



BIO THERM ENERGY (PTY) LTD

75MW SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC (PV) ENERGY FACILITY – SENDAWO SOLAR 1

Heritage Impact Assessment

Issue Date: 26 May 2016
Revision No.: 1
Project No.: 13303

Date:	26 May 2016
Document Title:	Heritage Impact Assessment
Author:	Jessica Angel/Wouter Fourie
Revision Number:	1
Checked by:	
For:	SiVEST Environmental Division

Executive Summary

PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd (PGS) was appointed by SiVEST Environmental Division (SiVEST) to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment that forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the proposed development of the Sendawo Solar 1, 75MW solar photovoltaic (PV) energy facility near Lichtenburg, North West Province.

Heritage resources are unique and non-renewable and as such any impact on such resources must be seen as significant.

The Heritage Impact Assessment has shown that the proposed Sendawo Solar projects have heritage resources present on the property. This has been confirmed through a field survey, archival research and evaluation of aerial photography of the sites.

Archaeological Resources

During the fieldwork 2 archaeological resources were identified of which all were archaeological sites representing the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age. The sites are all rated as having local heritage significance. No mitigation is required for sites **V01** and **V06**.

Palaeontological Resources

Local scree material and blocks of dolomite were inspected for fossils and all finds were recorded as photographic records. Outcrop of bedrock with significant stromatolites fossils was recorded and sites with potential cave breccia were recorded in areas where burrows of large vertebrates such as Aardvark were obviously present in the sandy deposits.

Based on the fieldwork findings, an extremely high palaeontological sensitivity area has been delineated (Figure 16) in the south eastern section of the proposed project area. The palaeontological finds around point 0522 are seen as the most significant of the area and can give a heritage grading of Grade 2 (Provincial Heritage Site) but potentially Grade 1 (National Heritage Site).

Final identification of possible sites where significant cave breccia will occur will only be identified after completion of the geotechnical surveys.

Mitigation:

- Mitigation through exclusion of the no-go area around point 0522 as indicated in Figure 15.
- Micro siting in the delineated extremely high paleontological sensitivity area and palaeontological excavations and collection if Geotechnical Survey indicates necessity for mitigation

- It is essential that the results of the Geotechnical Surveys be provided to the HIA team and palaeontologist to assess the possible presence of sinkholes and cave breccia sites on all the proposed development areas;
- If excavation of deeper than 1.5m is planned, the palaeontologist must assess the results of the geotechnical information and given the opportunity to comment on the likelihood of significant finds of fossils in all the planned development areas;
- If any excavation or collection of fossils is recommended, such mitigation measures will require a permit from SAHRA before mitigation can be done as well as a final destruction permit on completion of the mitigation work.

Due to the presence of significant stromatolites in a small area and the large number of boulders with stromatolites present on site it is recommended that an palaeontologist be appointed to monitor geotechnical investigations as part of a watching brief. The aim being the identification and mitigation of any newly discovered palaeontological sites, if recorded. The significant finds recorded in Table 5 must lead to exclusion of the specific sites from this development.

Cumulative impacts

An evaluation of the possible cumulative impacts from the combined solar projects in the area on heritage resources has shown that the biggest envisaged impact could be on the palaeontological heritage of the area of this proposed development increasing the possibility of impacts on the breccias that could occur in the area.

Though with the implementation of mitigation measures these impacts could be transformed into a positive impact through the discovery of previously unknown fossils and the subsequent study of such fossil finds adding to the academic knowledge of the palaeontological resources of the study area.

Assessment of Alternatives

An evaluation of the operations buildings, substation and lay down area alternatives have indicated that none of the proposed area impact directly on known heritage resources and thus no preference towards a specific alternative has been identified.

Key

PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a low impact / reduce the impact
FAVOURABLE	The impact will be relatively insignificant
NOT PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a high impact / increase the impact
NO PREFERENCE	The alternative will result in equal impacts

Comparative Assessment of Alternatives – Sendawo Solar 1

Alternative	Preference	Reasons
OPERATIONS BUILDING AND SUBSTATION		
Sendawo PV 1 Operations Building and Substation Alternative 1	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
Sendawo PV 1 Operations Building and Substation Alternative 2	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
LAYDOWN AREA		
Sendawo PV 1 Laydown Area Alternative 1	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
Sendawo PV 1 Laydown Area Alternative 2	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified

The overall impact on heritage resources is seen as acceptable and the proposed mitigation measures to be incorporated in the EMP will provided the necessary actions to address any impacts on heritage resources.

BIO THERM ENERGY (PTY) LTD

HERITAGE REPORT

Contents	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Scope of the Study	1
1.2. Specialist Qualifications	1
1.3. Assumptions and Limitations	1
1.4. Legislative Context	2
2. TECHNICAL DETAILS OF THE PROJECT	7
2.1. Site Location and Description	7
3. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	8
3.1. Methodology for Assessing Heritage Site significance	8
3.1.1. Scoping Phase	9
3.1.2. Impact Assessment Phase	9
4. BACKGROUND RESEARCH	9
4.1. Archival findings	9
4.1.1. Overview of the archaeological fabric of the study area and surroundings	9
4.1.2. Archaeological Sites as Revealed Through a Study of Published Literature	10
4.1.3. Findings of the background research	14
4.1.4. Themes identified during the research were	14
4.2. Palaeontology	15
4.2.1. Findings from the studies	16
4.3. Cumulative impacts	16
5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT	19
5.1. Field work findings	19
5.1.1. Methodology	19
5.1.2. Description of area	20
5.1.3. Finds	21

5.1.4. Palaeontological fieldwork	23
6. ASSESSMENT.....	29
6.1. Cumulative impacts	33
6.2. Impact Summary	33
6.3. Assessment of Alternatives	33
7. MANAGEMENT GUIDELINE	35
7.1. Heritage Management Plan for EMP implementation	35
8. HERITAGE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES.....	37
8.1. General Management Guidelines	37
8.2. All phases of the project	40
8.2.1. Archaeology	40
8.2.2. Graves	41
9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41
9.1. Archaeological Resources	42
9.2. Palaeontological Resources	42
9.3. Impact Summary	43
9.4. Assessment of Alternatives	43
10. REFERENCES.....	44
10.1. Published References	44
10.2. Unpublished References	45
10.3. Internet References	46
10.4. Historic Topographic Maps	46
10.5. Google Earth	46

Appendices

- A: LEGISLATIVE PRINCIPLES
- B: HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
- C: IMPACT ASSESSMENT MATRIX

1. INTRODUCTION

PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd (PGS) was appointed by SiVEST Environmental Division (SiVEST) to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment that forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the proposed development of the Sendawo Solar 1, 75MW solar photovoltaic (PV) energy facility near Lichtenburg, North West Province.

1.1. Scope of the Study

The aim of the study is to identify possible heritage sites, finds and sensitive areas that may occur in the study area for the EIA study. The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) aims to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment in the development of a comprehensive Environmental Management Plan to assist the developer in managing the discovered heritage resources in a responsible manner, in order to protect, preserve, and develop them within the framework provided by the National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 (Act 25 of 1999) (NHRA).

1.2. Specialist Qualifications

PGS Heritage (PGS) compiled this Heritage Scoping Report.

The staff at PGS has a combined experience of nearly 70 years in the heritage consulting industry. PGS and its staff have extensive experience in managing the HIA processes. PGS will only undertake heritage assessment work where they have the relevant expertise and experience to undertake that work competently.

Jessica Angel, Archaeologist and author, holds a Masters degree in Archaeology and is registered as a Professional Archaeologist with the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).

Wouter Fourie, Project manager for this project, is registered as a Professional Archaeologist with the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) and has CRM accreditation within the said organisation, as well as being accredited as a Professional Heritage Practitioner with the Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners – Western Cape (APHP).

1.3. Assumptions and Limitations

Not detracting in any way from the fieldwork undertaken, it is necessary to realise that the heritage sites located during the fieldwork do not necessarily represent all the heritage sites present within the area. Should any heritage feature or objects not included in the inventory be located or observed, a heritage specialist must immediately be contacted. Such observed or located heritage features and/or objects may not be disturbed or removed in any way, until such time that the heritage

specialist has been able to make an assessment as to the significance of the site (or material) in question. This applies to graves and cemeteries as well.

The survey was conducted over 2 days over the extent of the total footprint area. It must be stressed that the extent of the fieldwork was based on the available field time and was aimed at determining the heritage character of the area.

The fieldwork that covered the Sendawo solar PV application site is an area of 17.1 square kilometres.

A total of 2 sites, which can be considered archaeological were logged within the foot print area of PV1. All of these sites relate to the Stone Age.

1.4. Legislative Context

The identification, evaluation and assessment of any cultural heritage site, artefact or find in the South African context is required and governed by the following legislation:

- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), Act 107 of 1998
- National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), Act 25 of 1999
- Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), Act 28 of 2002

The following sections in each Act refer directly to the identification, evaluation and assessment of cultural heritage resources.

- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) Act 107 of 1998
 - Basic Environmental Assessment (BEA) – Section (23)(2)(d)
 - Environmental Scoping Report (ESR) – Section (29)(1)(d)
 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) – Section (32)(2)(d)
 - Environmental Management Plan (EMP) – Section (34)(b)
- National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) Act 25 of 1999
 - Protection of Heritage Resources – Sections 34 to 36; and
- Heritage Resources Management – Section 38
- Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA) Act 28 of 2002

Section 39(3)

The NHRA stipulates that cultural heritage resources may not be disturbed without authorization from the relevant heritage authority. Section 34(1) of the NHRA states that, “no person may alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years without a permit issued by the relevant provincial heritage resources authority...” The NHRA is utilized as the basis for the identification, evaluation and management of heritage resources and in the case of CRM those resources specifically impacted on by development as stipulated in Section 38 of NHRA, and those developments administered through NEMA, and MPRDA legislation. In the latter cases, the

feedback from the relevant heritage resources authority is required by the State and Provincial Departments managing these Acts before any authorizations are granted for development. The last few years have seen a significant change towards the inclusion of heritage assessments as a major component of Environmental Impacts Processes required by NEMA and MPRDA. This change requires us to evaluate the Sections of these Acts relevant to heritage (Fourie, 2008).

The NEMA 23(2)(b) states that an integrated environmental management plan should, "...identify, predict and evaluate the actual and potential impact on the environment, socio-economic conditions and cultural heritage".

A study of subsections (23)(2)(d), (29)(1)(d), (32)(2)(d) and (34)(b) and their requirements reveals the compulsory inclusion of the identification of cultural resources, the evaluation of the impacts of the proposed activity on these resources, the identification of alternatives and the management procedures for such cultural resources for each of the documents noted in the Environmental Regulations. A further important aspect to be taken account of in the Regulations under NEMA is the Specialist Report requirements laid down in Section 33 of the regulations (Fourie, 2008).

Refer to **Appendix A** for further discussions on heritage management and legislative frameworks

Table 1: Terminology

<i>Acronyms</i>	<i>Description</i>
AIA	Archaeological Impact Assessment
ASAPA	Association of South African Professional Archaeologists
CRM	Cultural Resource Management
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs
DWS	Department of Water and Sanitation
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
MSA	Middle Stone Age
MIA	Middle Iron Age
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Agency
PSSA	Palaeontological Society of South Africa
ROD	Record of Decision

SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency

Archaeological resources

This includes:

- i. 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 artefacts, human and hominid remains and artificial features and structures;
- ii. rock art, being 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;
- iii. 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;
- iv. features, structures and artefacts associated with 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 influence its stability and future well-being, including:

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

Early Stone Age

The archaeology of the Stone Age, between 700 000 and 2500 000 years ago.

Middle Stone Age

The archaeology of the Stone Age between 30 000-300 000 years ago, associated with early modern humans.

Late Stone Age

The archaeology of the last 30 000 years, associated with fully modern people.

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.

Fossil

Mineralised 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.

Holocene

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

Iron Age

The archaeology of the last 1000 years up to the 1800s, associated with people who carried out iron working and farming activities such as herding and agriculture.

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.

Mineralised 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.




Figure 1 – Human and Cultural Timeline in Africa (Morris, 2008)

2. TECHNICAL DETAILS OF THE PROJECT

2.1. Site Location and Description

Sendawo Solar PV1 will be located approximately 10km south of Vryburg, in the Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompoti District of the North West Province. (Figure 2).




Figure 2 – Sendawo Solar 1 - Locality

The application site is approximately 1700ha however the buildable area will be significantly smaller than this and was determined by sensitive areas identified during the Scoping Phase of the EIA.

Panels will be either fixed axis mounting or single axis tracking solutions, and will be either crystalline silicon or thin film technology. In addition to the PV panels each project will consist of:

- An onsite switching station, with the transformers for voltage step up from medium voltage to high voltage;
- The panels will be connected in strings to inverters and inverter stations will be required throughout the site. Inverter stations will house 2 x 1MW inverters and 1 x 2MVA transformers;
- DC power from the panels will be converted into AC power in the inverters and the voltage will be stepped up to 22-33kV (medium voltage) in the transformers.
- The 22-33kV cables will be run underground in the facility to a common point before being fed to the onsite switching station where the voltage will be stepped up to 132kV.

- A power line with a voltage of 132kV to the proposed Sendawo substation;
- A laydown area for the temporary storage of materials during the construction activities;
- Access roads and internal roads;
- A car park and fencing; and
- Administration, control and warehouse buildings.




Figure 3 – Sendawo Solar 1 - Layout

3. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The section below outlines the assessment methodologies utilised in the study.

3.1. Methodology for Assessing Heritage Site significance

PGS compiled this Heritage Assessment Document as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report for the proposed Sendawo Solar 1 Facility. The applicable maps, tables and figures, are included as stipulated in the NHRA (no 25 of 1999), the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (no 107 of 1998). The HIA process consisted of three steps:

3.1.1. *Scoping Phase*

Step I – Literature Review: The background information to the field survey relies greatly on the Heritage Background Research.

3.1.2. *Impact Assessment Phase*

Step II – Physical Survey: A physical survey was conducted on foot through the proposed project area by a qualified archaeologist, which aimed at locating and documenting sites falling within and adjacent to the proposed development footprint.

Step III – The final step involved the recording and documentation of relevant archaeological resources, the assessment of resources in terms of the HIA criteria and report writing, as well as mapping and constructive recommendations.

Appendix B, outlines the Plan of study for the Heritage Impact Assessment process, while **Appendix C** provides the guidelines for the impact assessment evaluation that will be done during the EIA phase of the project.

4. BACKGROUND RESEARCH

The examination of heritage databases, historical data and cartographic resources represents a critical additional tool for locating and identifying heritage resources and in determining the historical and cultural context of the study area. Therefore, an Internet literature search was conducted and relevant archaeological and historical texts were also consulted. Relevant topographic maps and satellite imagery were studied.

4.1. Archival findings

4.1.1. *Overview of the archaeological fabric of the study area and surroundings*

A small number of archaeological and heritage contract projects have been undertaken in the general surroundings of the study area. Of the three heritage studies located in this area, two were undertaken for proposed photovoltaic solar farms and one for an extension to an existing base metal mine. No purely academic archaeological research appears to have taken place in the direct vicinity of the study area, with the nearest known research locality the Taung Skull World Heritage Site situated 18.4 km south-east of the present study area. It is important to note that the information listed here does not necessarily represent all the previous archaeological work undertaken in the vicinity of the study area. The second source is information from reports that were accessed from the SAHRA electronic database known as SAHRIS, and which for the most part came about due to the

requirement for archaeological and heritage impact assessments to be undertaken for mining (and other development) activities.

4.1.2. Archaeological Sites as Revealed Through a Study of Published Literature

The following sites were identified by studying archaeological journals and books. The sites are grouped according to their respective farm names. At the end of each description the approximate distance between the site and the present study area is provided. No information could however be obtained with regard to any archaeological research that was undertaken in close proximity to the study area. In the surrounding landscape the following archaeological sites are known:

Taung

In 1924 Raymond Dart identified the skull of an infant gracile australopithecine from a limestone quarry near Taung. While numerous fossils have been recovered from the same quarry, the skull of the Taung Child is the only hominin remains recovered from this site. Taung is one of only three localities in South Africa where fossil evidence for early hominins were ever recovered, the other two being the Cradle of Humankind (with sites such as Sterkfontein and Kromdraai) and Makapansgat (Mitchell, 2002). The Taung Skull World Heritage Site is located 70 km south of the present study area.

Harts River Valley Survey Project

In 1989 the University of the Witwatersrand was commissioned to conduct an archaeological survey of a section of the Harts River valley that was scheduled to be flooded by the proposed construction of the Taung Dam. A total of 28 Stone Age and three pastoralist sites were identified during the survey. Of the 38 identified Stone Age sites, a total of 11 could be associated with the Early Stone Age.

The best-preserved sites identified during the survey were excavated in 1992, including two of the Early Stone Age sites namely 2724DB3 and 2724DB4. Incidentally, the research undertaken at these two sites has provided valuable insight into the Acheulian archaeology of South Africa. In the words of Prof. Kathleen Kuman (2001:20), the "...Harts Valley project provides further documentation for the South African part of this picture of technological continuity and the origins of prepared core technology within the Acheulian".

Seven rock art sites were also identified in the footprint area of the proposed Taung Dam. These seven sites comprise finger paintings of geometric patterns as well as one site which contains paintings of "...riders on horseback...riders on horseback chasing an elephant...and two geometric patterns" (Dowson et.al., 1992:28).

If any of these sites identified before the construction of the Taung Dam still exists, they would be located roughly 60 km south east of the present study area.



Figure 4 – Tracing of one of the rock art panels at a site located roughly 40 km east of the present study area (Dowson, et.al., 1992: 29).

The aim of the archival background research is to identify possible heritage resources that could be encountered during the field work, as summarised in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Summary of History of Vryburg Town and Surrounding Area

DATE	DESCRIPTION
2.5 million to 250,000 years ago	<p>The Earlier Stone Age (ESA) is the first and oldest phase identified in South Africa’s archaeological history and comprises two technological phases. The earliest of these technological phases is known as Oldowan which is associated with crude flakes and hammer stones and dates to approximately 2 million years ago. The second technological phase in the Earlier Stone Age of Southern Africa is known as the Acheulean and comprises more refined and better made stone artefacts such as the cleaver and bifacial handaxe. The Acheulean phase dates back to approximately 1.5 million years ago.</p> <p>A total of 11 Early Stone Age sites with Acheulean lithics have been recorded in the Harts River valley, immediately east of the town of</p>

	Taung and roughly 60 km east of the present study area (Kuman, 2001).
250,000 to 30,000 years ago	The Middle Stone Age is the second oldest phase identified in South Africa's archaeological history. It is associated with flakes, points and blades manufactured by means of the prepared core technique.
30,000 years ago to the historic past	The Later Stone Age is the third phase in South Africa's Stone Age history. It is associated with an abundance of very small stone artefacts (microliths). The Later Stone Age is also associated with rock engravings and rock paintings. Rock engravings are known from the wider vicinity of the study area (Bergh, 1998), with one known site located at Dinkweneng (roughly 43 km east of the study area). Furthermore, a Low Density Surface Scatter of Later Stone Age material was identified at the Pering Mine (approximately 60 km south-west of the study area) (Birkholtz, 2011).
Early 1600s	The Tswana groups known as the Thlaping and Thlaro moved southward into the area presently known as the Northern Cape. A century later they were settled in areas as far south as Majeng (Langeberg), Tsantsabane (Postmasburg) and Tlhaka le Tlou (Daniëlskuil) (Snyman, 1986).
c. 1770	The Kora moved into the area. Due to their superior firearms they applied increasing pressure on the Thlaping and Thlaro groups. In the end the Thlaping moved into a north-eastern direction to settle in the general vicinity of Dithakong, north-east of present-day Kuruman. The Thlaro settled in areas to the west and north-west of the Thlaping (Snyman, 1986).
c. 1795	Legassick (2010) confirms the presence of the Thlaping, Thlaro and Kora in the general vicinity of the study area during this time.
Early 1800s	After the threat of the Kora became less intensive the Thlaping moved to the vicinity of present-day Kuruman. The Thlaro returned to the Langeberg, establishing them on a permanent basis there during the 1820s (Snyman, 1986). During this time German-born deserter Jan Bloem and his followers established themselves at Lekatlong (Legassick, 2010).
1833	Hurutshe refugees established themselves at Taungs (Legassick, 2010). The present-day town of Taung is roughly 40 km due-south of the study area.
1834	Mahura and his Thlaping followers moved from the vicinity of Kuruman to Taungs. Apart from the 1,500 individuals that followed Mahura to Taungs, the settlement of Taungs at the time also included some 2,000 Hurutshe, the Kora leader Mosweu Taaibosch and his followers as well as some 1,500 Maudi (Legassick, 2010).
November 1840	Gasibonwe, the son of Mothibi, attacked Mahura's cattle posts at Taungs and further afield. His aim was to degenerate Mahura's rule and to achieve supremacy over all the Thlaping (Legassick, 2010).

22 April 1842	A treaty was signed between Griqua leader Andries Waterboer and Thlaping leader Mahura at Mahura's settlement near Taungs. The agreement included a definition of the boundary between the two groups. The section of the agreed upon boundary closest to the study area ran from Danielskuil to Boetsap, which meant that the study area was defined as part of this treaty as forming part of Thlaping land (Legassick, 2010). This boundary was very similar to an earlier one that was thought to have been agreed to during the 1820s as a boundary between the Griqua and the Thlaping (Legassick, 2010).
1867	Diamonds were discovered for the first time in South Africa near Hopetown. Alluvial diamonds were also discovered along both banks of the Orange River in the vicinity of the confluence of the Vaal and Harts Rivers (Van Staden, 1983). This resulted in large numbers of fortune seekers streaming into the area from overseas, which would have had a profound impact on the social-dynamics of the landscape.
27 October 1871	The area located in the triangle formed by the Orange and Vaal Rivers was proclaimed as British Territory and named Griqualand West. This proclamation came as a result of ownership disputes between the Griqua, the Boer Republic of the Orange Free State and the Boer Republic of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek in terms of the newly discovered diamond diggings (www.wikipedia.com).
1879	After Barend Barends was defeated by the Khumalo Ndebele of Mzilikazi, Boetsap was occupied by two shopkeepers, Hunter and Tasker.
1882-1885	The Boer Republic of Stellaland existed during this time in the general area of the Vryburg district. Stellaland had its roots in the conflict between Mankurwane's Thlaping and Mosweu's Kora over land. Both sides used white mercenaries who as part of their remuneration were to receive farms. Almost 300 Boers joined the side of Mosweu in this war and on 26 July 1882 Mankurwane sued for peace. As a result of the peace agreement a portion of land was set aside for the mercenaries. From September 1882 the capital of Stellaland was being laid out and named Vryburg. On 6 August 1883 the Republic of Stellaland was proclaimed. However, the republic ceased to exist when Sir Charles Warren proclaimed the Bechuanaland Protectorate on 30 September 1885 (Bergh, 1999). The Taungs area, including the farm Brakfontein, was located just outside the southern boundary of Stellaland.
30 September 1885	Sir Charles Warren proclaims British Bechuanaland. This proclaimed area included the study area (www.wikipedia.com).
1895	British Bechuanaland was incorporated into the Cape of Good Hope (www.wikipedia.com). The study area now fell within the Cape of Good Hope. In the same year the Kaukwe Native Reserve was

	established in accordance with British Bechuanaland Proclamation No. 220 (Breutz, 1986). This reserve is located 60km south-west of the present study area
1904	Reverend William Charles Willoughby and his wife Bessie arrives in the vicinity of the current study area with the aim of assisting the Batswana to establish a school in Bechuanaland. After several attempts the Institution was finally established at Tiger Kloof. http://www.tigerkloof.com/index.php/about-us/history

4.1.3. Findings of the background research

The pre-history of the area is evident through the presence of numerous farms with rock engravings, including Verdwaal Vlakte, Bernauw, Schatkist, Wonderfontein and Kinderdam (Van Schalkwyk, 2012; Morris, 1998).

The numerous dry pans in the northern section of the study area also increase the probability of finding Stone Age Sites associated with hunter gatherer subsistence.

Heritage Resources associated with the South African War can be traced through the presence of blockhouse lines between Taung and Vryburg and onwards towards Madibogo, as well as the Vryburg concentration camp situated on the Vryburg Allotment area that is now part of the Leon Taljaard Nature Reserve to the north west of Vryburg.

Other areas of significance identified are the Devondale Mission (*circa* pre-1900), Tiger Kloof Institute (*circa* 1904) as well as the farmstead of the first and only president, Gerrit Jacobus van Niekerk, of the republic of Stellaland on the farm Niekerksrus. some 36 kilometres northwest of Vryburg.

4.1.4. Themes identified during the research were

- Palaeontology
- Pre-colonial archaeology and early inhabitants – especially associated with inland water in the arid regions of South Africa
- Early Colonial History and settlement
- Routes and transport
- Military history
- Town and village formation

4.2. Palaeontology

The palaeontological resources in the Vryburg area have received very little scientific attention. To a great extent they can only be inferred from the rock units represented there on geological maps. Most of the potentially fossiliferous superficial deposits (e.g. Caenozoic alluvium) are not shown on the published geological maps, however.

Stromatolitic carbonate rocks (limestones, dolomites) of Early Precambrian (Archaean) age in outcrops of the Ventersdorp Group (Kameeldorns, Rietgat and Bothaville Formations) as well as the lower part of the Transvaal Supergroup (Ghaap Group, Vryburg Formation & Schmidtsdrift Subgroup, including the Boomplaas Formation). In the Vryburg area and further south towards Taung these include some of the oldest (> 2.5 billion years) and best-preserved stromatolites (fossil microbial mounds) known from this period;

Stromatolites are recorded from the dolomite layers. Highly fossiliferous Caenozoic cave breccias are also known to occur within the dolomite layers, but are not mapped individually. These fossiliferous deposits often contain more recent mammal and hominid fossils, e.g. in the Cradle of Humankind.”




Figure 5 - The study area is underlain by rocks of the Boomplaas (Vb) and Clearwater (Vc) Formations of the Ghaap Group, and calcrete (T-Qc)

4.2.1. Findings from the studies

Through the analysis of the aerial photographs and available maps of the study area no obvious heritage sensitive areas were identified inside the study area. Some rocky outcrops that could possibly contain rock engravings and open air stone age sites have been identified as possible heritage sensitive areas. **Figure 6** Indicates the possible heritage sensitive areas.




Figure 6 - Sendawo Solar heritage sensitivity map

4.3. Cumulative impacts

An evaluation of the possible cumulative impacts from the combined solar projects in the area (Table 1 and **Figure 7**) on heritage resources has shown that the biggest envisaged impact could be on the palaeontological heritage of the area with the Rosendal and Waterloo solar facilities just east and north east of the of this proposed development increasing the possibility of impacts on the breccias that could occur in the area.

Though with the implementation of mitigation measures these impacts could be transformed into a positive impact through the discovery of previously unknown fossils and the subsequent study of such fossil finds adding to the academic knowledge of the palaeontological resources of the study area.

Table 3: Renewable energy developments proposed within a 25km radius from the Sendawo PV application site

Proposed Development	DEA Reference Number	Current Status of EIA	Proponent	Proposed Capacity	Farm Details
Tiger Kloof Solar PV energy facility	14/12/16/3/3/2/535	Scoping and EIA processes underway.	Kabi Solar (Pty) Ltd	75MW	Portions 3 & 4 of the Farm Waterloo 730
Sediba Power Plant 75MW PV Solar Facility and associated infrastructure	14/12/16/3/3/2/390	Environmental authorisation received	Sediba Power Plant (Pty) Ltd	75MW	A portion of the remaining extent of the Farm Rosendal 673
Waterloo Solar Park	14/12/16/3/3/2/308	Environmental authorisation received and preferred bidder status (REIPPP window 4).	DPS79 Solar Energy (Pty) Ltd	75MW	Southern portion of the Farm Waterloo 992
Cronos Energy Renewable Energy Generation Project	14/12/16/3/3/2/750	Environmental authorisation received	Cronos Energy (Pty) Ltd	75MW	Remainder of the Farm Elma No 575
75MW Carocraft PV Solar Park and associated infrastructure	14/12/16/3/3/2/374	Environmental authorisation received 29 June 2013. Amended to 75MW on 4 April 2014.	Carocraft (Pty) Ltd	75MW	Portion 1 and the Remainder of the Farm Weltevrede 681

Expansion of the Carocraft Solar Park	14/12/16/3/3/2/699	Scoping and EIA processes underway.	Carocraft (Pty) Ltd	75MW	Southern side of the Remainder of the Farm Weltevrede 681
Woodhouse Solar 1 PV Facility	TBC	Scoping and EIA processes underway.	Genesis Woodhouse Solar 1 (Pty) Ltd	100MW	Remaining extent of the Farm Woodhouse 729
Woodhouse Solar 2 PV Facility	TBC	Scoping and EIA processes underway..	Genesis Woodhouse Solar 2 (Pty) Ltd	100MW	Remaining extent of the Farm Woodhouse 729




Figure 7 - Geographical position of renewable energy developments proposed within a 20km radius from the proposed Sendawo PV application site

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1. Field work findings

5.1.1. Methodology

Fieldwork was conducted on the application site of the Sendawo Solar PV Project from 3-4 December 2015. The methodology focused on a tracked selective walkthrough of the foot print areas of proposed PV project application area (**Figure 8**). An accredited professional archaeologist, Miss Jessica Angel, completed the fieldwork. The fieldwork was done on foot and by vehicle.

It must be stressed that the extent of the fieldwork was based on the available field time and was aimed at determining the heritage character of the area.

The field work that covered the Sendawo solar PV application site is an area of 17.1 square kilometres.

A total of 2 sites, which can be considered archaeological were logged. All of these resources relate to the Stone Age.

A general background scatter of Stone Age artefacts (lithics) occurring over the extent of the area, required a refinement of the methodology and the defining of what constitutes an archaeological site as opposed to a findspot.

It was decided to use the density of lithics present on the ground to be the guiding rule towards elaborating on a findspot and defining it as an archaeological site. A find spot was classified as an area containing a density of more than 10 lithics per square meter, while a density of or more than 20 lithics per square meter was deemed to be the trigger mechanism for converting a find spot to an archaeological site.




Figure 8 - Fieldwork tracklogs

5.1.2. Description of area

The study area and surrounds is characterised by low vegetation growth dispersed over fairly flat terrain. Dominating the surface area are vast exposed pebble layers usually associated with low rises in the landscape. Drainage lines and flat surface are characterised by red sand cover in between the exposed pebble layers.



Figure 9 – View of general area. This area is a pan than revealed archaeological materials



Figure 11 – General view of the area, dried pan with no archaeological finds



Figure 10 – View of general area



Figure 12 – Dried riverbed. At this location a substantial amount of LSA artefacts were located (V05)

5.1.3. Finds

The find spots varied from Later Stone Age (LSA) scatters consisting of flakes, chips and some cores manufactured from fine-grained quartzite, chalcedony, and cryptocrystalline (ccs) material; Middle Stones Age (MSA) lithics consisting of cores, chips and flakes with a low occurrence of formal tools. The majority of the material utilised were either lideanite that occur in the form of medium sized boulders or round washed pebbles in the area or coarse-grained quartzite that occur as sporadic outcrops.

Earlier Stone Age (ESA) lithics found at some of these finds spots consisted of a hand axe, cleavers and large flakes. Most of the lithics were either rolled or heavily weathered with patination evident on many of the lithics.

Find spots, **V01**, and **V06** have a low significance, however the possibility of subsurface deposits cannot be discounted and was kept in mind with the development of the mitigation recommendations.

Table 4 Sites – Application footprint

Site number	Type	Longitude	Latitude	Description	Heritage Significance
V01	MSA site	24.726070°	-27.068260°	Medium density scatter of MSA lithics over an area of approximately 20 m ² . The site is characterised by a large pebble concentration within a dry pan. The lithics assemblage is characterised by a large number of flakes and chips, while a small percentage of the material on site can be described as cores. The size of the site is about 60 m ² .	Grade 4B
V06	MSA site	24.742815°	-27.062160°	Low-density scatter. MSA core. The site is open air and characterised by the typical Savanna Biome and more specifically in the Ghaap Plateau Vaalbosveld Group.	Grade 4B



Figure 13 – Site V01, MSA Lithics (silcrete and quartzite)



Figure 15 – V06, Weathered quartzite MSA core.







Figure 14 – Site V01, MSA quartzite core found at the same location as Figure 13





5.1.4. Palaeontological fieldwork





During the fieldwork it was observed that most of the areas have little outcrop but an area at GPS stations 0482 to 0562 has significant outcrops of dolomite with both stromatolites and possible cave breccia (Table 5).





Table 5: Photographic observations during fieldwork session



Photo	GPS station no (Figure 16) and coordinates	Description	Picture
1	(0452) -27° 03' 51.8" 24° 43' 46.3"	Calcrete outcrop covered by thin sandy soils, no outcrop, no fossils observed	

2	(0462 -27° 03' 41.2" 24° 43' 35.2"	Typical dolomitic terrain with water point on fault zone associated with calcrete outcrops on dolomite	
3	(0472) -27° 03' 24.5" 24° 43' 34.8"	Calcrete on dolomite, wetland area possibly under water during wet season, close to spring	
4	(0482) -27° 03' 20.2" 24° 43' 32.5"	Shallow soils on stromatolitic dolomites and chert. Wetland area with indication of flooding during wet season, old spring that dried up during 2016. No significant fossils observed, but clear indication of human activity	
5	(0482) -27° 03' 20.2" 24° 43' 32.5"	Chert and stromatolitic dolomite at site of historically known spring that dried up for the first time in human memory during 2016	

6	(0482) -27° 03' 20.2" 24° 43' 32.5"	Deep sandy soils on dolomite. Circular excavations at site of spring ion dolomite.	
7	(0482) -27° 03' 20.2" 24° 43' 32.5"	Ash layers at the site of the historic spring, possibly indicating an attempt to drill a borehole with a percussion drill. Ash clearly the remains of coal, with nearest outcrop of coal at Pretoria, several hundred kilometres to the east of the site.	
8	(0492) -27° 03' 48.1" 24° 44' 16.4"	Significant Aardvark or similar animal burrows associated with fault zone in dolomite. Possible site to find cave breccia and fossils. To be confirmed by geotechnical investigation. Any new finds must to be recorded by the ECO.	
9	(0492) -27° 03' 48.1" 24° 44' 16.4"	Relatively large entrances to an underground chamber obviously occupied by large animals.	

10	(0502) -27° 03' 42.6" 24° 44' 09.7"	Dense tree growth at sites of possible cave breccias on dolomite fault zone	
11	(0512) -27° 03' 44.4" 24° 44' 28.2"	Calcrete with river gravel and cobblestone. Indication of old river channel.	
12	(0522) -27° 03' 42.5" 24° 44' 39.2"	Well-defined stromatolites in situ. Area must be excluded from planned development and it is recommended that structures be preserved in situ.	
13	(0522) -27° 03' 42.5" 24° 44' 39.2"	Scale of stromatolites and the configuration of the structures gives a very clear picture of the ancient seabed at the time of formation of these structures millions of years ago. A no-go area of 100 meters must be demarcated around this point.	

14	(0522) -27° 03' 42.5" 24° 44' 39.2"	The relatively small area where the fossils are found warrants the exclusion of this site from the proposed development.	
15	(0592) -27° 02' 02.7" 24° 43' 43.1"	Deeper red sandy soils in possibly Tertiary Aged river bed. outcrops are mostly shale and quartzite outcrops with minor stromatolitic dolomites	
16	(0602) -27° 01' 53.9" 24° 43' 38.0"	Deep red soils on shale and quartzite with minor dolomites, no fossils observed	
17	(0612) -27° 01' 57.5" 24° 43' 31.9"	Shallow sandy soils on shale and quartzites with minor dolomite. No fossils observed.	

18	(0622) -27° 02' 19.2" 24° 42' 57.8"	Deeper sandy soils, windblown sand on shale and quartzites, minor dolomite and no significant fossils observed	
19	(0632) -27° 02' 23.8" 24° 42' 56.0"	Deep soil and Aardvark burrows in sandy zone. Geotechnical investigation might reveal cave breccia site	

During the fieldwork period several well-defined finds of dolomite and chert with significantly well-defined stromatolites as well as a few potential sites with either associated sinkholes or cave breccias were recorded (**Table 5**). Confirmation of the significance of new sites will only be possible after completion of the geotechnical surveys.




Figure 16 – Heritage resource finds and sensitivities

6. ASSESSMENT

The fieldwork findings have shown that the study area is characterised by a background scatter of Stone Age artefact. The methodology utilised in the identification and classification of finds between find spots and sites enable a clear distinction between groupings.

A small part of the study area is characterised by the presence of significant Stromatolites and that stromatolites are present in almost all the dolomite boulders on site. Some areas have possible remains of cave breccia but no in situ outcrops were recorded. Based on the fieldwork findings, an extremely high palaeontological sensitivity area has been delineated (Figure 16) in the south eastern section of the proposed project area. The palaeontological finds around point 0522 are seen as the most significant of the area and can give a heritage grading of Grade 2 (Provincial Heritage Site) but potentially Grade 1 (National Heritage Site).

It must be kept in mind that the fieldwork could in no way identify all heritage resource within the development footprint and as such the fieldwork has shown that the possibility of encountering other Stone Age archaeological and palaeontological resources are extremely high.

The following set of tables provide an assessment of the impact on heritage resources within the development foot print

Table 6: Rating of Impacts – Chance finds

IMPACT TABLE		
Environmental Parameter	Heritage Resources	
Issue/Impact/Environmental Effect/Nature	The possibility of encountering previously unidentified heritage resources and specifically Stone Age archaeological sites. As well as the impact on the identified archaeological sites	
Extent	Will impact on the footprint area of the development	
Probability	The fieldwork has shown that such a predicted impact will definitely occur	
Reversibility	Due to the nature of archaeological sites the impact is seen as irreversible, however mitigation could enable the collection of enough information to preserve the data from such a site	
Irreplaceable loss of resources	The development could lead to significant losses in unidentified and unmitigated site	
Duration	The impact on heritage resources such as archaeological sites will be permanent	
Cumulative effect	As the type of development impact on a large area, and other similar development in the area will also impact on archaeological sites the cumulative impact is seen as having a medium negative impact.	
Intensity/magnitude	The large scale impact on archaeological sites and will require mitigation work.	
Significance Rating	The overall significance rating for the impact on heritage resources is seen as high pre-mitigation. This can be attributed to the very definite possibility of encountering more archaeological sites as shown through fieldwork. The implementation of the recommended heritage mitigation measures will address the envisaged impacts and reduce the overall rating to a low impact rating.	
	Pre-mitigation impact rating	Post mitigation impact rating

Extent	1	1
Probability	3	1
Reversibility	2	2
Irreplaceable loss	2	2
Duration	3	3
Cumulative effect	3	1
Intensity/magnitude	2	1
Significance rating	-28 (negative Medium Impact)	-10 (Positive low negative)
Mitigation measures	Monitoring during construction by an archaeologist Mitigation through archaeological excavations and collection where required	

Table 7: Rating of Impacts on palaeontological resources

IMPACT TABLE	
Environmental Parameter	Palaeontological Resources
Issue/Impact/Environmental Effect/Nature	The presence of previously unidentified Palaeontological heritage resources and specifically Palaeontological sites as well as the impact on the identified palaeontological sites. A small section of extremely high sensitivity as well as a delineated no-go area occurs in the south eastern section of the project layout.
Extent	Will impact on the footprint area of the development but will have a significant impact on the National Heritage database
Probability	The fieldwork has shown that such a predicted impact will definitely occur
Reversibility	Due to the nature of palaeontological sites the impact is seen as irreversible, however mitigation could enable the exclusion of a small area to preserve the highly sensitive sites and collection of enough information to preserve the data from such a site
Irreplaceable loss of resources	The development could lead to significant losses in unidentified and unmitigated sites. Fossils can never be replaced
Duration	The impact on heritage resources such as palaeontological sites will be permanent unless mitigated by exclusion from this development

Cumulative effect	As the type of development impact on a large area, and other similar development in the area will also impact on palaeontological sites the cumulative impact is seen as having a major negative impact.	
Intensity/magnitude	The large scale impact on palaeontological sites will require mitigation by exclusion of a small area from the proposed development	
Significance Rating	The overall significance rating for the impact on heritage resources is seen as very high negative pre-mitigation. This can be attributed to the confirmed presence of significant stromatolites (around point 0522) and the very high possibility of encountering more palaeontological sites (in the delineated palaeontological zone) during geotechnical investigations. The implementation of the recommended heritage mitigation measures will address the envisaged impacts and reduce the overall rating to a low impact rating or even significant positive rating in the case where the no-go zone at 0522 is implemented.	
	Pre-mitigation impact rating	Post mitigation impact rating
Extent	4	3
Probability	4	4
Reversibility	4	2
Irreplaceable loss	4	4
Duration	4	4
Cumulative effect	4	2
Intensity/magnitude	4	3
Significance rating	-96 (high negative)	57 (high positive)
Mitigation measures	<p><i>Mitigation through exclusion of the no-go area around point 0522 as indicated in Figure 16.</i></p> <p><i>Micro siting in the delineated extremely high paleontological sensitivity area and palaeontological excavations and collection if Geotechnical Survey indicates necessity for mitigation</i></p> <p><i>Monitoring during construction by palaeontologist if fossils are exposed during excavation of more than 1.5m of soil cover</i></p>	

6.1. Cumulative impacts

An evaluation of the possible cumulative impacts from the combined solar projects in the area on heritage resources has shown that the biggest envisaged impact could be on the palaeontological heritage of the area of this proposed development increasing the possibility of impacts on the breccias that could occur in the area.

Though with the implementation of mitigation measures these impacts could be transformed into a positive impact through the discovery of previously unknown fossils and the subsequent study of such fossil finds adding to the academic knowledge of the palaeontological resources of the study area.

6.2. Impact Summary

Table 8 provides a summary of the projected impact rating for this project on heritage resources.

Table 8: Comparison of summarised impacts on environmental parameters

Environmental parameter	Issues	Rating prior to mitigation	Average	Rating post mitigation	Average
Heritage resources	Impact during construction	28	Negative medium Impact	10	Positive Low Impact
Palaeontological Resources	Impact during construction	96	Negative High impact	57	Positive High Impact

6.3. Assessment of Alternatives

An evaluation of the operations buildings, substation and lay down area alternatives have indicated that none of the proposed area impact directly on known heritage resources and thus no preference towards a specific alternative has been identified.

Key

PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a low impact / reduce the impact
FAVOURABLE	The impact will be relatively insignificant
NOT PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a high impact / increase the impact
NO PREFERENCE	The alternative will result in equal impacts

Comparative Assessment of Alternatives – Sendawo Solar 1

Alternative	Preference	Reasons
OPERATIONS BUILDING AND SUBSTATION		
Sendawo PV 1 Operations Building and Substation Alternative 1	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
Sendawo PV 1 Operations Building and Substation Alternative 2	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
LAYDOWN AREA		
Sendawo PV 1 Laydown Area Alternative 1	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
Sendawo PV 1 Laydown Area Alternative 2	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified

7. MANAGEMENT GUIDELINE

7.1. Heritage Management Plan for EMP implementation

No.	Mitigation Measures	Phase	Timeframe	Responsible Party For Implementation	Monitoring Party (Frequency)	Target	Performance Indicators (Monitoring Tool)	Cost
A	Include section on possible heritage finds in induction prior to construction activities take place – Refer to Section 9 of this report	Planning /Pre-Construction	Prior to construction	Applicant ECO Heritage Specialist	ECO (Monthly)	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 36 and 38 of NHRA	No legal directives Legal compliance audit scores (Legal register) (ECO Monthly Checklist/Report)	R5 000
B	Implement chance find procedures in case where possible heritage finds area made	Construction	During construction	Applicant ECO Heritage Specialist	ECO (weekly)	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35 and 38 of NHRA	ECO Monthly Checklist/Report	Possibly R10 000
C	Implement mitigation for identified sites	Pre-construction	Pre-Construction	Applicant ECO Archaeologist	Once off	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35 and 38 of NHRA	Completion of mitigation measures and obtain destruction permit	Approximately R300 000

Table 9: Palaeontological Mitigation measures proposed

No.	Mitigation Measures	Phase	Timeframe	Responsible Party For Implementation	Monitoring Party (Frequency)	Target	Performance Indicators (Monitoring Tool)	Cost
A	Include section on possible palaeontological heritage finds in induction prior to construction activities take place – Refer to Section 5 of this report referring to geotechnical reports	Planning /Pre-Construction	Prior to construction	Applicant ECO Heritage Specialist	ECO (Monthly)	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 36 and 38 of NHRA	No legal directives Legal compliance audit scores (Legal register) (ECO Monthly Checklist/Report)	R5 000
B	Implement chance find procedures in case where possible new palaeontological heritage finds are made	Construction	During construction	Applicant ECO Heritage Specialist	ECO (weekly)	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35 and 38 of NHRA	ECO Monthly Checklist/Report	Possibly R10 000
C	Micro siting of layout and monitoring of construction activities by palaeontologist if indicated after completion of geotechnical report	Construction	During construction	Applicant ECO Palaeontologist	Palaeontologist (Initial 5 day visit and then one day every 2 weeks)	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35 and 38 of NHRA	Palaeontologist Monthly Checklist/Report	Monthly R40-50 000
D	Implementation of no-go zone of 100meters around point 0522	Construction and operational	Prior to construction through to operations	Applicant ECO Palaeontologist	Palaeontologist (Initial 5 day visit and then one day every 2 weeks during construction) EO during operations	Ensure compliance with relevant legislation and recommendations from SAHRA under Section 35 and 38 of NHRA	Construction - Palaeontologist Monthly Checklist/Report Operational EO Monthly Checklist	

8. HERITAGE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

8.1. General Management Guidelines

1. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) states that, any person who intends to undertake a development categorised as-
 - (a) the construction of a road, wall, transmission line, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier exceeding 300m in length;
 - (b) the construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length;
 - (c) any development or other activity which will change the character of a site-
 - (i) exceeding 5 000 m² in extent; or
 - (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof; or
 - (iii) involving three or more erven or divisions thereof which have been consolidated within the past five years; or
 - (iv) the costs of which will exceed a sum set in terms of regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority;
 - (d) the re-zoning of a site exceeding 10 000 m² in extent; or
 - (e) any other category of development provided for in regulations by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority, must at the very earliest stages of initiating such a development, notify the responsible heritage resources authority and furnish it with details regarding the location, nature and extent of the proposed development.

In the event that an area previously not included in an archaeological or cultural resources survey is to be disturbed, the SAHRA needs to be contacted. An enquiry must be lodged with them into the necessity for a Heritage Impact Assessment.

2. In the event that a further heritage assessment is required it is advisable to utilise a qualified heritage practitioner, preferably registered with the Cultural Resources Management Section (CRM) of the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA).

This survey and evaluation must include:

- (a) The identification and mapping of all heritage resources in the area affected;
- (b) An assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in section 6 (2) or prescribed under section 7 of the National Heritage Resources Act;
- (c) An assessment of the impact of the development on such heritage resources;
- (d) An evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development;
- (e) The results of consultation with communities affected by the proposed development and other interested parties regarding the impact of the development on heritage resources;

- (f) If heritage resources will be adversely affected by the proposed development, the consideration of alternatives; and
 - (g) Plans for mitigation of any adverse effects during and after the completion of the proposed development.
3. It is advisable that an information section on cultural resources be included in the SHEQ training given to contractors involved in surface earthmoving activities. These sections must include basic information on:
- a. Heritage;
 - b. Graves;
 - c. Archaeological finds; and
 - d. Historical Structures.
- This module must be tailor made to include all possible finds that could be expected in that area of construction.
- Possible finds include:
- a. Open air Stone Age scatters, disturbed during vegetation clearing. This will include stone tools.
 - b. Palaeontological deposits such as bone, and teeth in fluvial riverbank deposits.
4. In the event that a possible find is discovered during construction, all activities must be halted in the area of the discovery and a qualified archaeologist contacted.
5. The archaeologist needs to evaluate the finds on site and make recommendations towards possible mitigation measures.
6. If mitigation is necessary, an application for a rescue permit must be lodged with SAHRA.
7. After mitigation, an application must be lodged with SAHRA for a destruction permit. This application must be supported by the mitigation report generated during the rescue excavation. Only after the permit is issued may such a site be destroyed.
8. If during the initial survey sites of cultural significance are discovered, it will be necessary to develop a management plan for the preservation, documentation or destruction of such a site. Such a program must include an archaeological/palaeontological monitoring programme, timeframe and agreed upon schedule of actions between the company and the archaeologist.
9. In the event that human remains are uncovered, or previously unknown graves are discovered, a qualified archaeologist needs to be contacted and an evaluation of the finds made.
10. If the remains are to be exhumed and relocated, the relocation procedures as accepted by SAHRA need to be followed. This includes an extensive social consultation process.

Table 10: Roles and responsibilities of archaeological and heritage management when heritage resources are discovered during operations

ROLE	RESPONSIBILITY	IMPLEMENTATION
A responsible specialist needs to be allocated and should attend all relevant meetings, especially when changes in design are discussed, and liaise with SAHRA.	The client	Archaeologist and a competent archaeology support team
If chance finds and/or graves or burial grounds are identified during construction or operational phases, a specialist must be contacted in due course for evaluation.	The client	Archaeologist and a competent archaeology support team
Comply with defined national and local cultural heritage regulations on management plans for identified sites.	The client	Environmental Consultancy and the Archaeologist
Consult the managers, local communities and other key stakeholders on mitigation of archaeological sites, when discovered.	The client	Environmental Consultancy and the Archaeologist
Implement additional programs, as appropriate, to promote the safeguarding of our cultural heritage. (i.e. integrate the archaeological components into the employee induction course).	The client	Environmental Consultancy and the Archaeologist,
If required, conservation or relocation of burial grounds and/or graves according to the applicable regulations and legislation.	The client	Archaeologist, and/or competent authority for relocation services
Ensure that recommendations made in the Heritage Report are adhered to.	The client	The client
Provision of services and activities related to the management and monitoring of significant archaeological sites (when discovered). The client with the specialist needs to agree on the scope and activities to be performed	The client	Environmental Consultancy and the Archaeologist
When a specialist/archaeologist has been appointed for mitigation work on discovered heritage resources, comprehensive feedback reports should be submitted to relevant authorities during each phase of development.	Client and Archaeologist	Archaeologist

8.2. All phases of the project

8.2.1. Archaeology

The project will encompass a range of activities during the construction phase, including ground clearance, establishment of construction camps area.

It is possible that cultural material will be exposed during operations and may be recoverable, but this is the high-cost front of the operation, and so any delays should be minimised. Development surrounding infrastructure and construction of facilities results in significant disturbance, but construction trenches do offer a window into the past and it thus may be possible to rescue some of the data and materials. It is also possible that substantial alterations will be implemented during this phase of the project and these must be catered for. Temporary infrastructure is often changed or added to during the subsequent history of the project. In general, these are low impact developments as they are superficial, resulting in little alteration of the land surface, but still need to be catered for.

During the construction phase, it is important to recognise any significant material being unearthed, and to make the correct judgment on which actions should be taken. In the event that possible heritage resources are identified a qualified archaeologist/palaeontologist must be contacted to evaluate the finds and make recommendations on the mitigation required.

In addition, feedback reports can be submitted by the archaeologist to the client and SAHRA to ensure effective monitoring. This archaeological monitoring and feedback strategy should be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) of the project. Should an archaeological/palaeontological site or cultural material be discovered during construction (or operation), such as burials or grave sites, the project needs to be able to call on a qualified expert to make a decision on what is required and if it is necessary to carry out emergency recovery. SAHRA would need to be informed and may give advice on procedure. The developers therefore should have some sort of contingency plan so that operations could move elsewhere temporarily while the material and data are recovered. The project thus needs to have an archaeologist/palaeontologist available to do such work. This provision can be made in an archaeological monitoring programme.

In the case where archaeological material is identified during construction the following measures must be taken:

- Upon the accidental discovery of archaeological material, a buffer of at least 20 meters should be implemented.
- If archaeological material is accidentally discovered during construction, activities must cease in the area and a qualified archaeologist be contacted to evaluate the find. To remove the material permit must be applied for from SAHRA under Section 35 of the NHRA.

8.2.2. Graves

In the case where a grave is identified during construction the following measures must be taken:

- Upon the accidental discovery of graves, a buffer of at least 50 meters should be implemented.
- If graves are accidentally discovered during construction, activities must cease in the area and a qualified archaeologist be contacted to evaluate the find. To remove the remains a permit must be applied for from SAHRA (Section 36 of the NHRA) and other relevant authorities (National Health Act and its regulations). The local South African Police Services must immediately be notified of the find.
- Where it is recommended that the graves be relocated, a full grave relocation process that includes comprehensive social consultation must be followed.

The grave relocation process must include:

- i. A detailed social consultation process, that will trace the next-of-kin and obtain their consent for the relocation of the graves, that will be at least 60 days in length;
- ii. Site notices indicating the intent of the relocation;
- iii. Newspaper notices indicating the intent of the relocation;
- iv. A permit from the local authority;
- v. A permit from the Provincial Department of Health;
- vi. A permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency, if the graves are older than 60 years or unidentified and thus presumed older than 60 years;
- vii. An exhumation process that keeps the dignity of the remains intact;
- viii. The whole process must be done by a reputable company that is well versed in relocations;
- ix. The exhumation process must be conducted in such a manner as to safeguard the legal rights of the families as well as that of the developing company.

9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PGS Heritage (Pty) Ltd (PGS) was appointed by SiVEST Environmental Division (SiVEST) to undertake a Heritage Impact Assessment that forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the proposed development of the Sendawo Solar 1, 75MW solar photovoltaic (PV) energy facility near Lichtenburg, North West Province.

Heritage resources are unique and non-renewable and as such any impact on such resources must be seen as significant.

The Heritage Impact Assessment has shown that the proposed Sendawo Solar projects have heritage resources present on the property. This has been confirmed through a field survey, archival research and evaluation of aerial photography of the sites.

9.1. Archaeological Resources

During the fieldwork 2 archaeological resources were identified of which all were archaeological sites representing the Earlier, Middle and Later Stone Age. The sites are all rated as having local heritage significance. No mitigation is required for sites V01 and V06.

9.2. Palaeontological Resources

Local scree material and blocks of dolomite were inspected for fossils and all finds were recorded as photographic records. Outcrop of bedrock with significant stromatolites fossils was recorded and sites with potential cave breccia were recorded in areas where burrows of large vertebrates such as Aardvark were obviously present in the sandy deposits.

Based on the fieldwork findings, an extremely high palaeontological sensitivity area has been delineated (Figure 16) in the south eastern section of the proposed project area. The palaeontological finds around point 0522 are seen as the most significant of the area and can give a heritage grading of Grade 2 (Provincial Heritage Site) but potentially Grade 1 (National Heritage Site).

Final identification of possible sites where significant cave breccia will occur will only be identified after completion of the geotechnical surveys.

Mitigation:

- Mitigation through exclusion of the no-go area around point 0522 as indicated in Figure 15.
- Micro siting in the delineated extremely high paleontological sensitivity area and palaeontological excavations and collection if Geotechnical Survey indicates necessity for mitigation
- It is essential that the results of the Geotechnical Surveys be provided to the HIA team and palaeontologist to assess the possible presence of sinkholes and cave breccia sites on all the proposed development areas;
- If excavation of deeper than 1.5m is planned, the palaeontologist must assess the results of the geotechnical information and given the opportunity to comment on the likelihood of significant finds of fossils in all the planned development areas;
- If any excavation or collection of fossils is recommended, such mitigation measures will require a permit from SAHRA before mitigation can be done as well as a final destruction permit on completion of the mitigation work.

Due to the presence of significant stromatolites in a small area and the large number of boulders with stromatolites present on site it is recommended that an palaeontologist be appointed to monitor geotechnical investigations as part of a watching brief. The aim being the identification and mitigation of any newly discovered palaeontological sites, if recorded.

The significant finds recorded in Table 5 must lead to exclusion of the specific sites from this development.

9.3. Impact Summary

Table 11 provides a summary of the projected impact rating for this project on heritage resources.

Table 11: Comparison of summarised impacts on environmental parameters

Environmental parameter	Issues	Rating prior to mitigation	Average	Rating post mitigation	Average
Heritage resources	Impact during construction	28		10	
			Negative medium Impact		Positive Low Impact
Palaeontological Resources	Impact during construction	96	Negative High impact	57	Positive High Impact

9.4. Assessment of Alternatives

An evaluation of the operations buildings, substation and lay down area alternatives have indicated that none of the proposed area impact directly on known heritage resources and thus no preference towards a specific alternative has been identified.

Key

PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a low impact / reduce the impact
FAVOURABLE	The impact will be relatively insignificant
NOT PREFERRED	The alternative will result in a high impact / increase the impact
NO PREFERENCE	The alternative will result in equal impacts

Comparative Assessment of Alternatives – Sendawo Solar 1

Alternative	Preference	Reasons
OPERATIONS BUILDING AND SUBSTATION		
Sendawo PV 1 Operations Building and Substation Alternative 1	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have

Alternative	Preference	Reasons
		been identified
Sendawo PV 1 Operations Building and Substation Alternative 2	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
LAYDOWN AREA		
Sendawo PV 1 Laydown Area Alternative 1	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified
Sendawo PV 1 Laydown Area Alternative 2	NO PREFERENCE	The position of the foot print area impacts on no now heritage resources and no preference above the other alternatives have been identified

The overall impact on heritage resources is seen as acceptable and the proposed mitigation measures to be incorporated in the EMP will provided the necessary actions to address any impacts on heritage resources.

10. REFERENCES

10.1. Published References

Bergh, J.S. 1998. Geskiedenisatlas van die Vier Noordelike Provinsies. Van Schaik, Pretoria.

Bramford, M. & F. Thackeray. 2009. Continued Excavations at Wonderwerk Cave in The Digging Stick, Volume 26, No. 2.

Breutz, P.J. 1968. The Tribes of the Districts of Taung and Herbert. Department of Bantu Administration and Development, Ethnological Publication No. 51.

Dowson, T.A., Blundell, G. & Hall, S.L. 1992. Finger Paintings in the Harts River Valley, Northern Cape Province, South Africa in Southern African Field Archaeology, Volume 1, pp 27-32.

Humphreys, A.J.B. A Preliminary Report on Test Excavations at Dikbosch Shelter I, Herbert District, Northern Cape in The South African Archaeological Bulletin, Volume 29, No. 115 & 116

Kuman, K. 2001. An Acheulean Factory Site with Prepared Core Technology near Taung, South Africa. The South African Archaeological Bulletin, Vol. 56, No. 173/174 (Dec., 2001), pp. 8-22.

Legassick, M. 2010. The politics of a South African frontier: the Griqua, the Sotho-Tswana and the missionaries, 1780 – 1840. Basler Afrika Bibliographien, Basel.

Liebenberg, M.M.B. 1990. Schweizer-Reneke. HSRC, Pretoria.

Mitchell, P. 2002. The Archaeology of Southern Africa. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Morris, D. 1988. Engraved in Place and Time: A Review of Variability in the Rock Art of the Northern Cape and Karoo. The South African Archaeological Bulletin Vol. 43, No. 148 (Dec., 1988), pp. 109-120

Republic of South Africa, 1999. National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25.

Snyman, P.H.R. 1986. Die Langeberg=Rebellie en die totstandkoming van Olifantshoek in Contree No. 20.

Raper, PE. 1983. Dictionary of Southern African Place Names. Head, Onomastic Research Centre, HSRC

Van Staden, A.J.C. 1983. Die Geskiedenis van die Nederduits Gereformeerde Gemeente Reivilo 1883-1983. Church Council of the Reivilo Dutch Reformed Church, Reivilo.

10.2. Unpublished References

Birkholtz, P. 2011. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed Pering Mining Project, Located on the farm Pering Mine 1023 HN, North West Province. An unpublished report compiled by PGS Heritage and Grave Relocation Consultants for Marsh (Pty) Ltd.

Kruger, N. 2013. Archaeological Impact Assessment for a Photovoltaic Power Plant and Power Line Development on Portion 1 of the farm Kangkatjes 919 HN, North West Province. An unpublished report compiled by Ages for Vidigenix (Pty) Ltd.

Van Schalkwyk, J. 2011. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed development of Photovoltaic Power Plants on Five Different Locations in the North West and Northern Cape Provinces. An unpublished report compiled for Subsolar.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2012. Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed development of a photovoltaic power plant on a portion of the Farm Waterloo 992, Vryburg Region, North West Province.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2013. Basic Heritage Assessment for the proposed Mookodi 132kv Phase 2 Power Lines Development, North West Province.

10.3. Internet References

www.info.gov.za

www.beeld.com

www.wikipedia.org

www.jstor.org

Anglo Boere Oorlog/Boer War (1899-1902) British Concentration Camp project. Anglo Boere Oorlog/Boer War (1899-1902) VRYBURG Camp/Kamp. <http://www.geni.com/projects/Anglo-Boere-Oorlog-Boer-War-1899-1902-VRYBURG-Camp-Kamp/14136>. Accessed 30 May 2014.

10.4. Historic Topographic Maps

One of the historic topographic maps used in this report was obtained from the National Archives and the other from the digital resources of the William Cullen Library, Historical Papers, Early Maps collection.

10.5. Google Earth

All the aerial depictions and overlays used in this report are from Google Earth.



Appendix A

LEGISLATIVE PRINCIPLES

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS – TERMINOLOGY AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

3.1 General principles

In areas where there has not yet been a systematic survey to identify conservation worthy places, a permit is required to alter or demolish any structure older than 60 years. This will apply until a survey has been done and identified heritage resources are formally protected.

Archaeological and palaeontological sites, materials, and meteorites are the source of our understanding of the evolution of the earth, life on earth and the history of people. In the new legislation, permits are required to damage, destroy, alter, or disturb them. People who already possess material are required to register it. The management of heritage resources are integrated with environmental resources and this means that before development takes place heritage resources are assessed and, if necessary, rescued.

In addition to the formal protection of culturally significant graves, all graves, which are older than 60 years and are not in a cemetery (such as ancestral graves in rural areas), are protected. The legislation protects the interests of communities that have interest in the graves: they may be consulted before any disturbance takes place. The graves of victims of conflict and those associated with the liberation struggle will be identified, cared for, protected and memorials erected in their honour.

Anyone who intends to undertake a development must notify the heritage resource authority and if there is reason to believe that heritage resources will be affected, an impact assessment report must be compiled at the developer's cost. Thus, developers will be able to proceed without uncertainty about whether work will have to be stopped if an archaeological or heritage resource is discovered.

According to the National Heritage Act (Act 25 of 1999 section 32) it is stated that:

An object or collection of objects, or a type of object or a list of objects, whether specific or generic, that is part of the national estate and the export of which SAHRA deems it necessary to control, may be declared a heritage object, including –

- objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects, meteorites and rare geological specimens;
- visual art objects;
- military objects;
- numismatic objects;
- objects of cultural and historical significance;
- objects to which oral traditions are attached and which are associated with living heritage;
- objects of scientific or technological interest;
- books, records, documents, photographic positives and negatives, graphic material, film or video or sound recordings, excluding those that are public records as defined in section 1 (xiv) of the National Archives of South Africa Act, 1996 (Act No. 43 of 1996), or in a provincial law pertaining to records or archives; and
- any other prescribed category.

Under the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999), provisions are made that deal with, and offer protection, to all historic and pre-historic cultural remains, including graves and human remains.

3.2 Graves and cemeteries

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

Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years fall under Section 36 of Act 25 of 1999 (National Heritage Resources Act) as well as the Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983) and are the jurisdiction of the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA). The procedure for Consultation Regarding Burial Grounds and Graves (Section 36(5) of Act 25 of 1999) is applicable to graves older than 60 years that are situated outside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority. Graves in the category located inside a formal cemetery administrated by a local authority will also require the same authorisation as set out for graves younger than 60 years over and above SAHRA authorisation.

If the grave is not situated inside a formal cemetery but is to be relocated to one, permission from the local authority is required and all regulations, laws and by-laws set by the cemetery authority must be adhered to.



Appendix B

Heritage Assessment Methodology

The section below outlines the assessment methodologies utilised in the study.

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report to be compiled by PGS Heritage (PGS) for the proposed Tlisitseng Solar projects will assess the heritage resources found on site. This report will contain the applicable maps, tables and figures as stipulated in the NHRA (no 25 of 1999), the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (no 107 of 1998) and the Minerals and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA) (28 of 2002). The HIA process consists of three steps:

- Step I – Literature Review: The background information to the field survey leans greatly on the Heritage Scoping Report completed by PGS for this site.
- Step II – Physical Survey: A physical survey was conducted on foot through the proposed project area by qualified archaeologists, aimed at locating and documenting sites falling within and adjacent to the proposed development footprint.
- Step III – The final step involved the recording and documentation of relevant archaeological resources, as well as the assessment of resources in terms of the heritage impact assessment criteria and report writing, as well as mapping and constructive recommendations

The significance of heritage sites was based on four main criteria:

- **site integrity** (i.e. primary vs. secondary context),
- **amount of deposit, range of features** (e.g., stonewalling, stone tools and enclosures),
 - Density of scatter (dispersed scatter)
 - Low - <10/50m²
 - Medium - 10-50/50m²
 - High - >50/50m²
- **uniqueness** and
- **potential** to answer present research questions.

Management actions and recommended mitigation, which will result in a reduction in the impact on the sites, will be expressed as follows:

- A - No further action necessary;
- B - Mapping of the site and controlled sampling required;
- C - No-go or relocate pylon position
- D - Preserve site, or extensive data collection and mapping of the site; and
- E - Preserve site

-
-
-
-
-

- Site Significance

Site significance classification standards prescribed by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (2006) and approved by the Association for Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) for the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region, were used for the purpose of this report.

Table 12: Site significance classification standards as prescribed by SAHRA

FIELD RATING	GRADE	SIGNIFICANCE	RECOMMENDED MITIGATION
National Significance (NS)	Grade 1	-	Conservation; National Site nomination
Provincial Significance (PS)	Grade 2	-	Conservation; Provincial Site nomination
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3A	High Significance	Conservation; Mitigation not advised
Local Significance (LS)	Grade 3B	High Significance	Mitigation (Part of site should be retained)
Generally Protected A (GP.A)	Grade 4A	High / Medium Significance	Mitigation before destruction
Generally Protected B (GP.B)	Grade 4B	Medium Significance	Recording before destruction
Generally Protected C (GP.A)	Grade 4C	Low Significance	Destruction



Appendix C

**Impact Assessment Methodology to be utilised
during EIA phase**

1. Methodology for Impact Assessment

The EIA Methodology assists in evaluating the overall effect of a proposed activity on the environment. The determination of the effect of an environmental impact on an environmental parameter is determined through a systematic analysis of the various components of the impact. This is undertaken using information that is available to the environmental practitioner through the process of the environmental impact assessment. The impact evaluation of predicted impacts was undertaken through an assessment of the significance of the impacts.

1.1. Determination of Significance of Impacts

Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics, which include context, and intensity of an impact. Context refers to the geographical scale i.e. site, local, national or global whereas Intensity is defined by the severity of the impact e.g. the magnitude of deviation from background conditions, the size of the area affected, the duration of the impact and the overall probability of occurrence.

Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. The total number of points scored for each impact indicates the level of significance of the impact.

1.2. Impact Rating System

Impact assessment must take account of the nature, scale and duration of effects on the environment whether such effects are positive (beneficial) or negative (detrimental). Each issue / impact is also assessed according to the project stages:

- planning
- construction
- operation
- decommissioning

Where necessary, the proposal for mitigation or optimisation of an impact should be detailed. A brief discussion of the impact and the rationale behind the assessment of its significance has also been included.

1.2.1. Rating System Used To Classify Impacts

The rating system is applied to the potential impact on the receiving environment and includes an objective evaluation of the mitigation of the impact. Impacts have been consolidated into one rating. In assessing the significance of each issue the following criteria (including an allocated point system) is used:

Table 13: Description

NATURE		
Include a brief description of the impact of environmental parameter being assessed in the context of the project. This criterion includes a brief written statement of the environmental aspect being impacted upon by a particular action or activity.		
GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT		
This is defined as the area over which the impact will be expressed. Typically, the severity and significance of an impact have different scales and as such bracketing ranges are often required. This is often useful during the detailed assessment of a project in terms of further defining the determined.		
1	Site	The impact will only affect the site
2	Local/district	Will affect the local area or district
3	Province/region	Will affect the entire province or region
4	International and National	Will affect the entire country
PROBABILITY		
This describes the chance of occurrence of an impact		
1	Unlikely	The chance of the impact occurring is extremely low (Less than a 25% chance of occurrence).
2	Possible	The impact may occur (Between a 25% to 50% chance of occurrence).
3	Probable	The impact will likely occur (Between a 50% to 75% chance of occurrence).
4	Definite	Impact will certainly occur (Greater than a 75% chance of occurrence).
REVERSIBILITY		
This describes the degree to which an impact on an environmental parameter can be successfully reversed upon completion of the proposed activity.		
1	Completely reversible	The impact is reversible with implementation of minor mitigation measures
2	Partly reversible	The impact is partly reversible but more intense mitigation measures are required.
3	Barely reversible	The impact is unlikely to be reversed even with intense mitigation measures.
4	Irreversible	The impact is irreversible and no mitigation measures exist.

IRREPLACEABLE LOSS OF RESOURCES		
This describes the degree to which resources will be irreplaceably lost as a result of a proposed activity.		
1	No loss of resource.	The impact will not result in the loss of any resources.
2	Marginal loss of resource	The impact will result in marginal loss of resources.
3	Significant loss of resources	The impact will result in significant loss of resources.
4	Complete loss of resources	The impact is result in a complete loss of all resources.
DURATION		
This describes the duration of the impacts on the environmental parameter. Duration indicates the lifetime of the impact as a result of the proposed activity		
1	Short term	The impact and its effects will either disappear with mitigation or will be mitigated through natural process in a span shorter than the construction phase (0 – 1 years), or the impact and its effects will last for the period of a relatively short construction period and a limited recovery time after construction, thereafter it will be entirely negated (0 – 2 years).
2	Medium term	The impact and its effects will continue or last for some time after the construction phase but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (2 – 10 years).
3	Long term	The impact and its effects will continue or last for the entire operational life of the development, but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter (10 – 50 years).
4	Permanent	The only class of impact that will be non-transitory. Mitigation either by man or natural process will not occur in such a way or such a time span that the impact can be considered transient (Indefinite).

CUMULATIVE EFFECT		
This describes the cumulative effect of the impacts on the environmental parameter. A cumulative effect/impact is an effect, which in itself may not be significant but may become significant if added to other existing or potential impacts emanating from other similar or diverse activities as a result of the project activity in question.		
1	Negligible Cumulative Impact	The impact would result in negligible to no cumulative effects
2	Low Cumulative Impact	The impact would result in insignificant cumulative effects
3	Medium Cumulative impact	The impact would result in minor cumulative effects
4	High Cumulative Impact	The impact would result in significant cumulative effects
INTENSITY/ MAGNITUDE		
Describes the severity of an impact		
1	Low	Impact affects the quality, use and integrity of the system/component in a way that is barely perceptible.
2	Medium	Impact alters the quality, use and integrity of the system/component but system/component still continues to function in a moderately modified way and maintains general integrity (some impact on integrity).
3	High	Impact affects the continued viability of the system/ component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component is severely impaired and may temporarily cease. High costs of rehabilitation and remediation.
4	Very high	Impact affects the continued viability of the system/component and the quality, use, integrity and functionality of the system or component permanently ceases and is irreversibly impaired (system collapse). Rehabilitation and remediation often impossible. If possible rehabilitation and remediation often unfeasible due to extremely high costs of rehabilitation and remediation.

SIGNIFICANCE			
<p>Significance is determined through a synthesis of impact characteristics. Significance is an indication of the importance of the impact in terms of both physical extent and time scale, and therefore indicates the level of mitigation required. This describes the significance of the impact on the environmental parameter. The calculation of the significance of an impact uses the following formula:</p> <p>(Extent + probability + reversibility + irreplaceability + duration + cumulative effect) x magnitude/intensity.</p> <p>The summation of the different criteria will produce a non-weighted value. By multiplying this value with the magnitude/intensity, the resultant value acquires a weighted characteristic, which can be measured and assigned a significance rating.</p>			
Points	Impact Rating	Significance	Description
6 to 28	Negative Low impact		The anticipated impact will have negligible negative effects and will require little to no mitigation.
6 to 28	Positive Low impact		The anticipated impact will have minor positive effects.
29 to 50	Negative Medium impact		The anticipated impact will have moderate negative effects and will require moderate mitigation measures.
29 to 50	Positive Medium impact		The anticipated impact will have moderate positive effects.
51 to 73	Negative High impact		The anticipated impact will have significant effects and will require significant mitigation measures to achieve an acceptable level of impact.
51 to 73	Positive High impact		The anticipated impact will have significant positive effects.
74 to 96	Negative Very high impact		The anticipated impact will have highly significant effects and are unlikely to be able to be mitigated adequately. These impacts could be considered "fatal flaws".
74 to 96	Positive Very high impact		The anticipated impact will have highly significant positive effects.

The 2010 regulations also specify that alternatives must be compared in terms of impact assessment.

Appendix C

Heritage Maps

