrate trackways that are of special conservation value and should be protected by a 20 m-radius buffer zone (See also Fig. 43). The blue sites refer to low diversity assemblages of invertebrate trace fossils and plant debris (*e.g.* poorly-preserved fossil wood) that lie close to but outside the development footprint and that are not considered to be of special scientific value or warranting specific mitigation measures. The green triangle (U) within the southern portion of the powerline corridor refers to a known uranium ore anomaly (No. 190 of Cole & Vorster 1999) that should be safeguarded by a 20 m-radius buffer zone.

5. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

This palaeontological heritage assessment applies to the entire Maralla East WEF project area, including access roads and on-site IPP substation, but not to the 400 kV powerline connection to the national grid and Eskom on-site substation that are the subject of a separate Basic Assessment process or to any proposed borrow pits.

In terms of the palaeontological sensitivity of the rock units represented within the Maralla East WEF project area, the outcrop area of the Lower Beaufort Group is generally considered to be high to very high sensitivity because of its rich record of Permian vertebrates and plants (MacRae 1999, McCarthy & Rubidge 2005, Almond & Pether 2008a, 2008b, Smith *et al.* 2012, SAHRIS website). The overlying Late Caenozoic superficial deposits (alluvium *etc*) are generally of low sensitivity but may also be locally high (*e.g.* fossil mammals). Fieldwork in the Klein-Roggeveld region backed-up by desktop analysis indicates that fossil material such as vascular plants, vertebrate skeletal material (bones, teeth) and trace fossils are present within the Karoo Supergroup here (See References). However, well-preserved specimens of special scientific interest and conservation significance are very rare indeed.

Fossil material recorded within the Maralla East WEF study area mainly comprises poorly-preserved, transported woody plant material associated with channel sandstones, casts of reedy plant stems and low-diversity invertebrate burrow assemblages. These often common fossil taxa occur widely within the region and are therefore not of exceptional conservation significance. The only vertebrate skeletal remains recorded consist of a few dark bony fragments that might be of amphibian affinity. They were found in the vicinity of a rippled sandstone palaeosurface showing several well-preserved tetrapod (four-legged vertebrate) trackways that is of considerable scientific interest and conservation value (Loc. 036 on Welgemoed 268; see satellite image Figs. 43 & 44). It is recommended that this tetrapod trackway site be protected by a 20 m-radius buffer zone during the planning stage and safeguarded from disturbance during the construction phase of the WEF using security tape. A previously identified uranium ore anomaly at 32 45 33.0 S, 20 47 13.0 E on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Anomaly 190 of Cole & Vorster 1999) might be associated with fossil plant material which often played a key role in uranium mineralisation, but this association is unconfirmed. A 20 m–radius buffer for this site is recommended as a precautionary measure (See Loc. U in Fig. 44).

All South African fossil heritage is protected by law (South African Heritage Resources Act, 1999) and fossils may not be collected, damaged or disturbed without a permit from the relevant Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (in this case Heritage Western Cape and SAHRA for the Western Cape and Northern Cape respectively) (See Section 1.3). The construction phase of the proposed WEF will entail extensive surface clearance as well as excavations into the superficial sediment cover and underlying bedrock. The development may adversely affect potential fossil heritage within the study area by destroying, damaging, disturbing or permanently sealing-in fossils preserved at or beneath the surface of the ground that are then no longer available for scientific research or other public good. The operational and de-commissioning phases of the WEF are very unlikely to involve further adverse impacts on local palaeontological heritage and are therefore not separately assessed here.

5.1. Impact assessment for the construction phase

This assessment (See Table 1) refers to impacts on fossil heritage preserved at or beneath the ground surface within the Maralla East WEF project area during the construction phase, mainly due to surface clearance and excavation activities. Such impacts on fossil heritage are *limited to the site* (development footprint) and are generally *direct*, *negative* and of *permanent* effect (non-reversible).

While fossils of some sort (including microfossils, invertebrate trace fossils and plant debris) are of widespread occurrence within the project area, unique or scientifically-important fossils are very scarce indeed here, even where bedrock exposure levels are locally high. Recorded fossil sites lie outside the proposed development footprint. It is concluded that impacts on scientifically important palaeontological heritage resources are *improbable* and of *minor magnitude* since (1) significant fossil sites are unlikely to be affected and (2) in many cases these impacts can be mitigated. The overall impact significance of the Maralla East WEF *without mitigation* is rated as LOW in terms of palaeontological heritage resources. Should the proposed mitigation measures outlined in Section 6 below be fully implemented, the impact significance would remain low. However, residual negative impacts such as the inevitable loss of fossil heritage would be partially offset by an improved understanding of Karoo fossil heritage which is considered a *positive* impact.

There are no objections on palaeontological heritage grounds to authorisation of the proposed Maralla East WEF development. Given the overall low impact significance of the Maralla East WEF project, and the paucity of high-sensitivity fossil sites recorded here, there are no suggested modifications on palaeontological heritage grounds to the proposed layout, including wind turbine sites, access and internal roads and associated infrastructure. Likewise, there is no preference for one or other of the two sites under consideration for the on-site IPP substation and associated Operations and Maintenance Building. Once identified, any borrow pit sites will require separate palaeontological heritage assessment before excavation commences.

Confidence levels for this assessment are rated as medium, given the necessarily superficial nature of the short field assessment counterbalanced by the number of palaeontological field studies recently carried out within the broader Klein-Roggeveld study region (See Cumulative Impacts, Section 5.2).

The impact assessment for the **No-Go Option** considers future impacts on local fossil heritage that are likely to occur in the absence of WEF development, using the present status of fossil heritage in the area as a baseline. Destruction of near-surface or surface fossil material by natural bedrock weathering and erosion will be partially offset by on-going exposure of fresh fossil material by erosion. Improvements in our understanding of palaeontology of the area (a possible positive impact) will depend on whether or not field-based academic or impact studies are carried out here, which is inherently unpredictable (There is an on-going research project on the palaeontology of the SW Karoo by Wits University).

- Monitoring of all surface clearance and substantial excavations (>1 m deep) by the ECO for fossil material (e.g. bones, teeth, fossil wood) on an on-going basis during the construction phase.

- Protection of tetrapod trackway site (Loc. 036) and uranium anomaly site (Loc. U) within a 20 m-radius buffer zone (See Fig. 44 and Appendix). Buffer zone to around trackway site to be delimited using security tape during construction phase.

- Safeguarding of chance fossil finds (preferably *in situ*) during the construction phase by the responsible ECO, followed by reporting of finds to Heritage Western Cape / SAHRA.

- Recording and judicious sampling of significant chance fossil finds by a qualified palaeontologist, together with pertinent contextual data (stratigraphy, sedimentology, taphonomy).

- Curation of fossil material within an approved repository (museum / university fossil collection) by a qualified palaeontologist.

Potential Impact		Extent (E)	Duration (D)	Magnitude (M)	Probability (P)	Significance (S=(E+D+M)*P)		Status (+ve or -ve)	Confidence
	Nature of impact:	Disturbance, damage or destruction of fossils (direct, negative impacts) preserved at or beneath the ground surface within the development footprint during the construction phase, mainly due to surface clearance or excavation activities.							
	Without Mitigation	1	5	2	2	16	Low	-	Medium
	degree to which impact can be reversed:	Irreversible							
	degree of impact on irreplaceable resources:	Minor							
	Mitigation Measures	• Monitoring of all surface clearance and substantial excavations (>1 m deep) by the ECO for fossil material (e.g. bones, teeth, fossil wood) on an on-going basis during the construction phase. • Protection of tetrapod trackway site (Loc. 036) and uranium anomaly site (Loc. U) within a 20 m-radius buffer zone. Buffer zone to around trackway site to be delimited using security tape during construction phase. • Safeguarding of chance fossil finds (preferably in situ) during the construction phase by the responsible ECO, followed by reporting of finds to Heritage Western Cape / SAHRA. • Recording and judicious sampling of significant chance fossil finds by a qualified palaeontologist, together with pertinent contextual data (stratigraphy, sedimentology, taphonomy). • Curation of fossil material within an approved repository (museum / university fossil collection) by a qualified palaeontologist.							
	With Mitigation	1	5	2	2	16	Low	-	Medium

Table 1: Assessment of anticipated impacts on palaeontological heritage resources for the proposed Maralla East WEF (construction phase)

5.2. Assessment of cumulative impacts (construction phase)

Cumulative impacts inferred for the various alternative energy developments in the Klein-Roggeveld region between Matjiesfontein and Sutherland have been assessed here on the basis of desktop and field-based palaeontological impact assessment reports for these projects, the great majority of which were submitted by the present author (See references provided below and SAHRIS website). The projects concerned lie within a radius of some 50 km of the Maralla East WEF project area (Fig. 45). Relevant published palaeontological literature for the region has also been taken into account (*e.g.* Loock *et al.* 1994, Nicolas 2007). This assessment applies only to the construction phases of the WEF developments, since significant additional impacts on palaeontological heritage during the operational and de-commissioning phases are not anticipated.

It should be emphasized that, in the case of palaeontological heritage, it only makes sense to consider cumulative impacts on *comparable fossil assemblages* present in the same formations that are represented in the present study area as well as in the broader study region ("Comparable" here refers to assemblages of similar age, taxonomic composition, preservation and palaeoecology). For example, impacts on Permian aquatic fossil invertebrates in the Whitehill Formation (Ecca Group) that crops out in WEF project areas far to the southwest of the Maralla East WEF study area are not directly relevant to impacts on fossil assemblages of terrestrial vertebrates in the Lower Beaufort Group as represented in the latter area. The analysis in Table 2 is therefore restricted to considering cumulative impacts on fossil heritage preserved within rock units and fossil assemblages that are represented in the Maralla East WEF study area as well as in nearby project areas – specifically the Leeuvlei and Koornplaats Members of the lowermost Abrahamskraal Formation (*i.e.* basal portion of the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone). WEF projects in the SW Karoo that potentially share fossil assemblages in the lowermost Abrahamskraal Formation include the following: Karusa WEF (Almond 2015c), Soetwater WEF (Almond 2015d), Gunstfontein WEF (Almond 2015g), Maralla East and West WEFs (Almond 2016e and 2016h) as well as the Komsberg East WEF (Almond 2015e) and Komsberg West WEF (Almond 2015f). Further field-based PIAs (palaeontological impact assessments) of relevance include those for the Eskom Gamma-Omega 765kV transmission line (Almond 2010a) and the Komsberg Substation (Almond 2015b). In the case of the Great Karoo WEF to the south of the present study area no field-based palaeontological study has been done. Other WEF projects in the wider region, such as the Esizayo WEF (Almond 2016f), Perdekraal East WEF (Almond 2015a), Sutherland WEF (Almond 2010c) and Suurplaat WEF (Almond 2010b), are underlain by significantly older or younger rocks within the Lower Beaufort Group, or by much older Dwyka Group and Ecca Group rocks. These successions contain significantly different fossil assemblages and so are not relevant to the present cumulative impact assessment. This also applies to further alternative energy facilities within the Cape Fold Belt near Touwsrivier and Laingsburg, such as the Konstabel WEF (Almond 2010d) and Witberg WEF (Miller 2010) that are underlain by older pre-Karoo bedrocks and to solar energy facilities above the Great Escarpment near Sutherland that overlie younger portions of the Abrahamskraal Formation.

In all the strictly *relevant* field-based palaeontological studies listed above the palaeontological sensitivity of the project area and the palaeontological heritage impact significance for the developments concerned has been rated as low. In all cases it was concluded by the author that, despite the undoubted occurrence of sporadic scientifically-important fossil remains (notably fossil vertebrates, vertebrate trackways and burrows, petrified wood), the overall impact significance of the proposed developments was low because the probability of significant impacts on *scientifically important, unique or rare fossils* was slight. While fossils do indeed occur within some of the formations present, they tend to be sparse – especially as far as fossil vertebrates are concerned - while the great majority represent common forms that occur widely within the outcrop areas of the rock units concerned. Important exceptions include (1) vertebrate burrows attributed to small therapsids, and possibly also to lungfish (Almond 2016b, Almond 2016c) and (2) well-preserved vertebrate trackways made by temnospondyl amphibians or other, unidentified tetrapods within the Maralla East WEF project area (Almond 2016e and the present report).

Cumulative impacts for the Maralla East WEF in the context of comparable alternative energy projects proposed or authorised in the Klein-Roggeveld region are assessed in Table 2. It is concluded that the cumulative impact significance of the Maralla East WEF and other regional projects is *low* (*negative*), *provided that* the proposed monitoring and mitigation recommendations made for all these various projects are followed through. Unavoidable residual negative impacts may be partially offset by the improved understanding of Karoo palaeontology resulting from appropriate professional mitigation. This is regarded as a *positive* impact for Karoo palaeontological heritage. However, *without* mitigation the magnitude of cumulative (negative, direct) impacts of such a large number of WEFs affecting the same (albeit sparsely) fossiliferous rock successions would be significantly higher and probable. The cumulative impact significance without mitigation is accordingly assessed as *medium*.



Figure 45. Google earth© satellite image of SW Karoo showing the large number of WEF projects that have been proposed or already approved in the Laingsburg – Sutherland region. The Maralla East WEF project area, shaded in yellow, is indicated by the yellow arrow. Note that impacts incurred by these various WEF projects will not always involve fossil assemblages of the same age and taxonomic composition.

Potential Impact		Extent (E)	Duration (D)	Magnitude (M)	Probability (P)	Significance (S=(E+D+M)*P)		Status (+ve or -ve)	Confidence
	Nature of impact:	Disturbance, damage or destruction of fossils (direct, negative impacts) preserved at or beneath the ground surface within the development footprint during the construction phase, mainly due to surface clearance or excavation activities.							
	Without Mitigation	3	5	4	3	36	Medium	-	Medium
	degree to which impact can be reversed:	Irreversible							
	degree of impact on irreplaceable resources:	Low							
	Mitigation Measures	• Monitoring of all surface clearance and substantial excavations (>1 m deep) by the ECO for fossil material (e.g. bones, teeth, fossil wood) on an on-going basis during the construction phase. • Protection of tetrapod trackway site (Loc. 036) and uranium anomaly site (Loc. U) within a 20 m-radius buffer zone. Buffer zone to around trackway site to be delimited using security tape during construction phase. • Safeguarding of chance fossil finds (preferably in situ) during the construction phase by the responsible ECO, followed by reporting of finds to Heritage Western Cape / SAHRA. • Recording and judicious sampling of significant chance fossil finds by a qualified palaeontologist, together with pertinent contextual data (stratigraphy, sedimentology, taphonomy). • Curation of fossil material within an approved repository (museum / university fossil collection) by a qualified palaeontologist.							
	With Mitigation	3	5	2	2	20	Low	-	Medium

Table 2: Assessment of anticipated cumulative impacts on palaeontological heritage resources for the proposed Maralla East WEF in the context of numerous other alternative developments in the region (construction phase).

6. MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT MEASURES

The majority of the few fossil sites identified within the Maralla East WEF project area (See numbered sites marked in blue in Fig. 44) are not considered to be of special conservation significance since they represent fossil taxa (low-diversity invertebrate traces, reedy plant material, poorly-preserved petrified wood) that occur widely within the broader Klein-Roggeveld region and that are not of great scientific interest. In contrast, the rippled sandstone palaeosurface showing several well-preserved tetrapod (four-legged vertebrate) trackways recorded at Loc. 036 on Welgemoed 268 (See satellite images Figs. 43 and 44) is of considerable scientific interest and conservation value. It is therefore recommended that this tetrapod trackway site be protected by a 20 m-radius buffer zone during the planning stage and safeguarded from disturbance during the construction phase of the WEF using security tape. A previously identified uranium ore anomaly at 32 45 33.0 S, 20 47 13.0 E on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Anomaly 190 of Cole & Vorster 1999, Loc. U in Fig. 44) that might be associated with fossil plant material should also be safeguarded with a 20 m-radius buffer as a precautionary measure since uranium ores are often associated with fossil plant material.

Given the scarcity of scientifically-important, unique fossil heritage recorded within the remainder of the Maralla East WEF study area, no additional specialist palaeontological studies or mitigation are recommended for this development, pending the potential discovery of significant new fossils before or during the construction phase. There are no suggested modifications on palaeontological heritage grounds to the proposed layout, including wind turbine sites, access and internal roads, IPP substation and associated infrastructure. The following general palaeontological mitigation measures apply to the construction phase (See Table 3):

- Monitoring of all surface clearance and substantial excavations (>1 m deep) by the ECO for fossil material (*e.g.* bones, teeth, fossil wood) on an on-going basis during the construction phase.

- Safeguarding of chance fossil finds (preferably *in situ*) during the construction phase by the responsible ECO, followed by reporting of finds to SAHRA / Heritage Western Cape (HWC).

- Recording and judicious sampling of significant chance fossil finds by a qualified palaeontologist, together with pertinent contextual data (stratigraphy, sedimentology, taphonomy) (Phase 2 mitigation).

- Curation of fossil material within an approved repository (museum / university fossil collection) and submission of a Phase 2 palaeontological heritage report to SAHRA / HWC by a qualified palaeontologist.

Mitigation of significant chance fossil finds reported by the ECO would involve the recording, sampling and / or collection of fossil material and associated geological data by a professional palaeontologist during the construction phase of the development. The palaeontologist concerned with potential mitigation work (Phase 2) would need a valid fossil collection permit from SAHRA / HWC and any material collected would have to be curated in an approved depository (*e.g.* museum or university collection). All palaeontological fieldwork and reporting should meet the minimum standards outlined by SAHRA (2013) and Heritage Western Cape (2016).

Significant further impacts on palaeontological heritage resources are not anticipated during the planning, operational, decommissioning and rehabilitation phases of the WEF so no further mitigation or management measures in this respect are proposed here. These monitoring and mitigation requirements should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) for the WEF and also included as conditions for authorisation of the development project.

Activity	Mitigation and Management Measure	Responsible Person	Applicable Development Phase	Include as Condition of Authorisation	Monitoring Requirements
All actvities near protected localities 036 and U that involve surface disturbance, including surface clearance, excavations, vehicle use, dumping *etc*.	Designate protected 20 m-radius buffer zone around Loc. 036 and Loc. U (See Appendix for co-ordinates). Safeguard buffer zone using security tape.	Developer ECO	Planning Construction	Yes	ECO to ensure buffer zone is safeguarded from all disturbance during construction.
Surface clearance & substantial excavations (> 1 m deep)	Monitoring of all surface clearance and substantial excavations (>1 m deep) for fossil material (*e.g.* bones, teeth, fossil wood)	ECO	Construction	Yes	Inspect cleared ground and excavations for fossil remains. On-going, throughout construction phase
Surface clearance & substantial excavations (> 1 m deep)	Safeguarding of chance fossil finds (preferably *in situ*), followed by reporting of finds to SAHRA / Heritage Western Cape.	ECO	Construction	Yes	Define and secure fossil site with security tape. Report finds at earliest opportunity to SAHRA
Surface clearance & substantial excavations (> 1 m deep)	Recording and judicious sampling of significant chance fossil finds by a qualified palaeontologist, together with pertinent contextual data (stratigraphy, sedimentology, taphonomy).	Professional palaeontologist	Construction	Yes	Following consultation over chance fossil finds with SAHRA / Heritage Western Cape and professional palaeontologist

Activity	Mitigation and Management Measure	Responsible Person	Applicable Development Phase	Include as Condition of Authorisation	Monitoring requirements
Surface clearance & substantial excavations (> 1 m deep)	Curation of fossil material within an approved repository (museum / university fossil collection). Submission of Phase 2 palaeontological heritage report to SAHRA / Heritage Western Cape.	Professional palaeontologist	Construction	Yes	Following Phase 2 palaeontological mitigation
Development of borrow pits	Separate palaeontological heritage assessment for each proposed borrow pit	Professional palaeontologist	Pre-construction	Yes	To be specified by palaeontologist and SAHRA / Heritage Westen Cape on submission of palaeontological assessment reports

Table 3. Recommended mitigation and management measures concerning palaeontological heritage for the Maralla East WEF

7. STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

7.1. Stakeholder Consultation Process

Public participation is a requirement of the S&EIR process; it consists of a series of inclusive and culturally appropriate interactions aimed at providing stakeholders with opportunities to express their views, so that these can be considered and incorporated into the S&EIR decision-making process. Effective public participation requires the prior disclosure of relevant and adequate project information to enable stakeholders to understand the risks, impacts, and opportunities of the Proposed Project.

A comprehensive stakeholder consultation process was undertaken during the scoping phase. Stakeholders were identified through existing databases, site notices, newspaper adverts and meetings. All stakeholders identified to date have been registered on the project database. All concerns, comments, viewpoints and questions (collectively referred to as 'issues') received to date have been documented and responded to in a Comment and Response Report.

There will be ongoing communication between WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff and stakeholders throughout the S&EIR process.

The following stakeholder comments and responses on the Draft Scoping Report for the proposed Maralla East WEF have been reviewed with respect to palaeontological heritage issues for this EIA phase report:

- Letter from the Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning, Western Cape (undated)
- Letter from the national Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA Reference: 14/12/16/3/3/2/962).
- SAHRA Interim Comment, Maralla East Wind Energy Facility (Wednesday, October 26, 2016)

7.2. Stakeholder Comments and Response

Comments specifically relevant to palaeontological heritage and the corresponding specialist responses are provided in the table below.

STAKEHOLDER DETAILS	COMMENT	SPECIALIST RESPONSE
DEAD&DP	4.9.1 The paleontological 'no-go· area (i.e. the rippled sandstone palaeosurtace on Farm Welgemoed No. 268) identified by the Paleontological Study (June 2016) should be strictly excluded from the development layout.	This recommendation has been reinforced in the present EIA phase palaeontology report for including in the EMPr.

STAKEHOLDER DETAILS	COMMENT	SPECIALIST RESPONSE
SAHRA	SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites (APM) Unit accepts and promotes the recommendations of the Archaeological and Palaeontological Scoping Reports. The pending HIA must take the following aspects (but not limited to) into consideration when assessing impacts: • The detailed Palaeontological Impact Assessment conducted by John Almond must be incorporated into the HIA;	The present palaeontological heritage assessment will be incorporated into the consolidated HIA for the Maralla East WEF project.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The Maralla East WEF project area is underlain by fluvial and lacustrine sediments assigned to the lower part of the Abrahamskraal Formation (Lower Beaufort Group, Karoo Supergroup) that are of Middle Permian age. The lower portion of the Abrahamskraal Formation succession in this part of the SW Karoo is characterised by very rare tetrapod (four-legged vertebrate) remains, vertebrate burrows, vascular plants and other fossils of the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone.

Fossil material recorded within the Maralla East WEF study area mainly comprises poorly-preserved, transported woody plant material (including petrified wood) associated with channel sandstones, casts of reedy plant stems and low-diversity invertebrate burrow assemblages. These fossil taxa occur widely within the region and are therefore not of exceptional conservation significance. The only vertebrate skeletal remains recorded consist of a few dark bony fragments that might be of amphibian affinity. They were found in the vicinity of a rippled sandstone palaeosurface showing several well-preserved tetrapod trackways that are of considerable scientific interest and conservation value. It is recommended that this tetrapod trackway site (Loc. 036 on Welgemoed 268) be protected by a 20 m-radius buffer zone during the planning stage and safeguarded from disturbance during the construction phase of the WEF using security tape. A previously identified uranium ore anomaly at 32 45 33.0 S, 20 47 13.0 E on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Anomaly 190 of Cole & Vorster 1999) might be associated with fossil plant material which often played a key role in uranium mineralisation, but this association is unconfirmed. A 20 m–radius buffer for this site is recommended as a precautionary measure.

Given the rarity of scientifically-important, well-preserved fossil material here, is concluded that the Middle Permian bedrocks in the Maralla East WEF study area are generally of low palaeontological sensitivity. The same applies to a range of Late Caenozoic superficial sediments (alluvium, colluvium, calcretes, soils, surface gravels *etc*) overlying the Palaeozoic bedrocks; only isolated float blocks of downwasted petrified wood were found in these younger deposits during field assessment.

The overall impact significance of the construction phase of the proposed wind energy project is assessed as LOW (negative) in terms of palaeontological heritage resources. This is a consequence of (1) the paucity of irreplaceable, unique or rare fossil remains within the study area as well as (2) the extensive superficial sediment cover overlying most potentially-fossiliferous bedrocks here. This assessment applies to the proposed layout for the wind turbines, laydown area, access and internal roads, on-site IPP substation and associated WEF infrastructure within the study area. A comparable low impact significance is inferred for all project infrastructure alternatives and layout options under consideration, including different options for routing of access and internal roads, turbine layouts and siting of the on-site substation and associated Operations and Maintenance Building. Significant further impacts during the operational and de-commissioning phases of the WEF are not anticipated. There are therefore no preferences on palaeontological heritage grounds for any particular layout among the various options under consideration, including alternative sites for the on-site IPP substation. No significant further impacts on fossil heritage are anticipated during the planning, operational and de-commissioning phases of the WEF. The no-go alternative (*i.e.* no WEF development) will have a low (neutral) impact on palaeontological heritage.

Cumulative impacts on palaeontological heritage resources that are anticipated as a result of the numerous alternative energy developments currently proposed or authorised for the Klein-Roggeveldberge region, including the Maralla East WEF, are predicted to be low (negative), *provided that* the proposed monitoring and mitigation recommendations made for these various projects are followed through. Unavoidable residual negative impacts may be partially offset by the improved understanding of Karoo palaeontology resulting from appropriate professional mitigation. This is regarded as a *positive* impact for Karoo palaeontological heritage. *Without* mitigation, cumulative impacts resulting from the large number of WEF projects in the Klein-Roggeveld region are anticipated to be of medium significance.

There are no fatal flaws in the Maralla East WEF development proposal as far as fossil heritage is concerned. *Provided that* the recommendations for palaeontological monitoring and mitigation outlined below are followed through, there are no objections on palaeontological heritage grounds to authorisation of the Maralla East WEF project. It is noted that borrow pit sites will only be identified if and when the proposed WEF wins preferred bidder status. In this case, a separate palaeontological assessment of all borrow pit sites will be necessary in the pre-construction phase.

Two highly sensitive “no-go” areas within the proposed Maralla East WEF study area have been identified in this study and should be safeguarded by a 20 m-radius buffer zone. These include the tetrapod trackway site on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036) and the uranium ore anomaly site on Schalkwykskraal 204 (Anomaly 120 of Cole & Vorster 1999). Pending the potential discovery of substantial new fossil remains during construction, further specialist palaeontological mitigation is not recommended for this project. The following general recommendations concerning conservation and management of palaeontological heritage resources apply.

The Environmental Control Officer (ECO) responsible for the WEF development should be made aware of the potential occurrence of scientifically-important fossil remains within the development footprint. During the construction phase all major clearance operations (*e.g.* for new access roads, turbine placements) and deeper (> 1 m) excavations should be monitored for fossil remains on an on-going basis by the ECO. Should substantial fossil remains - such as vertebrate bones and teeth, or petrified logs of fossil wood - be encountered at surface or exposed during construction, the ECO should safeguard these, preferably *in situ*. They should then alert the relevant provincial heritage management authority as soon as possible - *i.e.* SAHRA for the Northern Cape (Contact details: Dr Ragna Redelstorff, SAHRA, P.O. Box 4637, Cape Town 8000. Tel: 021 202 8651. Email:

rredelstorff@sahra.org.za) and Heritage Western Cape for the Western Cape (Contact details: Protea Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town 8000. Private Bag X9067, Cape Town 8001. Tel: 086-142 142. Fax: 021-483 9842. Email: hwc@pgwc.gov.za). This is to ensure that appropriate action (*i.e.* recording, sampling or collection of fossils, recording of relevant geological data) can be taken by a professional palaeontologist at the developer's expense.

These mitigation recommendations should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) for the Maralla East WEF alternative energy project. Please note that:

- All South African fossil heritage is protected by law (South African Heritage Resources Act, 1999) and fossils cannot be collected, damaged or disturbed without a permit from the relevant Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (in this case SAHRA or HWC);
- The palaeontologist concerned with potential mitigation work will need a valid fossil collection permit from SAHRA / HWC and any material collected would have to be curated in an approved depository (*e.g.* museum or university collection);
- All palaeontological specialist work should conform to international best practice for palaeontological fieldwork and the study (*e.g.* data recording fossil collection and curation, final report) should adhere as far as possible to the minimum standards for Phase 2 palaeontological studies developed by Heritage Western Cape (2016) and SAHRA (2013).

9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ms Ashlea Strong of WSP | Parsons Brinckerhoff, Environment & Energy, Africa, Bryanston is thanked for commissioning this study, for providing the necessary background information, and for editorial input. Professor Roger Smith (Wits University, Johannesburg) provided interesting new insights on the Welgemoed tetrapod trackway during his site visit. I am, as always, especially grateful to Madelon Tusenius, Hedi Stummer and Erwin Stummer for companionship, for logistical assistance in the field, and – most of all - for finding fossils.

10. REFERENCES

ALMOND, J.E. 2005. Palaeontological scoping report: Proposed golf estate, Sutherland, Northern Cape, 10 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2008a. Fossil record of the Loeriesfontein sheet area. Unpublished report for the Council for Geoscience, Pretoria, 32pp.

ALMOND, J.E. 2008b. Palaeozoic fossil record of the Clanwilliam sheet area. Unpublished report for the Council for Geoscience, Pretoria, 49pp.

ALMOND, J.E. 2010a. Eskom Gamma-Omega 765kV transmission line: Phase 2 palaeontological impact assessment. Sector 1, Tanqua Karoo to Omega Substation (Western and Northern Cape Provinces), 95 pp + appendix. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2010b. Palaeontological impact assessment: desktop study – Proposed Suurplaat wind energy facility near Sutherland, Western Cape, 33 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2010c. Proposed Mainstream wind farm to the southeast of Sutherland, Northern Cape and Western Cape Provinces. Palaeontological impact assessment: pre-scoping desktop study, 19 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2010d. Proposed Mainstream wind farm at Konstabel near Touwsrivier, Laingsburg Magisterial District, Western Cape. Palaeontological impact assessment: pre-scoping desktop study, 19 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2011. Proposed photovoltaic solar energy facility on the farm Jakhals Valley (RE/99) near Sutherland, Karoo Hoogland Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Palaeontological specialist study: combined desktop and field assessment, 34 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2013. Proposed Spitskop Wind Energy Facility, Somerset East and Albany Magisterial Districts, Eastern Cape Province. Palaeontological specialist study: combined desktop & field-based assessment, 81 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2014. Proposed Karreebosch Wind Farm (Roggeveld Phase 2) near Sutherland, Northern Cape Province. Palaeontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study, 63 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015a. Proposed Perdekraal East Wind & Solar Renewable Energy Facility near Touwsrivier, Ceres Magisterial District, Western Cape Province. Palaeontological impact assessment: field study, 68 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015b. Proposed expansion of the existing Komsberg Main Transmission Substation on Farm Standvastigheid 210 near Sutherland, Northern Cape Province. Paleontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study (basic assessment), 39 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015c. Authorised Karusa Wind Farm near Sutherland, Namaqua District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Palaeontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study, 57 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015d. Authorised Soetwater Wind Farm near Sutherland, Namaqua District Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Palaeontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study, 57 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015e. Komsberg East Wind Energy Facility near Sutherland, Laingsburg District, Western Cape. Palaeontological scoping assessment: combined desktop and field-based study, 51 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015f. Komsberg West Wind Energy Facility near Sutherland, Laingsburg and Sutherland Districst, Western and Northern Cape. Palaeontological scoping assessment: combined desktop and field-based study, 55 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2015g. Proposed Gunstfontein Wind Energy Facility near Sutherland, Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality, Northern Cape Province. Palaeontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study, 62 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016a. Square Kilometre Array (SKA) core and Phase 1 development area, Great Karoo, Northern Cape - palaeontological heritage, 38 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016b. Proposed Rietkloof Wind Energy Facility near Laingsburg, Laingsburg District, Western Cape Province. Palaeontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study, 82 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016c. Proposed Brandvalley Wind Energy Facility near Laingsburg, Western and Northern Cape Provinces. Palaeontological heritage assessment: combined desktop & field-based study, 69 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016d. Esizayo Wind Energy Facility near Laingsburg, Western Cape: palaeontological heritage. Scoping report, 7 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016e. Maralla Wind Energy Facility near Sutherland, Northern Cape and Western Cape: palaeontological heritage. Scoping report, 8 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016f. Esizayo Wind Energy Facility near Laingsburg, Central Karoo District Municipality, Western Cape: palaeontological heritage assessment, 63 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016g. Proposed 400 kV powerline connection for the Esizayo Wind Energy Facility near Laingsburg, Central Karoo District Municipality, Western Cape: palaeontological heritage basic assessment, 28 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. 2016h. Maralla West Wind Energy Facility near Sutherland, Sutherland Magisterial District, Northern Cape: palaeontological heritage assessment, 51 pp. Natura Viva cc, Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. & PETHER, J. 2008a. Palaeontological heritage of the Western Cape. Interim SAHRA technical report, 20 pp. Natura Viva cc., Cape Town.

ALMOND, J.E. & PETHER, J. 2008b. Palaeontological heritage of the Northern Cape. Interim SAHRA technical report, 124 pp. Natura Viva cc., Cape Town.

ANDERSON, J.M. & ANDERSON, H.M. 1985. Palaeoflora of southern Africa. Prodromus of South African megafloras, Devonian to Lower Cretaceous, 423 pp. Botanical Research Institute, Pretoria & Balkema, Rotterdam.

BAMFORD, M. 1999. Permo-Triassic fossil woods from the South African Karoo Basin. Palaeontologia africana 35, 25-40.

BAMFORD, M.K. 2004. Diversity of woody vegetation of Gondwanan southern Africa. Gondwana Research 7, 153-164.

BENDER, P.A. 2004. Late Permian actinopterygian (palaeoniscid) fishes from the Beaufort Group, South Africa: biostratigraphic and biogeographic implications. Council for Geoscience Bulletin 135, 84 pp.

BENDER, P.A., RUBIDGE, B.S., GARDINER, B.S., LOOCK. J.C. & BREMNER, A.T. 1991. The stratigraphic range of the palaeoniscoid fish *Namaichthys digitata* in rocks of the Karoo sequence and its palaeoenvironmental significance. South African Journal of Science 87: 468-469.

BENDER, P.A. & BRINK, J.S. 1992. A preliminary report on new large mammal fossil finds from the Cornelia-Uitzoek site. South African Journal of Science 88: 512-515.

BOONSTRA, L.D. 1969. The fauna of the *Tapinocephalus* Zone (Beaufort Beds of the Karoo). Annals of the South African Museum 56: 1-73.

BOUSMAN, C.B. *et al.* 1988. Palaeoenvironmental implications of Late Pleistocene and Holocene valley fills in Blydefontein Basin, Noupoort, C.P., South Africa. Palaeoecology of Africa 19: 43-67.

BRINK, J.S. 1987. The archaeozoology of Florisbad, Orange Free State. Memoirs van die Nasionale Museum 24, 151 pp.

BRINK, J.S. et al. 1995. A new find of *Megalotragus priscus* (Alcephalini, Bovidae) from the Central Karoo, South Africa. Palaeontologia africana 32: 17-22.

BRINK, J.S. & ROSSOUW, L. 2000. New trial excavations at the Cornelia-Uitzoek type locality. Navorsinge van die Nasionale Museum Bloemfontein 16, 141-156.

BUATOIS, L. & MANGANO, M.G. 2004. Animal-substrate interactions in freshwater environments: applications of ichnology in facies and sequence stratigraphic analysis of fluvio-lacustrine successions. In: McIlroy, D. (Ed.) The application of ichnology to palaeoenvironmental and stratigraphic analysis. Geological Society, London, Special Publications 228, pp 311-333.

CHURCHILL, S.E. et al. 2000. Erfkroon: a new Florisian fossil locality from fluvial contexts in the western Free State, South Africa. South African Journal of Science 96: 161-163.

COLE, D.I., SMITH, R.M.H. & WICKENS, H. DE V. 1990. Basin-plain to fluvio-lacustrine deposits in the Permian Ecca and Lower Beaufort Groups of the Karoo Sequence. Guidebook Geocongress ’90, Geological Society of South Africa, PO2, 1-83.

COLE, D.I. & WICKENS, H. DE V. 1998. Lower Karoo Supergroup: glacial, basinal and terrestrial environments in the southwestern part of the main Karoo Basin. Guidebook 10th Gondwana Conference. University of Cape Town, South Africa, Pr1, 1-77.

COLE, D.I., NEVELING, J., HATTINGH, J., CHEVALLIER, L.P., REDDERING, J.S.V. & BENDER, P.A. 2004. The geology of the Middelburg area. Explanation to 1: 250 000 geology Sheet 3124 Middelburg, 44 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

COLE, D. & SMITH, R. 2008. Fluvial architecture of the Late Permian Beaufort Group deposits, S.W. Karoo Basin: point bars, crevasse splays, palaeosols, vertebrate fossils and uranium. Field Excursion FT02 guidebook, AAPG International Conference, Cape Town October 2008, 110 pp.

COLE, D.I. & VORSTER, C.J. 1999. The metallogeny of the Sutherland area, 41 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

COLE, D.I. AND WIPPLINGER, P.E. 2001, Sedimentology and molybdenum potential of the Beaufort Group in the main Karoo Basin, South Africa, Council for Geoscience Memoir, South Africa 80, 225 pp.

DAY 2013a. Middle Permian continental biodiversity changes as reflected in the Beaufort Group of South Africa: a bio- and lithostratigraphic review of the *Eodicynodon*, *Tapinocephalus* and *Pristerognathus* assemblage zones. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of the Watwatersrand, Johannesburg, 387 pp plus appendices.

DAY, M. 2013b. Charting the fossils of the Great Karoo: a history of tetrapod biostratigraphy in the Lower Beaufort Group, South Africa. Palaeontologia Africana 48, 41-47.

DAY, M. & RUBIDGE, B. 2010. Middle Permian continental biodiversity changes as reflected in the Beaufort Group of South Africa: An initial review of the *Tapinocephalus* and *Pristerognathus* assemblage zones. Proceedings of the 16th conference of the Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa, Howick, August 5-8, 2010, pp. 22-23.

GOVENDER, R. 2002. The postcranial anatomy of the most basal tapinocephalid dinocephalian *Tapinocaninus pamelae* (Amniota, Therapsida). Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, 109pp.

HASIOTIS, S.T., MITCHELL, C.E. & DUBIEL, R. 1993. Application of morphologic burrow interpretations to discern continental burrow architects: Lungfish or crayfish? Ichnos 2,315-333.

HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE (2016). Guide for minimum standards for archaeology and palaeontology reports submitted to Heritage Western Cape, 5pp. Approved: HWC Council June 2016.

JINNAH, Z.A. & RUBIDGE, B.S. 2007. A double-tusked dicynodont and its biostratigraphic significance. South African Journal of Science 103, 51-53.

JIRAH, S. & RUBIDGE, B.S. 2010. Sedimentological, palaeontological and stratigraphic analysis of the Abrahamskraal Formation (Beaufort Group) in an area south of Merweville, South Africa. Proceedings of the 16th conference of the Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa, Howick, August 5-8, 2010, pp. 46-47.

JIRAH, S. & RUBIDGE, B.S. 2014. Refined stratigraphy of the Middle Permian Abrahamskraal Formation (Beaufort Group) in the southern Karoo Basin. Journal of African Earth Sciences 100, 121–135.

JOHNSON, M.R. 1976. Stratigraphy and sedimentology of the Cape and Karoo sequences in the Eastern Cape Province. Unpublished PhD thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 336 pp.

JOHNSON, M.R., VAN VUUREN, C.J., VISSER, J.N.J., COLE, D.I., WICKENS, H. DE V., CHRISTIE, A.D.M., ROBERTS, D.L. & BRANDL, G. 2006. Sedimentary rocks of the Karoo Supergroup. In: Johnson. M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. & Thomas, R.J. (eds.) The geology of South Africa, pp. 461-499. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg & the Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

JORDAAN, M.J. 1990. Basin analysis of the Beaufort Group in the western part of the Karoo Basin. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein, 271 pp.

KEYSER, A.W. & SMITH, R.M.H. 1977-78. Vertebrate biozonation of the Beaufort Group with special reference to the Western Karoo Basin. Annals of the Geological Survey of South Africa 12: 1-36.

KITCHING, J.W. 1977. The distribution of the Karroo vertebrate fauna, with special reference to certain genera and the bearing of this distribution on the zoning of the Beaufort beds. Memoirs of the Bernard Price Institute for Palaeontological Research, University of the Witwatersrand, No. 1, 133 pp (incl. 15 pls).

KLEIN, R. 1980. Environmental and ecological implications of large mammals from Upper Pleistocene and Holocene sites in southern Africa. Annals of the South African Museum 81, 223-283.

KLEIN, R.G. 1984. The large mammals of southern Africa: Late Pliocene to Recent. In: Klein, R.G. (Ed.) Southern African prehistory and paleoenvironments, pp 107-146. Balkema, Rotterdam.

LANCI, L, TOHVER, E., WILSON A. & FLINT, S. 2013. Upper Permian magnetic stratigraphy of the lower Beaufort Group, Karoo Basin. Earth and Planetary Science Letters (2013), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2013.05.017.

LOOCK, J.C., BRYNARD, H.J., HEARD, R.G., KITCHING, J.W. & RUBIDGE, B.S. 1994. The stratigraphy of the Lower Beaufort Group in an area north of Laingsburg, South Africa. Journal of African Earth Sciences 18: 185-195.

MACRAE, C. 1999. Life etched in stone. Fossils of South Africa, 305 pp. The Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg. SCHNEIDER, G. & MARAIS, C. 2004. Passage through time. The fossils of Namibia. 158 pp. Gamsberg MacMillan, Windhoek.

MARSICANO, C.A., WILSON, J.A. & SMITH, R.M.H. 2014. A temnospondyl trackway from the early Mesozoic of Western Gondwana and its implications for basal tetrapod locomotion. PLOS ONE 9, 15 pp.

McCARTHY, T. & RUBIDGE, B. 2005. The story of Earth and life: a southern African perspective on a 4.6-billion-year journey. 334pp. Struik, Cape Town.

MEADOWS, M.E. & WATKEYS, M.K. 1999. Palaeoenvironments. In: Dean, W.R.J. & Milton, S.J. (Eds.) The karoo. Ecological patterns and processes, pp. 27-41. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

MILLER, D. 2010. Palaeontological potential of proposed Witberg Wind Farm. Heritage impact assessment prepared for ACO, Cape Town, 8 pp.

MILLER, D. 2011. Roggeveld Wind Farm: palaeontology study, 7 pp. Appendix to Archaeological, Heritage and Paleontological Specialist Report prepared by ACO Associates, St James.

NICOLAS, M.V. 2007. Tetrapod diversity through the Permo-Triassic Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup) of South Africa. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

NICOLAS, M. & RUBIDGE, B.S. 2010. Changes in Permo-Triassic terrestrial tetrapod ecological representation in the Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup) of South Africa. Lethaia 43, 45-59.

ODENDAAL, A.I. AND LOOCK, J.C. 2015. Lungfish burrows in the lower Beaufort Group in the south-western part of the Karoo Basin. Origin and Evolution of The Cape Mountains and Karoo Basin "Imbizo", 25-27 November 2015, NMMU, poster.

PARTRIDGE, T.C. & MAUD, R.R. 1987. Geomorphic evolution of southern Africa since the Mesozoic. South African Journal of Geology 90: 179-208.

PARTRIDGE, T.C. & SCOTT, L. 2000. Lakes and Pans. In: Partridge, T.C. & Maud, R.R. (Eds.) The Cenozoic of southern Africa, pp.145-161. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

PARTRIDGE, T.C., BOTHA, G.A. & HADDON, I.G. 2006. Cenozoic deposits of the interior. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. & Thomas, R.J. (Eds.) The geology of South Africa, pp. 585-604. Geological Society of South Africa, Marshalltown.

PARTRIDGE, T.C. & SCOTT, L. 2000. Lakes and pans. In: Partridge, T.C. & Maud, R.R. (Eds.) The Cenozoic of southern Africa, pp.145-161. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

ROSSOUW, L. 2006. Florisian mammal fossils from erosional gullies along the Modder River at Mitasrust Farm, Central Free State, South Africa. Navorsinge van die Nasionale Museum Bloemfontein 22, 145-162.

ROSSOUW, L. 2012. Palaeontological desktop assessment of the proposed Hidden Valley Wind Energy Facility near Sutherland, Northern Cape Province, 17 pp.

ROSSOUW, P.J. & DE VILLIERS, J. 1952. Die geologie van die gebied Merweville, Kaapprovinsie. Explanation to 1: 125 000 geology sheet 198 Merweville, 63 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

RUBIDGE, B.S. 1984. The cranial morphology and palaeoenvironment of *Eodicynodon* Barry (Therapsida: Dicynodontia). Navorsinge van die Nasionale Museum Bloemfontein 4, 325-402.

RUBIDGE, B.S. 1987. South Africa's oldest land-living reptiles from the Ecca-Beaufort transition in the southern Karoo. South African Journal of Science 83, 165-166.

RUBIDGE, B.S. 1991. A new primitive dinocephalian mammal-like reptile from the Permian of southern Africa. Palaeontology 34, 547-559.

RUBIDGE, B.S. (Ed.) 1995. Biostratigraphy of the Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup). South African Committee for Biostratigraphy, Biostratigraphic Series No. 1., 46 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

RUBIDGE, B.S. 1995. Biostratigraphy of the *Eodicynodon* Assemblage Zone. Pp. 3 to 7 *in* Biostratigraphy of the Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup). South African Committee for Biostratigraphy, Biostratigraphic Series No. 1., 46 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

RUBIDGE, B.S. 2005. Re-uniting lost continents – fossil reptiles from the ancient Karoo and their wanderlust. 27th Du Toit Memorial Lecture. South African Journal of Geology 108, 135-172.

RUBIDGE, B.S. & OELOFSEN, B.W. 1981. Reptilian fauna from Ecca rocks near Prince Albert, South Africa. South African Journal of Science 77, 425-426.

RUBIDGE, B.S., KING, G.M. & HANCOX, P.J. 1994. The postcranial skeleton of the earliest dicynodont synapsid *Eodicynodon* from the Upper Permian of South Africa. Palaeontology 37, 397-408.

RUBIDGE, B.S., HANCOX, P.J. & CATUNEANU, O. 2000. Sequence analysis of the Ecca-Beaufort contact in the southern Karoo of South Africa. South African Journal of Geology 103, 81-96.

RUBIDGE, B.S., ERWIN, D.H., RAMEZANI, J., BOWRING, S.A. & DE KLERK, W.J. 2010. The first radiometric dates for the Beaufort Group, Karoo Supergroup of South Africa. Proceedings of the 16th conference of the Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa, Howick, August 5-8, 2010, pp. 82-83.

RUBIDGE, B.S., ERWIN, D.H., RAMEZANI, J., BOWRING, S.A. & DE KLERK, W.J. 2013. High-precision temporal calibration of Late Permian vertebrate biostratigraphy: U-Pb zircon constraints from the Karoo Supergroup, South Africa. Geology published online 4 January 2013. doi: 10.1130/G33622.1.

SAHRA 2013. Minimum standards: palaeontological component of heritage impact assessment reports, 15 pp. South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.

SCHNEIDER, G. & MARAIS, C. 2004. Passage through time. The fossils of Namibia. 158 pp. Gamsberg MacMillan, Windhoek.

SCOTT, L. 2000. Pollen. In: Partridge, T.C. & Maud, R.R. (Eds.) The Cenozoic of southern Africa, pp.339-35. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

SEILACHER, A. 2007. Trace fossil analysis, xiii + 226pp. Springer Verlag, Berlin.

SKEAD, C.J. 1980. Historical mammal incidence in the Cape Province. Volume 1: The Western and Northern Cape, 903pp. Department of Nature and Environmental Conservation, Cape Town.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1979. The sedimentology and taphonomy of flood-plain deposits of the Lower Beaufort (Adelaide Subgroup) strata near Beaufort West, Cape Province. Annals of the Geological Survey of South Africa 12, 37-68.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1980. The lithology, sedimentology and taphonomy of flood-plain deposits of the Lower Beaufort (Adelaide Subgroup) strata near Beaufort West. Transactions of the Geological Society of South Africa 83, 399-413.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1986. Trace fossils of the ancient Karoo. Sagittarius 1 (3), 4-9.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1987a. Morphological and depositional history of exhumed Permian point bars in the southwestern Karoo, South Africa. Journal of Sedimentary Petrology 57, 19-29.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1987b. Helical burrow casts of therapsid origin from the Beaufort Group (Permian) of South Africa. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 60, 155-170.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1988. Fossils for Africa. An introduction to the fossil wealth of the Nuweveld mountains near Beaufort West. Sagittarius 3, 4-9. SA Museum, Cape Town.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1989. Fossils in the Karoo – some important questions answered. Custos 17, 48-51.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1990. Alluvial paleosols and pedofacies sequences in the Permian Lower Beaufort of the southwestern Karoo Basin, South Africa. Journal of Sedimentary Petrology 60, 258-276.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1993a. Sedimentology and ichnology of floodplain paleosurfaces in the Beaufort Group (Late Permian), Karoo Sequence, South Africa. Palaios 8, 339-357.

SMITH, R.M.H. 1993b. Vertebrate taphonomy of Late Permian floodplain deposits in the southwestern Karoo Basin of South Africa. Palaios 8, 45-67.

SMITH, R.M.H. & KEYSER, A.W. 1995a. Biostratigraphy of the *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone. Pp. 8-12 in Rubidge, B.S. (ed.) Biostratigraphy of the Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup). South African Committee for Stratigraphy, Biostratigraphic Series No. 1. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

SMITH, R.M.H. & ALMOND, J.E. 1998. Late Permian continental trace assemblages from the Lower Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup), South Africa. Abstracts, Tercera Reunión Argentina de Icnologia, Mar del Plata, 1998, p. 29.

SMITH, R., RUBIDGE, B. & VAN DER WALT, M. 2012. Therapsid biodiversity patterns and paleoenvironments of the Karoo Basin, South Africa. Chapter 2 pp. 30-62 in Chinsamy-Turan, A. (Ed.) Forerunners of mammals. Radiation, histology, biology. xv + 330 pp. Indiana University Press, Bloomington & Indianapolis.

STEAR, W.M. 1978. Sedimentary structures related to fluctuating hydrodynamic conditions in flood plain deposits of the Beaufort Group near Beaufort West, Cape. Transactions of the Geological Society of South Africa 81, 393-399.

STEAR, W.M. 1980a. The sedimentary environment of the Beaufort Group uranium province in the vicinity of Beaufort West, South Africa. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Port Elizabeth, 188 pp.

STEAR, W.M. 1980b. Channel sandstone and bar morphology of the Beaufort Group uranium district near Beaufort West. Transactions of the Geological Society of South Africa 83: 391-398.

THERON, J.N. 1983. Die geologie van die gebied Sutherland. Explanation of 1: 250 000 geological Sheet 3220, 29 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

THERON, J.N., WICKENS, H. DE V. & GRESSE, P.G. 1991. Die geologie van de gebied Ladismith. Explanation of Sheet 3320. 99 pp. Geological Survey / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

TURNER, B.R. 1981. The occurrence, origin and stratigraphic significance of bone-bearing mudstone pellet conglomerates from the Beaufort Group in the Jansenville District, Cape Province, South Africa. Palaeontologia africana 24, 63-73.

VAN DER WALT, M., DAY, M., RUBIDGE, B., COOPER, A.K. & NETTERBERG, I. 2010. A new GIS-based biozone map of the Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup), South Africa. Palaeontologia Africana 45, 1-5.

VILJOEN, J.H.A. 1989. Die geologie van die gebied Williston. Explanation to geology sheet 3120 Williston, 30 pp. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.

WILSON, A., FLINT, S., PAYENBERG, T., TOHVER, E. & LANCI, L. 2014. Architectural styles and sedimentology of the fluvial Lower Beaufort Group, Karoo Basin, South Africa. Journal of Sedimentary Research 84, 326-348.

APPENDIX

All GPS readings were taken in the field using a hand-held Garmin GPSmap 60CSx instrument. The datum used is WGS 84. Land parcel names used in the table refer to those shown on the relevant 1: 50 000 maps 3320DA Verlatekloof, 322DC Swartland, 3220DB Komsberg and 3220DD Koornplaats (Published by the Chief Directorate: National Geo-spatial Information, Mowbray). Fossil localities that were recorded during fieldwork are shown in relation to relevant major components of the proposed development footprint on the satellite image provided in Figure 44. Please note that this map does *not* show all fossils that are present at surface within the study area, and further, unrecorded fossil occurrences (the majority) are to be expected at the surface or in the subsurface, where they may be impacted during the construction phase of the development. Areas on the map that do not contain known fossil sites are therefore not necessarily fossil-free or palaeontologically insensitive. *N.B. Fossil locality data is not for general release to the public (e.g. through publication on open access websites) for conservation reasons.*

Loc.	GPS data	Comments
031	S32° 42' 17.1" E20° 48' 53.8"	Welgemoed 268. Viewpoint for gently south-dipping Abrahamskral Fm (Lower Beaufort Group) stratigraphy from Escarpment southwards into Maralla East WEF study area (*e.g.* Mieliekop). Hillslope and gulley exposures of grey-green and purple-brown overbank mudrocks adjacent to dust road. Downwasted coarse, subangular Beaufort Group sandstone clasts up to boulder-sized mantling most of landscape along foot of the Komsberg Escarpment.
032	S32° 42' 21.8" E20° 49' 21.4"	Welgemoed 268, Ventersrivier. Good riverbank exposures of tabular-bedded L. Abrahamskraal Fm blue-grey and purple-brown mudrocks, crevasse-splay sandstones and sharp-based, cross-bedded channel sandstones.
033	S32° 42' 19.5" E20° 49' 18.4"	Welgemoed 268. River bed and bank exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm. Small, dispersed calcrete nodules. Mudflake intraformational breccias. Gypsum pseudomorphs
034	S32° 42' 19.5" E20° 49' 22.7"	Welgemoed 268. Very coarse (bouldery), poorly-sorted and –consolidated, rubbly alluvial conglomerates of subrounded to moderately-rounded Abrahmskraal Fm sandstones exposed in banks of Ventersrivier. Coarse downwasted surface gravels of Abrahamskral Fm sandstones.
035	S32° 42' 56.9" E20° 49' 33.8"	Welgemoed 268. Several successive wave-rippled sandstone bed tops towards top of thick Abrahamskraal Fm channel sandstone. Overbank mudrocks with ferruginous calcrete nodules. Float blocks of channel lag calcrete clast -rich conglomerates.
036	S32° 42' 58.3" E20° 49' 39.9"	Welgemoed 268. Two successive partially-exposed, wave-rippled sandstone palaeosurfaces with mudcracks, dendritic rill marks, pustulose microbial matt textures, complex tetrapod trackways and paired, tramline-like digital furrows, fish swimming trails (*Undichna*) and other trace fossils. Concentrations of vertical plant stem casts (probably reedy sphenophytes) exposed on sole surfaces of sandstone blocks. Sparse dark bone fragments from dark grey mudrocks (possibly fish or amphibian). Site to be protected by a 20 m radius buffer zone.
037	S32° 43' 23.9" E20° 49' 59.8"	Welgemoed 268. Extensive exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm sandstone channel top and overlying purple-brown to grey-green overbank mudrocks. Laterally-persistent horizons of rusty-brown ferruginous carbonate concretions. Cobble-sized calcrete concretions abundant.
311	32 43 13.5 S 20 50 53.1 E	Just south of boundary fence with Welgemoed 268. Abrahamskraal Fm exposed in stream bed and banks. Purple-brown and grey-green mudrocks mantled with thick, coarse, rubbly mixed alluvial and colluvial deposits (mainly angular to subrounded sandstone clasts). Thin sandstones with gradational bases. Unistorey channel sandstone with lenticular cross-bedding, sharp erosive base. Common moulds of plant stem fragments.
312	32 42 24.7 S 20 50 52.7 E	Welgemoed 268. Stream bed and hillslope exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm (lower Koornplaats Member).
313	32 42 25.4 S 20 50 47.7 E	Welgemoed 268. Stream bank section through thick, semi-consolidated, poorly-sorted colluvial and alluvial rubble overlying Abrahamskraal Fm bedrocks (clasts mainly sandstone with minor dolerite).
314	32 42 25.4 S 20 50 59.4 E	Welgemoed 268. Hillslope exposures of grey-green and purple-brown Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks with abundant brownish palaeocalcrete and rusty-brown ferruginous carbonate concretions. Coarse, poorly-sorted colluvial gravels of Abrahamskraal sandstone.
315	32 42 18.3 S 20 51 05.5 E	Welgemoed 268. Steep stream gulley exposure of massive to thin-bedded Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks. Fine-grained, tabular, thin-bedded to massive and mottled channel sandstones with sharp bases.
316	32 42 53.5 S 20 47 47.5 E	Welgemoed 268. Gentle hillslope exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks NW of Mieliekop, prominent-weathering tabular channel sandstones. Colluvial surface rubble of subrounded fine sandstone and reworked palaeocalcrete concretions.

317	32 43 06.3 S 20 47 37.2 E	Welgemoed 268. Streambed exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm. Sandstone bed tops with longitudinal ripples, rib-and-furrow structure.
318	32 43 35.2 S 20 47 36.7 E	Welgemoed 268. Gentle hillslope exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks. Locally abundant brownish palaeocalcrete surface gravels.
319	32 43 53.0 S 20 47 35.0 E	Welgemoed 268. Long stream gulley exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm. Possible upward-coarsening mudrock- sandstone cycles (several dm thick) with siltstone grading up into fine-grained sandstone.
321	32 45 19.4 S 20 46 00.7 E	Drie Roode Heuwels 180. Hillslope exposures of the Abrahamskraal Fm (Koornplaats Member). Tabular channel sandstones, thin- to thick-bedded, friable, pale yellowish-brown, with heavy mineral lamination, horizontal lamination. Basal ferruginised, calcrete-rich channel breccia lenses up to 20 cm thick. Basal sandstones with lenses rich in ferruginous moulds of transported woody plant debris – plant compressions and poorly-preserved petrified wood, seen on float blacks as well as *in situ*. *Koffieklip* (ferruginous carbonate concretions) in float.
322	32 45 22.6 S 20 46 01.9 E	Schalkwykskraal 204. Yellowish-brown, tabular channel sandstone of the Koornplaats Member (Abrahamskral Fm) with well-developed, calcrete-rich ferruginised basal breccia (30-40 cm thick).
323	32 45 16.1 S 20 46 09.3 E	Schalkwykskraal 204. Gentle slopes of Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks, thin highly ferruginised sandstone capping with thin basal breccia (lowermost Koornplaats Member). Lower down is fine-grained sandstone showing loading, no basal breccia – probably top of Leeuvlei Member.
324	32 45 33.2 S 20 46 19.7 E	Schalkwykskraal 204. Good gentle hillslope exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm (Koornplaats Member), grey-green and purple-brown mudrocks. Abundant ferruginous carbonate nodules and lenses, float blocks of calcrete breccia. Sandstone float blocks with ferruginised moulds of reworked plant material.
325	32 45 34.1 S 20 46 18.3 E	As above. Concentration of float blocks of calcrete breccia and plant moulds & ferruginised petrified wood blocks.
326	32 45 40.9 S 20 46 26.1 E	Schalkwykskraal 204. Hillslope exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm (Koornplaats Mb) mudrocks and yellow-brown sandstones. Ferruginous carbonate lenses.
327	32 45 41.3 S 20 46 47.8 E	Schalkwykskraal 204. Extensive riverine exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm mudocks and ill-defined fine-grained sandstones (probably upper Leeuvlei Member) capped by rubbly "High Level Gravels" several meters above modern stream bed.
328	32 42 35.1 S 20 48 15.7 E	Welgemoed 268. Good hillslope exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks N of Mieliekop. Calcretised palaeosols with calcrete veining.
329	32 42 35.6 S 20 48 28.7 E	Welgemoed 268. Shallow stream gulley and hillslope exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm mudrocks. Small patches of wave-rippled sandstone palaeosurfaces overlain by thin-bedded mudrocks. Small grey calcrete nodules.
330	32 42 33.2 S 20 48 34.8 E	Welgemoed 268. Extensive wave-rippled sandstone palaeosurface in stream bed, Abrahamskraal Fm. Falling water marks, microbial mat pustulose textures, sandstone-infilled desiccation cracks, surface veneer of small, subrounded mudflakes (or perhaps microbial-bound intraclasts).
331	32 42 35.2 S 20 48 44.6 E	Welgemoed 268. Extensive hillslope and gulley exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm purple-brown and blue-grey mudrocks. Deep calcrete crack infills. Silicified gypsum pseudomorphs. Horizons of brownish-weathering grey palaeocalcrete concretions.
332	32 42 13.7 S 20 48 56.3 E	Welgemoed 268. Extensive riverine exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm well-jointed, cross-bedded, sharply erosive-based channel sandstones and overbank mudrocks. Sandstone load casts, large-scale cross-bedding. Pustulose microbial mat textures on sandstone bedding surfaces with vague small-scale horizontal burrows.
333	32 41 56.5 S 20 49 56.5 E	Welgemoed 268. Good hillslope and stream gulley exposure of Abrahamskraal Fm. Nearby borrow pit into overbank mudrocks. Closely-spaced, thin crevasse-splay and shallow channel sandstones within grey-green overbank mudrocks (probably Koornplaats Member). Ripple cross-laminated sandstone bed tops.
334	32 41 56.5 S 20 49 56.5 E	Welgemoed 268, near eastern boundary. Roadside gulley exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm (Koornplaats Member). Horizons of large lenticular ferruginous carbonate concretions.
335	32 43 03.6 S 20 48 27.5 E	Welgemoed 268. Exposures of Abrahamskraal Fm (Koornplaats Member) on NW slopes of Mieliekop. Pedogenic palaeocalcrete nodules common.
336	32 43 08.5 S 20 48 25.3 E	As above, incised stream gullies.
337	32 43 08.8 S 20 48 23.5 E	As above, incised stream gullies. Stacked thin-bedded mudstones and sandstones with downward-tapering desiccation crack infills. First major channel sandstone with no basal breccia or associated fossil plant material. Downwasted sandstone boulders along ridge crest.
U	32 45 33.0 S 20 47 13.0 E.	Schalkwykskraal 204. Uranium ore anomaly identified by Cole & Vorster (1999) (Their anomaly No. 190). Site to be protected by a 20 m radius buffer zone (Site *not* visited by author).