

Morokweng Filling Station

Kagisana-Molopo Local Municipality, North West Province

Farm: Morokweng 246 IM

Fourie, H. Dr heidicindy@yahoo.com

012 322 7632/012 993 3110

Palaeontological Impact Assessment: Desktop study

Facilitated by: LEAP

P.O. Box 13185, Hatfield, 0028

Tel: 012 344 3582

2016/10/24

Ref: Pending



B. Executive summary

Outline of the development project: LEAP has facilitated the appointment of Dr H. Fourie, a palaeontologist, to undertake a Paleontological Impact Assessment (PIA), Desktop Study of the suitability of the proposed filling station development, with related infrastructure on the Farm Morokweng 246 IM in the Kagisana-Molopo Local Municipality, North West Province.

The applicant, The Vildev Group Pty (Ltd) proposes to develop the property in to a filling station development with related infrastructure in Morokweng.

The Project includes one Option (see google.earth image):

Option 1: A rectangular block outlined in red with the R379 to the southwest. The town of Morokweng is to the south. The site is approximately 2,446 hectares.

Legal requirements:-

The **National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA)** requires that all heritage resources, that is, all places or objects of aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance are protected. The Republic of South Africa (RSA) has a remarkably rich fossil record that stretches back in time for some 3.5 billion years and must be protected for its scientific value. Fossil heritage of national and international significance is found within all provinces of the RSA. South Africa's unique and non-renewable palaeontological heritage is protected in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act. According to this act, palaeontological resources may not be excavated, damaged, destroyed or otherwise impacted by any development without prior assessment and without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority.

The main aim of the assessment process is to document resources in the development area and identify both the negative and positive impacts that the development brings to the receiving environment. The PIA therefore identifies palaeontological resources in the area to be developed and makes recommendations for protection or mitigation of these resources.

"palaeontological" means any fossilised remains or fossil trace of animals or plants which lived in the geological past, other than fossil fuels or fossiliferous rock intended for industrial use, and any site which contains such fossilised remains or traces.

For this study, resources such as geological maps, scientific literature, institutional fossil collections, satellite images, aerial maps and topographical maps were used. It provides an assessment of the observed or inferred palaeontological heritage within the study area, with recommendations (if any) for further specialist palaeontological input where this is considered necessary.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment is generally warranted where rock units of LOW to VERY HIGH palaeontological sensitivity are concerned, levels of bedrock exposure within the study area are adequate; large scale projects with high potential heritage impact are planned; and where the distribution and nature of fossil remains in the proposed area is unknown. The specialist will inform whether further monitoring and mitigation are necessary.

Types and ranges of heritage resources as outlined in Section 3 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No.25 of 1999):

(i) (i) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens.

This report adheres to the guidelines of Section 38 (1) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999).


Subject to the provisions of subsections (7), (8) and (9), any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as (a) the construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300 m in length; (b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50 m in length; (c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site (see Section 38); (d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; (e) or any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a PHRA authority.

This report aims to provide comment and recommendations on the potential impacts that the proposed development could have on the fossil heritage of the area and to state if any mitigation or conservation measures are necessary.

Outline of the geology and the palaeontology:

The geology was obtained from map 1:100 000, Geology of the Republic of South Africa (Visser 1984).

Figure 3: The geology of the development area.



Legend to Map and short explanation.

T-Qk/Vgh – Sand, limestone (yellow). Kalahari Group with a suboutcrop of Vgh below.

T-Qk/ZA – Sand, limestone (yellow). Kalahari Group with a suboutcrop of Swazian age granite and gneiss.

Vgh – Dolomite, limestone, chert (blue). Ghaapplato, Campbell Group, Griqualand West Supergroup.

Vvs – Dolomite, shale, sandstone, andesite. Campbell Group, Griqualand West Supergroup and Vryburg Formation.

---f--- (black) Fault (Roodepoort).

..... – Lineament.

X – Approximate position of proposed filling station.

Mining Activities

None.

Summary of findings: The Palaeontological Impact Assessment: Desktop study was undertaken in October 2016 in the summer in dry and hot conditions, as this is a desktop study the season (Appendix 6 of Act, 1(d)) has no influence on the outcome, and the following is reported:

The development is taking place on the Kalahari Group (T-Qk) with underlying granite and gneiss of Swazian age (ZA).

The Kalahari deposits extend in age down to at least the Late and probably the Early Tertiary (65 million years ago). Fossils are scarce, and are of terrestrial plants and animals with close affinity to living forms. Included in the Kalahari Group are the Quaternary alluvium, terrace gravels, surface limestone, silcrete, and Aeolian sand. Four major types of sands have been delineated (Kent 1980).

The alluvium sands were deposited by a river system and reworked by wind action (Snyman 1996). A thick cover of Kalahari reddish sand blankets most outcrops and is dominated by the typical Kalahari thornveld (Norman and Whitfield 2006). The Kalahari Group is underlain by the Uitenhage and Zululand Groups (McCarthy and Rubidge 2005).

Fossils in South Africa mainly occur in rocks of sedimentary nature and not in rocks from igneous or metamorphic nature. Therefore, if there is the presence of Karoo Supergroup strata the palaeontological sensitivity can generally be LOW to VERY HIGH, and here locally HIGH for the Kalahari Group (SG 2.2 SAHRA APMHOB, 2012) (Groenewald and Groenewald 2014).

Recommendation:

The impact of the development on fossil heritage is **HIGH** and therefore a field survey or further mitigation or conservation measures may be necessary for this development (according to SAHRA protocol). A Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment and or mitigation may be recommended. The overburden and inter-burden must always be surveyed for fossils. Special care must be taken during the digging, drilling, blasting and excavating of foundations, trenches, channels and footings and removal of overburden not to intrude fossiliferous layers.

Table 2: Criteria used (Fossil Heritage Layer Browser/SAHRA):

Rock Unit	Significance/vulnerability	Recommended Action
Ghaaplato	High	Desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely
Kalahari Group	Moderate	Desktop study is required
Granite, gneiss	Insignificant or Zero	No palaeontological study is required

The Kalahari Group is present here in the development area. Groenewald & Groenewald 2014 rates this Group as having a high palaeontological significance due to the significant fossil remains of Cenozoic aged terrestrial organisms that have been recorded from the sedimentary rocks. These fossils are important indicators of palaeo-environmental conditions. Therefore a **HIGH** status is allocated.

The Project includes one Option (see google.earth image):

Option 1: A rectangular block outlined in red with the R379 to the southwest. The town of Morokweng is to the south. The site is approximately 2,446 hectares.

Concerns/threats:

1. Threats are earth moving equipment/machinery (front end loaders, excavators, graders, dozers) during construction, the sealing-in, disturbance, damage or destruction of the fossils by development, vehicle traffic and human disturbance.
2. Mitigation is not needed, permission needed from SAHRA.
3. No consultation with parties was necessary.

Stakeholders: Developer – The Vildev Group Pty (Ltd), P.O. Box 95710, Waterkloof, 0145.

Environmental – LEAP, P.O. Box 13185, Hatfield, 0028, Tel. 012 344 3582.

Landowner – The Vildev Group Pty (Ltd).

C. Table of Contents

A. Title page	1
B. Executive Summary	2
C. Table of Contents	4
D. Background Information on the project	4
E. Description of the Property or Affected Environment	6
F. Description of the Geological Setting	6
G. Background to Palaeontology of the area	8
H. Description of the Methodology	9
I. Description of significant fossil occurrences	10
J. Recommendation	11
K. Conclusions	11
L. Bibliography	12
Declaration	12
Appendix 1: Table	14

D. Background information on the project

Report


This report is part of the environmental impact assessment process under the National Environmental Management Act, as amended (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and includes Appendix 6 (GN R38282 of 4 December 2014) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (see Appendix 2).

Outline of development

This report discusses and aims to provide the developer with information regarding the location of palaeontological material that will be impacted by the development. In the pre-construction phase it is necessary for the developer to apply for the relevant permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA / PHRA).

The applicant, The Vildev Group Pty (Ltd) proposes to develop the property in to a filling station development with related infrastructure in Morokweng. The development will introduce a commercial element to the Morokweng area whilst creating employment opportunities.

Figure 1: Topographic map showing location (LEAP).



The following infrastructure is anticipated:

1. Road,
2. Buildings,
3. Parking area,
4. Water services,
5. Sewerage services,
6. And associated infrastructure such as electricity lines.

The Project includes one Option (see google.earth image):

Option 1: A rectangular block outlined in red with the R379 to the southwest. The town of Morokweng is to the south. The site is approximately 2,446 hectares.

Rezoning/ and or subdivision of land: No.

Name of Developer and Consultant: The Vildev Group Pty (Ltd) and LEAP.

Terms of reference: Dr H. Fourie is a palaeontologist commissioned to do a palaeontological impact assessment to ascertain if any palaeontological sensitive material is present in the development area. This study will advise on the impact on fossil heritage mitigation or conservation necessary, if any.

Dr Fourie obtained a Ph.D from the Bernard Price Institute for Palaeontological Research (now ESI), University of the Witwatersrand. Her undergraduate degree is in Geology and Zoology. She specialises in vertebrate morphology and

function concentrating on the Therapsid Therocephalia. For the past twelve years she carried out field work in the Eastern Cape, Limpopo, Mpumalanga, Gauteng and Free State Provinces. Dr Fourie has been employed at the Ditsong: National Museum of Natural History in Pretoria (formerly Transvaal Museum) for 22 years.

Legislative requirements: South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) for issue of permits if necessary. National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999). An electronic copy of this report must be supplied to SAHRA.

E. Description of property or affected environment

Location and depth:

The proposed filling station development, with related infrastructure will be situated on the Farm Morokweng 246 IM in the Kagisana-Molopo Local Municipality, North West Province.

Depth is determined by the related infrastructure.

The Project includes one Option (see google.earth image):

Option 1: A rectangular block outlined in red with the R379 to the southwest. The town of Morokweng is to the south. The site is approximately 2,446 hectares.

Figure 2: Google.earth image showing location (LEAP).



The site is underlain by the Kalahari Group rocks.

F. Description of the Geological Setting

Description of the rock units:


The Kalahari deposits extend in age down to at least the Late and probably the Early Tertiary (65 million years ago). Fossils are scarce, and are of terrestrial plants and animals with close affinity to living forms. Included in the Kalahari Group are the Quaternary alluvium, terrace gravels, surface limestone, silcrete, and Aeolian sand. Four major types of sands have been delineated (Kent 1980).

The alluvium sands were deposited by a river system and reworked by wind action (Snyman 1996). A thick cover of Kalahari reddish sand blankets most outcrops and is dominated by the typical Kalahari thornveld (Norman and Whitfield 2006). The Kalahari Group is underlain by the Uitenhage and Zululand Groups (McCarthy and Rubidge 2005).

Over areas totalling fully 40% of Southern Africa the 'hard rocks', from the oldest to the Quaternary, are concealed by normally unconformable deposits – principally sand, gravel, sandstone, and limestone. Inland deposits are much more

extensive than marine deposits and are terrestrial and usually unfossiliferous. Some of these deposits date back well into the Tertiary, whereas others are still accumulating. Owing to the all-to-often lack of fossils and of rocks suitable for radiometric or palaeomagnetic dating, no clear-cut dividing line between the Tertiary and Quaternary successions could be established (Kent 1980). The alluvium sands were deposited by a river system and reworked by wind action (Snyman 1996).

Figure 3: Geology of Morokweng (Visser 1984)



T-Qk/Vgh – Sand, limestone (yellow). Kalahari Group with a suboutcrop of Vgh below.

T-Qk/ZA – Sand, limestone (yellow). Kalahari Group with a suboutcrop of Swazian age granite and gneiss.

Vgh – Dolomite, limestone, chert (blue). Ghaapplat, Campbell Group, Griqualand West Supergroup.

Vvs – Dolomite, shale, sandstone, andesite. Campbell Group, Griqualand West Supergroup and Vryburg Formation.

---f--- (black) Fault (Roodepoort).

..... – Lineament.

X – Approximate position of the filling station.

The Vryburg Formation constitutes the lowermost formation of the Griqualand West basin / Supergroup. It unconformably overlies pre-Griqualand West rocks, and is conformably overlain by the Schmidtsdrif Formation. An age of 2300 ± 50 Ma was obtained. It consists essentially of quartzitic sandstone, mudrock and siltstone, with andesitic/basaltic lava present in places. This formation is not thicker than 900 m and often covered with Karoo Supergroup and Kalahari Group sediments. It is correlated with the Black Reef Series in the Transvaal Supergroup (Smit, *et al.* 1991). Smit *et al.* (1991) recognised five members, the Kalkput Quartzite, Geelbeksdam, Rosendal, Waterloo and Oceola.

Groenewald and Groenewald (2014) placed the Ghaapplat as a Group in the Transvaal Supergroup with the Campbell Group as a subgroup. The Ghaapplat was deposited as a thick layer of carbonaceous sediments in extensive shallow basins. It consists of carbonates, siliclastics and iron formations. The age is Late Archaean, Early Proterozoic.

The geological history of the North West Province spans a total of 3600 million years, including some of the major events that lead to the deposition of a wealth of economically important sequences of rocks. The Kalahari Group has a high palaeontological significance due to the significant fossil remains of Cenozoic aged terrestrial organisms that have been recorded from the sedimentary rocks. These fossils are important indicators of palaeo-environmental conditions. Very large stromatolites have been described from the Campbell Rand Subgroup of the Ghaap Group (Groenewald and Groenewald 2014).

The Morokweng crater or impact structure was formed by an asteroid of 5 – 10 km in diameter forming a crater of at least 70 km in diameter. It is probably of Jurassic – Cretaceous boundary age.

The Project includes one Option (see google.earth image):

Option 1: A rectangular block outlined in red with the R379 to the southwest. The town of Morokweng is to the south. The site is approximately 2,446 hectares.

It is recommended to wait for the response from SAHRA on the Desktop Study (this report), and if a Phase 1: Field study is recommended then SAHRA protocol must be followed. Alternatives will not be feasible.

G. Background to Palaeontology of the area

Summary: When rock units of moderate to very high palaeontological sensitivity are present within the development footprint, a desk top and or field scoping (survey) study by a professional palaeontologist is usually warranted. The main purpose of a field scoping (survey) study would be to identify any areas within the development footprint where specialist palaeontological mitigation during the construction phase may be required (SG 2.2 SAHRA AMPHOB, 2012).

'Algal microfossils' have been reported from shales and are probably of diagenetic origin (Eriksson 1999). Stromatolites are significant indicators of palaeoenvironments and provide evidence of algal growth between 2640 and 2432 million years ago. Significant fossil remains of Cenozoic aged terrestrial organisms have been recorded from the sedimentary rocks of the Kalahari Group. These fossils are rarely found and are allocated a **HIGH** palaeontological sensitivity as they are important indicators of palaeo-environmental conditions in this part of the North West Province (Groenewald and Groenewald 2014).

The more recent Phanerozoic deposits (Cenozoic) are of importance in the study of life during the last 300 million years. Large areas in the western part of the Province are underlain by Cenozoic (Tertiary, Quaternary) deposits of the Kalahari Group. The Ghaapplate is known for stromatolites and cyanobacterial microfossils. Very large stromatolites have been described from the Campbell Rand Subgroup of the Ghaap Group (Groenewald and Groenewald 2014).

Table 1: Taken from Palaeotechnical Report (Groenewald and Groenewald 2014).

Subgroup/sequence	Group	Formation	Fossil Heritage	Comment
Tertiary-Quaternary	Kalahari Group	-	Terrestrial organisms	Trace fossils, ostracods, bivalves, gastropod shells, diatoms
Griqualand West SG	Campbell	Ghaapplate (Vgh)	Stromatolites	Cyanobacterial microfossils are present

Fossils in South Africa mainly occur in rocks of sedimentary nature and not in rocks from igneous or metamorphic nature. Therefore, if there is the presence of Karoo Supergroup strata the palaeontological sensitivity is generally LOW to VERY HIGH, but here locally **HIGH** for the Kalahari Group.

Table 2: Criteria used (Fossil Heritage Layer Browser/SAHRA):

Rock Unit	Significance/vulnerability	Recommended Action
Ghaapplate	High	Desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely
Kalahari Group	Modderate	Desktop study is required
Granite, gneiss	Insignificant or Zero	No palaeontological studies are required

The Kalahari Group is present here in the development area. Groenewald & Groenewald 2014 rates this Group as having a high palaeontological significance due to the significant fossil remains of Cenozoic aged terrestrial organisms that have been recorded from the sedimentary rocks. These fossils are important indicators of palaeo-environmental conditions. Therefore a **HIGH** status is allocated.

Databases and collections: Ditsong: National Museum of Natural History.

Impact: **HIGH** for the Kalahari Group. There are significant fossil resources that may be impacted by the development and if destroyed are no longer available for scientific research or other public good.

H. Description of the Methodology

The palaeontological impact assessment desktop study was undertaken in October 2016. A literature survey is included and the study relied on literature, geological maps, google.maps and google.earth images.

Assumptions and Limitations (Appendix 6 of Act 1(i):-

The accuracy and reliability of the report may be limited by the following constraints:

1. Most development areas have never been surveyed by a palaeontologist or geophysicist.
2. Variable accuracy of geological maps and associated information.
3. Poor locality information on sheet explanations for geological maps.
4. Lack of published data.
5. Lack of rocky outcrops.
6. Insufficient data from developer and exact lay-out plan for all structures.

A Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment: Field Study will include:

1. Recommendations for the future of the site.
2. Background information on the project.
3. Description of the property of affected environment with details of the study area.
4. Description of the geological setting and field observations.
5. Background to palaeontology of the area.
6. Field Rating.
7. Stating of Significance (Heritage Value).

A Phase 2 Palaeontological Impact Assessment: Mitigation will include:

1. Recommendations for the future of the site.
2. Description of work done (including number of people and their responsibilities).
3. A written assessment of the work done, fossils excavated, not removed or collected and observed.
4. Conclusion reached regarding the fossil material.
5. A detailed site plan.
6. Possible declaration as a heritage site or Site Management Plan.

The National Heritage Resources Act No. 25 of 1999 further prescribes.

Act No. 25 of 1999. National Heritage Resources Act, 1999.

National Estate: 3 (2) (f) archaeological and palaeontological sites,

(i)(1) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens,

Heritage assessment criteria and grading: (a) Grade 1: Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;

(b) Grade 11: Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or a region; and (c) Grade 111: Other heritage resources worthy of conservation.

SAHRA is responsible for the identification and management of Grade 1 heritage resources.

Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PHRA) identifies and manages Grade 11 heritage resources.

Local authorities identify and manage Grade 111 heritage resources.

No person may damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of a provincially protected place or object without a permit issued by a heritage resources authority or local authority responsible for the provincial protection.

Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites: Section 35.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (8) (a), 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.

Mitigation involves planning the protection of significant fossil sites, rock units or other palaeontological resources and/or excavation, recording and sampling of fossil heritage that might be lost during development, together with pertinent geological data. The mitigation may take place before and / or during the construction phase of development. The specialist will require a Phase 2 mitigation permit from the relevant Heritage Resources Authority before a Phase 2 may be implemented.

The Mitigation is done in order to rescue representative fossil material from the study area to allow and record the nature of each locality and establish its age before it is destroyed and to make samples accessible for future research. It also interprets the evidence recovered to allow for education of the public and promotion of palaeontological heritage.

Should further fossil material be discovered during the course of the development (*e. g.* during bedrock excavations), this must be safeguarded, where feasible *in situ*, and reported to a palaeontologist or to the Heritage Resources authority. In situations where the area is considered palaeontologically sensitive (*e. g.* Karoo Supergroup Formations, ancient marine deposits in the interior or along the coast) the palaeontologist might need to monitor all newly excavated bedrock. The developer needs to give the palaeontologist sufficient time to assess and document the finds and, if necessary, to rescue a representative sample.

When a Phase 2 palaeontological impact study is recommended, permission for the development to proceed can be given only once the heritage resources authority has received and approved a Phase 2 report and is satisfied that (a) the palaeontological resources under threat have been adequately recorded and sampled, and (b) adequate development on fossil heritage, including, where necessary, *in situ* conservation of heritage of high significance. Careful planning, including early consultation with a palaeontologist and heritage management authorities, can minimise the impact of palaeontological surveys on development projects by selecting options that cause the least amount of inconvenience and delay.


Three types of permits are available; Mitigation, Destruction and Interpretation. The specialist will apply for the permit at the beginning of the process (SAHRA 2012).

I. Description of significant fossil occurrences

Details of the location and distribution of all significant fossil sites or key fossiliferous rock units are often difficult to determine due to thick topsoil, subsoil, overburden and alluvium. Depth of the overburden may vary a lot.

Stromatolites are likely to be present. These structures range from a centimetre to several tens of metres in size. They are the result of algal growth in shallow water, indicating a very rich growth that would have caused an enrichment in the amount of oxygen in the atmosphere (Groenewald and Groenewald 2014).

Figure 4: Thin section of a stromatolite (De Zanche and Mietto 1977).



The threats are:- earth moving equipment/machinery (front end loaders, excavators, graders, dozers) during construction, the sealing-in or destruction of fossils by development, vehicle traffic, and human disturbance. See Description of the Geological Setting (F) above.

J. Recommendation

- a. There is no objection (see Recommendation B) to the development, it may be necessary to request a Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment: Field study to determine whether the development will affect fossiliferous outcrops as the palaeontological sensitivity is **HIGH**. A Phase 2 Palaeontological Mitigation may be required if a Phase 1 Palaeontological Assessment identifies a fossiliferous formation (for example breccia).
- b. This project may benefit the economy, the growth of the community and social development in general.
- c. Preferred choice: The impact on the palaeontological heritage is **HIGH** for Kalahari Group. Care must be taken during the grading of roads, digging of foundations and removing topsoil, subsoil and overburden (see Executive Summary) or blasting of bedrock.
- d. The following should be conserved: if any palaeontological material is exposed during digging, excavating, drilling or blasting SAHRA must be notified. All construction activities must be stopped and a palaeontologist should be called in to determine proper mitigation measures.

Sampling and collecting:

Wherefore a permit is needed from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA / PHRA).

- a. Objections: Cautious. See heritage value and recommendation.
- b. Conditions of development: See Recommendation.
- c. Areas that may need a permit: Yes.
- d. Permits for mitigation: Needed from SAHRA/PHRA prior to Mitigation.

K. Conclusions

- a. All the land involved in the development was assessed and none of the property is unsuitable for development (see Recommendation B).
- b. All information needed for the Desktop study was provided by the Consultant. All technical information was provided by LEAP.
- c. Areas that would involve mitigation and may need a permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency are discussed.
- d. The following should be conserved: if any palaeontological material is exposed during digging, excavating, drilling or blasting, SAHRA must be notified. All development activities must be stopped and a palaeontologist should be called in to determine proper mitigation measures, for example, shallow caves.

- e. Condition in which development may proceed: It is further suggested that a Section 37(2) agreement of the Occupational, Health and Safety Act 85 of 1993 is signed with the relevant contractors to protect the environment and adjacent areas as well as for safety and security reasons.

L. Bibliography

- ALMOND, J., PETHER, J. and GROENEWALD, G. 2013. South African National Fossil Sensitivity Map. SAHRA and Council for Geosciences.
- BOWLES, M., DE BRUIN, D., DE KOCK, G., DIXON, R.D., FIELD, M., HAMMERBECK, E.C.I., HERZBERG, W., KEYSER, A.W., MACRAE, C.S., VILJOEN, M.J., WINTERBACH, D.J. and WORST, B. 1992. Some superlatives of geology in southern Africa. Presented by The Geological Society of South Africa on occasion of the 29th International Geological Congress, Kyoto, Japan. Pp 20.
- DE ZANCHE, V. and MIETTO, P. 1977. *The World of Fossils*. Sampson Low Guides, Berkshire, Printed in Italy, Pp 256.
- GROENEWALD, G. and GROENEWALD, D. 2014. SAHRA Palaeotechnical Report: Palaeontological Heritage of the North West Province. South African Heritage Resources Agency, Pp 1-20.
- KENT, L. E., 1980. Part 1: Lithostratigraphy of the Republic of South Africa, South West Africa/Namibia and the Republics of Bophuthatswana, Transkei and Venda. SACS, Council for Geosciences, *Stratigraphy of South Africa*. 1980. *South African Committee for Stratigraphy*. Handbook 8, Part 1, Pp 690.
- MCCARTHY, T and RUBIDGE, B. 2005. *The Story of Earth Life: A southern African perspective on a 4.6-billion-year journey*. Struik. Pp 333.
- NORMAN, N. 2013. *Geology off the beaten track: exploring South Africa's hidden treasures*. De Beers, Struik, Pp 1-256.
- NORMAN, N. and WHITFIELD, G., 2006. *Geological Journeys*. De Beers, Struik, Pp 1-320.
- SG 2.2 SAHRA APMHOB Guidelines, 2012. Minimum standards for palaeontological components of Heritage Impact Assessment Reports, Pp 1-15.
- SNYMAN, C. P., 1996. *Geologie vir Suid-Afrika*. Departement Geologie, Universiteit van Pretoria, Pretoria, Volume 1, Pp. 513.
- VAN DER WALT, M., DAY, M., RUBIDGE, B. S., COOPER, A. K. & NETTERBERG, I., 2010. Utilising GIS technology to create a biozone map for the Beaufort Group (Karoo Supergroup) of South Africa. *Palaeontologia Africana*, **45**: 1-5.
- VISSER, D.J.L. (ed) 1984. Geological Map of South Africa 1:100 000. South African Committee for Stratigraphy. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria.
- VISSER, D.J.L. (ed) 1989. *Toeligting: Geologiese kaart (1:100 000). Die Geologie van die Republieke van Suid Afrika, Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda, Ciskei en die Koningkryke van Lesotho en Swaziland*. South African Committee for Stratigraphy. Council for Geoscience, Pretoria, Pp 494.

Declaration

I, Heidi Fourie, declare that I am an independent consultant and have no business, financial, personal or other interest in the proposed development project for which I was appointed to do a palaeontological assessment. There are no circumstances that compromise the objectivity of me performing such work.

I accept no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies me against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by the use of the information contained in this document.

It may be possible that the desktop study may have missed palaeontological resources in the Project Area as the presence of outcrops are not known and may only be found once development commences.

This report may not be altered in any way and any parts drawn from this report must make reference to this report.



Heidi Fourie

2016/10/24

Appendix 1:

Table 3: Listing points in Appendix 6 of the Act and position in Report.

Section	Point in Act	Heading
B	1(c)	Outline of development project
	1(d)	Summary of findings
	1(g)	Concerns/threats:
	1(n)i	"
	1(n)ii	"
	1(o)	"
	1(p)	"
D	1(h)	Figures
	1(a)i	Terms of reference
H	1(e)	Description of Methodology
	1(i)	Assumptions and Limitations
I	1(f)	Heritage value
J	1(j)	Recommendation
	1(l)	"
	1(m)	Sampling and collecting
	1(k)	"
	1(b)	Declaration
Declaration	1(b)	Declaration
Appendix 1	1(k)	Protocol for finds
	1(m)	"
	1(q)	"