

**Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the
proposed extension of mining for Kranspan
Colliery, southwest of Carolina,
Mpumalanga Province**

Site Visit Report (Phase 2)

For

Beyond Heritage

11 December 2022

Prof Marion Bamford
Palaeobotanist
P Bag 652, WITS 2050
Johannesburg, South Africa
Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za

Expertise of Specialist

The Palaeontologist Consultant: Prof Marion Bamford

Qualifications: PhD (Wits Univ, 1990); FRSSAf, ASSAf

Experience: 33 years research; 25 years PIA studies

Declaration of Independence

This report has been compiled by Professor Marion Bamford, of the University of the Witwatersrand, sub-contracted by Beyond Heritage, Modimolle, South Africa. The views expressed in this report are entirely those of the author and no other interest was displayed during the decision making process for the Project.

Specialist: Prof Marion Bamford

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Bamford', with a horizontal line underneath it.

Signature:

Executive Summary

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the proposed extension of coal mining activities on Farm Kranspan 210 IS to include two adjacent farms, Vaalbank 212 and Farm Roodebloem 51 IT, about 18km southwest of Carolina. Ilima Coal Company plans to extend the opencast pits and increase coal production. Minimal surface infrastructure will be required.

To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit (Phase 2) Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development.

The proposed sites lie entirely on potentially very highly sensitive rocks of the Vryheid Formation (Ecca Group, Karoo Supergroup) that could preserve impressions of fossil plants of the *Glossopteris* flora. The site visit and walk through by the palaeontologist confirmed that there are NO FOSSIL PLANTS of the *Glossopteris* flora present on the surface. The area is flat and open with secondary grassland or glades of invasive trees. Most of the area has been cultivated previously. It is unknown if there are fossils below the ground surface, therefore, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the contractor, developer, environmental officer or other designated responsible person once excavations, drilling or mining activities have commenced. Since the impact will be low to moderate, as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised provided that any fossils found are rescued and that SAHRA is notified.

Table of Contents

Expertise of Specialist	2
Declaration of Independence	2
1. Background	5
2. Methods and Terms of Reference.....	8
3. Geology and Palaeontology.....	8
i. Project location and geological context	8
ii. Palaeontological context.....	10
iii. Site visit observations	11
4. Impact assessment.....	17
5. Assumptions and uncertainties.....	18
6. Recommendation.....	18
7. References	19
8. Chance Find Protocol	20
9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils	21
10. Appendix B – Details of specialist.....	22
Figure 1: Google Earth map of the project area	7
Figure 2: Google Earth Map of the project footprint	8
Figure 3: Geological map of the area around the project site.....	9
Figure 4: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the project	11
Figures 5-9: Site visit photographs	12-16

1. Background

Ilima Coal Company is seeking to apply for an EA and IWULA in support of an S102 MPRDA application.

Ilima Coal already has an EA, IWULA and mining right over the Farm Kranspan, situated approximately 18 km south west of Carolina in the Mpumalanga Province. The company is now seeking to expand the Kranspan Mining Right Area (MRA) through the inclusion of two prospecting right areas (PRAs) situated to the south-west and east of the Kranspan MRA (Figures 1-2).

All the required mine infrastructure for the Project Area will be established within the proposed Kranspan Mining Right Extension site. The B Seam, C Upper and Lower and the E Seam are all considered economic to mine (Ilima Mine Works Programme, 2022). On the Farm Vaalbank 212 IS, the C and B Seam reserve will be mined through opencast mining, and mine infrastructure will be established. On Farm Roodebloem 51 IT, the E Seam will be mined through opencast mining, and mine infrastructure will be established.

All the required mine infrastructure for the additional mining areas (Vaalbank 212 IS and Roodebloem 51 IT) that are being incorporated through the Section 102 application will be serviced from the existing Kranspan mine.

The client has been advised that a S102 MPRDA application and associated new EA and new IWUL is required.

The mine works programme and mine design for the two PRAs is indicated as follows:

- The intention for the proposed extension areas is surface (opencast) mining focusing on extraction of the B, CL and E Seam via the roll over mining method.
- Besides the open pits, haul roads, temporary topsoil and overburden stockpiles, ROM stockpiles and PCDs will be established on the proposed extension areas as part of the mining process. In addition, temporary container-type office and ablution facilities and potable water abstraction boreholes will be established. The location of all these is still to be determined.
- A coal processing plant (wet and dry) will be established on the proposed extension areas to process the coal following extraction. This will include dry crushing and screening of the coal at the processing plant area, and beneficiation of the export coal product through an on-site coal washing plant with filter press.
- The two prospecting right areas will be applied for as a single application – this report, therefore, addresses both areas (Figure 2).

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the Kranspan Coal project. To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in

terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit and walkthrough (Phase 2) Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development and is reported herein.

Table 1: National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014 (as amended) - Requirements for Specialist Reports (Appendix 6).

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
ai	Details of the specialist who prepared the report,	Appendix B
aii	The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Appendix B
b	A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page 2
c	An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
ci	An indication of the quality and age of the base data used for the specialist report: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map accessed – date of this report	Yes
cii	A description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change	Section 5
d	The date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	N/A
e	A description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process	Section 2
f	The specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the activity and its associated structures and infrastructure	Section 4
g	An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	N/A
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;	N/A
i	A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 5
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	Section 4
k	Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 8, Appendix A
l	Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A
m	Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 8, Appendix A

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
ni	A reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised	Section 6
nii	If the opinion is that the proposed activity 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	Sections 6, 8
o	A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A
p	A summary and copies of any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A
q	Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A
2	Where a government notice gazetted 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.	N/A



Figure 1: Google Earth map of the proposed expansion of coal mining on Farms Kranspan, Vaalbank and Roodebloem (red outline) showing the relevant land marks.




Figure 2: Annotated Aerial map for the Kranspan Colliery extended mining area.

2. Methods and Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this study were to undertake a PIA and provide feasible management measures to comply with the requirements of SAHRA.

The methods employed to address the ToR included:

1. Consultation of geological maps, literature, palaeontological databases, published and unpublished records to determine the likelihood of fossils occurring in the affected areas. Sources included records housed at the Evolutionary Studies Institute at the University of the Witwatersrand and SAHRA databases;
2. Where necessary, site visits by a qualified palaeontologist to locate any fossils and assess their importance, as is the case here;
3. Where appropriate, collection of unique or rare fossils with the necessary permits for storage and curation at an appropriate facility (*not applicable to this assessment*); and
4. Determination of fossils' representivity or scientific importance to decide if the fossils can be destroyed or a representative sample collected (*not applicable to this assessment*).

3. Geology and Palaeontology

i. Project location and geological context

The site lies in the northeastern part of the Karoo basin where the lower Karoo Supergroup strata are exposed (Figure 3). Along the rivers and streams much young reworked sands and alluvium overly the older strata.




Figure 3: Geological map of the area west of Newcastle, and Farms Craig 2989 HS and Waterfall 3335 HS. Abbreviations of the rock types are explained in Table 2. Map enlarged from the Geological Survey 1: 250 000 map 2728 Frankfort.

Table 2: Explanation of symbols for the geological map and approximate ages (Johnson et al., 2006; Partridge et al., 2006). SG = Supergroup; Fm = Formation; Ma = million years; grey shading = formations impacted by the project.

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Qc	Quaternary	Alluvium, sand, calcrete	Neogene, ca 2.5 Ma to present
Jd	Jurassic dykes	Dolerite dykes, intrusive	Jurassic, Ca 183 Ma

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Pv	Vryheid Fm, Ecca Group, Karoo SG	Shales, mudstone, sandstone, coal seams	Early Permian Ca 290-270 Ma

The Karoo Supergroup rocks cover a very large proportion of South Africa and extend from the northeast (east of Pretoria) to the southwest and across to almost the KwaZulu Natal south coast. It is bounded along the southern margin by the Cape Fold Belt and along the northern margin by the much older Transvaal Supergroup rocks. Representing some 120 million years (300 – 183Ma), the Karoo Supergroup rocks have preserved a diversity of fossil plants, insects, vertebrates and invertebrates.

During the Carboniferous Period South Africa was part of the huge continental landmass known as Gondwanaland and it was positioned over the South Pole. As a result, there were several ice sheets that formed and melted, and covered most of South Africa (Visser, 1986, 1989; Isbell et al., 2012). Gradual melting of the ice as the continental mass moved northwards and the earth warmed, formed fine-grained sediments in the large inland sea. These are the oldest rocks in the system and are exposed around the outer part of the ancient Karoo Basin, and are known as the Dwyka Group. They comprise tillites, diamictites, mudstones, siltstones and sandstones that were deposited as the basin filled. This group has been divided into two formations with Elandsvlei Formation occurring throughout the basin and the upper Mbizane Formation occurring only in the Free State and KwaZulu Natal (Johnson et al., 2006).

Overlying the Dwyka Group rocks are rocks of the Ecca Group that are Early Permian in age. There are eleven formations recognised in this group but they do not all extend throughout the Karoo Basin. In Mpumalanga, the Free State and KwaZulu Natal, from the base upwards are the Pietermaritzburg Formation, **Vryheid Formation** and the Volksrust Formation. All of these sediments have varying proportions of sandstones, mudstones, shales and siltstones and represent shallow to deep water settings, deltas, rivers, streams and overbank depositional environments.

Large exposures of Jurassic dolerite dykes occur throughout the area. These intruded through the Karoo sediments around 183 million years ago at about the same time as the Drakensberg basaltic eruption.

ii. Palaeontological context

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 4. The site for the surface infrastructure for the underground mining is in the Vryheid Formation.

The Vryheid Formation lies on the uneven topography of pre-Karoo or Dwyka Group rocks in the northern and northwestern margins, but lies directly on the Pietermaritzburg Formation in the central and eastern part. The lithofacies show a number of upward-coarsening cycles, some very thick, and they are essentially deltaic in origin. There are also delta-front deposits, evidence of delta switching, and fluvial deposits with associated meandering rivers, braided streams, back swamps or interfluves

and abandoned channels (Cadle et al., 1993; Cairncross, 1990; 2001; Johnson et al., 2006). Coal seams originated where peat swamps developed on broad abandoned alluvial plains, and less commonly in the backswamps or interfluves. Most of the economically important coal seams occur in the fluvial successions (ibid). In the east (Mpumalanga and northern KwaZulu Natal), the Vryheid formation can be subdivided into a lower fluvial-dominated deltaic interval, a middle fluvial interval, and an upper fluvial-dominated deltaic interval again (Taverner-Smith et al., 1988).

The **Vryheid Formation** preserves the distinctive Gondwanan flora, the *Glossopteris* flora. As the climate warmed up and the huge continent drifted polewards the land was rapidly colonised by luxuriant vegetation, in some parts. Peats formed in waterlogged environments and over time were buried, preserved and altered by heat and pressure to eventually form the coal seams typical of this formation and abundant in Mpumalanga and KwaZulu Natal coalfields. Coals themselves do not preserve the original plant structures, but plant impressions or compressions can be preserved in the lenses between the coals or in fine grained sediments. The flora is composed of the dominant *Glossopteris* plants (leaves, seeds, reproductive structures, roots and wood). Other plants are lycopods, sphenophytes, ferns, cordaitaleans and other early gymnosperms. Vertebrates are not found with the fossil plants because they require a different set of conditions for preservations. Plants require rapid burial in a reducing and anoxic environment, while bones can be preserved in oxidizing environments (Cowan, 1995).

The Jurassic dolerite does not preserve fossils because it is an intrusive volcanic rock. The very young Quaternary sands along the stream are also very unlikely to preserve fossils as they have been moved by the river floods and fossils would have been destroyed, if present in the first place.




Figure 4: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the proposed mining right amendment on Farms Kranspan, Vaalbank and Roodebloem shown within the yellow rectangle. Background colours indicate the following degrees of sensitivity: red = very highly sensitive; orange/yellow = high; green = moderate; blue = low; grey = insignificant/zero.

iii. Site visit observations

The proposed project area is situated about 13-18 km south of Carolina along the R36. The land has been cultivated for decades and so is highly disturbed from clearing of the land of rocks for cultivation and ploughing. There are no rocky outcrops within the cultivated land. With a gently rolling topography covered with either secondary grassland or exposed soils after ploughing, the visibility was generally good. Pans and streams were not surveyed for fossils because they are seldom permitted to be developed, but more importantly, water and water-logged areas are not good for the preservation of fossils.

East of the R36, Farm Roodebloem. Part of this area is cultivated but the eastern part has exposures of sandstone, sometimes with Quaternary laterites draping over the coarse sandstones. No fossils and no shales were seen in this section (Figures 5-6).

West of the R36, Farm Kranspan also is mostly cultivated (recently or currently and no rocky outcrops were seen except for the laterite recorded by Billstead (2019 site visit report)). No fossils were seen (Figure 7).

Southwestern part on Farm Vaalbank, is cultivated or used for grazing for cattle or sheep. The western margin has many glades of invasive trees such as back wattle and gums. Previous mining activities are evident from the occasional sink holes. Other signs of disturbance are access points for an underground pipeline as well as power lines traversing the properties. Fields lying fallow and grazing areas are covered with thick secondary grasslands indicating deep sandy soils (Figures 8-9).



Figure 5: Most representative view of the project area.



Figure 6: Site photographs for the Kranspan Coal expansion project. East of R36 on Farm Roodebloem 51 IT. A-B – general view showing thick grasslands on deep soils, some invasive trees and generally rolling topography. C – access road shows deep sandy soils. D – sink hole probably caused by collapse of a shaft from previous mining activities.




Figure 7: Site photographs for the Kranspan mine expansion. West side of R36 on Farm Kranspan. A-D views of ploughed fields showing a complete lack of any outcrop. Along fence lines there frequently are alien invasive trees.



Figure 8: Site photographs for the Kranspan extension project. Farm Vaalbank. A – margin of a ploughed field showing invasive trees. B – flat, ploughed field with no outcrops. C-D – even amongst the trees where the land has not been ploughed there are no outcrops of shale that could preserve fossil plants.



Figure 9: Site photographs for the Kranspan expansion project. Farm Vaalbank. A-B – abandoned fields covered with weeds and secondary grassland and invasive trees along the margins. C – rare outcrop of weathered sandstone but no fossils. D – old mine dump filling in a pit(?). No fossils and not even any shales.

4. Impact assessment

An assessment of the potential impacts to possible palaeontological resources considers the criteria encapsulated in Table :

Table 4a: Criteria for assessing impacts

PART A: DEFINITION AND CRITERIA		
Criteria for ranking of the SEVERITY/NATURE of environmental impacts	H	Substantial deterioration (death, illness or injury). Recommended level will often be violated. Vigorous community action.
	M	Moderate/ measurable deterioration (discomfort). Recommended level will occasionally be violated. Widespread complaints.
	L	Minor deterioration (nuisance or minor deterioration). Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	L+	Minor improvement. Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	M+	Moderate improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. No observed reaction.
	H+	Substantial improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. Favourable publicity.
Criteria for ranking the DURATION of impacts	L	Quickly reversible. Less than the project life. Short term
	M	Reversible over time. Life of the project. Medium term
	H	Permanent. Beyond closure. Long term.
Criteria for ranking the SPATIAL SCALE of impacts	L	Localised - Within the site boundary.
	M	Fairly widespread – Beyond the site boundary. Local
	H	Widespread – Far beyond site boundary. Regional/ national
PROBABILITY (of exposure to impacts)	H	Definite/ Continuous
	M	Possible/ frequent
	L	Unlikely/ seldom

Table 4b: Impact Assessment

PART B: Assessment		
SEVERITY/NATURE	H	-
	M	-
	L	Soils do not preserve plant fossils; so far there are no records from the Vryheid formation of plant or animal fossils in this region so it is very unlikely that fossils occur on the site. The impact would be very unlikely.
	L+	-
	M+	-

PART B: Assessment		
	H+	-
DURATION	L	-
	M	-
	H	Where manifest, the impact will be permanent.
	L	Since the only possible fossils within the area would be fossil plants from the <i>Glossopteris</i> flora in the shales, the spatial scale will be localised within the site boundary.
SPATIAL SCALE	M	-
	H	-
	L	-
PROBABILITY	H	-
	M	-
	L	It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be found in the loose sand that will be developed for infrastructure but it is unknown what lies below the soils. Therefore, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the eventual EMPr.

Based on the nature of the project, surface activities may impact upon the fossil heritage if preserved in the development footprint. The geological structures suggest that the rocks are the correct age and type to preserve fossils. The site visit and walk through confirmed that there were NO FOSSILS of any significance in the project footprint. Furthermore, the surface material to be excavated is soil and this does not preserve fossils. Since there is a good chance that fossils from the Vryheid Formation will be disturbed if open cast or underground mining takes place, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol has been added to this report. Taking account of the defined criteria, the potential impact to fossil heritage resources is low to moderate.

5. Assumptions and uncertainties

Based on the geology of the area and the palaeontological record as we know it, it can be assumed that the formation and layout of the dolomites, sandstones, shales and sands are typical for the country and do contain fossil plant, insect, invertebrate and vertebrate material. The site visit and walk through in early October 2022 by palaeontologists confirmed that there are no fossils on the surface. There were no outcrops of shales that could potentially preserve fossils. The outcrop of sandstone in the western part of Farm Vaalbank is coarse-grained and very weathered and it has no fossils on the surface. It was too dangerous to inspect the sink holes and so it is not known what lies below the surface. The sands of the Quaternary period would not preserve fossils.

6. Recommendation

Based on the fossil record but confirmed by the site visit and walk through there are NO FOSSILS of any significance such as those of recognisable *Glossopteris* floral elements, even though fossils have been recorded from rocks of a similar age and type in South

Africa. It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be preserved in the overlying soils and sands of the Quaternary. There is a very small chance that fossils may occur below the ground surface in the shales of the Vryheid Formation so a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. If fossils are found by the environmental officer, or other responsible person once excavations and drilling have commenced for the surface infrastructure for the new colliery, then they should be rescued and SAHRA notified so that a palaeontologist can be called to assess and collect a representative sample.

7. References

- Anderson, J.M., Anderson, H.M., 1985. Palaeoflora of Southern Africa: Prodrum of South African megafloras, Devonian to Lower Cretaceous. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam.
- Cadle, A.B., Cairncross, B., Christie, A.D.M., Roberts, D.L., 1993. The Karoo basin of South Africa: the type basin for the coal bearing deposits of southern Africa. *International Journal of Coal Geology* 23, 117-157.
- Cairncross, B. 1990. Tectono-sedimentary settings and controls of the Karoo Basin Permian coals, South Africa. *International Journal of Coal Geology* 16: 175-178.
- Cairncross, B. 2001. An overview of the Permian (Karoo) coal deposits of southern Africa. *African Earth Sciences* 33: 529–562.
- Cowan, R., 1995. History of Life. 2nd Edition. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Boston. 462pp.
- Isbell, J.L., Henry, L.C., Gulbranson, E.L., Limarino, C.O., Fraiser, F.L., Koch, Z.J., Ciccioli, P.I., Dineen, A.A., 2012. Glacial paradoxes during the late Paleozoic ice age: Evaluating the equilibrium line altitude as a control on glaciation. *Gondwana Research* 22, 1-19.
- Johnson, M.R., van Vuuren, C.J., Visser, J.N.J., Cole, D.I., Wickens, H.deV., Christie, A.D.M., Roberts, D.L., Brandl, G., 2006. Sedimentary rocks of the Karoo Supergroup. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). The Geology of South Africa. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. Pp 461 – 499.
- Millstead, B.S., 2019. Full assessment Palaeontological Heritage Assessment report in respect of a coal mine (Kranspan Colliery) proposed to be located on the Farm Kranspan 49 IT, approximately 12.5 km southwest of Carolina, Mpumalanga Province – for Ilima.
- Plumstead, E.P., 1969. Three thousand million years of plant life in Africa. Geological Society of southern Africa, Annexure to Volume LXXII. 72pp + 25 plates.
- Snyman, C.P., 1998. Coal. In: Wilson, M.G.C., and Anhaeusser, C.P., (Eds). The Mineral Resources of South Africa: Handbook, Council for Geosciences 16, 136-205.

Taverner-Smith, R., Mason, T.R., Christie, A.D.M., Smith, A.M., van der Spuy, M., 1988. Sedimentary models for coal formation in the Vryheid Formation, northern Natal. Bulletin of the Geological Survey of South Africa, 94. 46pp.

Visser, J.N.J., 1989. The Permo-Carboniferous Dwyka Formation of southern Africa: deposition by a predominantly subpolar marine icesheet. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 70, 377-391.

8. Chance Find Protocol

Monitoring Programme for Palaeontology – to commence once the excavations / drilling / mining activities begin.

1. The following procedure is only required if fossils are seen on the surface and when drilling/excavations/mining commence.
2. When excavations begin the rocks and discard must be given a cursory inspection by the environmental officer or designated person. Any fossiliferous material (trace fossils, fossils of plants, insects, bone or coalified material) should be put aside in a suitably protected place. This way the project activities will not be interrupted.
3. Photographs of similar fossils must be provided to the developer to assist in recognizing the fossil plants, vertebrates, invertebrates or trace fossils in the shales and mudstones (for example see Figure 10). This information will be built into the EMP's training and awareness plan and procedures.
4. Photographs of the putative fossils can be sent to the palaeontologist for a preliminary assessment.
5. If there is any possible fossil material found by the developer/environmental officer/miners then the qualified palaeontologist sub-contracted for this project, should visit the site to inspect the selected material and check the dumps where feasible.
6. Fossil plants or vertebrates that are considered to be of good quality or scientific interest by the palaeontologist must be removed, catalogued and housed in a suitable institution where they can be made available for further study. Before the fossils are removed from the site a SAHRA permit must be obtained. Annual reports must be submitted to SAHRA as required by the relevant permits.
7. If no good fossil material is recovered then no site inspections by the palaeontologist will be necessary. A final report by the palaeontologist must be sent to SAHRA once the project has been completed and only if there are fossils.
8. If no fossils are found and the excavations and mining have finished then no further monitoring is required.

9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils from the Vryheid Formation




Figure 10: Photographs of fossil plants of the *Glossopteris* flora from the Vryheid formation that would be expected to occur.

10. Appendix B – Details of specialist

Marion Bamford (PhD) **Short CV for PIAs – July 2022**

i) Personal details

Present employment: Professor; Director of the Evolutionary Studies Institute.
Member Management Committee of the NRF/DST Centre of
Excellence Palaeosciences, University of the Witwatersrand,
Johannesburg, South Africa

Telephone : +27 11 717 6690
Fax : +27 11 717 6694
Cell : 082 555 6937
E-mail : marion.bamford@wits.ac.za ;
marionbamford12@gmail.com

ii) Academic qualifications

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:

1980-1982: BSc, majors in Botany and Microbiology. Graduated April 1983.

1983: BSc Honours, Botany and Palaeobotany. Graduated April 1984.

1984-1986: MSc in Palaeobotany. Graduated with Distinction, November 1986.

1986-1989: PhD in Palaeobotany. Graduated in June 1990.

iii) Professional qualifications

Wood Anatomy Training (overseas as nothing was available in South Africa):

1994 - Service d'Anatomie des Bois, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren,
Belgium, by Roger Dechamps

1997 - Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France, by Dr Jean-Claude Koeniguer

1997 - Université Claude Bernard, Lyon, France by Prof Georges Barale, Dr Jean-Pierre
Gros, and Dr Marc Philippe

iv) Membership of professional bodies/associations

Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa

Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards

Academy of Sciences of South Africa - Member: Oct 2014 onwards

International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991

International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+

Botanical Society of South Africa

South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016

SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+

PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative

ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+

INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

vii) Supervision of Higher Degrees

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	11	0
Masters	14	1
PhD	11	6
Postdoctoral fellows	12	2

viii) Undergraduate teaching

Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year

Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 25 students per year

Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology;

Micropalaeontology – average 12 - 20 students per year.

ix) Editing and reviewing

Editor: *Palaeontologia africana*: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor

Guest Editor: *Quaternary International*: 2005 volume

Member of Board of Review: *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*: 2010 –

Associate Editor: *Cretaceous Research*: 2018-2020

Associate Editor: *Royal Society Open*: 2021 -

Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 25 local and international journals

x) Palaeontological Impact Assessments

Selected from recent project only – list not complete:

- Mala Mala 2017 for Henwood
- Modimolle 2017 for Green Vision
- Klipoortjie and Finaalspan 2017 for Delta BEC
- Ledjadja borrow pits 2018 for Digby Wells
- Lungile poultry farm 2018 for CTS
- Olienhout Dam 2018 for JP Celliers
- Isondlo and Kwasobabili 2018 for GCS
- Kanakies Gypsum 2018 for Cabanga
- Nababeep Copper mine 2018
- Glencore-Mbali pipeline 2018 for Digby Wells
- Remhoogte PR 2019 for A&HAS
- Bospoort Agriculture 2019 for Kudzala
- Overlooked Quarry 2019 for Cabanga
- Richards Bay Powerline 2019 for NGT
- Eilandia dam 2019 for ACO
- Eastlands Residential 2019 for HCAC
- Fairview MR 2019 for Cabanga
- Graspan project 2019 for HCAC
- Lieliefontein N&D 2019 for Enviropro
- Skeerpoort Farm Mast 2020 for HCAC
- Vulindlela Eco village 2020 for 1World
- KwaZamakhule Township 2020 for Kudzala
- Sunset Copper 2020 for Digby Wells
- McCarthy-Salene 2020 for Prescali
- VLNR Lodge 2020 for HCAC
- Madadeni mixed use 2020 for Enviropro

- Frankfort-Windfield Eskom Powerline 2020 for 1World
- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe
- Glosam Mine 2021 for AHSA

XI) Research Output

Publications by M K Bamford up to July 2022 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 165 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 10 book chapters.

Scopus h-index = 30; Google Scholar h-index = 36; i10-index = 95

Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.