

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

(REQUIRED UNDER SECTION 38(8) OF THE NHRA (No. 25 OF 1999))

FOR THE PROPOSED PRIESKA COPPER MINE, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE.

Type of development:

Mining Development

Client:

E – Mail: paul@abs-africa.com

Developer:

Orion Minerals



HCAC - Heritage Consultants

Private Bag X 1049

Suite 34

Modimolle

0510

Tel: 082 373 8491

Fax: 086 691 6461

E-Mail: jaco.heritage@gmail.com

Report Author:

Mr. J. van der Walt

Project Reference:


217103

Report date:

Feb 2018

APPROVAL PAGE

Project Name	Prieska Copper Mine
Report Title	Heritage Impact Assessment Prieska Copper Mine
Authority Reference Number	TBC
Report Status	Draft Report
Applicant Name	Orion Minerals

	Name	Signature	Qualifications and Certifications	Date
Field work and Document Compilation	Jaco van der Walt		MA Archaeology ASAPA #159	Feb 2018

DOCUMENT PROGRESS**Distribution List**

Date	Report Reference Number	Document Distribution	Number of Copies
15 February 2018	217103	ABS Africa (Pty) Ltd	Electronic Copy

Amendments on Document

Date	Report Reference Number	Description of Amendment
26 April 2018	217103	Technical revisions

INDEMNITY AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO THIS REPORT

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

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

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

COPYRIGHT

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

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

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

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

REPORT OUTLINE

Appendix 6 of the GNR 326 EIA Regulations published on 7 April 2017 provides the requirements for specialist reports undertaken as part of the environmental authorisation process. In line with this, Table 1 provides an overview of Appendix 6 together with information on how these requirements have been met.

Table 1. Specialist Report Requirements.

Requirement from Appendix 6 of GN 326 EIA Regulation 2017	Chapter
(a) Details of - (i) the specialist who prepared the report; and (ii) the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Section a Section 12
(b) Declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	<i>Declaration of Independence</i>
(c) Indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
(cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report	Section 3.4 and 7.1.
(cB) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change;	9
(d) Duration, Date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	Section 3.4
(e) Description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used	Section 3
(f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of a site plan identifying site alternatives;	Section 8 and 9
(g) Identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 9
(h) Map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers	Section 8
(I) Description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge	Section 3.7
(j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity including identified alternatives on the environment or activities;	Section 9
(k) Mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 9 and 10
(l) Conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	Section 9 and 10
(m) Monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 9 and 10
(n) Reasoned opinion - (i) as to whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised; (iA) regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and (ii) if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Section 10.2
(o) Description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report	Section 6
(p) A summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and	Refer to EIA report
(q) Any other information requested by the competent authority	Section 10

Executive Summary

HCAC was appointed to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment of the proposed Prieska Copper Mine project to determine the presence of cultural heritage sites and the impact of the proposed development on these non-renewable resources. The study area was assessed both on desktop level and by a field survey. The field survey was conducted as a non-intrusive pedestrian survey to cover the extent of the development footprint.

The entire site has been transformed by mining activities from the 1970's onwards however several Middle Stone Age artefacts were found scattered over the area in varying densities. According to Beaumont *et al* (1995) "thousands of square kilometres of Bushmanland are covered by a low density lithic scatter". These artefacts are referred to as background scatter (Orton 2016) and of low heritage significance. The paleontological component was independently assessed (Rossouw 2017) who concluded that the study area consist of non-fossiliferous metamorphic rocks and superficial deposits (aeolian sand) of low to very low palaeontological sensitivity. No further mitigation prior to construction is recommended in terms of Section 35 for the proposed development to proceed.


In terms of the built environment of the area (Section 34), although the remains of previous mining infrastructure do exist in the study area none of these are older than 60 years and the structures are not protected under the heritage Act and therefore of no significance.

In terms of Section 36 of the Act no burial sites were recorded. If any graves are located in future they should ideally be preserved *in-situ* or alternatively relocated according to existing legislation. No public monuments are located within or close to the study area. The study area is located in a rural area at an existing mine away from main tourist routes and the proposed development will not impact negatively on significant viewscales. During the public participation process conducted for the project no heritage concerns was raised.

The impact of the proposed project on heritage resources is considered acceptable and it is recommended that the proposed project can commence provided that the recommendations below are adhered to and based on approval from SAHRA

- Implementation of a chance find procedure.

Declaration of Independence

Specialist Name	Jaco van der Walt
Declaration of Independence	<p>I declare, as a specialist appointed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 108 of 1998) and the associated 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, that I:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I act as the independent specialist in this application; • I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant; • I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work; • I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity; • I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation; • I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity; • I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority; • All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and • I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.
Signature	
Date	08/11/2017

a) Expertise of the specialist

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT OUTLINE.....	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.....	1
A) EXPERTISE OF THE SPECIALIST.....	1
ABBREVIATIONS.....	7
GLOSSARY.....	7
1 INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE:.....	8
1.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	8
2 LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	13
3 METHODOLOGY.....	15
3.1 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	15
3.2 GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY AND GOOGLE EARTH MONUMENTS.....	15
3.3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:.....	15
3.4 SITE INVESTIGATION.....	15
3.5 SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND FIELD RATING.....	19
3.6 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY.....	20
3.7 LIMITATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS OF THE STUDY	21
4 DESCRIPTION OF SOCIO ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL.....	21
5 DESCRIPTION OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT:.....	21
6 RESULTS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:.....	22
7 LITERATURE / BACKGROUND STUDY:.....	23
7.1 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	23
7.2 GENERAL HISTORY OF THE AREA	24
7.3 HISTORICAL INFORMATION.....	25
8 FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY.....	26
8.1 DESCRIPTION OF EACH IMPACT AREA	27
9 HERITAGE RESOURCES IN TERMS OF NHRA SECTION 34 -36.....	34
9.1 BUILT ENVIRONMENT (SECTION 34 OF THE NHRA).....	34
9.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES (SECTION 35 OF THE NHRA).....	34
9.3 BURIAL GROUNDS AND GRAVES (SECTION 36 OF THE NHRA).....	36
9.4 CULTURAL LANDSCAPES, INTANGIBLE AND LIVING HERITAGE.	36

9.5	PALAEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES	36
9.6	BATTLEFIELDS AND CONCENTRATION CAMPS.....	36
9.7	IMPACT OF THE PROJECT ON HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	36
10	RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION	38
10.1	CHANCE FIND PROCEDURES	39
10.2	REASONED OPINION	39
11	REFERENCES.....	40
12	APPENDICES:.....	42
	CURRICULUM VITAE OF SPECIALIST	42

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. PROVINCIAL LOCALITY MAP (1: 250 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP).....	10
FIGURE 2: REGIONAL LOCALITY MAP (1:50 000 TOPOGRAPHICAL MAP).....	11
FIGURE 3. SATELLITE IMAGE INDICATING THE STUDY AREA (GOOGLE EARTH 2017).	12
FIGURE 4: TRACK LOGS OF THE SURVEY IN BLACK.	17
FIGURE 5. TRACK LOGS OF THE SURVEY IN BLACK.	18
FIGURE 6. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	22
FIGURE 7. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	22
FIGURE 8. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	22
FIGURE 9. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	22
FIGURE 10. EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS.....	26
FIGURE 11. ABANDONED MINING INFRASTRUCTURE.	26
FIGURE 12. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS	26
FIGURE 13. EXISTING ACCESS ROAD	26
FIGURE 14. LOCALITY MAP OF TSF 1 AND 2	27
FIGURE 15. LOCALITY MAP OF TSF 3	27
FIGURE 16 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF1.....	28
FIGURE 17. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF1.....	28
FIGURE 18. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF1.....	28
FIGURE 19. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF1.....	28
FIGURE 20. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF 2	28
FIGURE 21. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF 2	28
FIGURE 22. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS TSF 2	29
FIGURE 23. EXISTING ACCESS ROAD IN TSF 3.....	29
FIGURE 24. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS IN TSF 3.....	29
FIGURE 25. LOCALITY MAP OF WASTE ROCK DUMP 1 AND 2	30
FIGURE 26 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS WRD 1	30
FIGURE 27. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS WRD 1	30
FIGURE 28. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS WRD 1	30
FIGURE 29. GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS WRD 1	30
FIGURE 30. WRD 2	31
FIGURE 31. WRD 2	31
FIGURE 32. WRD 2	31
FIGURE 33. WRD 2	31
FIGURE 34. LOCALITY MAP OF THE MANAGEMENT OFFICES.....	32
FIGURE 35 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS AT THE PROPOSED AREA FOR THE MANAGEMENT OFFICES.	32
FIGURE 36. LOCALITY MAP OF THE PLANT TERRACE	33
FIGURE 37. REMAINS OF HISTORICAL MINING INFRASTRUCTURE.	33
FIGURE 38. REMAINS OF PREVIOUS MINING ACTIVITIES.	33

FIGURE 39. REMAINS OF DILAPIDATED STRUCTURES 33

FIGURE 40. REMAINS OF DILAPIDATED STRUCTURES 33

FIGURE 41. STRUCTURE IN TSF 3 34

FIGURE 42. CEMENT SLAB IN TSF 3 34

FIGURE 43. ARTEFACTS FOUND IN WRD 2 35

FIGURE 44. ARTEFACTS FOUND IN TSF 2 35

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. SPECIALIST REPORT REQUIREMENTS.....	4
TABLE 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION	9
TABLE 3: INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROJECT ACTIVITIES	9
TABLE 4: SITE INVESTIGATION DETAILS	16
TABLE 6. IMPACT TABLE – ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE RESOURCES.	37

ABBREVIATIONS

AIA: Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA: Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
BGG Burial Ground and Graves
BIA: Basic Impact Assessment
CFPs: Chance Find Procedures
CMP: Conservation Management Plan
CRR: Comments and Response Report
CRM: Cultural Resource Management
DEA: Department of Environmental Affairs
EA: Environmental Authorisation
EAP: Environmental Assessment Practitioner
ECO: Environmental Control Officer
EIA: Environmental Impact Assessment*
EIA: Early Iron Age*
EIA Practitioner: Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner
EMP: Environmental Management Programme
ESA: Early Stone Age
ESIA: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
GIS Geographical Information System
GPS: Global Positioning System
GRP Grave Relocation Plan
HIA: Heritage Impact Assessment
LIA: Late Iron Age
LSA: Late Stone Age
MEC: Member of the Executive Council
MIA: Middle Iron Age
MPRDA: Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act
MSA: Middle Stone Age
NEMA National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998)
NHRA National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999)
NID Notification of Intent to Develop
NoK Next-of-Kin
PRHA: Provincial Heritage Resource Agency
SADC: Southern African Development Community
SAHRA: South African Heritage Resources Agency

**Although EIA refers to both Environmental Impact Assessment and the Early Iron Age both are internationally accepted abbreviations and must be read and interpreted in the context it is used.*

GLOSSARY

Archaeological site (remains of human activity over 100 years old)

Early Stone Age (~ 2.6 million to 250 000 years ago)

Middle Stone Age (~ 250 000 to 40-25 000 years ago)

Later Stone Age (~ 40-25 000, to recently, 100 years ago)

The Iron Age (~ AD 400 to 1840)

Historic (~ AD 1840 to 1950)

Historic building (over 60 years old)

1 Introduction and Terms of Reference:

Heritage Contracts and Archaeological Consulting CC (**HCAC**) has been contracted by ABS Africa (Pty) Ltd to conduct a heritage impact assessment of the proposed project. The report forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Environmental Management Programme Report (EMPR) for the Prieska Copper Mine.

The aim of the study is to survey the proposed development footprint to identify cultural heritage sites, document, and assess their importance within local, provincial and national context. It serves to assess the impact of the proposed project on non-renewable heritage resources, and to submit appropriate recommendations with regard to the responsible cultural resources management measures that might be required to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner. It is also conducted to protect, preserve, and develop such resources within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999). The report outlines the approach and methodology utilized before and during the survey, which includes: Phase 1, review of relevant literature; Phase 2, the physical surveying of the area on foot and by vehicle; Phase 3, reporting the outcome of the study.

During the survey, Middle Stone Age artefacts were found scattered in low densities across the study area as well as abandoned mine infrastructure dating back to the 1970's. General site conditions and features on sites were recorded by means of photographs, GPS locations, and site descriptions. Possible impacts were identified and mitigation measures are proposed in the following report. SAHRA as a commenting authority under section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) require all environmental documents, compiled in support of an Environmental Authorisation application as defined by NEMA EIA Regs section 40 (1) and (2), to be submitted to SAHRA. As such the EIA report and its appendices must be submitted to the case as well as the EMPr, once it's completed by the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP).

1.1 Terms of Reference

Field study

Conduct a field study to: (a) locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest; b) record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas; c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources affected by the proposed development.

Reporting

Report on the identification of anticipated and cumulative impacts the operational units of the proposed project activity may have on the identified heritage resources for all 3 phases of the project; i.e., construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Consider alternatives, should any significant sites be impacted adversely by the proposed project. Ensure that all studies and results comply with the relevant legislation, SAHRA minimum standards and the code of ethics and guidelines of ASAPA.

To assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, and to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act No 25 of 1999).


Table 2: Project Description

Size of farm and portions	The mining right area comprises of the full extent of Ptn 25 and 26 of Vogelstruisbult and the full extent of Portion 0 of Slimes Dam. In addition, some infrastructure needed for the mining is situated on Ptn 1 of Vogelstruisbult.
Magisterial District	Siyathemba Municipality
1: 50 000 map sheet number	2922 CD
Central co-ordinate of the development	29°59'34" S 22°18'48.45" N

Table 3: Infrastructure and project activities

Type of development	Copper Mine
Project size	Development footprint approximately 250 ha
Project Components	<p>Surface mining of the remaining oxide ore deposits will run for 4 years In parallel with the surface mining, development of the underground mine will proceed. Underground mining will run for 11 years.</p> <p>The oxide and sulphide ore will be processed on site, including crushing and screening, milling, flotation, filtration as well as tailings and waste rock deposition;</p> <p>Dewatering of the mine is planned during the construction phase of the project, while the surface mining operation is under way. The estimated volume to be dewatered is approximately 8.5 million m³ of water. Various options for the dewatering have been proposed; and</p> <p>A new TSF, with a development footprint of approximately 68 ha, is required</p> <p>Associated infrastructure including access roads and waste dumps will be included.</p>

HIA – Prieska Copper Mine






Figure 2: Regional locality map (1:50 000 topographical map).




Figure 3. Satellite image indicating the study area (Google Earth 2017).

2 Legislative Requirements

The HIA, as a specialist sub-section of the EIA, is required under the following legislation:

- National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Act No. 25 of 1999)
- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), Act No. 107 of 1998 - Section 23(2)(b)
- Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), Act No. 28 of 2002 - Section 39(3)(b)(iii)

A Phase 1 HIA is a pre-requisite for development in South Africa as prescribed by SAHRA and stipulated by legislation. The overall purpose of heritage specialist input is to:

- Identify any heritage resources, which may be affected;
- Assess the nature and degree of significance of such resources;
- Establish heritage informants/constraints to guide the development process through establishing thresholds of impact significance;
- Assess the negative and positive impact of the development on these resources; and
- Make recommendations for the appropriate heritage management of these impacts.

The HIA should be submitted, as part of the impact assessment report or EMPr, to the PHRA if established in the province or to SAHRA. SAHRA will ultimately be responsible for the professional evaluation of Phase 1 AIA reports upon which review comments will be issued. 'Best practice' requires Phase 1 AIA reports and additional development information, as per the impact assessment report and/or EMPr, to be submitted in duplicate to SAHRA after completion of the study. SAHRA accepts Phase 1 AIA reports authored by professional archaeologists, accredited with ASAPA or with a proven ability to do archaeological work.

Minimum accreditation requirements include an Honours degree in archaeology or related discipline and 3 years post-university CRM experience (field supervisor level). Minimum standards for reports, site documentation and descriptions are set by ASAPA in collaboration with SAHRA. ASAPA is based in South Africa, representing professional archaeology in the SADC region. ASAPA is primarily involved in the overseeing of ethical practice and standards regarding the archaeological profession. Membership is based on proposal and secondment by other professional members.

Phase 1 AIA's are primarily concerned with the location and identification of heritage sites situated within a proposed development area. Identified sites should be assessed according to their significance. Relevant conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations should be made. Recommendations are subject to evaluation by SAHRA.

Conservation or Phase 2 mitigation recommendations, as approved by SAHRA, are to be used as guidelines in the developer's decision-making process.

Phase 2 archaeological projects are primarily based on salvage/mitigation excavations preceding development destruction or impact on a site. Phase 2 excavations can only be conducted with a permit, issued by SAHRA to the appointed archaeologist. Permit conditions are prescribed by SAHRA and includes (as minimum requirements) reporting back strategies to SAHRA and deposition of excavated material at an accredited repository.

In the event of a site conservation option being preferred by the developer, a site management plan, prepared by a professional archaeologist and approved by SAHRA, will suffice as minimum requirement.

After mitigation of a site, a destruction permit must be applied for with SAHRA by the applicant before development may proceed.

Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act, with reference to Section 36. Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983), and are the jurisdiction of SAHRA. The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36[5]) of Act 25 of 1999 is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in this age category, located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority, require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years, in addition to SAHRA authorisation. If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery, but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws, set by the cemetery authority, must be adhered to.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected under Section 2(1) of the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance No. 7 of 1925), as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983), and are the jurisdiction of the National Department of Health and the relevant Provincial Department of Health and must be submitted for final approval to the office of the relevant Provincial Premier. This function is usually delegated to the Provincial MEC for Local Government and Planning; or in some cases, the MEC for Housing and Welfare. Authorisation for exhumation and reinternment must also be obtained from the relevant local or regional council where the grave is situated, as well as the relevant local or regional council to where the grave is being relocated. All local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws must also be adhered to. To handle and transport human remains, the institution conducting the relocation should be authorised under Section 24 of Act 65 of 1983 (Human Tissues Act).

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Literature Review

A brief survey of available literature was conducted to extract data and information on the area in question to provide general heritage context into which the development would be set. This literature search included published material, unpublished commercial reports and online material, including reports sourced from the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS).

3.2 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

Google Earth and 1:50 000 maps of the area were utilised to identify possible places where sites of heritage significance might be located; these locations were marked and visited during the field work phase. The database of the Genealogical Society was consulted to collect data on any known graves in the area.

3.3 Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

Stakeholder engagement is a key component of any BAR process, it involves stakeholders interested in, or affected by the proposed development. Stakeholders are provided with an opportunity to raise issues of concern (for the purposes of this report only heritage related issues will be included). The aim of the public consultation process was to capture and address any issues raised by community members and other stakeholders during key stakeholder and public meetings. The process involved:

- Placement of advertisements and site notices
- Stakeholder notification (through the dissemination of information and meeting invitations);
- Stakeholder meetings undertaken with I&APs;
- Authority Consultation
- The compilation of a EIA report.
- The compilation of a Comments and Response Report (CRR).

3.4 Site Investigation

Conduct a field study to: a) systematically survey the proposed project area to locate, identify, record, photograph and describe sites of archaeological, historical or cultural interest; b) record GPS points of sites/areas identified as significant areas; c) determine the levels of significance of the various types of heritage resources recorded in the project area.

Recorded heritage features were given numerical site numbers. Low density Stone Age scatters (between 3 - 5 artefacts per m²) were recorded as find spots or background scatter. Scatters higher than 5 artefacts per m² are labelled as sites. Scatters with densities less than 2 artefacts per m² were not recorded as they occur throughout the study area. Individual occurrences were not point plotted within the recorded scatters however an attempt was made at determining site extent. GPS readings are taken roughly in the middle of each identified heritage site. Sites/heritage features were located during the physical walkthrough for the project that occurred over a period of 4 days conducted by an archaeologist. All the sites were mapped and georeferenced on 1:50 000 maps or aerial imagery of the area. Site locations were recorded with a GPS Montana handheld device and coordinates were taken when an accuracy reading of less than 4 meters were obtained.

Table 4: Site Investigation Details

	Site Investigation
Date	September 2017
Season	Spring - vegetation in the study area is low with good archaeological visibility. The study area was sufficiently covered (Figure 4 & 5) to adequately record the presence of heritage resources.



Figure 4: Track logs of the survey in black.




Figure 5. Track logs of the survey in black.

3.5 Site Significance and Field Rating

Section 3 of the NHRA distinguishes nine criteria for places and objects to qualify as 'part of the national estate' if they have cultural significance or other special value. These criteria are:

- Its importance in/to the community, or pattern of South Africa's history;
- Its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa's natural or cultural heritage;
- Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of South Africa's natural or cultural places or objects;
- Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- Its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- Its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in the history of South Africa;
- Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.

The presence and distribution of heritage resources define a 'heritage landscape'. In this landscape, every site is relevant. In addition, because heritage resources are non-renewable, heritage surveys need to investigate an entire project area, or a representative sample, depending on the nature of the project. In the case of the proposed project the local extent of its impact necessitates a representative sample and only the footprint of the areas demarcated for development were surveyed. In all initial investigations, however, the specialists are responsible only for the identification of resources visible on the surface. This section describes the evaluation criteria used for determining the significance of archaeological and heritage sites. The following criteria were used to establish site significance with cognisance of Section 3 of the NHRA:

- The unique nature of a site;
- The integrity of the archaeological/cultural heritage deposits;
- The wider historic, archaeological and geographic context of the site;
- The location of the site in relation to other similar sites or features;
- The depth of the archaeological deposit (when it can be determined/is known);
- The preservation condition of the sites; and
- Potential to answer present research questions.

In addition to this criteria field ratings prescribed by SAHRA (2006), and acknowledged by ASAPA for the SADC region, were used for the purpose of this report. The recommendations for each site should be read in conjunction with section 10 of this report.

FIELD RATING	GRADE	SIGNIFICANCE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; national site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; provincial site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High significance	Conservation; mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High significance	Mitigation (part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP.A)	-	High/medium significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP.B)	-	Medium significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.C)	-	Low significance	Destruction

3.6 Impact Assessment Methodology

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

- The **nature**, which shall include a description of what causes the effect, what will be affected and how it will be affected.
- The **extent**, wherein it will be indicated whether the impact will be local (limited to the immediate area or site of development) or regional, and a value between 1 and 5 will be assigned as appropriate (with 1 being low and 5 being high):
- The **duration**, wherein it will be indicated whether:
 - * the lifetime of the impact will be of a very short duration (0-1 years), assigned a score of 1;
 - * the lifetime of the impact will be of a short duration (2-5 years), assigned a score of 2;
 - * medium-term (5-15 years), assigned a score of 3;
 - * long term (> 15 years), assigned a score of 4; or
 - * permanent, assigned a score of 5;
- The **magnitude**, quantified on a scale from 0-10 where; 0 is small and will have no effect on the environment, 2 is minor and will not result in an impact on processes, 4 is low and will cause a slight impact on processes, 6 is moderate and will result in processes continuing but in a modified way, 8 is high (processes are altered to the extent that they temporarily cease), and 10 is very high and results in complete destruction of patterns and permanent cessation of processes.
- The **probability of occurrence**, which shall describe the likelihood of the impact actually occurring. Probability will be estimated on a scale of 1-5 where; 1 is very improbable (probably will not happen), 2 is improbable (some possibility, but low likelihood), 3 is probable (distinct possibility), 4 is highly probable (most likely) and 5 is definite (impact will occur regardless of any prevention measures).
- The **significance**, which shall be determined through a synthesis of the characteristics described above and can be assessed as low, medium or high; and
- the **status**, which will be described as either positive, negative or neutral.
- the degree to which the impact can be reversed.
- the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.
- the *degree* to which the impact can be mitigated.

The **significance** is calculated by combining the criteria in the following formula:

$$S=(E+D+M)P$$

S = Significance weighting

E = Extent

D = Duration

M = Magnitude

P = Probability

The **significance weightings** for each potential impact are as follows:

- < 30 points: Low (i.e., where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),
- 30-60 points: Medium (i.e., where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated),
- 60 points: High (i.e., where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

3.7 Limitations and Constraints of the study

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

4 Description of Socio Economic Environmental

According to the Integrated Development Plan 2015/16 Siyathemba Municipality “ *the population of Siyathemba declined from just over 21,370 people in 2000 to about 21,330 in 2010.Total employment in Siyathemba has been in fluctuating over the last ten years. Moreover, employment in the Study Area declined marginally from some 4,800 jobs during 2000 to just below 4,700 in 2010. Over a ten-year period, this could be translated to an average annual decline of 0.2%.....Most workers in Siyathemba are employed in the Government Services Sector (around 1,700 workers), followed by Agriculture (about 1,100 workers) and the Trade (about 670 workers) sector....*”

Challenges include infrastructure provision (water, sanitation as well as electricity) as well as unemployment.

5 Description of the Physical Environment:

The Project is located approximately 60 km south-west of the town Prieska in the Siyathemba Municipality, Northern Cape Province of South Africa, around co-ordinates 29°59'34" S, 22°18'48.45" N on the following farms: Vogelstruisbult 104 (Portions 25 and 26) and Slimes Dam 154. The site can be accessed by an existing secondary gravel road, branching off the R357 that services Copperton town. The vegetation is predominantly Bushmanland Arid Grassland vegetation in the Nama-Karoo biome (Mucina & Rutherford 2006) which consists of Karoo scrub and grass and a few isolated *Acacia Karoo* trees. The project area has been extensively disturbed by previous mining activities (Figure 6 – 9).



Figure 6. General site conditions



Figure 7. General site conditions



Figure 8. General site conditions



Figure 9. General site conditions

6 Results of Public Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement:

Adjacent landowners and the public at large were informed of the proposed activity as part of the EIA process. Site notices and advertisements notifying interested and affected parties were placed at strategic points and in local newspapers as part of the process.

7 Literature / Background Study:

7.1 Literature Review

Previous heritage studies were conducted on the farm under investigation by Van Ryneveld (2006) and Orton (2015). Orton (2012) also conducted a study to the east on the farm Hoekplaas and Kaplan and Wiltshire (2011) on portion 3 and 4 of the farm Nelspoortjie (now called Vogelstruisfontein).

All the studies recorded ESA, MSA and LSA artefacts scattered over the landscape with MSA and LSA sites centred on pans and watercourses. Studies by Van der Walt (2012, 2013, 2017) concurred with these findings and also recorded widespread Stone Age scatters and some discreet MSA and LSA sites. Orton (2012) also recorded stone walled enclosures.

7.1.1 Genealogical Society and Google Earth Monuments

No known grave sites are indicated close to the study area.

7.2 General History of the area

7.2.1 Archaeology of the area

Beaumont et al. (1995: 240) observed that “thousands of square kilometres of Bushmanland are covered by a low density lithic scatter”. These artefacts are generally very well weathered and mostly pertain to the ESA and MSA. Occasional LSA artefacts are also noted. What is noteworthy of the Northern Cape archaeological record is the presence of pans which frequently display associated archaeological material. Of interest, is the work of Kiberd (2001, 2005, 2006) who excavated Bundu Pan, some 25 to 30 km northwest of Copperton. The site yielded ESA, MSA and LSA horizons and the artefacts were accompanied by warthog and equid teeth to name a few (Beaumont et al. 1995).

Orton (2011) noted that to the northwest, west and southwest of Copperton sites have been investigated by Beaumont and colleagues (1995), Smith (1995) and Parsons (2003, 2004, 2007, 2008) yielding LSA deposits. Work on these sites led to a distinction between hunter-gatherer and herder sites, based on stone artefact assemblages (Beaumont et al. 1995). All these Later Stone Age sites have very few, if any, organic items on them. The only organic material found on sites like these is fragments of ostrich eggshell probably belonging to broken water containers. Such flasks have been widely recorded across the Northern Cape (Morris 1994).

The archaeological importance of pans in the area are now well documented (Kiberd 2006, Kaplan & Wiltshire 2011, Orton 2012) and if any occur in the study area they could be of significance. Van der Walt (2012) recorded low densities of ESA, MSA and LSA scatters just east of the current study area and were given a field rating of low archaeological significance. However, several discrete MSA and LSA sites were also documented.

Most of the material expected for the study area is MSA in nature consisting of large flakes, radial and bipolar cores, points, end scrapers, large utilized and retouched blade tools, and utilized and retouched flakes. Raw material is expected to be predominantly in fine grained quartzite, hornfels, banded ironstone, chert and vein quartz based on the results of the 2012 study by the author of this report.

7.3 Historical Information

In an article in the Patriot, dated December 1995, some background information is given on the history of the town of Copperton. This town is not very old, as it was only developed in 1972 with the establishment of a copper mine in the area. The mine closed in 1992, and Copperton was sold to a private person, on the condition that the houses in the town would be demolished. About 300 houses were broken down, when it was decided that some homes would be kept in order to develop a retirement town. These houses were apparently solidly built, with stone walls and corrugated roofs. It was noted that the area was very sparsely populated, and that the farmers in the area farmed with sheep. Next to the Orange River, maize and grapes were planted. It was noted that the closest hospitals were located at Prieska, some 35 to 40 minutes' drive from Copperton, and linked with a tarred road (Anon 1995: 4).

7.3.1 Anglo-Boer War

The discovery of diamonds and gold in the Northern provinces had very important consequences for South Africa. After the discovery of these resources, the British, who at the time had colonized the Cape and Natal, had intentions of expanding their territory into the northern Boer republics. This eventually led to the Anglo-Boer War, which took place between 1899 and 1902 in South Africa, and which was one of the most turbulent times in South Africa's history. Even before the outbreak of war in October 1899 British politicians, including Sir Alfred Milner and Mr. Chamberlain, had declared that should Britain's differences with the Z.A.R. result in violence, it would mean the end of republican independence. This decision was not immediately publicized, as a consequence, republican leaders based their assessment of British intentions on the more moderate public utterances of British leaders. Consequently, in March 1900, they asked Lord Salisbury to agree to peace on the basis of the status quo ante bellum. Salisbury's reply was a clear statement of British war aims. (Du Preez 1977).

In March 1900 Boer forces had taken Prieska, Kenhardt, Kakamas and Upington, attracting rebel support in the process. British columns were able to recapture the towns and the invasion had ended by June 1900. Local militias, including the Border Scouts (Upington), Bushmanland Borderers (Kenhardt) and Namaqualand Border Scouts (from the west) were established and patrolled the area.

8 Findings of the Survey

It is important to note that only the development footprint was surveyed. The study area has been extensively transformed by previous mining development and abandoned mining infrastructure occurs throughout the study area (Figure 10 -13). Based on the information on the Copperton mine that was operational from the 1970's (van der Walt 2017) the infrastructure is not older than 60 years. During the survey, several Middle Stone Age artefacts were found scattered over the area in varying densities.



Figure 10. Existing site conditions



Figure 11. Abandoned mining infrastructure. .



Figure 12. General site conditions



Figure 13. Existing access road

The findings in the impact areas of respectively the TSF Option 1, 2 and 3 as well as the options for the Waste Rock Dumps (1 and 2) and the Plant Terrace and management offices will be briefly discussed in Section 9.

8.1 Description of each impact area

8.1.1 TSF Option 1, 2 and 3.

TSF option 1 is located on the existing slimes dam (Figure 18) that has entirely transformed the impact area and this would have destroyed all surface indicators of heritage resources. TSF Option 2 is in an area that is mostly undisturbed consisting of open veld located next to the existing slimes dam (Figure 18). There was some secondary impact on the impact area of TSF 2 due to a pipeline servitude. TSF 3 is located in a disturbed area where the old golf course and recreational facilities used to be located. Previous developments would have destroyed all surface indicators of heritage resources in this area.




Figure 14. Locality map of TSF 1 and 2




Figure 15. Locality map of TSF 3



Figure 16 General Site conditions TSF1



Figure 17. General Site conditions TSF1



Figure 18. General Site conditions TSF1



Figure 19. General Site conditions TSF1



Figure 20. General site conditions TSF 2



Figure 21. General site conditions TSF 2



Figure 22. General site conditions TSF 2



Figure 23. Existing access road in TSF 3



Figure 24. General site conditions in TSF 3.

8.1.2 Waste Rock dump area 1 and 2

Both areas have been heavily impacted on. WRD 2 is has been completely transformed by previous mining activities. WRD 1 has been impacted on by the development of roads, pipelines and pits.




Figure 25. Locality map of Waste Rock Dump 1 and 2



Figure 26 General Site conditions WRD 1



Figure 27. General Site conditions WRD 1



Figure 28. General Site conditions WRD 1



Figure 29. General Site conditions WRD 1



Figure 30. WRD 2



Figure 31. WRD 2



Figure 32. WRD 2



Figure 33. WRD 2

8.1.3 Management Offices

The location of the management offices has been completely transformed by the construction of buildings for the previous mining activities in the area. These structures were subsequently demolished (Figure 35).



Figure 34. Locality map of the Management Offices



Figure 35 General Site conditions at the proposed area for the management offices.

8.1.4 Plant Terrace

The plant terrace was also previously developed and the area is disturbed by roads, dilapidated mining related structures and associated mining activities.




Figure 36. Locality map of the Plant Terrace



Figure 37. Remains of historical mining infrastructure.



Figure 38. Remains of previous mining activities.



Figure 39. Remains of dilapidated structures



Figure 40. Remains of dilapidated structures.

9 Heritage Resources in terms of NHRA Section 34 -36

9.1 Built Environment (Section 34 of the NHRA)

No standing structures older than 60 years occur in the study area. In the proposed impact areas numerous abandoned and dilapidated structures occur that can be associated with mining activities dating to the 1970's. These structures are not older than 60 years and are not protected by the NHRA.



Figure 41. Structure in TSF 3



Figure 42. Cement slab in TSF 3

9.2 Archaeological resources (Section 35 of the NHRA)

During the survey, several Middle Stone Age artefacts were found scattered over the area of impact for TSF 2 and both waste rock dumps in varying densities. Artefact density is no higher than 3 artefacts per m². Almost no formal tools were observed and artefacts consist mostly of flakes with faceted platforms, cores, blades, a point and a possible scraper. The raw material for these artefacts are from Metaquartzite (sometimes glassy quartzite with a grey-green colour) and calcsilicates and quartzite schist.

According to Beaumont *et al* (1995) “thousands of square kilometres of Bushmanland are covered by a low density lithic scatter”. These artefacts are scattered too sparsely to be of any significance apart from noting their presence, which has been done so in this report. These low-density scatters are of low significance.



Figure 43. Artefacts found in WRD 2



Figure 44. Artefacts found in TSF 2

9.3 Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36 of the NHRA)

In terms of Section 36 of the Act no burial sites were recorded. If any graves are located in future they should ideally be preserved *in-situ* or alternatively relocated according to existing legislation.

9.4 Cultural Landscapes, Intangible and Living Heritage.

The cultural landscape of the study area is related to agricultural and historical mining activities. The main elements of the cultural landscape are the wide-open spaces bisected by farm tracks and the demolished remains of mining infrastructure. The overall landscape character is very natural with rural elements due to the minimally developed landscape. The proposed development is in line with previous land use of the area.

9.5 Palaeontological Resources

The proposed development footprint is underlain by Precambrian metamorphic rocks and Permo-Carboniferous Karoo Supergroup sediments capped by aeolian sand. The planned development will impact non-fossiliferous metamorphic rocks and superficial deposits (aeolian sand) of low to very low palaeontological sensitivity (Rossouw (2017)).

9.6 Battlefields and Concentration Camps

No Battlefield sites were identified in the study area.

9.7 Impact of the project on heritage resources

The impact on heritage sites by the proposed development is considered low. Any direct impacts that may occur would be during the construction phase only and would be of very low significance. Cumulative impacts occur from the combination of effects of various impacts on heritage resources. The importance of identifying and assessing cumulative impacts is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. This and other projects in the area could have an indirect impact on the heritage landscape.

9.7.1 Pre-Construction phase:

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

9.7.2 Construction Phase

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

9.7.3 Operation Phase:

No impact is envisaged for the recorded heritage resources during this phase.

Table 5. Impact table – Archaeological heritage resources.

Nature: During the construction phase activities resulting in disturbance of surfaces and/or sub-surfaces may destroy, damage, alter, or remove from its original position archaeological material or objects.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation (Preservation/ excavation of site)
Extent	Local (1)	Local (1)
Duration	Permanent (5)	Permanent (5)
Magnitude	Low (2)	Low (2)
Probability	Not probable (2)	Not probable (2)
Significance	16 (Low)	16 (Low)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Not reversible	Not reversible
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No resources were recorded	No resources were recorded.
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes, a chance find procedure should be implemented.	Yes
Mitigation: A Chance Find Procedure should be implemented for the project should any sites be identified during the construction process.		
Cumulative Impacts: Due to the fact that the area has previously been used for a mining development and the greater area is very sparsely populated the cumulative impact is regarded as low.		
Residual Impacts: If sites are destroyed this results in the depletion of archaeological record of the area. However, if sites are recorded and preserved or mitigated this adds to the record of the area.		

10 Recommendations and conclusion

In terms of the archaeology component of Section 35 of the NHRA several Middle Stone Age flakes were found scattered over the area in low densities. According to Beaumont *et al* (1995) “thousands of square kilometres of Bushmanland are covered by a low density lithic scatter”. These artefacts are referred to as background scatter or occurrences and of low heritage significance. The paleontological component was addressed by Rossouw (2017), he concluded: “*The proposed development footprint is underlain by Precambrian metamorphic rocks and Permo-Carboniferous Karoo Supergroup sediments capped by aeolian sand. The planned development will impact non-fossiliferous metamorphic rocks and superficial deposits (aeolian sand) of low to very low palaeontological sensitivity. As far as the palaeontological heritage is concerned, the proposed development may proceed with no further palaeontological assessments required*”

In terms of the built environment of the area (Section 34), no standing structures older than 60 years occur within the study area. In terms of Section 36 of the Act no burial sites were recorded. If any graves are located in future they should ideally be preserved *in-situ* or alternatively relocated according to existing legislation. No public monuments are located within or close to the study area. The study area is surrounded by residential developments and road infrastructure developments and the proposed development will not impact negatively on significant cultural landscapes or views. During the public participation process conducted for the project no heritage concerns was raised.

The impact of the proposed project on heritage resources is considered low and it is recommended that the proposed project can commence on the condition that the following recommendations are implemented as part of the EMP and based on approval from SAHRA.

- Implementation of a chance find procedure.
- A condition of authorisation is that any substantial change to the lay out as represented in this report must be subjected to a field survey.

10.1 Chance Find Procedures

The possibility of the occurrence of subsurface finds cannot be excluded. Therefore, if during construction any possible finds such as stone tool scatters, artefacts or bone and fossil remains are made, the operations must be stopped and a qualified archaeologist must be contacted for an assessment of the find and therefor chance find procedures should be put in place as part of the EMP. A short summary of chance find procedures is discussed below.

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

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

10.2 Reasoned Opinion

The impact of the proposed project on heritage resources is considered low and no further pre-construction mitigation in terms of archaeological resources is required based on approval from SAHRA. Furthermore, the socio-economic benefits also outweigh the possible impacts of the development if the correct mitigation measures (i.e. chance find procedure and avoidance of sites) are implemented for the project.

11 References

- Anon. 1991. Myndorp in Noord-Kaap ontwikkel vir volkstaters. *Die Burger*, 16 November 1991, p. 2.
- Beaumont, P.B., Smith, A.B. & Vogel, J.C. 1995. Before the Einiqua: the archaeology of the frontier zone. In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier: 236-264. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Du Preez, S. J. 1977. *Peace attempts during the Anglo Boer War until March 1901*. Magister Artium thesis in History. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Kaplan, J & N, Wiltshire. 2011. Archaeological Impact Assessment Of A Proposed Wind Energy Facility, Power Line And Landing Strip In Copperton, Siyathemba Municipality, Northern Cape Prepared for: Aurecon South Africa (Pty) Ltd
- Kiberd, P. 2001. Bundu Farm: a Middle and Later Stone Age pan site, Northern Cape, South Africa: preliminary results of fieldwork. *Nyame Akuma* 55: 51-55.
- Kiberd, P. 2005. Bundu Farm and the transition from Earlier to Middle Stone Age in the Northern Cape, South Africa. Unpublished M.Phil dissertation. Southampton: University of Southampton.
- Kiberd, P. 2006. Bundu Farm: a report on archaeological and palaeoenvironmental assemblages from a pan site in Bushmanland, Northern Cape, South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 61: 189-201.
- Morris, D. 1994. An ostrich eggshell cache from the Vaalbos National Park, Northern Cape, South Africa. *Southern African Field Archaeology* 3: 55-58.
- Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. *Strelitzia* 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute. Pretoria.
- National Heritage Resources Act NHRA of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999)
- Orton, J. 2011. Heritage impact assessment for a proposed photovoltaic energy plant on the farm Klipgats Pan near Copperton, Northern Cape.
- Orton, J. 2012. Heritage Impact Assessment For A Proposed Photovoltaic Energy Plant On The Farm Hoekplaas Near Copperton, Northern Cape
- Orton, J. 2016. Heritage Impact Assessment For Four Proposed Borrow Pits On Remainder Of Farm Vogelstruisbult 104/1, Prieska Magisterial District, Northern Cape.
- Parsons, I. 2000. Later Stone Age open-air sites on Bloubos, Northern Cape. *Southern African Field Archaeology* 9: 55-67.
- Parsons, I. 2003. Lithic expressions of Later Stone Age lifeways in the Northern Cape. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 58: 33-37.
- Parsons, I. 2004. Stone circles in the Bloubos landscape, Northern Cape. *Southern African Humanities* 16: 59-69.
- Parsons, I. 2007. Hunter-gatherers or herders? Reconsidering the Swartkop and Doornfontein Industries, Northern Cape Province, South Africa. *Before Farming* 2007/4: Article 3.
- Parsons, I. 2008. Five Later Stone Age artefact assemblages from the interior Northern Cape Province. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 63: 51-60.
- SAHRA Report Mapping Project Version 1.0, 2009
- Smith, A.B. 1995. Archaeological observations along the Orange River and its hinterland. In: Smith, A.B. (ed.) Einiqualand: studies of the Orange River frontier: 236-264. Rondebosch: UCT Press.
- Van der Walt, J. 2012a. Scoping report for Garob Wind Farm. Unpublished report.
- Van der Walt, J. 2012b. AIA for Garob Wind Farm. Unpublished report.
- Van der Walt, J. 2016. Archaeological Impact Assessment for The Proposed Garob Borrow Pit, Northern Cape Province.
- Van der Walt, J. 2017. Heritage Scoping report Copperton. Unpublished report.
- Van Ryneveld, K. 2006. Archaeological Impact Assessment – Vogelstruis Bult 104, Prieska District, Northern Cape, South Africa. Report prepared for Amber Mountain Investments. National Museum Bloemfontein.

Additional Sources:

- Anon. 1991. Copperton to become 2nd 'Orania' for rightwingers. *Weekend Argus*, 16 November 1991, p. 5.
- Anon. 1991. Myndorp in Noord-Kaap ontwikkel vir volkstaters. *Die Burger*, 16 November 1991, p. 2.
- Anon. 1995. Copperton – Privaat dorp in die Noordkaap. *Patriot*, 21 Desember 1995, p. 4.
- Burton, A. R. E. 1903. *Cape Colony for the Settler*. Cape Town: J. C. Juta & Co.
- Skead, C. J. 2009. *Historical plant incidence in southern Africa. A collection of early travel records in southern Africa*. Pretoria: South African National Biodiversity Institute.

12 Appendices:**Curriculum Vitae of Specialist**

Jaco van der Walt
Archaeologist

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

Education:

Particulars of degrees/diplomas and/or other qualifications:

Name of University or Institution: University of Pretoria
Degree obtained : BA Heritage Tourism & Archaeology
Year of graduation : 2001

Name of University or Institution: University of the Witwatersrand
Degree obtained : BA Hons Archaeology
Year of graduation : 2002

Name of University or Institution : University of the Witwatersrand
Degree Obtained : MA (Archaeology)
Year of Graduation : 2012

Name of University or Institution : University of Johannesburg
Degree : PhD
Year : Currently Enrolled

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

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

Countries of work experience include:

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

SELECTED PROJECTS INCLUDE:

Archaeological Impact Assessments (Phase 1)

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

Archaeological Impact Assessment Mmamethlake Landfill

Archaeological Impact Assessment Libangeni Landfill

Linear Developments

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

Archaeological Impact Assessment Medupi – Spitskop Power Line,

Archaeological Impact Assessment Nelspruit Road Development

Renewable Energy developments

Archaeological Impact Assessment Karoshoek Solar Project

Grave Relocation Projects

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

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

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

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

Phase 2 Mitigation Projects

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

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

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

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

Heritage management projects

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

MEMBERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

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

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

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

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

REFERENCES:

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