



PGS HERITAGE

**PALAEONTOLOGICAL DESKTOP ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED KANGRA
MAQUASA BLOCK C MINING DEVELOPMENT NEAR PIET RETIEF, IN THE MKHONDO
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY WITHIN THE GERT SIBANDE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY.**

Issue Date: 1 September 2019

Revision No.: v0.1

Client:

PGS Project No: PIA

**PGS
HERITAGE**



+ 27 (0) 12 332 5305



+27 (0) 86 675 8077



contact@pgsheritage.co.za



PO Box 32542, Totiusdal, 0134

Offices in South Africa, Kingdom of Lesotho and Mozambique

Head Office:
906 Bergarend Streets
Waverley, Pretoria,
South Africa

Directors: HS Steyn, PD Birkholtz, W Fourie

Declaration of Independence

I, Elize Butler, declare that –

General declaration:

- I act as the independent palaeontological 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 favorable to the applicant
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting palaeontological impact assessments, 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 will take into account, to the extent possible, the matters listed in section 38 of the NHRA when preparing the application and any report relating to the application;
- 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;
- I will ensure that information containing all relevant facts in respect of the application is distributed or made available to interested and affected parties and the public and that participation by interested and affected parties is facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties will be provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments on documents that are produced to support the application;
- I will provide the competent authority with access to all information at my disposal regarding the application, whether such information is favorable to the applicant or not
- All the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct;
- I will perform all other obligations as expected a palaeontological specialist in terms of the Act and the constitutions of my affiliated professional bodies; and
- I realize that a false declaration is an offense in terms of regulation 71 of the Regulations and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the NEMA.

Disclosure of Vested Interest

I do not have and will not have any vested interest (either business, financial, personal or other) in the proposed activity proceeding other than remuneration for work performed in terms of the Regulations;

PALAEONTOLOGICAL CONSULTANT:

Banzai Environmental (Pty) Ltd

CONTACT PERSON:

Elize Butler


Tel: +27 844478759

Email: elizebutler002@gmail.com

SIGNATURE:



ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|--------------------|
| Report Title | PALAEONTOLOGICAL DESKTOP ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED KANGRA MAQUASA BLOCK C MINING DEVELOPMENT NEAR PIET RETIEF, IN THE MKHONDO LOCAL MUNICIPALITY WITHIN THE GERT SIBANDE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY | | |
| Control | Name | Signature | Designation |
| Author | Elize Butler |  | Palaeontologist |
| Reviewed | | | |
| Client | | | |

CLIENT:

CONTACT PERSON:

The heritage impact assessment report has been compiled taking into account the National Environmental Management Act 1998 (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Regulations 2014 as amended, requirements for specialist reports, Appendix 6, as indicated in the table below.

| NEMA Regs (2014) - Appendix 6 | Relevant section in report |
|--|---|
| 1. (1) A specialist report prepared in terms of these Regulations must contain- 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; | Page ii of Report – Contact details and company, Section 2 and Appendix A |
| b) a declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority; | Page ii |
| c) an indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared; | Section 4 – Objective |
| (cA) an indication of the quality and age of base data used for the specialist report; | Section 5 – Geological and Palaeontological history |
| (B) a description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change; | Section 9 |
| d) the date, duration and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment; | N/A Desktop Study |
| e) a description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialized process inclusive of equipment and modeling used; | Section 7 Approach and Methodology |
| f) details of an assessment of the specifically 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 1 and 10 |
| g) an identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers; | Not identified, |
| h) a 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 5 – Geological and Palaeontological history |

| NEMA Regs (2014) - Appendix 6 | Relevant section in report |
|---|--|
| i) a description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge; | Section 7.1 – Assumptions and Limitation |
| 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 10 |
| k) any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr; | N/A |
| l) any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorization; | N/A |
| m) any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorization; | N/A |
| n) a reasoned opinion- i. as to whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorized; (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 authorized, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan; | Desktop Assessment |
| o) a description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of preparing the specialist report; | Not applicable. |
| p) a summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and | Not applicable. |
| q) any other information requested by the competent authority. | Not applicable. |
| 2) Where a government notice <i>gazetted</i> by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply. | Section 3 compliance with SAHRA guidelines |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Banzai Environmental was appointed by PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd to conduct the Palaeontological Desktop Assessment (DIA) to assess the proposed Kangra Maquasa Block C mining development in Driefontein near Piet Retief, in the Mkhondo Local Municipality within the Gert Sibande District Municipality. The National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999, section 38) (NHRA), states that a Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) is key to detect the presence of fossil material within the planned development footprint. This DIA is thus necessary to evaluate the effect of the construction on the palaeontological resources.

The proposed Kangra Maquasa Block C mining development is entirely underlain by the Vryheid Formation of the Ecca Group (Karoo Supergroup). According to the PalaeoMap of South African Heritage Resources Information System the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Vryheid Formation is Very High while the Ecca has a moderate Palaeontological Sensitivity (Almond and Pether 2008, SAHRIS website).

An EIA level palaeontology report will be conducted to assess the value and prominence of fossils in the development area and the effect of the proposed development on the palaeontological heritage. The purpose of the EIA Report is to elaborate on the issues and potential impacts identified during the scoping phase. A Phase 1 field-based assessment will be conducted and research in the site-specific study area as well as a comprehensive assessment of the impacts identified during the scoping phase

TABLE OF CONTENT

List of Figures

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Figure 1: Google Earth Image (2019) indicating the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations. Map provided by EXM Advisory Services.....</i> | <i>3</i> |
| <i>Figure 2: Google Earth Image (2019) indicating the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations in white. Map was drawn by QGIS 2.18.28.</i> | <i>4</i> |
| <i>Figure 3. Extract of the 1:50 000 Topographical (2730 AB) map indicating the location of the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations in green. Map was drawn by QGIS 2.18.28..</i> | <i>5</i> |
| <i>Figure 4. Surface geology of the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations is completely underlain by the Vryheid Formation, Ecca Group (Karoo Supergroup). Map was drawn by QGIS 2.18.28.</i> | <i>8</i> |
| <i>Figure 5: Coalfields of Southern Africa, taken from Hancox and Götz (2014).</i> | <i>9</i> |
| <i>Figure 6: Extract of the 1 in 250 000 SAHRIS PalaeoMap map (Council of Geosciences). Approximate location of the proposed development is indicated in black.....</i> | <i>12</i> |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <i>Table 1: Ecca Group and Formations. (Modified from Johnson et al, 2006).</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>Table 2: Quantitative rating and equivalent descriptors for the impact assessment criteria ...</i> | <i>14</i> |
| <i>Table 3: Description of the significance rating scale</i> | <i>15</i> |
| <i>Table 4: Description of the Spatial significance rating scale</i> | <i>16</i> |
| <i>Table 5: Description of the temporal rating scale</i> | <i>16</i> |
| <i>Table 6: Description of the degree of probability of an impact occurring</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Table 7: Description of the degree of certainty rating scale</i> | <i>17</i> |
| <i>Table 8: Example of Rating Scale</i> | <i>18</i> |
| <i>Table 9: Impact Risk Classes</i> | <i>18</i> |

Appendix A: CV

TERMINOLOGY AND ABBREVIATIONS

Archaeological resources

This includes:

- material remains resulting from human activity which are in a state of disuse and are in or on land and which are older than 100 years including artifacts, human and hominid remains, and artificial features and structures;
- rock art is any form of painting, engraving or other graphic representation on a fixed rock surface or loose rock or stone, which was executed by human agency and which is older than 100 years, including any area within 10m of such representation;
- wrecks, being any vessel or aircraft, or any part thereof, which was wrecked in South Africa, whether on land, in the internal waters, the territorial waters or in the maritime culture zone of the Republic as defined in the Maritimes Zones Act, and any cargo, debris or artefacts found or associated therewith, which is older than 60 years or which SAHRA considers to be worthy of conservation;
- features, structures, and artifacts associated with a military history which are older than 75 years and the site on which they are found.

Cultural significance

This means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance

Development

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

- construction, alteration, demolition, removal or change in use of a place or a structure at a place;
- carrying out any works on or over or under a place;
- subdivision or consolidation of land comprising a place, including the structures or airspace of a place;
- constructing or putting up for display signs or boards;
- any change to the natural or existing condition or topography of land; and
- any removal or destruction of trees, or removal of vegetation or topsoil

Fossil

Mineralized bones of animals, shellfish, plants, and marine animals. A trace fossil is the track or footprint of a fossil animal that is preserved in stone or consolidated sediment.

Heritage

That which is inherited and forms part of the National Estate (historical places, objects, fossils as defined by the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999).

Heritage resources

This means any place or object of cultural significance and can include (but not limited to) as stated under Section 3 of the NHRA,

- places, buildings, structures, and equipment of cultural significance;
- places to which oral traditions are attached or which are associated with living heritage;
- historical settlements and townscapes;
- landscapes and natural features of cultural significance;
- geological sites of scientific or cultural importance;
- archaeological and palaeontological sites;
- graves and burial grounds, and
- sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa;

Holocene

The most recent geological time period which commenced 10 000 years ago.

Palaeontology

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 trace.

| Abbreviations | Description |
|------------------|--|
| ASAP | Association of South African Professional Archaeologists |
| BRMO | Black Rock Mining operations |
| CRM | Cultural Resource Management |
| DEA | Department of Environmental Affairs |
| DIA | Desktop Impact Assessment |
| ECO | Environmental Control Officer |
| EIA practitioner | Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner |
| EIA | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| ESA | Early Stone Age |
| GPS | Global Positioning System |
| HIA | Heritage Impact Assessment |
| I&AP | Interested & Affected Party |
| LSA | Late Stone Age |
| LIA | Late Iron Age |

| Abbreviations | Description |
|----------------------|--|
| MSA | Middle Stone Age |
| MIA | Middle Iron Age |
| NEMA | National Environmental Management Act |
| NHRA | National Heritage Resources Act |
| PIA | Palaeontological Impact Assessment |
| PHRA | Provincial Heritage Resources Authority |
| PSSA | Palaeontological Society of South Africa |
| SADC | Southern African Development Community |
| SAHRA | South African Heritage Resources Agency |

1 INTRODUCTION

Kangra Coal is an existing coal mine located in Driefontein, near Piet Retief, in the Mkhondo Local Municipality within the Gert Sibande District Municipality. The Maquasa East operations include the historical opencast and underground operations, the waste rock dump, Process Plant and administration buildings. Kangra is currently mining the underground and opencast coal resources at Maquasa West Extension. The life of mine for the opencast resources is expected to be reached in November 2019. In order to prevent retrenchments and allow for continuity in mining, the current staff operating the Maquasa West opencast pit will need to be moved to another opencast pit coal resource area.

It is the intention of Kangra Coal to expand the existing operations by mining opencast pit located within their current mining right area, at Maquasa East near the discard dump to augment the current production (Figure 1-3). No additional infrastructure is required. The proposed open cast pit will continue to use the following infrastructure that already exist within the mining right area. The Block C Pit will be located within the Maquasa East Operation, to the east of the existing discard dump and north of the processing plant. It will be located within the mine's mining right area on Farm Roodekraal 21HT which is owned by Kangra¹.

1.1 Surface Infrastructure

The Block C Open Pit Project will largely utilise existing support infrastructure located at the Maquasa East Section. The infrastructure is operated under the mine's approved EMPr and Water Use Licence. This includes:

- Processing Plant (South of the Pit).
- Run of Mine (ROM) Stockpile Pad (located at the processing plant)
- Haul and service roads
- Workshops and washbay areas (Processing plant area)
- Non-mineralogical waste storage areas
- Fuel/hazardous storage
- Explosives storage

The following infrastructure will require modification/expansion to accommodate the Block C Open Pit Project¹:

- Overburden Dump
- Clean water channels close to the open pit.
- Processing Plant (located 800m away from proposed open pit)
- Overburden dump (located 200m from proposed open pit)
- Haul roads (100m from proposed open pit)
- ROM stockpile area
- Product Stockpile area
- Pollution Control dams (600m from proposed pit)
- Stormwater Trenches (80m from proposed pit) ¹

2 QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF THE AUTHOR

The author (Elize Butler) has an MSc in Palaeontology from the University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa. She has been working in Palaeontology for more than twenty-four years. She has extensive experience in locating, collecting and curating fossils, including exploration field trips in search of new localities in the Karoo Basin. She has been a member of the Palaeontological Society of South Africa for 13 years. She has been conducting PIAs since 2014.

¹Information provided by PGS




Figure 1: Google Earth Image (2019) indicating the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations. Map provided by EXM Advisory Services.



Figure 2: Google Earth Image (2019) indicating the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations in white. Map was drawn by QGIS 2.18.28.




Figure 3. Extract of the 1:50 000 Topographical (2730 AB) map indicating the location of the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations in green. Map was drawn by QGIS 2.18.28..

3 LEGISLATION

3.1 National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)

Cultural Heritage in South Africa, includes all heritage resources, is protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) (NHRA). Heritage resources as defined in Section 3 of the Act include “**all objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects and material, meteorites and rare geological specimens**”.

Palaeontological heritage is unique and non-renewable and is protected by the NHRA. Palaeontological resources may not be unearthed, broken moved, or destroyed by any development without prior assessment and without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority as per section 35 of the NHRA.

This DIA forms part of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and adhere to the conditions of the Act. According to **Section 38 (1)**, an HIA is required to assess any potential impacts to palaeontological heritage within the development footprint where:

- the construction of a road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300 m in length;
- the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50 m in length;
- any development or other activity which will change the character of a site—
- (exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or
- involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
- involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
- the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority
- the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent;
- or any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a Provincial heritage resources authority.

4 OBJECTIVE

The objective of a DPIA is to determine the impact of the development on potential palaeontological material at the site.

According to the “SAHRA APM Guidelines: Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports” the aims of the PIA are: 1) to **identify** the palaeontological status of the exposed as well as rock formations just below the surface

in the development footprint 2) to estimate the **palaeontological importance** of the formations 3) to determine the **impact** on fossil heritage; and 4) to recommend how the developer ought to protect or mitigate damage to fossil heritage.

The terms of reference of a DPIA are as follows:

General Requirements:

- Adherence to the content requirements for specialist reports in accordance with Appendix 6 of the EIA Regulations 2014, as amended;
- Adherence to all applicable best practice recommendations, appropriate legislation and authority requirements;
- Submit a comprehensive overview of all appropriate legislation, guidelines;
- Description of the proposed project and provide information regarding the developer and consultant who commissioned the study,
- Description and location of the proposed development and provide geological and topographical maps
- Provide Palaeontological and geological history of the affected area.
- Identification sensitive areas to be avoided (providing shapefiles/kmls) in the proposed development;
- Evaluation of the significance of the planned development during the Pre-construction, Construction, Operation, Decommissioning Phases and Cumulative impacts. Potential impacts should be rated in terms of the direct, indirect and cumulative:
 - a. **Direct impacts** are impacts that are caused directly by the activity and generally occur at the same time and at the place of the activity.
 - b. **Indirect impacts** of an activity are indirect or induced changes that may occur as a result of the activity.
 - c. **Cumulative impacts** are impacts that result from the incremental impact of the proposed activity on a common resource when added to the impacts of other past, present or reasonably foreseeable future activities.
- Fair assessment of alternatives (infrastructure alternatives have been provided):
- Recommend mitigation measures to minimise the impact of the proposed development; and
- Implications of specialist findings for the proposed development (such as permits, licenses etc).




Figure 4. Surface geology of the proposed Kangra Coal Block C mining operations is completely underlain by the Vryheid Formation, Ecca Group (Karoo Supergroup). Map was drawn by QGIS 2.18.28.

5 GEOLOGICAL AND PALAEOONTOLOGICAL HISTORY

The proposed Kangra Maquasa Coal Block C development in Driefontein near Piet Retief, in the Mkhondo Local Municipality within the Gert Sibande District Municipality is entirely underlain by the Vryheid Formation of the Ecca Group (Karoo Supergroup) (Figure 4). According to the PalaeoMap of South African Heritage Resources Information System the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Vryheid Formation is Very High while the Ecca has a moderate Palaeontological Sensitivity (Almond and Pether 2008, SAHRIS website).

All the South African coalfields occur in the Main Karoo Basin or its associated sub-basins. The Main Karoo Basin forms part of a primary series of Gondwanan basins that was established along the southern boundary of Gondwana (Cole, 1992; De Wit and Ransome 1992; Veevers et al. 1994; Catuneanu et al. 1998;). These basins include Beacon Basin in Antarctica, Bowen Basin in Australia as well as the Paraná Basin in South America. The Basins formed between the Late Carboniferous and Middle Jurassic and their joint stratigraphies characterize the best record of non-marine sedimentation in the world.




Figure 5: Coalfields of Southern Africa, taken from Hancox and Götz (2014).

Most of the coal mined in South Africa is from the Permian Vryheid Formation (Figure 5). The depth of the Vryheid Formation in the main Karoo Basin varies from 70 m to 500 m near Vryheid and New Castle in Kwazulu-Natal, where the basin was at its deepest.

Table 1: *Ecca Group and Formations. (Modified from Johnson et al, 2006).*

| Period | Supergroup | Group | Formation West of 24° E | Formation East of 24° E | Formation Free State / KwaZulu Natal |
|---------|------------------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Permian | Karoo Supergroup | Ecca Group | Waterford Formation | Waterford Formation | Volksrust Formation |
| | | | Tierberg / Fort Brown Formation | Fort Brown Formation | |
| | | | Laingsburg / Rippon Formation | Rippon Formation | Vryheid Formation |
| | | | Collingham Formation | Collingham Formation | Pietermaritzburg Formation |
| | | | Whitehill Formation | Whitehill Formation | |
| | | | Prince Albert Formation | Prince Albert Formation | |
| | | | | Mbizane Formation | |
| | | | | | |

This Group consists of the following Formations (DWA, 1998):

The **Vryheid Formation** comprises mudrock, rhythmite, siltstone and fine- to coarse-grained sandstone (pebbly in places). The Formation contains up to five (mineable) coal seams. The different lithofacies are mainly arranged in upward-coarsening deltaic cycles (up to 80m thick in the southeast). Fining-upward fluvial cycles, of which up to six are present in the east, are typically sheet-like in geometry, although some form valley-fill deposits. They comprise coarse-grained to pebbly, immature sandstones - with an abrupt upward transition into fine-grained sediments and coal seams.

The Vryheid Formation is known to contain a rich assemblage of Glossopteris flora which is the source vegetation for the Vryheid Formation. Gymnospermous glossopterids dominated the peat and non-peat accumulating of Permian wetlands after continental deglaciation took place (Falcon, 1986c, Greb et al., 2006).

Recent paleobotanical studies in the Vryburg Formation include that of Adenforff (2005), Bordy and Prefec (2008) and Prefec *et al.* (2008, 2009, 2010) and Prevec, (2011). Bamford (2011) described numerous plant fossils from this formation (e.g. *Azaniodendron fertile*, *Cyclodendron leslii*, *Sphenophyllum hammanskraalensis*, *Annularia sp.*, *Raniganjia sp.*, *Asterotheca spp.*, *Liknopetalon enigmata*, *Hirsutum sp.*, *Scutum sp.*, *Ottokaria sp.*, *Estcourtia sp.*, *Arberia sp.*, *Lidgettonia sp.*, *Noeggerathiopsis sp.*, *Podocarpidites sp.* as well as more than 20 Glossopteris species.

In the past palynological studies have focused on the coal bearing successions of the Vryheid Formation and include articles by Aitken (1993, 1994, 1998), and Millsted (1994, 1999), while recent studies were conducted by Götz and Ruckwied (2014).

Bamford (2011) is of the opinion that only a small amount of data have been published on these potentially fossiliferous deposits and that most likely good material are present around coal mines and in other areas the exposures are poor and of little interest. When plant fossils do occur they are usually abundant. According to Bamford it is not feasible to preserve all the sites but in the interests of science these sites ought to be well documented, researched and the collected fossils must be housed in an accredited institution.

To date no fossil vertebrates have been collected from the Vryheid formation. The presence of fossil insects is rare, while palynomorphs are diverse. Non-marine bivalves and fish scales have also been reported from this formation. Trace fossils are abundantly found but the diversity is low. The mesosaurid reptile, *Mesosaurus* has been found in the southern parts of the basin but may also be present in other areas of the Vryheid formation. Regardless of the rare and irregular occurrence of fossils in this biozone a single fossil may be of scientific importance as many fossil taxa are known from a single fossil.




Figure 6: Extract of the 1 in 250 000 SAHRIS PalaeoMap map (Council of Geosciences). Approximate location of the proposed development is indicated in black

| Colour | Sensitivity | Required Action |
|---------------|--------------------|---|
| RED | VERY HIGH | field assessment and protocol for finds is required |
| ORANGE/YELLOW | HIGH | desktop study is required and based on the outcome of the desktop study, a field assessment is likely |
| GREEN | MODERATE | desktop study is required |
| BLUE | LOW | no palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required |
| GREY | INSIGNIFICANT/ZERO | no palaeontological studies are required |
| WHITE/CLEAR | UNKNOWN | these areas will require a minimum of a desktop study. As more information comes to light, SAHRA will continue to populate the map. |

According to the SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map (Figure 6) there is very high possibility of finding fossils in this area.

6 GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF THE SITE

The proposed Kangra Maquasa Block C Mining development in Driefontein is located west of the town of Piet Retief, in the Mkhondo Local Municipality within the Gert Sibande District Municipality (See Figure 2).

7 METHODS

A desktop study was assembled to evaluate the possible risk to palaeontological heritage (this includes fossils as well as trace fossils) in the proposed development area. In compiling the desktop report aerial photos, Google Earth 2018, topographical and geological maps and other reports from the same area as well as the author's experience were used to assess the proposed development footprint.

7.1 Assumptions and Limitations

The accuracy of DIA is reduced by several factors which may include the following: the databases of institutions are not always up to date and relevant locality and geological information were not accurately documented in the past. Various remote areas of South Africa have not been assessed by palaeontologists and data is based on aerial photographs alone. Geological maps concentrate on the geology of an area and the sheet explanations were never intended to focus on palaeontological heritage.

Similar Assemblage Zones, but in different areas is used to provide information on the presence of fossil heritage in an unmapped area. Desktop studies of similar geological formations and Assemblage Zones generally **assume** that exposed fossil heritage is present within the development area. The accuracy of the Palaeontological Impact Assessment is thus improved considerably by conducting a field-assessment.

8 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONSULTED

In compiling this report the following sources were consulted:

- The Palaeosensitivity Map from the SAHRIS website.
- 2730 AB Topographical map
- Geological map 1:100 000, Geology of the Republic of South Africa (Visser 1984)
- A Google Earth map with polygons of the proposed development was obtained from PGS Consultants.

- Palaeontological Impact Assessments found on the internet in close vicinity of the proposed development include Bamford, 2017. This assessment is included in the reference list.

9 IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

An assessment of the impact significance of the proposed BRMO upgrade on local fossil heritage is presented here:

9.1 Methodology for Impact Assessment

In order to ensure uniformity, a standard impact assessment methodology has been utilised so that a wide range of impacts can be compared. The impact assessment methodology makes provision for the assessment of impacts against the following criteria:

- Significance;
- Spatial scale;
- Temporal scale;
- Probability; and
- Degree of certainty.

A combined quantitative and qualitative methodology was used to describe impacts for each of the aforementioned assessment criteria. A summary of each of the qualitative descriptors, along with the equivalent quantitative rating scale for each of the aforementioned criteria, is given in Error! Reference source not found..

Table 2: Quantitative rating and equivalent descriptors for the impact assessment criteria

| RATING | SIGNIFICANCE | EXTENT SCALE | TEMPORAL SCALE |
|--------|------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1 | VERY LOW | <i>Isolated site/ proposed corridor</i> | <u>Incidental</u> |
| 2 | LOW | Study area | <u>Short-term</u> |
| 3 | MODERATE | <i>Local</i> | <u>Medium-term</u> |
| 4 | HIGH | <i>Regional / Provincial</i> | <u>Long-term</u> |
| 5 | VERY HIGH | <i>Global / National</i> | Permanent |

A more detailed description of each of the assessment criteria is given in the following sections.

9.1.1 Significance Assessment

The Significance rating (importance) of the associated impacts embraces the notion of extent and magnitude, but does not always clearly define these, since their importance in the rating scale is very relative. For example, the magnitude (i.e. the size) of an area affected by atmospheric pollution may be extremely large (1000 km²) but the significance of this effect is dependent on the concentration or level of pollution. If the concentration is great, the significance of the impact would be HIGH or VERY HIGH, but if it is diluted it would be VERY LOW or LOW. Similarly, if 60 ha of a grassland type are destroyed, the impact would be VERY HIGH if only 100 ha of that grassland type were known. The impact would be VERY LOW if the grassland type was common.

A more detailed description of the impact significance rating scale is given in Error! Reference source not found. below.

Table 3: Description of the significance rating scale

| RATING | | DESCRIPTION |
|--------|-----------|--|
| 5 | VERY HIGH | Of the highest order possible within the bounds of impacts which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts: there is no possible mitigation and/or remedial activity which could offset the impact. In the case of beneficial impacts, there is no real alternative to achieving this benefit. |
| 4 | HIGH | Impact is of substantial order within the bounds of impacts which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts: mitigation and/or remedial activity is feasible but difficult, expensive, time-consuming or some combination of these. In the case of beneficial impacts, other means of achieving this benefit are feasible but they are more difficult, expensive, time-consuming or some combination of these. |
| 3 | MODERATE | Impact is real but not substantial in relation to other impacts, which might take effect within the bounds of those which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts: mitigation and/or remedial activity are both feasible and fairly easily possible. In the case of beneficial impacts: other means of achieving this benefit are about equal in time, cost, effort, etc. |
| 2 | LOW | Impact is of a low order and therefore likely to have little real effect. In the case of adverse impacts: mitigation and/or remedial activity is either easily achieved or little will be required, or both. In the case of beneficial impacts, alternative means for achieving this benefit are likely to be easier, cheaper, more effective, less time consuming, or some combination of these. |
| 1 | VERY LOW | Impact is negligible within the bounds of impacts which could occur. In the case of adverse impacts, almost no mitigation and/or remedial activity |

| | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| | | are needed, and any minor steps which might be needed are easy, cheap, and simple. In the case of beneficial impacts, alternative means are almost all likely to be better, in one or a number of ways, than this means of achieving the benefit. Three additional categories must also be used where relevant. They are in addition to the category represented on the scale, and if used, will replace the scale. |
| 0 | NO IMPACT | There is no impact at all - not even a very low impact on a party or system. |

9.1.2 Spatial Scale

The spatial scale refers to the extent of the impact i.e. will the impact be felt at the local, regional, or global scale. The spatial assessment scale is described in more detail in the table below.

Table 4: Description of the Spatial significance rating scale

| RATING | | DESCRIPTION |
|--------|-----------------------------------|---|
| 5 | Global/National | The maximum extent of any impact. |
| 4 | Regional/Provincial | The spatial scale is moderate within the bounds of possible impacts, and will be felt at a regional scale (District Municipality to Provincial Level). The impact will affect an area up to 50 km from the proposed site. |
| 3 | Local | The impact will affect an area up to 5 km from the proposed site. |
| 2 | Study Area | The impact will affect an area not exceeding the boundary of the study area. |
| 1 | Isolated Sites / proposed site | The impact will affect an area no bigger than the site. |

9.1.3 Temporal/Duration Scale

In order to accurately describe the impact, it is necessary to understand the duration and persistence of an impact in the environment. The temporal or duration scale is rated according to criteria set out in **Table 5**.

Table 5: Description of the temporal rating scale

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
|--------|-------------|
|--------|-------------|

| | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| 1 | Incidental | The impact will be limited to isolated incidences that are expected to occur very sporadically. |
| 2 | Short-term | The environmental impact identified will operate for the duration of the construction phase or a period of less than 5 years, whichever is the greater. |
| 3 | Medium-term | The environmental impact identified will operate for the duration of life of the project. |
| 4 | Long-term | The environmental impact identified will operate beyond the life of operation of the project. |
| 5 | Permanent | The environmental impact will be permanent. |

9.1.4 Degree of Probability

The probability, or likelihood, of an impact occurring will be described as shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Description of the degree of probability of an impact occurring

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
|--------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Practically impossible |
| 2 | Unlikely |
| 3 | Could happen |
| 4 | Very likely |
| 5 | It's going to happen / has occurred |

9.1.5 Degree of Certainty

As with all studies, it is not possible to be 100% certain of all facts, and for this reason a standard “degree of certainty” scale is used, as discussed in Error! Reference source not found.. The level of detail for specialist studies is determined according to the degree of certainty required for decision-making. The impacts are discussed in terms of affected parties or environmental components.

Table 7: Description of the degree of certainty rating scale

| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
|----------|--|
| Definite | More than 90% sure of a particular fact. |
| Probable | Between 70 and 90% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring. |

| | |
|------------|--|
| Possible | Between 40 and 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of an impact occurring. |
| Unsure | Less than 40% sure of a particular fact or the likelihood of an impact occurring. |
| Can't know | The consultant believes an assessment is not possible even with additional research. |

9.1.6 Quantitative Description of Impacts

To allow for impacts to be described in a quantitative manner, in addition to the qualitative description given above, a rating scale of between 1 and 5 was used for each of the assessment criteria. Thus, the total value of the impact is described as the function of significance, spatial and temporal scale, as described below:

$$\text{Impact Risk} = \frac{(\text{SIGNIFICANCE} + \text{Spatial} + \text{Temporal}) \times \text{Probability}}{3 \quad \quad \quad 5}$$

An example of how this rating scale is applied is shown below:

Table 8: Example of Rating Scale

| IMPACT | SIGNIFICANCE | SPATIAL SCALE | TEMPORAL SCALE | PROBABILITY | RATING |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| | Very High | Study Area | Permanent | Very likely | High |
| Impact on heritage sites | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3.2 |

Note: The significance, spatial and temporal scales are added to give a total of 12, which is divided by 3 to give a criterion rating of 4. The probability (4) is divided by 5 to give a probability rating of 0.8. The criteria rating of 4 is then multiplied by the probability rating (0.8) to give the final rating of 3.2.

The impact risk is classified according to 5 classes as described in the table below.

Table 9: Impact Risk Classes

| RATING | IMPACT CLASS | DESCRIPTION |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|
| 0.1 – 1.0 | 1 | Very Low |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1.1 – 2.0 | 2 | Low |
| 2.1 – 3.0 | 3 | Moderate |
| 3.1 – 4.0 | 4 | High |
| 4.1 – 5.0 | 5 | Very High |

Therefore, with reference to the example used for air quality above, an impact rating of 3.2 will fall in the Impact Class 4, which will be considered to be a High impact.

9.2 Summary of Impact Tables

The development footprint is completely underlain by the Vryheid Formation of the Ecca Group. The Palaeontological Sensitivity of this formation is rated as Very High. The expected duration of the impact is assessed as potentially permanent. In the absence of mitigation procedures (should fossil material be present within the affected area) the damage or destruction of any palaeontological materials will be **permanent**. Impacts on palaeontological heritage during the construction phase could potentially occur but are regarded as having a Very High possibility.

10 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed Kangra Maquasa Block C mining development in Driefontein near Piet Retief, in the Mkhondo Local Municipality within the Gert Sibande District Municipality is entirely underlain by the Vryheid Formation of the Ecca Group (Karoo Supergroup). According to the PalaeoMap of South African Heritage Resources Information System the Palaeontological Sensitivity of the Vryheid Formation is Very High while the Ecca has a moderate Palaeontological Sensitivity (Almond and Pether 2008, SAHRIS website).

An EIA level palaeontology report will be conducted to assess the value and prominence of fossils in the development area and the effect of the proposed development on the palaeontological heritage. The purpose of the EIA Report is to elaborate on the issues and potential impacts identified during the scoping phase. A Phase 1 field-based assessment will be conducted and research in the site-specific study area as well as a comprehensive assessment of the impacts identified during the scoping phase.

11 REFERENCES

ALMOND, J.E. and PETHER, J. 2009. SAHRA Palaeotechnical Report: Palaeontological Heritage of the Northern Cape Province. South African Heritage Resources Agency, Pp 1-143.

ALMOND, J., PETHER, J, and GROENEWALD, G. 2013. South African National Fossil Sensitivity Map. SAHRA and Council for Geosciences. Schweitzer *et al.* (1995) pp p288.

BAMDORD, M. 2017. Desktop Palaeontological Assessment for the proposed upgrade of the National Route N2 Section 34 (Between Piet Retief and Ermelo): link and grade-separation for existing intersection at Provincial Road P97/2 and D803 for Kangra Mine Coal Haulage at Panbult, Mpumalanga Province

DU TOIT, A. 1954. The geology of South Africa. xii + 611pp, 41 pls. Oliver & Boyd, Edinburg.

FALCON, R.M.S., 1986. A brief review of the origin, formation, and distribution of coal in southern Africa, in: Anhaesser, C.R., Maske, S. (Eds.), Mineral Deposits of Southern Africa, Vol. II, Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg, pp. 1879–1898.

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, Pp 535-574.

MACRAE, C. 1999. Life etched in stone. Fossils of South Africa. 305 pp. The Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg.

SG 2.2 SAHRA APMHOB Guidelines, 2012. Minimum standards for palaeontological components of Heritage Impact Assessment Reports, Pp 1-15.

VAN DER MERWE, S.J. 1997. Basin Analysis of the Kalahari Manganese Basin. Unpublished MSc Thesis, UOFS.

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.

Appendix A – Elize Butler CV

CURRICULUM VITAE

ELIZE BUTLER

PROFESSION: Palaeontologist
YEARS' EXPERIENCE: 26 years in Palaeontology

EDUCATION: B.Sc Botany and Zoology, 1988
University of the Orange Free State

B.Sc (Hons) Zoology, 1991
University of the Orange Free State

Management Course, 1991
University of the Orange Free State

M. Sc. *Cum laude* (Zoology), 2009
University of the Free State

Dissertation title: The postcranial skeleton of the Early Triassic non-mammalian Cynodont *Galesaurus planiceps*: implications for biology and lifestyle

Registered as a PhD fellow at the Zoology Department of the UFS

2013 to current

Dissertation title: A new gorgonopsian from the uppermost *Daptocephalus Assemblage Zone*, in the Karoo Basin of South Africa

MEMBERSHIP

Palaeontological Society of South Africa (PSSA) 2006-currently

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Part-time Laboratory assistant Department of Zoology & Entomology
University of the Free State Zoology
1989-1992

Part-time laboratory assistant Department of Virology
University of the Free State Zoology
1992

| | |
|---|--|
| Research Assistant | National Museum, Bloemfontein 1993 – 1997 |
| Principal Research Assistant and Collection Manager | National Museum, Bloemfontein 1998–currently |

TECHNICAL REPORTS

Butler, E. 2014. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed upgrade of existing water supply infrastructure at Noupoort, Northern Cape Province. 2014. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological impact assessment of the proposed consolidation, re-division and development of 250 serviced erven in Nieu-Bethesda, Camdeboo local municipality, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological impact assessment of the proposed mixed land developments at Rooikraal 454, Vrede, Free State. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological exemption report of the proposed truck stops development at Palmiet 585, Vrede, Free State. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological impact assessment of the proposed Orange Grove 3500 residential development, Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality East London, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Gonubie residential development, Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality East London, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Ficksburg raw water pipeline. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Heritage Impact Assessment report on the establishment of the 65 MW Majuba Solar Photovoltaic facility and associated infrastructure on portion 1, 2 and 6 of the farm Witkoppies 81 HS, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed township establishment on the remainder of portion 6 and 7 of the farm Sunnyside 2620, Bloemfontein, Mangaung metropolitan municipality, Free State, Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Woodhouse 1 photovoltaic solar energy facilities and associated infrastructure on the farm Woodhouse729, near Vryburg, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Woodhouse 2 photovoltaic solar energy facilities and associated infrastructure on the farm Woodhouse 729, near Vryburg, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Orkney solar energy farm and associated infrastructure on the remaining extent of Portions 7 and 21 of the farm Wolvehuis 114, near Orkney, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2015. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Spectra foods broiler houses and abattoir on the farm Maiden Manor 170 and Ashby Manor 171, Lukhanji Municipality, Queenstown, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of the 150 MW Noupoot concentrated solar power facility and associated infrastructure on portion 1 and 4 of the farm Carolus Poort 167 and the remainder of Farm 207, near Noupoot, Northern Cape. Prepared for Savannah Environmental. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Woodhouse 1 Photovoltaic Solar Energy facility and associated infrastructure on the farm Woodhouse 729, near Vryburg, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Woodhouse 2 Photovoltaic Solar Energy facility and associated infrastructure on the farm Woodhouse 729, near Vryburg, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Proposed 132kV overhead power line and switchyard station for the authorised Solis Power 1 CSP project near Upington, Northern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Senqu Pedestrian Bridges in Ward 5 of Senqu Local Municipality, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Recommendation from further Palaeontological Studies: Proposed Construction of the Modderfontein Filling Station on Erf 28 Portion 30, Founders Hill, City Of Johannesburg, Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Recommendation from further Palaeontological Studies: Proposed Construction of the Modikwa Filling Station on a Portion of Portion 2 of Mooihoek 255 Kt, Greater Tubatse Local Municipality, Limpopo Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Recommendation from further Palaeontological Studies: Proposed Construction of the Heidedal filling station on Erf 16603, Heidedal Extension 24, Mangaung Local Municipality, Bloemfontein, Free State Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Recommended Exemption from further Palaeontological studies: Proposed Construction of the Gunstfontein Switching Station, 132kv Overhead Power Line (Single Or Double Circuit) and ancillary infrastructure for the Gunstfontein Wind Farm Near Sutherland, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Galla Hills Quarry on the remainder of the farm Roode Krantz 203, in the Lukhanji Municipality, division of Queenstown, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Chris Hani District Municipality Cluster 9 water backlog project phases 3a and 3b: Palaeontology inspection at Tsomo WTW. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of the 150 MW Noupoot concentrated solar power facility and associated infrastructure on portion 1 and 4 of the farm Carolus Poort 167 and the remainder of Farm 207, near Noupoot, Northern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed upgrading of the main road MR450 (R335) from the Motherwell to Addo within the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality and Sunday's river valley Local Municipality, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment construction of the proposed Metals Industrial Cluster and associated infrastructure near Kuruman, Northern Cape province. Savannah South Africa. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed construction of up to a 132kv power line and associated infrastructure for the proposed Kalkaar Solar Thermal Power Plant near Kimberley, Free State, and Northern Cape Provinces. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed development of two burrow pits (DR02625 and DR02614) in the Enoch Mgijima Municipality, Chris Hani District, Eastern Cape.

Butler, E. 2016. Ezibeleni waste Buy-Back Centre (near Queenstown), Enoch Mgijima Local Municipality, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed construction of two 5 Mw Solar Photovoltaic Power Plants on Farm Wildebeestkuil 59 and Farm Leeuwbosch 44, Leeudoringstad, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed development of four Leeuwberg Wind farms and basic assessments for the associated grid connection near Loeriesfontein, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological impact assessment for the proposed Aggeneys south prospecting right project, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological impact assessment of the proposed Motuoane Ladysmith Exploration right application, KwaZulu Natal. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016. Palaeontological impact assessment for the proposed construction of two 5 MW solar photovoltaic power plants on farm Wildebeestkuil 59 and farm Leeuwbosch 44, Leeudoringstad, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2016: Palaeontological desktop assessment of the establishment of the proposed residential and mixed-use development on the remainder of portion 7 and portion 898 of the farm Knopjeslaagte 385 Ir, located near Centurion within the Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality of Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological impact assessment for the proposed development of a new cemetery, near Kathu, Gamagara local municipality and John Taolo Gaetsewe district municipality, Northern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment Of The Proposed Development Of The New Open Cast Mining Operations On The Remaining Portions Of 6, 7, 8 And 10 Of The Farm Kwaggafontein 8 In The Carolina Magisterial District, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the Proposed Development of a Wastewater Treatment Works at Lanseria, Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Scoping Report for the Proposed Construction of a Warehouse and Associated Infrastructure at Perseverance in Port Elizabeth, Eastern Cape Province.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the Proposed Establishment of a Diesel Farm and a Haul Road for the Tshipi Borwa mine Near Hotazel, In the John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality in the Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the Proposed Changes to Operations at the UMK Mine near Hotazel, In the John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality in the Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the Development of the Proposed Ventersburg Project-An Underground Mining Operation near Ventersburg and Henneman, Free State Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological desktop assessment of the proposed development of a 3000 MW combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT) in Richards Bay, KwaZulu-Natal. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the Development of the Proposed Revalidation of the lapsed General Plans for Elliotdale, Mbhashe Local Municipality. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological assessment of the proposed development of a 3000 MW Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) in Richards Bay, KwaZulu-Natal. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed development of the new opencast mining operations on the remaining portions of 6, 7, 8 and 10 of the farm Kwaggafontein 8 10 in the Albert Luthuli Local Municipality, Gert Sibande District Municipality, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed mining of the farm Zandvoort 10 in the Albert Luthuli Local Municipality, Gert Sibande District Municipality, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed Lanseria outfall sewer pipeline in Johannesburg, Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed development of open-pit mining at Pit 36W (New Pit) and 62E (Dishaba) Amandelbult Mine Complex, Thabazimbi, Limpopo Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological impact assessment of the proposed development of the sports precinct and associated infrastructure at Merrifield Preparatory school and college, Amathole Municipality, East London. PGS Heritage. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological impact assessment of the proposed construction of the Lehae training and fire station, Lenasia, Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed development of the new opencast mining operations of the Impunzi mine in the Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the construction of the proposed Viljoenskroon Munic 132 KV line, Vierfontein substation and related projects. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed rehabilitation of 5 ownerless asbestos mines. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed development of the Lephalale coal and power project, Lephalale, Limpopo Province, Republic of South Africa. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of a 132KV powerline from the Tweespruit distribution substation (in the Mantsopa local municipality) to the Driedorp rural substation (within the Naledi local municipality), Free State province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed development of the new coal-fired power plant and associated infrastructure near Makhado, Limpopo Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of a Photovoltaic Solar Power station near Collett substation, Middelberg, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed township establishment of 2000 residential sites with supporting amenities on a portion of farm 826 in Botshabelo West, Mangaung Metro, Free State Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed prospecting right project without bulk sampling, in the Koa Valley, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed Aroams prospecting right project, without bulk sampling, near Aggeneys, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Belvior aggregate quarry II on portion 7 of the farm Maidenhead 169, Enoch Mjijima Municipality, division of Queenstown, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. PIA site visit and report of the proposed Galla Hills Quarry on the remainder of the farm Roode Krantz 203, in the Lukhanji Municipality, division of Queenstown, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of Tina Falls Hydropower and associated power lines near Cumbu, Mthlontlo Local Municipality, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed construction of the Mangaung Gariep Water Augmentation Project. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed Belvoir aggregate quarry II on portion 7 of the farm Maidenhead 169, Enoch Mjijima Municipality, division of Queenstown, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of the Melkspruit-Rouxville 132KV Power line. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017 Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed development of a railway siding on a portion of portion 41 of the farm Rustfontein 109 is, Govan Mbeki local municipality, Gert Sibande district municipality, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed consolidation of the proposed Ilima Colliery in the Albert Luthuli local municipality, Gert Sibande District Municipality, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed extension of the Kareerand Tailings Storage Facility, associated borrow pits as well as a stormwater drainage channel in the Vaal River near Stilfontein, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed construction of a filling station and associated facilities on the Erf 6279, district municipality of John Taolo Gaetsewe District, Ga-Segonyana Local Municipality Northern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed of the Lephale Coal and Power Project, Lephale, Limpopo Province, Republic of South Africa. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed Overvaal Trust PV Facility, Buffelspoort, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed development of the H2 Energy Power Station and associated infrastructure on Portions 21; 22 And 23 of the farm Hartebeestspruit in the Thembisile Hani Local Municipality, Nkangala District near Kwamhlanga, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed upgrade of the Sandriver Canal and Klippan Pump station in Welkom, Free State Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed upgrade of the 132kv and 11kv power line into a dual circuit above ground power line feeding into the Urania substation in Welkom, Free State Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed Swaziland-Mozambique border patrol road and Mozambique barrier structure. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed diamonds alluvial & diamonds general prospecting right application near Christiana on the remaining extent of portion 1 of the farm Kaffraria 314, registration division HO, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed development of Wastewater Treatment Works on Hartebeesfontein, near Panbult, Mpumalanga. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2017. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed development of Wastewater Treatment Works on Rustplaas near Piet Retief, Mpumalanga. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the Proposed Landfill Site in Luckhoff, Letsemeng Local Municipality, Xhariep District, Free State. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed development of the new Mutsho coal-fired power plant and associated infrastructure near Makhado, Limpopo Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the authorization and amendment processes for Manangu mine near Delmas, Victor Khanye local municipality, Mpumalanga. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed Mashishing township establishment in Mashishing (Lydenburg), Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the Proposed Mlonzi Estate Development near Lusikisiki, Ngquza Hill Local Municipality, Eastern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Phase 1 Assessment of the proposed Swaziland-Mozambique border patrol road and Mozambique barrier structure. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed electricity expansion project and Sekgame Switching Station at the Sishen Mine, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological field assessment of the proposed construction of the Zonnebloem Switching Station (132/22kV) and two loop-in loop-out power lines (132kV) in the Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Field Assessment for the proposed re-alignment and decommissioning of the Firham-Platrand 88kv Powerline, near Standerton, Lekwa Local Municipality, Mpumalanga province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed Villa Rosa development In the Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality, East London. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological field Assessment of the proposed Villa Rosa development In the Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality, East London. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological desktop assessment of the proposed Mookodi – Mahikeng 400kV line, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the proposed Thornhill Housing Project, Ndlambe Municipality, Port Alfred, Eastern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological desktop assessment of the proposed housing development on portion 237 of farm Hartebeestpoort 328. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological desktop assessment of the proposed New Age Chicken layer facility located on holding 75 Endicott near Springs in Gauteng. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018 Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the development of the proposed Leslie 1 Mining Project near Leandra, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological field assessment of the proposed development of the Wildealskloof mixed-use development near Bloemfontein, Free State Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Field Assessment of the proposed Megamor Extension, East London. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed diamonds Alluvial & Diamonds General Prospecting Right Application near Christiana on the Remaining Extent of Portion 1 of the Farm Kaffraria 314, Registration Division HO, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of a new 11kV (1.3km) Power Line to supply electricity to a cell tower on farm 215 near Delportshoop in the Northern Cape. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Field Assessment of the proposed construction of a new 22 kV single wood pole structure power line to the proposed MTN tower, near Britstown, Northern Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Exemption Letter for the proposed reclamation and reprocessing of the City Deep Dumps in Johannesburg, Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Exemption letter for the proposed reclamation and reprocessing of the City Deep Dumps and Rooikraal Tailings Facility in Johannesburg, Gauteng Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Proposed Kalabasfontein Mine Extension project, near Bethal, Govan Mbeki District Municipality, Mpumalanga. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the development of the proposed Leslie 1 Mining Project near Leandra, Mpumalanga Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop assessment of the Proposed New Age Chicken Layer Facility located on Holding 75 Endicott near Springs in Gauteng. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Desktop Assessment of the proposed Mookodi – Mahikeng 400kV Line, North West Province. Bloemfontein.

Butler, E. 2018. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Proposed 325mw Rondekop Wind Energy Facility between Matjiesfontein and Sutherland in the Northern Cape Province.

Butler, E. 2018. Palaeontological Impact Assessment of the proposed construction of the Tooverberg Wind Energy Facility, and associated grid connection near Touws River in the Western Cape Province. Bloemfontein.

CONFERENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

NATIONAL

PRESENTATION

Butler, E., Botha-Brink, J., and F. Abdala. A new gorgonopsian from the uppermost *Dicynodon Assemblage Zone*, Karoo Basin of South Africa. 18th Biennial conference of the PSSA 2014. Wits, Johannesburg, South Africa.

INTERNATIONAL

Attended the Society of Vertebrate Palaeontology 73th Conference in Los Angeles, America. October 2012.

CONFERENCES: POSTER PRESENTATION

NATIONAL

Butler, E., and J. Botha-Brink. Cranial skeleton of *Galesaurus planiceps*, implications for biology and lifestyle. University of the Free State Seminar Day, Bloemfontein. South Africa. November 2007.

Butler, E., and J. Botha-Brink. Postcranial skeleton of *Galesaurus planiceps*, implications for biology and lifestyle. 14th Conference of the PSSA, Matjiesfontein, South Africa. September 2008:

Butler, E., and J. Botha-Brink. The biology of the South African non-mammaliaform cynodont *Galesaurus planiceps*. 15th Conference of the PSSA, Howick, South Africa. August 2008.

INTERNATIONAL VISITS

Natural History Museum, London

July 2008

Paleontological Institute, Russian Academy of Science, Moscow

November 2014