

ASHA Consulting (Pty) Ltd

6A Scarborough Road Muizenberg 7945

13 June 2014

Mariagrazia Galimberti SAHRA

By email: mgalimberti@sahra.org.za

Dear Mariagrazia

EXTRA INFORMATION REGARDING MITIGATED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES ON KLIPGATS PAN 117/4, COPPERTON. (SAHRA Case ID: 315)

As requested, please find below the extra information required in terms of your comment issued on 10<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

## Regarding methodology:

All material lay on top of the hard silts, sometimes within a light accumulation of drift sand. There was therefore no depth to the sites. In places a slightly larger amount of wind-blown sand had accumulated around the bases of the vegetation but this sand overlay the artefacts which were always on the hard surface of the silt. All material was thus scraped off the surface of the hard silt and sieved. Volumes were very small and not worth recording as they were a function of natural factors rather than anthropogenic factors.

## Regarding site KGP2014/013:

The cluster of rocks was odd and difficult to interpret. It was a cluster of rocks obviously gathered there by people, and was perhaps some sort of feature in the past. Now there is only solid silt around the rocks from flooding of the area that has occurred since occupation. The most obvious conclusions were that it might represent either a grave or a hearth. It was thus imperative to check because of the high significance attached to human remains. When the rocks were lifted it was evident that they penetrated below the hard silts, unlike everything else. Some artefacts and ostrich eggshell fragments were found between them. There seems no way to understand what the feature was but there was no charcoal present and it was not a burial. The most parsimonious conclusion is that it was a feature of some sort laid in a hollow but that all evidence of the excavated hollow is lacking due to subsequent repeated flooding and silt deposition.

Although one square at the northern margin of the excavated area of KGP2014/013 had a high density of artefacts, it is clear from the analysis that the majority of the main activity area has been captured by the excavation because the retouched artefacts were all found in the centre of the excavated area. While a larger excavation would undoubtedly have increased the sample size to some degree, it would be highly

unlikely to alter the character of the site as we understand it from the present sample. I therefore do not believe that further excavation here would serve much purpose.

I trust that the above meets the requirements of SAHRA and that the case may now be finalised.

Yours sincerely

Jayson Orton