

Site number, development phase and activity			Recommended mitigation	Site significance	Impact significance	Impact significance (post-mitigation)
SYL1256/DW045 – Findspot				1	25	25
SYL1256/DW047 – Feature				2	26	26
SYL1256/DW049 – Historical				2	26	26

Table 17-3: Identified heritage resources that will be impacted upon by the haul road

Site number, development phase and activity			Recommended mitigation	Site significance	Impact significance	Impact significance (post-mitigation)
SYL1256/DW001 – Iron Age	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> Heritage Mitigation: Conduct a Phase 2 HIA including sampling through test excavation and mapping. Apply for a Destruction Permit from the relevant HRA. Implement a monitoring programme during construction.	4	94	34
SYL1256/DW002 – Feature	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> . Heritage Mitigation: No mitigation is required.	1	79	28
SYL1256/DW003 – Iron Age	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> Heritage Mitigation: Record and document the extent of the site through extensive mapping, photographs and surface collection. Apply for a Destruction Permit from the relevant HRA.	2	80	29
SYL1256/DW004 & DW005 – Iron Age	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> . Heritage Mitigation: No mitigation is required.	3	81	30
SYL1256/DW006 – Feature	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> . Heritage Mitigation: No mitigation is required.	2	80	29
SYL1256/DW007 – Historical	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> Heritage Mitigation: Record and document the extent of the site through extensive mapping, photographs and surface collection. Apply for a Destruction Permit from the relevant HRA.	3	81	30
SYL1256/DW008, DW009 & DW046 – Historical	C, O, D	1, 2, 6 11 & 12	Project Mitigation: Adjust planned Haul Road & associated infrastructure to bypass heritage resource. <i>(As far is feasible)</i> . Heritage Mitigation: No mitigation is required.	2	80	29

Table 17-4: Identified heritage resources that will be impacted on by mining

Site number, development phase and activity			Recommended mitigation	Site significance	Impact significance	Impact significance (post-mitigation)
SYL1256/DW036 – Historical	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 10, 11 & 12	Project mitigation: Adjust planned location of Open Cast Pit to avoid irreparable damage to heritage resource. Heritage mitigation: Conduct a Phase 2 HIA including sampling through test excavation and mapping. Apply for a Destruction Permit from the relevant HRA.	3	99	43
SYL1256/DW050 – Feature	C, O, D	1, 3, 5, 10, 11 & 12	Project mitigation: No mitigation is required Heritage mitigation: No mitigation is required	1	113	106
SYL1256/DW043 & DW044 – Burial			Project mitigation: Preserve burial ground in situ, draft management plan, and site monitoring; Heritage mitigation: relocation process must be implemented, including Public Participation	4	28	28
SYL1256/DW048 – Burial				4	28	28

Table 17-5: Recommendations for the Choma Village Complex

SYL1256/DW034 & DW035 – Choma Village	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 10, 11 & 12	Project mitigation: Adjust the mine plan to exclude the complex from the mining area. Preserve the site. Heritage mitigation: Conservation management plan and nomination of the site as a Regional Heritage Site with SAHRA	4	40	40
SYL1256/DW037 – Choma Village	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 10, 11 & 12		3	99	43
SYL1256/DW038 – Choma Village	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 10, 11 & 12		3	136	53
SYL1256/DW039 – Choma Village	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 10, 11 & 12		3	136	53
SYL1256/DW040 – Choma Village				3	51	51



SYL1256

Choma Village Complex (Pistorius 2006)	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, & 12		5	138	55
Pistorius (2006) C004	C, O, D	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, & 12		4	116	54

17.2 Proposal for Protection or Mitigation

- No mitigation is recommended for sites SYL1256/DW10-33; 41-42, 47; 49; 50, as these sites are either of no heritage value or further than 500 m outside the proposed impact area.
- Adjustment of the haul road and associated infrastructure as far as is feasible be conducted for sites SYL1256/DW1-9 and 46. Where this is not possible, heritage mitigation will include a Phase 2 Heritage Assessment consisting of test excavation, shovel test pits (STP), sampling and collection of material culture, and detailed mapping for site SYL1256/DW1. Recording of sites SYL1256/DW3-5; 7-9; and 46 through surface collections, photographs and detailed mapping is also recommended. On completion of the recommended heritage mitigations, a Destruction Permit from SAHRA can be applied for on behalf of Aquarius.
- For heritage resources impacted upon by mining infrastructure and activities, it is recommended that the proposed mine plan be amended as far as is feasible to avoid irreparable damage to heritage resources. Additionally, *in situ* preservation for burial sites SYL1256/DW43-44 and 48 with an associated draft management plan and monitoring programme is recommended. Where this is not possible, a Phase 2 HIA consisting of STP's, sampling and collection of material culture, detailed mapping and an application for a Destruction Permit from SAHRA is recommended for SYL1256/DW36. For burial sites SYL1256/DW43-44 and 48, relocation of the graves including PPP is recommended.
- Adjustment of the mine plan to exclude the Choma Village Complex is recommended. In addition, it is recommended that the Choma Village Complex be conserved, a conservation management plan be developed and that the complex be nominated for Grade III Heritage Site status with SAHRA.

17.3 Detailed recommendations with regard to burial grounds and graves

Management and recommendations regard to burial grounds and graves are the minimum requirements governed by the legislation stipulated in the NHRA and Regulations.

General requirements would include that every attempt be made by Aquarius to minimise the possibility of accidental damage to any graves or burial grounds. This can be achieved by fencing off of identified burial grounds and graves where the fence must be a minimum of 5m away from the grave and a buffer zone of 15m must be adhered to around the fence. In cases where relocation of graves will be required, Section 36(4) & (5) of the NHRA will come into effect in which Aquarius will have to demonstrate:

- Satisfactory arrangements for exhumation and re-internment.
- Concerted effort in contacting and consulting with communities and individuals
- Agreement with communities or individuals regarding the future of the graves.

Regulation 39 of the NHRA states that every effort must be made to identify the descendants or family members of the person buried. Agreement on the future of the grave must be reached through a process of consultation. If agreement cannot be achieved, a record of the consultations and comments of all I&APs must be submitted to the provincial heritage resources authority.

Please refer to Appendix B for detailed explanation of Chance Find Procedures (CFP).

17.3.1 Recommendations for protection during development and long term

The purpose of this monitoring program is to provide general information to Aquarius with regards to management recommendations for the heritage component of the EIA/EMP. Such a monitoring programme is planned for observation and investigation conducted during any operation carried out for non-archaeological reasons. This will be within a specified area or site on land where there is a possibility that heritage resource may be disturbed or destroyed. In essence, the main purpose of a management and monitoring programme is:

- To allow, within the resources available, the preservation by record of heritage resources, the presence and nature of which could not be established (or established with sufficient accuracy) in advance of development or other potentially disruptive works;
- To provide an opportunity, if required, for the monitoring archaeologist to signal to all interested parties, before the destruction of the material in question, that an heritage find has been made for which the resources allocated to the monitoring programme itself are not sufficient to support treatment to a satisfactory and proper standard;
- To emphasise the requirement for excavation and/or preservation of known or inferred deposits and guide any requirement for contingent excavation or preservation of possible deposits; and
- To establish and disclose information about the heritage resource existing on a site.

17.3.2 Recommendations for relocation of graves

To mitigate the process, it is recommended that Aquarius undertake a Burial Grounds and Graves Survey (BGGs). A BGGs is a specified survey aimed at identifying all visible burial grounds and graves within the project area before any decisions about grave relocation are made. The identified burial grounds and graves are then recorded via recording forms, photographs, and mapping. Additionally, through consultation, every effort is made to identify the identity of the remains and *bona fide* next-of-kin. Once graves earmarked for relocation have been identified, Aquarius will have a list of contactable *bona fide* I&APs for those specific graves and discussion regarding the future of the graves can commence as specified under Section 36 and Regulation 39 of the NHRA.

If relocation is required, Section 36(4) and (5) of the NHRA will come into effect. This will include, but is not limited to:

- Satisfactory arrangements for the exhumations and re-internment must be made by Aquarius.

- Aquarius must demonstrate a concerted effort in contacting and consulting with communities and individuals, which can be facilitated through a BGGs.
- Agreement with the communities or individuals regarding the future of the graves must be achieved.

Please note, the process of relocation will take a minimum of 120 days from the start of the consultation process, therefore appropriate time must be allotted for the implementation of grave relocations.

17.4 Recommendations concerning intangible and living heritage resources

Due to the nature of intangible heritage, the precise location of these heritage sites is not easily attained. It is recommended that through a process of consultation I&APs, detailed information be gathered regarding the intangible heritage resource, and consensus be reached between the I&APs and Aquarius with regard to the future of these resources. Possible solutions may include but are not limited to:

- Negotiated access to initiation sites by community members to conduct the initiation ceremonies;
- Relocation of initiation sites to new area chosen by the community; and
- Negotiated access to the project area for the collection of traditionally used flora.

17.5 Recommendations concerning the Palaeontological Environment

There is a low probability of terrestrial fossils being found in excavations of *in situ* deposits. For this reason, it is recommended that a Letter of Recommendation for Exemption from a Palaeontological Impact Assessment be considered.

However, it is also recommended that Fossil Find Procedures be implemented. A regular monitoring presence over the period during which excavations are made, by either an archaeologist or palaeontologist, is generally not practical. Instead, the field supervisor or foreman and workers involved in the digging excavations must be encouraged and informed of the need to watch for potential fossil and buried archaeological material. If potential objects are identified by workers, the archaeologist and/or palaeontologist contracted must be informed of the fossil finds. The procedures suggested below are in general terms, to be adapted as befits a context. They are expressed as finds of fossil bones that usually occur sparsely. However, they may also serve as a guideline for other fossil material that may occur.

Bone finds can be classified as two types: isolated bone finds and bone cluster finds. In the process of digging the excavations, isolated bones may be spotted as single finds particularly in the hole sides or bottom, or as they appear on the soil heap. If the number of distinct bones exceeds six pieces, the finds must be treated as a bone cluster. In the event of isolated bone finds, several actions should be undertaken:

- Action 1: an isolated bone exposed in an excavation or soil heap must be retrieved before it is covered by further soil from the excavation
- Action 2: the site foreman must be informed;
- Action 3: the responsible field person must take custody of the fossil. The following information to be recorded:

- Position (excavation position);
 - Depth of find in hole;
 - Digital image of hole showing vertical section (side); and
 - Digital image of fossil.
- Action 4: the fossil should be placed in a bag such as a Ziplock bag, along with any detached fragments. A label must be included with the date of find, position, and depth; and
 - Action 5: The archaeologist and/or palaeontologist is to be informed and will then assess the information.

A bone cluster is a major find of bones (several bones in close proximity or bones resembling parts of a skeleton). These bones will likely be seen in broken sections in the sides of the hole and as bones appearing at the bottom of the hole and on the soil heap. In the event of a bone cluster find, several actions should be undertaken:

- Action 1: immediately stop excavation in the vicinity of the potential material. Mark or flag the position and also the soil that may contain fossils;
- Action 2: inform the responsible field person; and
- Action 3: The archaeologist and/or palaeontologist is to be informed and will then assess the information.

To allow for minimal disruption of work, it may be possible to continue the excavation further along or proceed to the next excavation. The response or scheduling of the field assessment is to be decided in consultation with the developer and the environmental consultant. During field assessment, if the fossils are in a palaeontological context, the palaeontologist must evaluate the site and decide if Rescue Excavation is feasible, or if it is a Major Find.

Rescue Excavation refers to the removal of the material from the excavation. This would apply if it is feasible to remove it without comprising the contextual data. In principle, the strategy during mitigation is to “rescue” the fossil material as quickly as possible. The strategy to be adopted depends on the nature of the occurrence, particularly the density of the fossils. The methods of collection would depend on the preservation or fragility of the fossils and whether in loose or in lithified sediment. These include:

- On-site selection and sieving in the case of robust material in sand;
- Fragile material in loose sediment would be encased in blocks using Plaster-of-Paris or reinforced mortar.

A Major Find is the occurrence of material that, by virtue of quantity, importance and time constraints, cannot be feasibly rescued without compromise of detailed material recovery and contextual observations. With regards to the current project, a Major Find is not expected.

18 FATAL FLAWS

The southern portion of the proposed Open Cast Pit and Ring Road lay directly over the extensive Choma Village Complex. Due to its connection with the royal Choma lineage, its intangible heritage for the surrounding communities, and the presence of burial sites within

the complex, it has a high significance rating. It is suggested the mine plan be changed so as to decrease the mining area to exclude the village complex avoiding possible damage to the structures and burials, and lengthy consultation and mitigation processes. Additionally, it is recommended that the Choma Village Complex be nominated for Grade III Heritage Site status with the SAHRA and a Conservation Management Plan be completed.

19 CONCLUSION

Aquarius plans to develop a new platinum mine on the farm Vygenhoek 10 JT near Lydenburg. The proposed project, called Everest North Mine, will be located within the Groot Dwars River valley, approximately 28 km north east Roosenekal and 30 km west of Lydenburg.

A site visit was conducted from 25 – 28 March 2012 where a total of 50 heritage resources in addition to the Choma Village Complex were identified. The sites were rated individually, and a range from low to high significance of heritage resources can be found in the project area.

All sites that fall inside the proposed mine plan or within 500 m of the mineable resource area should be mitigated. General mitigations include adjustment of the proposed impact area as far as possible to conserve identified heritage resources *in situ* and implementing a watching brief during construction. Where adjustments of the proposed impact areas are not feasible, it is recommended that a Phase 2 Heritage Assessment be conducted and a Destruction Permit from the HRA be applied for. It is recommended that the Choma Village Complex be conserved *in situ* and nominated for Grade III Heritage Site status with the SAHRA. Due to its high cultural significance, it is recommended that the southern portion of the project area be declared a fatal flaw and excluded from the project.

Identified burial grounds and graves are recommended to be preserved *in situ*. In cases where relocation of graves will be required, minimum requirements as stipulated by the NHRA and Regulations will need to be followed.

20 REFERENCES

20.1 Literature

Bonner, P.L., Esterhuysen, A.B., Schoeman, M. H., Swanepoel, N. J. & Wright, J. B. 2008. Introduction. In: Swanepoel, N., Esterhuysen, A. & Bonner, P. (Eds) *Five Hundred Years Rediscovered: Southern African Precedents and Prospects*: 1-19. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Bredenkamp, G., Granger, J.E. & Van Rooyen, N. 1996. Moist Sandy Highveld Grassland. In: Low, A.B. & Robelo, A.G. (eds) *Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland*. Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Pretoria.

Clark, J.D. 1982. The cultures of the Middle Palaeolithic/Middle Stone Age. *The Cambridge History of Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

De Wit, M. J. (2007). A History of Deep Time. In P. Delius (Ed.), *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage* (pp. 27 - 38). KwaZulu-Natal: KwaZulu-Natal Press.

- De Wit, M. J., Armstrong, R. A., Kamo, S. L., & Erlank, A. J. (1993). Gold-bearing sediments in the Pietersburg greenstone belt: Age equivalents of the Witwatersrand Supergroup sediments, South Africa. *Economic Geology*, 88, 1242 - 1252.
- Eales, H. V., & Cawthorn, R. G. (1996). The Bushveld Complex. *Developments in Petrology*, 15, 181 - 229.
- Eriksson, P. G., Hattingh, P. J., & Altermann, W. (1995). An overview of the geology of the Transvaal Sequence and Bushveld Complex, South Africa. *Mineralium Deposita*, 30, 98 - 111.
- Esterhuysen, A & Smith, J. 2007. Chapter 2: Stories in Stone. In: *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage* (Eds) Peter Delius. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press: Durban.
- Hall, M. 1987. *The Changing Past: Farmers, Kings and Traders in Southern Africa 2000 – 1860*. David Phillip Publishing: Cape Town.
- Huffman, T.N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age: The Archaeology of Pre-Colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. Cape Town: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press
- Klein, R. 1984. Later Stone Age Faunal Samples from Heuningneskrans Shelter (Transvaal) and Leopard's Hill Cave (Zambia). *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 39 (140): 109 – 116.
- Lee, C. A. (1996). A review of mineralization in the Bushveld Complex and some other layered intrusions. *Developments in Petrology*, 15, 103 - 145.
- Louw, A. W. 1969. Bushman Rock Shelter, Ohrigstad, Eastern Transvaal: A Preliminary Investigation, 1965. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 24 (94): 39-51.
- Maggs, T. 1995. Neglected Rock Art: The Rock Engravings of Agriculturalist Communities in South Africa. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 50(162): 132-142.
- Makhura, T. 2007 Chapter 4: Early Inhabitants. In: *Mpumalanga: History and Heritage* (Eds) Peter Delius. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press: Durban.
- Mitchell, P. 2002. *The Archaeology of Southern Africa*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Plug, I. 1982. Bone Tools and Shell, Bone and Ostrich Eggshell Beads from Bushman Rock Shelter (BRS) Eastern Transvaal. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 37(136): 57 – 62.
- Smith, K. W. 1969. The Fall of the Pedi of the North-Eastern Transvaal. *The Journal of African History* 10(2): 237 – 252.
- Smith, B & Ouzman, S. 2004. Taking Stock: Identifying Khoekhoen Herder Rock Art in Southern Africa. *Current Anthropology* 45(4): 499-526.
- Smith, B & Zubieta, L. F. 2007. The Power of Ancient Art. In: Peter Delius (Eds) *Mpumalanga History and Heritage*. University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press: Durban.

20.2 Reports

- Huffman, T. N. & Schoeman, M. H. 2002. Archaeological Assessment of the Der Brochen Project, Mpumalanga. Archaeological Resource Management (ARM).

Pistorius, J. C. C. 2006. A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Study for the Proposed New Everest North Platinum Mine in the Limpopo Province, South Africa.

Roodt, F. 2003a. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment: Der Brochen Tailings Dams Farm: Helena and St. George, Mpumalanga Province. Cultural Resource Consultants

Roodt, F. 2003b. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment: Der Brochen Project, Helena Complex: Trial Mining Phase, Mpumalanga Province

Roodt, F. 2003c. Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment: Der Brochen Project, Richmond Complex: Trial Mining Phase, Mpumalanga Province. Cultural Resource Consultants

Roodt, F. 2008. Phase 1 Heritage Resources Scoping Report: Der Brochen Mine, Richmond Farm: Mpumalanga. Cultural Resource Consultants

Steyn, H. 2012. Site Visit Report for Aquarius Platinum (SA) Pty (Ltd): Portions of the Farm Vygenhoek 10, Mpumalanga, South Africa. PGS Heritage & Grave Relocation Consultants

Van Der Walt, J. 2009. Archaeological Impact Assessment: Booyensdal Platinum Mine on the Farms Booyensdal 43 JT and Der Brochen 7 JT, Steelpoort, Mpumalanga Province. Heritage Contracts Unit

Van Der Walt, J. & Fourie, W. 2007. Archaeological Impact Assessment: Mining Development on the Farm Mareesburg 8 JT, District Steelpoort. Matakoma Heritage Consultants.

Van Schalkwyk, J. A. 2007. Heritage Impact Scoping Report for the Planned Steelpoort Integration Project, Limpopo Province. National Cultural History Museum

20.3 Databases

University of the Witwatersrand (WITS) Archaeological Site Database

National Archives of South Africa (NASA), TAB- National Archives Repository (Public Records of former Transvaal Provinces and its predecessors as well as of magistrates and local authorities)

Genealogical Society of South Africa (GSSA) Database

20.4 Websites

Lydenburg Museum 2004. [URL:http://www.lydenburgmuseum.org.za](http://www.lydenburgmuseum.org.za) Accessed 18/10/2011

Wilson, M. G. (2012). *Council for Geoscience*. Retrieved September 13, 2012, from http://www.geoscience.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=454:a-brief-overview-of-the-economic-geology-of-south-africa



Appendix A: Specialist CV's



DIGBY WELLS
ENVIRONMENTAL

JUSTIN DU PIESANIE

Mr Justin du Piesanie
Archaeology Consultant
Social Sciences Department
Digby Wells Environmental

1 EDUCATION

University of the Witwatersrand

- BA Degree (2004)
- BA Honours Degree (2005) - Archaeology
 - Title of Dissertation - Seal Skeletal Distribution of Herder and Forager Sites at Kasteelberg, Western Cape Province of South Africa.
- Master of Science (MSc) Degree (2008) – Archaeology
 - Title of Dissertation – Understanding the Socio-Political Complexity of Leokwe Society during the Middle Iron Age in the Shashe-Limpopo Basin through a Landscape Approach

2 COURSES

- Introduction into ArcGIS. GIMS Ltd, Midrand. Received Certificate (2006)
- French Institute of South Africa (IFAS) GIS Workshop, University of the Witwatersrand. Received Certificate (2010)

3 CONFERENCES

- ASAPA, University of Botswana, Gabarone, Botswana (2005).
- Mupungubwe Symposium, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa (2006) - Presented paper titled, “Social Complexity in the Shashe Limpopo Basin: The Case of K2 and Leokwe”
- ASAPA, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa (2008).
- SAfA, University of Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany (2008) - Presented paper titled, “Social Complexity in the Shashe Limpopo Basin: Conclusions”

4 PUBLICATIONS

- Huffman, T.N. & du Piesanie, J.J. 2011. Khami and the Venda in the Mapungubwe Landscape. *Journal of African Archaeology* 9(2): 189-206

5 EMPLOYMENT

Present:	Archaeology Consultant at Digby Wells Environmental
2009 to 2011:	Archaeology Collections Manager at the University of the Witwatersrand.
2009 to 2011:	Freelance Archaeologist for Archaeology Resource Management (ARM), Matakoma Heritage Consultants, Wits Heritage Contracts Unit & Umlando Heritage Consultants.
2006 to 2007:	Tour Guide at Sterkfontein Caves World Heritage Site.

6 PROJECT EXPERIENCE

- Wits Fieldschool - Excavation at Meyersdal, Klipriviersberg Johannesburg (Late Iron Age Settlement).
- Wits Fieldschool - Phase 1 Survey of Prentjiesberg in Ugie / Maclear area, Eastern Cape.
- Wits Fieldschool – Excavation at Kudu Kopje, Mapungubwe National Park Limpopo Province.
- Wits Fieldschool – Excavation of Weipe 508 (2229 AB 508) on farm Weipe, Limpopo Province.
- Survey at Meyerdal, Klipriviersberg Johannesburg.
- Mapping of Rock Art Engravings at Klipbak 1 & 2, Kalahari.
- Survey at Sonop Mines, Windsorton Northern Cape (Vaal Archaeological Research Unit).
- Excavation of Kudu Kopje, Mapungubwe National Park Limpopo Province.
- Excavation of KK (2229 AD 110), VK (2229 AD 109), VK2 (2229 AD 108) & Weipe 508 (2229 AB 508) (Origins of Mapungubwe Project)
- Phase 1 Survey of farms Venetia, Hamilton, Den Staat and Little Muck, Limpopo Province (Origins of Mapungubwe Project)
- Excavation of Canteen Kopje Stone Age site, Barkley West, Northern Cape
- Excavation of Khami Period site AB32 (2229 AB 32), Den Staat Farm, Limpopo Province

Cultural Resource Management (CRM) Work

- Phase 2 Mitigation at Meyersdal, Klipriviersberg Johannesburg (ARM)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Mapping of Late Iron Age Site in Pilansberg, Sun City (ARM)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Witbank dam development (ARM)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Glen Austin AH, Johannesburg (Matakoma)



- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 34, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 38, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 44, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 46, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 47, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 48, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 49, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 50, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 61, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 62, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 71, Johannesburg (Matakoma).
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein AH Holding 72, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Modderfontein 35IR Portion 40, Johannesburg (Matakoma)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Rhino Mines, Thabazimbi Limpopo Province (ARM)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Moddergat 389KQ, Schilpadnest 385KQ, Swartkop 369KQ, Cronimet Project, Thabazimbi Limpopo Province (Matakoma)
- Desktop Study – Desktop study for the Eskom Thohoyandou SEA Project, Limpopo Province (Matakoma)
- Phase 2 Mitigation – Excavation of Iron Age site on Wenzelrust, Shoshanguve Gauteng (Heritage Contracts Unit)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Mapping of Late Stone Age shelter, Parys, Free State
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Vaalkrans Battlefield for the Transnet NMPP Line (Umlando)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of Portion 222 of Mindale Ext 7 Witpoortjie 254 IQ & Portion 14 of Nooitgedacht 534 IQ, Johannesburg (ARM)
- Phase 2 Mitigation – Excavation of Site 19 for the Anglo Platinum Mines Der Brochen & Booyensdal, Steelpoort, Mpumalanga (Heritage Contracts Unit)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Mapping of sites 23, 26, 27, 28a & b for the Anglo Platinum Mines Der Brochen & Booyensdal, Steelpoort, Mpumalanga (Heritage Contracts Unit)
- Desktop Study - Desktop study for the inclusion into the Thohoyandou Electricity Master Network for Eskom, Limpopo Province (Strategic Environmental Focus)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Mapping of historical sites as part of the mitigation for the expansion of the Bathlako Mine's impact area (Heritage Contracts Unit).
- Phase 2 Mitigation – Grave Relocation Project (GRP) for the Kibali Gold Project, Democratic Republic of Congo (Digby Wells)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Heritage Assessment and Survey for the proposed Kibali Hydro Power Stations, Democratic Republic of Congo (Digby Wells)



- Phase 1 Mitigation – Survey of the farm Vygenhoek for Sylvania Resources Everest North Mining Project, Steelpoort, Mpumalanga (Digby Wells)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Heritage Impact Assessment for the Gold One International Ltd Proposed Geluksdal Tailings Storage Facility and Pipeline Infrastructure, Johannesburg, Gauteng Province (Digby Wells)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Burial Grounds and Graves Survey (BGGS) for Platreef Resources, Mokopane, Limpopo Province (Digby Wells)
- Phase 2 Mitigation – Archaeological Impact Assessment of sites for Resource Generation Boikarabelo Mine, Steenbokpan, Limpopo Province (Digby Wells)
- Phase 1 Mitigation – Watching Brief for Bokoni Platinum Mines (Pty) Ltd, Burgersfort, Limpopo Province (Digby Wells)

7 PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA): Professional & CRM Member

Society for Africanist Archaeologists (SAfA) Member



DIGBY WELLS
ENVIRONMENTAL

NATASHA HIGGITT

Ms Natasha Higgitt
Archaeology Intern
Social Sciences Department
Digby Wells Environmental

1 EDUCATION

- University of Pretoria
- BA Degree (2008)
- Archaeology Honours (2009)
- Title of Dissertation- Pass the Salt: An Archaeological analysis of lithics and ceramics from Salt Pan Ledge, Soutpansberg, for evidence of salt working and interaction.

2 EMPLOYMENT

July 2011 to Present: Archaeology Intern at Digby Wells Environmental
April 2011 to June 2011: Lab assistant at the Albany Museum Archaeology Department
April 2010 to March 2011: Intern at the Archaeology Department, Albany Museum under the Department of Sports, Recreation, Arts and Culture, Eastern Cape Government, South Africa (DSRAC)

3 PROJECT EXPERIENCE

- Rescue excavation at St Francis Bay (shell midden burial)
- Rescue excavation at Wolwefontein (skeleton in donga)
- Recorded two rock art sites at Blaauwbosch Private Game Reserve, Eastern Cape
- Attended a 2 week excavation/study tour in the Friuli Region in Italy, organised by the Società Friulana di Archeologia, sponsored by Ente Friuli nel Mondo, and excavated a 12th century medieval castle
- Attended a 2 week excavation in Limpopo, Waterpoort Archaeological Project organised by Xander Antonites (Yale PhD Candidate)
- UP Archaeology Fieldschool at Bivack, Limpopo (Survey and Excavation) (15 days)
- UP Archaeology Fieldtrip at De Witteberg, Mpumalanga (Rock Art recording) (1 day)
- UP Archaeology Fieldschool at Machete, Limpopo (Fieldschool administrator, Excavation and base station recording and mapping) (16 days)

Digby Wells & Associates (Pty) Ltd. Co. Reg. No. 1999/05985/07. Fern Isle, Section 10, 359 Pretoria Ave Randburg Private Bag X10046, Randburg, 2125, South Africa
Tel: +27 11 789 9495, Fax: +27 11 789 9498, info@digbywells.com, www.digbywells.com

Directors: AR Wilke, CD Wells, LF Koeslag, PD Tanner (British)*, AJ Reynolds (Chairman) (British)*, GE Trusler (C.E.O)
*Non-Executive



- UP Archaeology Fieldschool at Bivack, Limpopo and Ratho, Limpopo (Survey and excavation) (15 days)
- UP Geography Fieldschool at Injisuthi, Drakensberg (Weathering Analysis on Rock face with rock art) (2 days)
- UP Archaeology Fieldschool at Hillbrow, Gauteng (Phase 2 CRM Style Excavation) (7 days)
- UP Archaeology Fieldschool at Ratho, Limpopo (Excavation and Survey) (15 days)

CRM (Contract work)

- Notice of Intent to Develop and Cultural Resources Pre-Assessment for Orlight SA (PTY) Ltd Solar PV Project. 2012. (Digby Wells Environmental)
- Agricultural Survey for Platreef ESIA, Mokopane, Limpopo. 2011. (Digby Wells Environmental)
- Cultural Resources Pre-Assessment for the Proposed Sylvania Everest North Mining Development in Mpumalanga, near Lydenburg. 2011. (Digby Wells Environmental)
- Phase 2 Mitigation of Archaeological sites at Boikarabelo Coal Mine, Steenbokpan, Limpopo. 2011. (Digby Wells Environmental)
- Cultural Resources Pre-Assessment for Proposed Platinum Mine Prospecting in Mpumalanga, near Bethal for Anglo Platinum. 2011. (Digby Wells Environmental)
- Cultural Resources Pre-Assessment for proposed Platinum Mine at Mokopane, Limpopo for Ivanhoe Platinum. 2011. (Digby Wells Environmental)
- Phase 1 AIA Mixed-use housing Development, Kwanobuhle, Extension 11, Uitenhage, Eastern Cape. 2011.
- Phase 1 AIA Centane to Qholora and Kei River mouth road upgrade survey, Mquma Municipality, Eastern Cape. 2011. (SRK Consulting)
- Phase 1 AIA Clidet Data Cable survey, Western Cape, Northern Cape, Free State and Eastern Cape. 2011. (SRK Consulting)
- Phase 1 AIA Karoo Renewable Energy Facility, Victoria West, Northern Cape. 2011. (Savannah Environmental)
- Phase 1 AIA Windfarm survey in Hamburg, Eastern Cape. 2010. (Savannah Environmental)
- Phase 1 AIA Windfarm survey in Molteno, Eastern Cape. 2010. (Savannah Environmental)
- Phase 1 AIA Housing Development at Motherwell, P.E. 2010. (SRK Consulting)
- Phase 1 AIA Sand quarry survey in Paterson, Eastern Cape. 2010. (SRK Consulting)
- Phase 1 AIA Quarry Survey at Victoria West. 2010. (Acer [Africa] Environmental Management Consultants)
- Phase 1 AIA Quarry Survey at Port Elizabeth. 2010. (E.P Brickfields)



4 PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA): Professional member

document1



Appendix B: Chance Find Procedures

CHANCE FIND PROCEDURES FOR HERITAGE RESOURCES

The following procedures must be considered in the event that previously unknown heritage resources, including burial grounds or graves, are exposed or found during the life of the project (extracted and adapted from the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 Regulations Reg No. 6820, GN: 548).

List of Acronyms

CRM	Cultural Resources Management
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Authority
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Authority
SAPS	South African Police Service

For simplicity, the term 'heritage resource' includes burial grounds and graves, unless these are specifically addressed.

Heritage Resources: structures, archaeology, palaeontology, meteors, public monuments

1. The heritage resource must be avoided and all activities in the immediate vicinity temporarily ceased;
2. The Digby Wells project manager and/or CRM unit must be notified of the discovery;
3. Digby Wells will deploy a qualified specialist to consider the heritage resource, either via communicating with the Environmental Officer via telephone or email, or based on a site visit;
4. Appropriate measures will then be presented to Aquarius Platinum;
5. Should the specialist conclude that the find is a heritage resource protected in terms of the NRHA (Sections 34, 36, 37) and NHRA Regulations (Regulation 38, 39, 40), Digby Wells will notify SAHRA and/or PHRA on behalf of Aquarius Platinum;
6. SAHRA/PHRA may require that a HIA in terms of NHRA Section 38 must take place that may include rescue excavations, for which Digby Wells will submit costs and proposal as relevant;

Burial grounds and graves

1. In the event that human remains were accidentally exposed, the Digby Wells project manager and/or Cultural Resources Management (CRM) unit must immediately be notified of the discovery in order to take the required further steps:
 - a. The local SAPS will be notified on behalf of Aquarius Platinum;
 - b. Digby Wells will deploy a suitably qualified specialist to inspect the exposed burial and determine in consultation with the SAPS whether:
 - i. The temporal context of the remains, i.e.:
 - forensic,
 - authentic burial grave (informal or older than 60 years, NHRA Section 36); or
 - archaeological (older than 100 years, NHRA Section 38).
 - ii. Any additional graves may exist in the vicinity.
2. Should the specialist conclude that the find is a heritage resource protected in terms of the NRHA (Section 35) and NHRA Regulations (Regulation 38, 39, 40), Digby Wells will notify SAHRA and/or PHRA on behalf of Aquarius Platinum;
3. SAHRA/PHRA may require that an identification of interested parties, consultation and /or grave relocation take place;
4. Consultation must take place in terms of NHRA Regulations 39, 40, 42;
5. Grave relocation must take place in terms of NHRA Regulations 34

Digby Wells can facilitate and assist with all chance find procedures outlined above.

Project Manager:	Johan Hayes
	Work: 011 789 9495
	Cell: 082 859 1932
CRM Unit:	Johan Nel
	Work: 011 789 9495
	Cell: 072 288 5496