

# HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

---

**SECTION 24G RECTIFICATION PROCESS FOR ACTIVITIES  
COMMENCED WITH AT FUMANI GAME LODGE SITUATED ON PORTION  
4 OF THE FARM HARTBEESTLAAGTE 252 KR WITHIN THE MODIMOLLE-  
MOOKGOPHONG MUNICIPALITY OF WATERBERG DISTRICT, LIMPOPO  
PROVINCE**

---

**FOR:** EnviroXcellence Services cc.  
P.O Box 4879,  
Polokwane, 0700

**Frans Roodt**  
November 2021

**Cell:** 083 770 2131  
**E-Mail:** fransroodt2454@gmail.com



PostNet Suite 139  
P/Bag X9700  
**POLOKWANE**  
0700

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report addresses a Heritage Impact Assessment of Fumani Game Lodge within Portion 4 of the farm Hartbeestlaagte 252 KR in support of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIR) processes relating to an application in terms of Section 24G of the NEMA of.

Fortunately, no significant heritage remains were observed in the entire Lodge area. The unauthorised development did not impact on any heritage resources. From a heritage management perspective there is no objection to the continuation of the development. The proposed project will have no once off or any cumulative impact on heritage resources.

No mitigation measures are recommended for the development.

## CONTENTS

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	2
1. INTRODUCTION AND TERRAIN DESCRIPTION	4
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	4
3. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	4
3.1 The National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) (NHRA)	4
3.2 The Human Tissues Act (65 of 1983) and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies (Ordinance 7 of 1925)	7
4. METHODOLOGY	7
5. GENERIC BASELINE INFORMATION	8
6. RESULT OF THE SURVEY	10
7. EVALUATION AND STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE	10
8. DISCUSSION	12
9. RECOMMENDATIONS	12
10. REFERENCES	12
11. IMAGES AND MAPS	13

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Google earth historical (2012) view of the of the Lodge area before development commenced. Note encircled structures 1 – 3..	13
Figure 2	Current Google earth view of the Lodge area – structure 1 had been demolished but structures 2 & 3 have been retained – red arrow.	14
Figure 3	View of the Lodge area with GPS track.	15
Figure 4	General view of the Lodge and chalets.	16
Figure 5	View of a chalet.	16
Figure 6	General view of the extension of the Lodge.	17
Figure 7	View of the surface area around construction site where the earthworks disturbances could be closely inspected for traces of cultural material.	17
Figure 8	Earthworks for a probable septic tank which show no signs of cultural remains.	18
Figure 9	Cleared area which was inspected for cultural remains.	18
Figure 10	View of an incomplete building, which as the others clearly indicated that all activities was ceased because of the lack of authorisation for the development	19
Figure 11	The natural veldt adjacent to the Lodge area	19
Annexure A	CHANCE FOSSIL FINDS PROTOCOL: FUMANI GAME LODGE.	20

## **1. INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE**

---

### **1.1 Introduction**

The author was contracted EnviroXcellence Services cc. to undertake a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment of Fumani Lodge in support of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIR) processes relating to an application in terms of Section 24G of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA).

Section 24G of the NEMA makes provision for a person to submit an application to the relevant MEC/Minister, which, if successful, will enable a person to lawfully continue with the listed activity and/or legalise an otherwise unlawful structure.

### **1.2 Project location and description**

The proposed development is located at coordinates S24°36'56" E28°36'43" about 15km south-west of the Mookgophong/Naaboomspruit CBD. It falls within the quarter degree grid 2428 DA. The development area is approximately 20 hectares within Portion 4 of the farm Hartbeestlaagte 252 KR. It is accessed via the R101 between Modimolle and Mookgophong.

The development consists of a lodge, hotel, and tourism or hospitality facilities.

### **1.3 Terms of reference and scope of work**

Undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment and submit a specialist report, which addresses the following:

- A desktop and field assessment to gather information on Heritage resources within the proposed development site;
- Identify possible archaeological, cultural and historic sites within the proposed development area;
- Evaluate the potential impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed development on archaeological, cultural and historical resources;
- Recommend mitigation measures to ameliorate any negative impacts on areas of archaeological, cultural or historical importance; and
- Identifying key uncertainties and risks.

## **2. RELEVANT LEGISLATION**

---

### **2.1 The National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) (NHRA)**

This Act established the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and makes provision for the establishment of Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities (PHRA). The Act makes provision for the undertaking of heritage resources impact assessments for various categories of development as determined by Section 38. It also provides for the grading of heritage resources

(Section 7) and the implementation of a three-tier level of responsibilities and functions for heritage resources to be undertaken by the State, Provincial authorities and Local authorities, depending on the grade of the Heritage resources (Section 8).

In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (1999) the following is of relevance:

### **Historical remains**

**Section 34(1)** No person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure, which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority.

### **Archaeological remains**

Section 35(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 or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

**Subsection 35(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 with the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.

**Subsection 35(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 procedures 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.

**Subsection 35(6)** The responsible heritage resources authority may, after consultation with the owner of the land on which an archaeological or palaeontological site or meteorite is situated; serve a notice on the owner or any other controlling authority, to prevent activities within a specified distance from such site or meteorite.

### **Burial grounds and graves**

#### **Subsection 36(3)**

- (a) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority-
- (c) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- (d) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in detection or recovery of metals.

Subsection 36(6) Subject to the provision of any law, any person who in the course of development or any other activity discovers the location of a grave, the existence of which was previously unknown, must immediately cease such activity and report the discovery to the responsible heritage resources authority which must, in co-operation with the South African Police Service and in accordance with regulations of the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (a) carry out an investigation for the purpose of obtaining information on whether or not such grave is protected in terms of this Act or is of significance to any community; and
- (b) if such grave is protected or is of significance, assist any person who or community which is a direct descendant to make arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the content of such grave or, in the absence of such person or community, make any such arrangement as it deems fit.

### **Culture Resource Management**

**Subsection 38(1)** Subject to the provisions of subsection (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development\* ...

must at the very earliest stages of initiating such development notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.

\***‘development’** means any physical intervention, excavation, or action, other than those caused by natural forces, which may in the opinion of the heritage authority in any way result in a change to the nature, appearance or physical nature of a place, or influence its stability and future well-being, including-

- (a) construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change of use of a place or a structure at a place;
- (b) carry out any works on or over or under a place\*;
- (e) any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land, and
- (f) any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil;

**\*\*place** means a site, area or region, a building or other structure\* ...”

**\*\*structure** means any building, works, device or other facility made by people and which is fixed to the ground ...”

## **2.2 The Human Tissues Act (65 of 1983) and Ordinance on the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies (Ordinance 7 of 1925)**

This Act and Ordinance protects graves younger than 60 years. These fall under the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the Provincial Health Departments. Approval for the exhumation and re-burial must be obtained from the relevant Provincial MEC as well as the relevant Local Authorities.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

---

### **3.1 Sources of information**

The project area was traversed on foot. Standard archaeological practices for observation were followed. As most archaeological material occurs in single or multiple stratified layers beneath the soil surface, special attention was given to disturbances, both man-made as well as those made by natural agents such as burrowing animals and erosion. In addition, the SAHRIS database was consulted and no previous heritage impact assessment that covers the immediate area was found. Google earth and the 1:50000 map 2428 DA was consulted.

### **3.2 Limitations**

Development had commenced some years earlier and the terrain had been altered by buildings, roads, gardens and paving. This limited surface visibility. In the area of the most recent extensions of chalets, the earthworks had exposed the subterranean soil where it is clear that no cultural material or deposits are present.

### **3.3 Categories of significance**

The significance of heritage sites is ranked into the following categories.

No significance: sites that do not require mitigation.
Low significance: sites, which <i>may</i> require mitigation.
Medium significance: sites, which require mitigation.
High significance: sites, which must not be disturbed at all.

The significance of specifically an archaeological site is based on the amount of deposit, the integrity of the context, the kind of deposit and the potential to help answer present research questions. Historical structures are defined by Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, while other historical and cultural significant sites, places and features, are generally determined by community preferences.

### 3.4 Terminology

Early Stone Age:	Predominantly the Oldowan artefacts and Acheulian hand axe industry complex dating to + 1Myr yrs – 250 000 yrs. before present.
Middle Stone Age:	Various lithic industries in SA dating from ± 250 000 yrs. - 22 000 yrs. before present.
Late Stone Age:	The period from ± 22 000-yrs. to contact period with either Iron Age farmers or European colonists.
Early Iron Age:	Most of the first millennium AD
Middle Iron Age:	10 <sup>th</sup> to 13 <sup>th</sup> centuries AD
Late Iron Age:	14 <sup>th</sup> century to colonial period. <i>The entire Iron Age represents the spread of Bantu speaking peoples.</i>
Phase 1 assessments:	Scoping surveys to establish the presence of and to evaluate heritage resources in a given area
Phase 2 assessments:	In depth culture resources management studies which could include major archaeological excavations, detailed site surveys and mapping / plans of sites, including historical / architectural structures and features. Alternatively, the sampling of sites by collecting material, small test pit excavations or auger sampling could be undertaken.
Sensitive:	Often refers to graves and burial sites, as well as ideologically significant sites such as ritual / religious places. <i>Sensitive</i> may also refer to an entire landscape / area known for its significant heritage remains.
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRIS	South African Heritage Resources Information System

## 4. GENERIC BASELINE INFORMATION

---

### 4.1 The Stone Age

The Stone Age covers most of southern Africa and the earliest consist of the Oldowan and Acheul artefacts assemblages. Oldowan tools are regularly referred to as “choppers”. Oldowan artefacts are associated with Homo *habilis*, the first true humans. In South Africa definite occurrences have been found at the sites of Sterkfontein and Swartkrans. Here they are dated to between 1.7 and 2 million years old. Bearing in mind the proximity of the Makapans Valley palaeontological site about 30km south-east of the project area it is possible that they may occur here. This was followed by the Acheulian technology from about 1.4 million years ago which introduced a new level of complexity. The large tools that dominate the Acheulian artefact assemblages range in length from 100 to 200



mm or more. Collectively they are called bifaces because they are normally shaped by flaking on both faces. In plan view they tend to be pear-shape and are broad relative to their thickness. Most bifaces are pointed and are classified as handaxes, but others have a wide cutting end and are termed cleavers. The Acheulian design persisted for more than a million years and only disappeared about 250 000 years ago. Here, the Makapans Valley Site is referenced; especially the Cave of Hearths.

The change from Acheulian with their characteristic bifaces, handaxes and cleavers to Middle Stone Age (MSA), which are characterized by flake industries, occurred about 250 000 years ago and ended about 30 000 – 22 000 years ago. For the most part the MSA is associated with modern humans; *Homo sapiens*. MSA remains are found in open spaces where they are regularly exposed by erosion as well as in caves and shelters. Characteristics of the MSA are flake blanks in the 40 – 100 mm size range struck from prepared cores, the striking platforms of the flakes reveal one or more facets, indicating the preparation of the platform before flake removal (the prepared core technique), flakes show dorsal preparation – one or more ridges or arise down the length of the flake – as a result of previous removals from the core, flakes with convergent sides (laterals) and a pointed shape, and flakes with parallel laterals and a rectangular or quadrilateral shape: these can be termed pointed and flake blades respectively. Other flakes in MSA assemblages are irregular in form. *MSA flakes were recorded on the farm Witkoppie 596KR (Monate Game Lodge) approximately 20km to the south-east of Fumani Lodge (Roodt & Roodt 2006).*

The change from Middle Stone Age to Later Stone Age (LSA) took place in most parts of southern Africa little more than about 20 000 years ago. It is marked by a series of technological innovations or new tools that, initially at least, were used to do much the same jobs as had been done before, but in a different way. Their introduction was associated with changes in the nature of hunter-gatherer material culture. The innovations associated with the Later Stone Age “package” of tools include rock art – both paintings and engravings, smaller stone tools, so small that the formal tools less than 25mm long are called microliths (sometimes found in the final MSA) and Bows and arrows. Rock art is an important feature of the LSA.

*Rock Art was recorded on the farm Witkoppie 596KR (Monate Game Lodge) approximately 20km to the south-east of Fumani Lodge. These consisted of both the so-called late whites, which is rock art executed by Bantu speaking people and San paintings (Roodt & Roodt 2006).*

## 4.2 The Iron Age

According to the archaeological cultural distribution sequences by Huffman (2007), this area falls within the distribution area of various cultural groupings originating out of both the Urewe Tradition (eastern stream of migration) and the Kalundu Tradition (western stream of migration). The ceramic (pottery) facies that may be present are:

Kalundu Tradition:	Happy Rest sub-branch	Diamant facies AD 750 - 1000 (Early Iron Age) Eiland facies AD 1000 – 1300 (Middle Iron Age)
Urewe Tradition:	Moloko branch (Sotho-Tswana people)	Madikwe facies AD 1300 - 1500 (Late Iron Age) Uitkomst facies AD 1650 – 1820 (Late Iron Age)

No cultural remains of the sequences mentioned above were noted in the project area, *however Eiland pottery shards were recorded on the farm Witkoppie 596KR (Monate Game Lodge) approximately 20km to the south-east of Fumani Lodge (Roodt & Roodt 2006).*

### **4.3 The historical landscape**

Mookgophong, also known by its former name, Naboomspruit, dates back to the late 1800's when it was a rest station for the Pretoria-Polokwane mail coach. Although the little village eventually developed around the railway station on the farm Naboomspruit, Mookgophong owes its growth largely to the discovery of minerals in the area in the early 1900's. The discovery of tin led to a "tin rush" in 1910. Later, platinum was also discovered in the vicinity. Naboomspruit was originally named for the profusion of euphorbia trees (known in Afrikaans as naboom) growing on the banks of a nearby stream (spruit, in Afrikaans). The town was officially renamed Mookgophong on the 24<sup>th</sup> November 2006, by the South African government. Mookgophong is the indigenous name for the same Euphorbia tree.

## **5. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY**

---

### **5.1 Palaeontology**

The area fall in the blue colour code of the SAHRIS Palaeo-sensitivity map. A protocol for palaeontological find is required, which is attached as Annexure A.

### **5.2 Stone Age remains**

No Stone Age material was detected within the project area.

### **5.3 Iron Age**

No Iron Age material was detected within the project area.

### **5.4 Graves and burials**

No graves or burial sites were detected within the project area.

### **5.5 The built environment**

The Google earth historical image of 2012 shows three structures on the terrain (Figure 1). One structure clearly had a thatched roof with some sort of deck while the other two appear to have corrugated iron roofs. In the most recent Google earth image (Figure 2) the thatched roof building has been demolished and the other two roofs are altered but seems to have been incorporated into the development. The design and building materials are modern and show no unique or intrinsic features that have historical significance. It is unlikely that the structures were older than 60 years.

## **6. EVALUATION AND STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

---

The continuation of the development of Fumani Game Lodge within Portion 4 of the farm Hartbeestlaagte 252 KR will have no impact on heritage resources.

### 6.1 Significance criteria in terms of Section 3(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act.

Significance	Rating
1. The importance of the cultural heritage in the community or pattern of South Africa's history (Historic and political significance)	None
2. Possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage (Scientific significance).	None
3. Potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage (Research/scientific significance)	None
4. Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects (Scientific significance)	None
5. Importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group (Aesthetic significance)	None
6. Importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period (Scientific significance)	None
7. Strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons (Social significance)	None
8. Strong or special association with the life and work of a person, group or organization of importance in the history of South Africa (Historic significance)	None
9. The significance of the site relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.	None

#### 6.2 **Section 38(3) (c) An assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources.**

The development will have no effect on heritage remains.

#### 6.3 **Section 38(3) (d) An evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable economic benefits to be derived from the development.**

No heritage resources were detected within the project area.

#### 6.4 **Section 38(3) (e) The results of consultation with the communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources.**

No impact on community heritage resources.

#### 6.5 **Section 38(3)(f) If heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development the consideration of alternatives.**

No heritage resources were adversely affected.

#### 6.6 **Section 38(3)(g) Plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development.**

No mitigation measures are proposed.

## 7 DISCUSSION

---

All construction activities where the Lodge was extended had been stopped because of the lack of prior authorization and therefore the Section G24 application.

Fortunately, no significant heritage remains were observed in the entire Lodge area. The unauthorised development did not impact on any heritage resources. From a heritage management perspective there is no objection to the continuation of the development.

## 8 RECOMMENDATIONS

---

No mitigation measures are recommended for the proposed development. Although highly unlikely, should any heritage remains be discovered during further development, a heritage practitioner or the heritage authority must be notified and all activities in the immediate vicinity must be ceased.

## 9 REFERENCES

---

Deacon, HJ and Deacon, J. 1999. Human Beginnings in South Africa. *Uncovering the Secrets of the Stone Age*. David Philip Publishers. Cape Town & Johannesburg.

Huffman, T.N. 2007. Handbook to the Iron Age. *The archaeology of Pre-colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Groenewald, G & Groenewald, D. 2014. Palaeontological Heritage Of Limpopo. SAHRA Palaeotechnical Report.

Roodt, F & Roodt, H. 2006. Heritage Resources Scoping Report. Monate Game Lodge, Portion 1 of Witkoppie 596KR. A report for Alto Africa, Modimole.

<https://www.facebook.com/Mookgophongtalks/posts/a-brief-history-of-naboomspruitmookgophong-also-known-by-its-former-name-nabooms/444862438879389/>

[https://africanlanguages.com/south\\_africa/place\\_names\\_sagns.html](https://africanlanguages.com/south_africa/place_names_sagns.html)



---

**FRANS ROODT** (BA Hons, MA Archaeology, Post Grad Dip. in Museology; UP)

## 11. MAPS AND IMAGES

---



Figure 1. Google earth historical (2012) view of the of the Lodge area before development commenced. Note encircled structures 1 – 3.





Figure 2. Current Google earth view of the Lodge area – structure 1 had been demolished but structures 2 & 3 have been retained – red arrow.





Figure 3. View of the Lodge area with GPS track.





Figure 4. General view of the Lodge and chalets.



Figure 5. View of a chalet.





Figure 6. General view of the extension of the Lodge.



Figure 7. View of the surface area around construction site where the earthworks disturbances could be closely inspected for traces of cultural material.





Figure 8. Earthworks for a probable septic tank which show no signs of cultural remains.



Figure 9. Cleared area which was inspected for cultural remains.





Figure 10. View of an incomplete building, which as the others clearly indicated that all activities were ceased because of the lack of authorisation for the development.



Figure 11. The natural veldt adjacent to the Lodge area.

## ANNEXURE A

<b>CHANCE FOSSIL FINDS PROTOCOL: FUMANI GAME LODGE.</b>		
<b>Farm: Portion 4 of the farm Hartbeestlaagte 252 KR</b>		
<b>Province &amp; region:</b> 2428 Nylsroom 1:250000 Geological Series	Modimolle-Mookgophong Municipality of Waterberg District, Limpopo Province.	
<b>Responsible Heritage Management Authority</b>	SAHRA, 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town. PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000, South Africa. Phone: +27 (0)21 462 4502. Fax: +27 (0)21 462 4509. Web : www.sahra.org.za	
<b>Rock unit(s)</b>	<b>Rooiberg Group: Schrikkloof formation.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Porphyritic,</li> <li>• spherulitic rhyolite and subordinate andesite,</li> <li>• tuff,</li> <li>• volcanic breccias,</li> <li>• and in places ignimbrite at top.</li> </ul>	
<b>Potential fossils</b>	No fossils have up till now, been described from the Rooiberg Group, and this, mainly volcanic sequence of rock is allocated a low palaeontological sensitivity. There is an unlikely possibility of fossiliferous material in isolated Quaternary deposits.	
<b>Environmental officer</b>	<b>1.</b> Once alerted to fossil occurrence(s): alert site foreman, stop work in area immediately, safeguard site with security tape / fence / sand bags for support if necessary.	
	<b>2.</b> Record key data while fossil remains are still in situ: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate geographic location – describe and mark on site map / 1: 50 000 map / satellite image / aerial photo / GPS</li> <li>• Context – describe position of fossils within stratigraphy (rock layering) and depth below surface</li> <li>• Photograph fossil(s) in situ with scale, from different angles, including images showing context (e.g. rock layering)</li> </ul>	
	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>3. If feasible to leave fossils in situ:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alert Heritage Management Authority and project palaeontologist who will advise on any necessary mitigation</li> <li>• Ensure fossil site remains safeguarded until clearance is given by the Heritage Management Authority for work to resume</li> </ul> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>3. If not feasible to leave fossils in situ (emergency procedure only):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carefully remove fossils, as far as possible still enclosed within the original sedimentary matrix (e.g. entire block of fossiliferous rock)</li> <li>• Photograph fossils against a plain, level background, with scale</li> <li>• Carefully wrap fossils in several layers of newspaper / tissue paper / plastic bags</li> <li>• Safeguard fossils together with locality and collection data</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table>	<b>3. If feasible to leave fossils in situ:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alert Heritage Management Authority and project palaeontologist who will advise on any necessary mitigation</li> <li>• Ensure fossil site remains safeguarded until clearance is given by the Heritage Management Authority for work to resume</li> </ul>
<b>3. If feasible to leave fossils in situ:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alert Heritage Management Authority and project palaeontologist who will advise on any necessary mitigation</li> <li>• Ensure fossil site remains safeguarded until clearance is given by the Heritage Management Authority for work to resume</li> </ul>	<b>3. If not feasible to leave fossils in situ (emergency procedure only):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carefully remove fossils, as far as possible still enclosed within the original sedimentary matrix (e.g. entire block of fossiliferous rock)</li> <li>• Photograph fossils against a plain, level background, with scale</li> <li>• Carefully wrap fossils in several layers of newspaper / tissue paper / plastic bags</li> <li>• Safeguard fossils together with locality and collection data</li> </ul>	

		<p>(including collector and date) in a box in a safe place for examination by a palaeontologist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alert Heritage Management Authority and project palaeontologist who will advise on any necessary mitigation</li> </ul>
	<p>4. If required by Heritage Management Authority, ensure that a suitably-qualified specialist palaeontologist is appointed as soon as possible by the developer.</p>	
	<p>5. Implement any further mitigation measures proposed by the palaeontologist and Heritage Management Authority</p>	
<p><b>Specialist palaeontologist</b></p>	<p>Record, describe and judiciously sample fossil remains together with relevant contextual data (stratigraphy / sedimentology / taphonomy). Ensure that fossils are curated in an approved repository (e.g. museum / university / Council for Geoscience collection) together with full collection data. Submit Palaeontological Mitigation report to Heritage Resources Authority. Adhere to best international practice for palaeontological fieldwork and Heritage Management Authority minimum standards.</p>	