

Marion Bamford trading as  
**Marion Bamford Consulting**  
PO Box 652, Wits 2050  
Johannesburg, South Africa  
Tel: 011 717 6690; Cell: 082 555 6937  
Email: [marionbamford12@gmail.com](mailto:marionbamford12@gmail.com)  
[Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za](mailto:Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za)

Ref:

26 August 2022

Attention: Project Directors  
Unit B1 Mayfair Square  
Century Way  
Century City  
Western Cape  
7441

RE: CONFIRMATION THAT THE PALAEOONTOLOGICAL SPECIALIST ASSESSMENT OF THE SPRINGHAAS GRID CONNECTION PROJECT HAS MET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STANDARD FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND EXPANSION OF POWER LINES AND SUBSTATIONS WITHIN IDENTIFIED GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS, 2022

This letter is presented as a pre-face to the specialist report:

*Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed LiLo Connection from Springhaas Collector Substation A to the Beta/ Hydra 400kV Overhead Line, Near Dealesville, Bloemfontein, Free State (Prof M. Bamford, 2022)*

#### **PURPOSE OF THIS LETTER**

This letter serves to confirm and demonstrate that the specialist assessment undertaken for the project:

*Springhaas Grid Connection: LiLo Connection of up to 400kV in capacity from Springhaas Collector Substation A to Beta/ Hydra 400kV overhead line, near Dealesville, Bloemfontein, Free State (LiLo 1)*

has met the requirements of the Standard for the Development and Expansion of Power Lines and Substations within Identified Geographical Areas, 2022 (Revision 2), as gazetted by GN 2313 of 2022 and promulgated under the National Environmental Management Act (Act 59 of 2008), as amended.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The above-mentioned "Standard" was promulgated on 27 July 2022, and saw certain listed activities, as listed in Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations Listing Notices 1 and 2, become no longer applicable under certain conditions, and instead be replaced by the need to register certain qualifying developments in terms of the Standard, and demonstrate compliance with the provisions of the Standard. The project described above is affected by this change. The site is located within the Kimberley Renewable Energy Development Zone and is also located within the Central Strategic Transmission Corridor.

This specialist assessment described above (and subsequent draft report) was commenced prior to this change in July 2022 and hence the draft specialist report does not specifically reference the Standard. This letter, which serves as a

subsequent addendum to the specialist report, presents information demonstrating that the specialist has subsequently considered this Standard.

## CONSIDERATION OF THE STANDARD

The Standard presents four key sections relevant to specialist assessments:

- Procedural Requirements (Chapter 2). These are the procedural steps that are to be followed in the registration process,
- General Environmental Principles (Chapter 3). These are principles that must be adhered to when planning a powerline route or locating a substation position,
- Environmental Specifications (Appendix A). These actions need to be carried out to verify the environmental sensitivity of the site,
- Specialist Confirming Statements (Appendix B). A statement by the specialist confirming that certain key aspects have been considered. As per the requirements of the Standard, this statement is to be prepared after the public participation process, as it references input from Interested & Affected parties (I&APs).

The tables below indicate how the requirements of these three sections have been considered in the specialist study:

Table 1. Procedural Requirement that must be followed when planning a powerline or sub-station. Note, only those applicable to specialists are listed.

No.	Requirement	Comment
7	The proponent must ensure that the EAP and <u>specialists</u> identify through their specialist knowledge and site verifications/walkthrough as necessary, a proposed route and/or the substation location/s (where a substation or substations are relevant) within the <i>preliminary corridor</i> based on: a) consideration and implementation of the mitigation hierarchy, b) environmental sensitivity identified using the methodologies or processes as stipulated in Chapter 3 of this Standard, and c) engineering constraints.	The specialist has considered the location of the site through site verifications and walkthroughs. a) The mitigation hierarchy has been considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid: The footprint of LILO 1 avoids sensitive palaeontological resources. Avoidance of high sensitivity areas has been achieved.</li> <li>• Minimise: The specialist has provided recommendations to minimise the impact of the development on palaeontological resources at all stages of the development. These measures have been incorporated into the generic EMPr.</li> <li>• Rehabilitate: No specific rehabilitation measures, in relation to palaeontological impacts, have been deemed necessary.</li> <li>• Offset: No offsets are required as no high sensitivity palaeontological resources are impacted by LILO 1.</li> </ul> b) Sensitivities were identified using methodologies as stipulated in Chapter 3, General Environmental Processes. This is demonstrated in Table 2 below. c) Engineering constraints were considered.  The overall grid connection corridor is considered appropriate, and the location of the project therein is also acceptable.
10. (e)	A discussion by the <u>specialists</u> and/or EAP of the process used to confirm that the proposed route and/or substation location has applied the principles stipulated in Chapter 3, and the process used to confirm that the site sensitivity of the proposed route and/or substation location is of low or medium environmental sensitivity.	Confirmed.  Furthermore, Table 2 below lists the principles stipulated in Chapter 3 and confirms that the process of confirming the proposed route, and the site sensitivity, has considered the General environmental Principle stipulated in Chapter 3.

Table 2. General Environmental Principles that must be adhered to when planning a powerline.

No.	Requirement	Comment
22	There must be no removal of threatened plant species.	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
23	There must be no impact on Tier 1 plant species identified through the screening process and site verification process	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
24	Clear-cutting during construction must be kept to a maximum of 8 m.	Not applicable to the palaeontological

No.	Requirement	Comment
		assessment
25	Wetlands must be avoided or, where wetland crossing is unavoidable, the power line should be routed over the narrowest part of the wetland. For the most part, wetlands and rivers can be traversed by the power line with little to no impact by placing the pylons outside of the wetland	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
26	Avoid all known Blue Swallow breeding habitat by a 2.5 km buffer. Should the full extent of the buffering not be practically possible, a thorough investigation must be conducted by a suitably experienced avifaunal specialist with experience of Blue Swallows to identify any potential nesting holes, which must then be appropriately buffered, in consultation with Ezemvelo KwaZulu-Natal Wildlife and BirdLife South Africa to prevent destruction of the nest holes.	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
27	Avoid Cape Vulture and White-backed Vulture breeding colonies by a 5 km buffer. In addition, it would require management of the potential impacts on the breeding birds once construction commences, which would necessitate the involvement of the avifaunal specialist and the environmental control officer (ECO).	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
28	Avoid Lappet-faced Vulture and Bearded Vulture restaurants by a 5 km buffer. Should the full extent of the buffering at vulture restaurants not be practically possible, the vulture restaurant should be relocated in consultation with the owner of the restaurant	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
29	The power line alignment or substation footing shall not be located within 500m of the edge of waterbodies found to be suitable for Greater Flamingo, Black Stork, Blue Crane, Great White Pelican, Lesser Flamingo and African Marsh-harrier	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment
30.	The power line alignment or substation shall not be located within 1 km of major piggeries and poultry farms.	Not applicable to the palaeontological assessment

Table 3. Specifications required ito of the Standard for the Development and Expansion of Power Lines and Substations within Identified Geographical Area (DFFE, 2022)

Standard No.	Specification	Comment
18	Where required, a heritage impact assessment (HIA) will be undertaken in compliance with Section 38(1) to 38(4) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) as well as any Minimum Standards or Guidelines published in relation to Section 38(3) 31 .	A HIA has been undertaken by a specialist (Asha Consulting). A Palaeontological Impact Assessment (Phase 1) was undertaken by a specialist (Prof Bamford) in support of the HIA.
19	The HIA must be submitted to the South African Heritage Resources Agency and applicable Provincial Heritage Authorities for decision making procedures.	The HIA report, together with the Palaeontological Impact Assessment (Phase 1) report will be submitted to the South African Heritage Resources Agency and applicable Provincial Heritage Authorities for decision making procedures.
20	The applicable recommendations or requirements from the South African Heritage Resources Agency and applicable Provincial Heritage Authorities must be documented in the final environmental sensitivity report.	The applicable recommendations from these authorities are to be documented in the final environmental sensitivity report.

Table 4. Confirming Statement by specialist

No.	Requirement	Comment
51	A description of the affected environment in terms of heritage resources and palaeontology, and an indication of existing heritage and palaeontological impacts within the preliminary corridor based on the site verification inspection and walk through.	Addressed in specialist report (see section 3)
52	Identification of heritage resources and palaeontological areas to be avoided within the preliminary corridor,	Addressed in specialist report (see section 4.1)

No.	Requirement	Comment
	including buffers;	
53	A heritage sensitivity map overlaid with the proposed development footprint (i.e. pylon placement and power line route, as well as supporting infrastructure) based on most recently obtainable and available desktop data, such as the information on the screening tool and the South African Heritage Resources Information System, site verification inspection and walk through (where necessary);	Addressed in specialist report (see section 3, Figure 4)
54	Where required, a written comment or letter of no objection from the South African Heritage Resources Agency and/or applicable provincial heritage authority confirming that there is no unacceptable impact on heritage resources and palaeontology;	Addressed in specialist report (see section 4)
55	Confirmation that any recommendations as required by the South African Heritage Resources Agency and/or applicable provincial heritage authority have been incorporated and considered;	These are to be incorporated once/if received.
56	A description on how the identified environmental sensitivity pertaining to heritage resources and palaeontology has been considered in determining the proposed route;	Addressed in specialist report (see section 2)
57	A description of the implementation of the mitigation hierarchy in order to determine the proposed route and/or substation location;	See Table 1
58	How the inputs of I&APs were considered when determining the final pre-negotiated route and/or substation location; and	To be updated post Public Participation Process.
59	A statement confirming that: a. impact management actions as contained in the pre-approved Generic EMPr template are sufficient for the avoidance, management and mitigation of impacts and risks; or b. where required, specific impact management outcomes and actions are required and have been provided as part of the site specific EMPr.	a. Confirmed b. Confirmed

## CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The proposed project, in the location specified and assessed in the report, is supported.

Should you have any queries, feel free to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Prof Marion Bamford

Cell: 082 555 6937

26 August 2022

## SPECIALIST DETAILS –

Table 5. Specialist Details

No.	Requirement	Comment
1	Contact Information	See Appendix 1
2	Relevant qualifications	See Appendix 1
3	Curriculum vitae	See Appendix 2
4	Description of expertise in preparing the statement;	PhD in Palaeontology (Wits, 1990) More than 20 years of experience in Impact Assessment More than 300 reports produced

APPENDIX 1 – SPECIALIST DECLARATION TEMPLATE

**APPENDIX D - SPECIALIST DECLARATION TEMPLATE**

Specialist Company Name:	Marion Bamford Consulting		
Specialist name:	Prof Marion Bamford		
Specialist Qualifications:	PhD in Palaeontology (Wits, 1990)		
Professional affiliation/registration <sup>32</sup>	FRSSAf, mASSAf, PSSA, SASQUA, INQUA, IOP, IAWA (PSSA does not a formal accreditation like the Archaeological Society)		
Physical address:	24A 8 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, Parktown North 2193, Johannesburg		
Postal address:	P O Box 652, WITS		
Postal code:	2050	Cell:	082 555 6937
Telephone:	011 717 6690	Fax:	-
Email:	Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za		

DECLARATION BY THE SPECIALIST

I, Marion Kathleen Bamford, declare that –

- I act as the independent specialist in this Standard registration process;
- I have performed the work relating to the specialist assessment and/or route or substation location confirmation in an objective manner;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting the specialist input and confirming statement relevant to this request for registration, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, and all other applicable legislation;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the proponent all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing compliance with the Standards registration process; and
- all the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct.



Signature of the Specialist:

---

Name of Company: Marion Bamford Consulting

---

Date: 26 August 2022

<sup>32</sup> A copy of the most recent registration certificate must be appended to this declaration

## Curriculum vitae (short) - Marion Bamford PhD January 2022

### I) Personal details

Surname : **Bamford**  
First names : **Marion Kathleen**  
Present employment : Professor; Director of the Evolutionary Studies Institute.  
Member Management Committee of the NRF/DST Centre of Excellence Palaeosciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa  
Telephone : +27 11 717 6690  
Fax : +27 11 717 6694  
Cell : 082 555 6937  
E-mail : [marion.bamford@wits.ac.za](mailto:marion.bamford@wits.ac.za) ;  
[marionbamford12@gmail.com](mailto:marionbamford12@gmail.com)

### ii) Academic qualifications

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:

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

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

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

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

NRF Rating: C-2 (1999-2004); B-3 (2005-2015); B-2 (2016-2020); B-1 (2021-2026)

### iii) Professional qualifications

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

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

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

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

### iv) Membership of professional bodies/associations

Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa

Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards

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

International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991

International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+

Botanical Society of South Africa

South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016

SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+  
 PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative  
 ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+  
 INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

### vii) Supervision of Higher Degrees

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	13	0
Masters	11	3
PhD	11	6
Postdoctoral fellows	15	1

### viii) Undergraduate teaching

Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year  
 Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 45 students per year  
 Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology;  
 Micropalaeontology – average 12-20 students per year.

### ix) Editing and reviewing

Editor: *Palaeontologia africana*: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor  
 Guest Editor: *Quaternary International*: 2005 volume  
 Member of Board of Review: *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*: 2010 –  
 Associate Editor *Open Science UK*: 2021 -  
 Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 30 local and international journals  
 Reviewing of funding applications for NRF, PAST, NWO, SIDA, National Geographic, Leakey Foundation

### x) Palaeontological Impact Assessments

Selected from the past five years only – list not complete:

- Mala Mala 2017 for Henwood
- Modimolle 2017 for Green Vision
- Klipportjie and Finaalspan 2017 for Delta BEC
- Ledjadja borrow pits 2018 for Digby Wells
- Lungile poultry farm 2018 for CTS
- Olienhout Dam 2018 for JP Celliers
- Isondlo and Kwasobabili 2018 for GCS
- Kanakies Gypsum 2018 for Cabanga
- Nababeep Copper mine 2018
- Glencore-Mbali pipeline 2018 for Digby Wells
- Remhoogte PR 2019 for A&HAS
- Bospoort Agriculture 2019 for Kudzala
- Overlooked Quarry 2019 for Cabanga
- Richards Bay Powerline 2019 for NGT
- Eilandia dam 2019 for ACO
- Eastlands Residential 2019 for HCAC



- Fairview MR 2019 for Cabanga
- Graspan project 2019 for HCAC
- Lieliefontein N&D 2019 for EnviroPro
- Skeerpoort Farm Mast 2020 for HCAC
- Vulindlela Eco village 2020 for 1World
- KwaZamakhule Township 2020 for Kudzala
- Sunset Copper 2020 for Digby Wells
- McCarthy-Salene 2020 for Prescali
- VLNR Lodge 2020 for HCAC
- Madadeni mixed use 2020 for EnviroPro
- Frankfort-Windfield Eskom Powerline 2020 for 1World
- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe

#### **xi) Research Output**


Publications by M K Bamford up to January 2022 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 160 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 10 book chapters.

Scopus h-index = 30; Google scholar h-index = 35; i10-index = 92

Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.

**APPENDIX 3 – SPECIALIST REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE**

Note that the Palaeontological Society of SA does not have any form of accreditation. Proof of PhD certificate is presented



**Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the  
proposed LiLo Connection from Springhaas  
Collector Substation A to the Beta/ Hydra 400kV  
Overhead Line, Near Dealesville, Bloemfontein,  
Free State**

**Desktop Study (Phase 1)**

**For**

**ASHA Consulting**

**25 July 2022**

**Prof Marion Bamford**

Palaeobotanist

P Bag 652, WITS 2050

Johannesburg, South Africa

[Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za](mailto:Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za)

## **Expertise of Specialist**

The Palaeontologist Consultant: Prof Marion Bamford  
Qualifications: PhD (Wits Univ, 1990); FRSSAf, mASSAf  
Experience: 33 years research and lecturing in Palaeontology  
25 years PIA studies and over 300 projects completed

## **Declaration of Independence**

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

Specialist: Prof Marion Bamford

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "M Bamford". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Signature:

## Executive Summary

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the proposed Line-in-Line-Out (LiLo) connection up to 400kV powerline from Springhaas Collector Substation A to the Beta/ Hydra 400Kv overhead line near Dealesville, Free State Province.

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

The proposed LiLo 1 route lies on the non-fossiliferous Jurassic dolerite. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the contractor, environmental officer or other designated responsible person once excavations, drilling or mining activities have commenced. Since the impact will be low, as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

The palaeontological significance pre-mitigation is very low negative, and post-mitigation is very low positive.

Cumulative impacts are the same as the individual impacts

There is no No-Go Area.

Structure	Geology	Palaeontology	Action
LiLo 1	Jurassic dolerite	None	None

## Table of Contents

Expertise of Specialist .....	1
Declaration of Independence .....	1
1. Background.....	4
2. Methods and Terms of Reference .....	10
3. Geology and Palaeontology.....	11
i. Project location and geological context.....	11
ii. Palaeontological context.....	13
4. Impact assessment.....	14
4.1 Pre-Construction Phase.....	16
4.2 Construction Phase, Operations Phase and Decommissioning Phase .....	16
4.3 Operations Phase.....	17
4.1 Decommissioning Phase .....	18
4.2 Cumulative Impacts.....	18
4.1 No-Go Impacts.....	18
5. Assumptions and uncertainties .....	18
6. Recommendation.....	19
7. References .....	19
8. Chance Find Protocol.....	20
9. Appendix A – Details of specialist.....	21
10. Appendix B – Specialist Declaration.....	24

# 1. Background

## Project description

ABO Wind renewable energies (Pty) Ltd proposes the construction and operation of a grid connection to connect the Springhaas solar PV facilities located south-west of Dealesville in the Free State Province to add new capacity to the national electricity grid. In order for the Springhaas Solar PV facilities to evacuate the generated solar power to the national grid, a connection must be established between the solar PV facilities and the existing Eskom 400kV lines, namely the Beta/Delphi and Beta/Hydra lines located to the east and west of the solar PV facilities respectively.

This PIA assess the Line in Line Out (LiLo) connection up to 400kV in capacity powerline from Springhaas Collector Substation A to the Beta/ Hydra 400kV overhead line (**LiLo 1**). LiLo 1 forms part of a larger project known as the Springhaas Grid Connection and would include development of the following components, each of which would require a separate Environmental Authorisation (EA):

1. Up to 2 (two) collector sub-stations/switching stations and associated auxiliary buildings (i.e. for control/storage/electrical infrastructure/components) each with a development footprint of up to 8Ha for the collector station (this includes the auxiliary buildings), including but not limited to the construction of a new platform with an earth mat and civil works, as well as new infrastructure such as feeder bay/s, line bay/s, busbar/s, circuit breaker/s, bussection/s, and/or transformer/s, with various protection equipment. [Table 1; TWO EAs]
2. Up to 7 (seven) overhead lines (OHL) connecting the Springhaas Solar PV Facilities to the collector/switching/transformation sub-stations, via single/double-circuit up to 275kV, mono pole lines, complete with structures, foundations, conductor, fibre layout, insulation, and assemblies. [Table 2; SEVEN EAs]
3. Up to 2 (two) LiLo connections into the existing Eskom 400KV line, via a single/double-circuit power line of up to 400kV between the collector/switching/transformation substation/s and the Eskom 400kV line, complete with structures, foundations, conductor, fibre layout, insulation, and assemblies. [Table 3; TWO EAs]

Access to “Collector A” would be via the access roads for Springhaas Solar Facility 8 (which is included in the facility Basic Assessment scope). Access to “Collector B” would be via the main access road for Springhaas Solar Facilities 1 and 3, with an additional up to 6m wide main access road constructed off that road. An up to 4m wide jeep track would be required to provide access along the OHL servitude.

The Springhaas Grid Connection including up to 2 collector/switching/transformation Substations with associated auxiliary buildings, up to 2x 400kV LiLo connections and up to 7 OHLs have been assessed within a grid connection corridor ranging from approximately 100 m to approximately 575 m wide and 18 km in length. The assessment of a corridor allows for the optimisation of the grid connection infrastructure to accommodate and avoid any environmental sensitivities identified through the assessment, noting, however, that the corridor itself has been intentionally located to avoid environmentally sensitive areas as far as possible and to rather locate the corridor in previously disturbed areas. The entire extent of the grid connection corridor is within the Kimberley REDZ as well as within a Strategic Transmission Corridor.

**Table 1: Details of Collector/Switching Stations (each to receive separate decision)**

Name	Location	Connection	Capacity	Footprint	Height
Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation substation A (and auxiliary buildings)	western edge of Remainder of Farm Corneliasdal No. 45	Will collect multiple up to 275 kV overhead lines (located within the grid corridor), potentially step-up to 400 kV (if required), consolidated overhead lines would leave the collector sub-station for connection to the existing Eskom 400 kV lines.	Up to 400 kV	Up to 8 Ha (this includes Aux buildings)	Up to 10 m
Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation substation B (and auxiliary buildings)	eastern edge of Farm Alsace No. 1181 and north eastern section of Farm Oertel's Rest No. 1184				

Access: Each sub-station would be accessed by an up to 6m wide access road.

Access Road details:

Collector/switching/transformation sub-station A- via the access roads for Springhaas Solar Facility 8 (which is included in the facility Basic Assessment scope)

Collector/switching/transformation sub-station B- via the main access road for Springhaas Solar Facilities 1 and 3 (noting that this is within the facility Basic Assessment scope), with an additional road of up to 6m wide and 75m long required extending from the facilities 'main access road to the sub-station.

**Table 2: Details of Overhead Lines to Collector Stations (each to receive separate decision)**

Power Line Route Description	Capacity	Length	Type of Line*
Line 1: Springhaas Solar Facility 1 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station B	Up to 275 kV	Up to 1.8km	Overhead Line
Line 2: Springhaas Solar Facility 3 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station B	Up to 275 kV	Up to 1.7km	Overhead Line
Line 3: Springhaas Solar Facility 4 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station A	Up to 275 kV	Up to 3km	Overhead Line
Line 4: Springhaas Solar Facility 5 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station A	Up to 275 kV	Up to 2.5km	Overhead Line
Line 5: Springhaas Solar Facility 6 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station B	Up to 275 kV	Up to 3.8km	Overhead Line
Line 6: Springhaas Solar Facility 8 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station A	Up to 275 kV	Up to 0.3km	Overhead Line
Line 7: Springhaas Solar Facility 9 to Springhaas Collector/switching/transformation sub-station A	Up to 275 kV	Up to 2.6km	Overhead Line

The following specifications apply to all seven proposed lines:

Foundation: The type of terrain will determine the choice of foundation. The size of the footprint area will range from 0.6m x 0.6m to 1.5m x 1.5m. The minimum working area required around a structure pylon position is 20 m x 20 m.

Pylon/Tower: up to 275 kV steel monopole or lattice towers.

Tower type: Self-supporting and/or Angle strain towers.

Height: up to 40 m.

Span length: minimum 200m up to 375 m.

Servitude width: up to 47m (i.e., 23.5 m on either side of the power line). Note: wider corridor for all the power lines listed above will be assessed, in order to identify sensitivities and features that need to be avoided.

Service Road: There would be a jeep track (up to 4m wide) within the development footprint/ servitude of the line (underneath the line), where possible.

\* **Underground line assessed as an alternative, but it is not preferred to go underground. The overhead line is the preferred alternative.**



**Table 3: Details of Grid Connection (each to receive separate decision) (LiLo 1 details shown in blue).**

<b>Components</b>	<b>Specifications</b>	<b>Location</b>
LiLo 1: LiLo into Beta/Hydra 400kV OHL	<b>Type:</b> Overhead Line <b>Connection:</b> Loop in-Loop out (LiLo) connection to existing Eskom 400kV overhead Line <b>Capacity:</b> up to 400 kV <b>Length:</b> two lines each up to 905m <b>Height:</b> up to approx. 60m <b>Servitude width:</b> up to 55m <b>Tower Spacing/span length:</b> 300m up to 400m <b>Service Road:</b> There would be a jeep track (up to 4m wide) within the development footprint/ servitude of the line (underneath the line), i.e., a centre line track, where possible.	Western half of Remainder of Farm Corneliassdal No. 45
LiLo 2: LiLo into Beta/Delphi 400kV OHL	<b>Type:</b> Overhead Line <b>Connection:</b> Loop in-Loop out (LiLo) connection to existing Eskom 400kV overhead Line <b>Capacity:</b> up to 400 kV <b>Length:</b> two lines each up to 470m <b>Height:</b> up to approx. 60m <b>Servitude width:</b> up to 55m <b>Tower Spacing/span length:</b> 300m up to 400m <b>Service Road:</b> There would be a jeep track (up to 4m wide) within the development footprint/ servitude of the line (underneath the line), i.e., a centre line track, where possible.	Southern area of Farm Johanna No. 1209 and north eastern section of Farm Oertel's Rest No. 1184

### Identification of alternatives

The following alternatives are assessed in this process:

1. The no-go alternative.


A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the Grid Connection for the Dealesville Springhaas Solar PV Facility project. To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a desktop Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development and is reported herein. No fieldwork was deemed necessary for the PIA. A site visit and walkthrough was however undertaken by the Archaeologist.

This PIA is for LiLo 1. The other grid connection components are assessed in separate reports.


**Table 4:** National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014 (as amended) - Requirements for Specialist Reports (Appendix 6).

Section	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
ai	Details of the specialist who prepared the report,	Appendix B
aii	The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Appendix B
b	A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page 1
c	An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
cA	An indication of the quality and age of the base data used for the specialist report: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map accessed – date of this report	Yes
cB	A description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change	Section 5
d	The duration, date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	N/A. As the site is located in an area of low sensitivity no site visit was deemed necessary.
e	A description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used	Section 2
f	Details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure, inclusive of a site plan identifying site alternatives	Section 4
g	An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	N/A. No sensitive area to be avoided were identified.
h	A map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	N/A. The entire site was rated as low sensitivity.
i	A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 5
j	A description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity or activities	Section 4
k	Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 8, Appendix A

<b>Section</b>	<b>A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:</b>	<b>Relevant section in report</b>
l	Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A
m	Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 8, Appendix A
ni	A reasoned opinion whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised	Section 6
niA	Regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and	
nii	If the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Sections 6, 8
o	A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A
p	A summary and copies of any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A
q	Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A
2	Where a government notice gazetted by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.	N/A



**Figure 1:** Site layout plan (provided by GIBB Environmental)



**Figure 2:** Google Earth Map of the proposed LiLo 1 (turquoise square) on Remainder of Farm Corneliasdal No. 45, also shown in the figure, grid corridor (red), Collector Substation A (black), access roads (light brown), solar PV facility boundary (light grey), broader study area (yellow)

## 2. Methods and Terms of Reference


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

The methods employed to address the ToR included:

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

### 3. Geology and Palaeontology

#### i. Project location and geological context



**Figure 3:** Geological map of the area around the Dealesville Springhaas Solar PV Facility (blue outline). Turquoise line indicates the approximate location of LiLo 1. Abbreviations of the rock types are explained in Table 2. Map enlarged from the Geological Survey 1: 250 000 map 2824 Kimberley.

**Table 5:** Explanation of symbols for the geological map and approximate ages (Johnson et al., 2006; Partridge et al., 2006). SG = Supergroup; Fm = Formation; Ma = million years; shading for the formations corresponds to the SAHRIS Palaeosensitivity coding in Figure 5.

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Qs	Quaternary	Alluvium, sand,	Quaternary, ca 1.2 – 1.0 Ma
Qc	Kalahari sands	Calcrete. Calcified pan dune	Quaternary, ca 1.2 – 1.0 Ma
Jd	Jurassic dykes	Dolerite dykes, intrusive	Jurassic, approx. 180 Ma
Pt	Tierberg Fm, Ecca Group, Karoo SG	Shales, siltstones, sandstone,	Early Permian, ca 290 Ma

The project is located in the north central part of the Karoo Basin where Karoo Supergroup rocks cover a very large proportion of South Africa and have preserved a diversity of fossil plants, insects, vertebrates and invertebrates.

During the Carboniferous Period South Africa was part of the huge continental landmass known as Gondwanaland and it was positioned over the South Pole. As a result, there were several ice

sheets that formed and melted, and covered most of South Africa. Gradual melting of the ice as the continental mass moved northwards and the earth warmed, formed fine-grained sediments in the large inland sea. These are the oldest rocks in the system and are exposed around the outer part of the ancient Karoo Basin, and are known as the Dwyka Group. They comprise tillites, diamictites, mudstones, siltstones and sandstones that were deposited as the basin filled (Johnson et al., 2006).

Overlying the Dwyka Group rocks are rocks of the Ecca Group that are Early Permian in age. There are eleven formations recognised in this group but they do not all extend throughout the Karoo Basin. In the west and central part are the following formations, from base upwards: Prince Albert Formation, Whitehill Formation, Collingham Formation, Laingsburg / Ripon Formations, **Tierberg** / Fort Brown Formations, and Waterford Formation. In the eastern Free State and KwaZulu Natal, from the base upwards are the Pietermaritzburg Formation, Vryheid Formation and the Volksrust Formation. All of these sediments have varying proportions of sandstones, mudstones, shales and siltstones and represent shallow to deep water settings, deltas, rivers, streams and overbank depositional environments.

Overlying the Ecca Group are the rocks of the Beaufort Group that have been divided into the lower Adelaide Subgroup for the Upper Permian strata, and the Tarkastad Subgroup for the Early to Middle Triassic strata. As with the older Karoo sediments, the formations vary across the Karoo Basin.

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

The **Quaternary Kalahari sands** form an extensive cover of much younger deposits over much of Botswana, the Northern Cape Province and the Free State Province. Haddon and McCarthy (2005) proposed that the Kalahari basin formed as a response to down-warp of the interior of the southern Africa, probably in the Late Cretaceous. This, along with possible uplift along epeirogenic axes, back-tilted rivers into the newly formed Kalahari basin and deposition of the Kalahari Group sediments began. Sediments included basal gravels in river channels, sand and finer sediments. A period of relative tectonic stability during the mid-Miocene saw the silcretisation and calcretisation of older Kalahari Group lithologies, and this was followed in the Late Miocene by relatively minor uplift of the eastern side of southern Africa and along certain epeirogenic axes in the interior. More uplift during the Pliocene caused erosion of the sand that was then reworked and redeposited by aeolian processes during drier periods, resulting in the extensive dune fields that are preserved today.

There are numerous pans in the Kalahari Group sediments, generally 3–4 km in diameter (Haddon and McCarthy, 2005). According to Goudie and Wells (1995) there are two conditions required for the formation of pans. Firstly, the fluvial processes must not be integrated, and second, there must be no accumulation of aeolian material that would fill the irregularities or depressions in the land surface. Favoured materials or substrates for the formation of pans in South Africa are Dwyka and Ecca shales and sandstones (ibid).

New cosmogenic burial ages obtained from a 55 m section of Kalahari Group sediments (Matmon et al., 2015) indicate that in the southern Kalahari, the majority of deposition occurred rapidly at 1.0–1.2 Ma. All earlier sediments in this region were eroded during previous sedimentary cycles. In summary, they showed that the stratigraphy, sedimentology, and cosmogenic nuclide data indicate:


1) the existence of a stable, shallow and low-energy water body over the southern Kalahari for at least 450 ka prior to 1–1.2 Ma;

- 2) rapid sediment accumulation that filled up the basin at 1–1.2 Ma; and
- 3) the establishment of the Kalahari sand cover shortly thereafter.

The authors acknowledge that this timeframe is far younger than expected from the conventional estimates for the Kalahari Group sediments (Haddon and McCarthy, 2005). The significant hiatus between the Pleistocene sequence and the underlying Archaean basement implies that evidence of earlier cycles of deposition and erosion are no longer preserved in the sedimentary record.

## ii. Palaeontological context

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 5. The site for development is in the Tierberg Formation, Jurassic dolerite, Quaternary calcrete and Quaternary sands.



**Figure 4:** SAHRIS Palaeosensitivity map for the site for the proposed LiLo 1, turquoise line. Broader study area, yellow Background colours indicate the following degrees of sensitivity: red = very highly sensitive; orange/yellow = high; green = moderate; blue = low; grey = insignificant/zero.

From the SAHRIS map above the area is indicated as highly sensitive (orange) for the Tierberg Formation and Quaternary sands, moderately sensitive (green) for the Quaternary calcrete and on no sensitivity (grey) for the Jurassic dolerite.

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 4. In the westernmost part of the basin the Tierberg Formation is predominantly argillaceous. In the northwest of its occurrence where it is in contact with the Collingham or Whitehill Formations, it grades up into the arenaceous overlying Waterford Formation (Johnson et al., 2006). Trace fossils of *Nereites*, *Planolites* and *Zoophycus* can be found in the fine mudstones (Johnson et al., 2006).



The Tertiary calcretes can trap fossils and artefacts when associated with palaeo-pans and dunes or palaeo-springs (Partridge et al., 2006). Where deflation has occurred, for example along the west coast of South Africa, any trapped materials in the different levels can be concentrated in the depo-centre of the pan or dune and thus it can be challenging to interpret the deposit (Felix-Henningsen et al., 2003; Netterberg, 1969).

The aeolian sands of the Gordonia Formation do not preserve fossils because they have been transported and reworked, but in some regions these too may have covered pan or spring deposits and these can trap fossils, and more frequently archaeological artefacts. Usually these geomorphological features can be detected using satellite imagery. Several pans are in the project area so they were surveyed by Dr Jayson Orton.

## 4. Impact assessment

The objective of the assessment of potential impacts is to identify and assess all the significant, potential impacts that may arise as a result of the project.

For each of the main project phases the existing and potential future impacts and benefits (associated only with the project) will be described using the criteria listed below. The assignment of ratings has been undertaken based on past experience of the team, as well as through research. Subsequently, mitigation measures will be identified and considered for each impact and the assessment repeated in order to determine the significance of the residual impacts (the impact remaining after the mitigation measure has been implemented).

The following alternatives are assessed in this process:

1. The no-go alternative.

There are no palaeontologically very highly sensitive areas in footprint so there are no no-go areas to be considered.

**Table 4A: Impact Assessment Criteria**

Criteria	Rating Scales	Notes
Nature	Positive	An evaluation of the effect of the impact related to the proposed development
	Negative	
Extent	Footprint	The extent of the impact is rated as footprint as it only affects the area in which the proposed activity will occur
	Site	The extent of the impact is rated as site as it will affect only the development area
	Local	The extent of the impact is rated as Local as it affects the development area and adjacent properties
	Regional	The extent of the impact is rated as Regional as the effects of the impact extends beyond municipal boundaries
	National	The extent of the impact is rated as National as the effects of the impact extends beyond more than 2 regional/ provincial boundaries
	International	The extent of the impact is rated as International as the effect of the impact extends beyond country borders
Duration	Temporary	The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last 0-6 months and as such is rated as Temporary
	Short term	The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last 6-18 months and as such is rated as Short term
	Medium term	The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last 18 months-5 years and as such is rated as Medium term
	Long term	The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last more than 5 years and as such is rated as Long Term

Criteria	Rating Scales	Notes
Severity	High negative	The severity of the impact is rated as High negative as the natural, cultural or social functions and processes are altered to the extent that the natural process will temporarily or permanently cease; and valued, important, sensitive or vulnerable systems or communities are substantially affected.
	Moderate negative	The severity of the impact is rated as Moderate negative as the affected environment is altered but natural, cultural and social functions and processes continue albeit in a modified way; and valued, important, sensitive or vulnerable systems or communities are negatively affected
	Low negative	The severity of the impact is rated as Low negative as the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally affected
	Low positive	The severity of the impact is rated as Low positive as the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally improved
	Moderate positive	The severity of the impact is rated as Moderate positive as the affected environment is altered but natural, cultural and social functions and processes continue albeit in a modified way; and valued, important, sensitive or vulnerable systems or communities are positively affected
	High positive	The severity of the impact is rated as High positive as the natural, cultural or social functions and processes are altered to the extent that valued, important, sensitive or vulnerable systems or communities are substantially positively affected.
Potential for impact on irreplaceable resources	No	No irreplaceable resources will be impacted.
	Yes	Irreplaceable resources will be impacted.
Consequence	Extremely detrimental	A combination of extent, duration, intensity and the potential for impact on irreplaceable resources
	Highly detrimental	
	Moderately detrimental	
	Slightly detrimental	
	Negligible	
	Slightly beneficial	
	Moderately beneficial	
	Highly beneficial	
Extremely beneficial		
Likelihood of the impact occurring	Unlikely	It is highly unlikely or less than 50 % likely that an impact will occur.
	Likely	It is between 50 and 75 % certain that the impact will occur.
	Definite	It is more than 75 % certain that the impact will occur or it is definite that the impact will occur.
Significance	Very high - negative	A function of Consequence and Likelihood
	High - negative	
	Moderate - negative	
	Low - negative	
	Very low	
	Low - positive	
	Moderate - positive	
	High - positive	
Very high - positive		

#### 4.1 Pre-Construction Phase

There will be no significant impacts on palaeontological resources during the pre-construction phase.

#### 4.2 Construction Phase, Operations Phase and Decommissioning Phase

Palaeontological resources may be impacted during excavation and earthworks in the construction phase.

**Table 4B. Construction phase impacts**

IMPACT ON POSSIBLE PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
PROJECT PHASE	<i>Construction phase</i>			
DIRECT IMPACT	<i>Destruction of fossils in the footprint</i>			
INDIRECT IMPACT				
CUMULATIVE IMPACT	<i>Loss of fossil heritage and scientific knowledge</i>			
DIMENSION	RATING	MOTIVATION	CONSEQUENCE	LIKELIHOOD
PRE-MITIGATION				
DURATION	2	<i>The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last 6-18 months and as such is rated as Short term</i>	-3	3
EXTENT	1	<i>The extent of the impact is rated as footprint as it only affects the area in which the proposed activity will occur</i>		
SEVERITY	-1	<i>The severity of the impact is rated as Low negative as the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally affected</i>	Negligible	Definite
IMPACT ON IRREPLACEABLE RESOURCES	0	<i>No irreplaceable resources will be impacted.</i>		
SIGNIFICANCE	-9	<b>Very Low Negative</b>		
PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES				
<i>If fossils are found once excavations for foundations and amenities have commenced then they should be photographed, removed and put in a safe place. Photographs should be sent to a palaeontologist to assess their scientific value. If the fossils are important the palaeontologist must obtain a permit from SAHRA, visit the site and remove the fossils for curation and storage in a recognised facility such as a museum or palaeontology department in a university</i>				
POST-MITIGATION				
DURATION	2	<i>The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last 6-18 months and as such is rated as Short term</i>	3	3
EXTENT	1	<i>The extent of the impact is rated as footprint as it only affects the area in which the proposed activity will occur</i>		
SEVERITY	1	<i>The severity of the impact is rated as Low positive as the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally improved</i>	Negligible	Definite

IMPACT ON IRREPLACEABLE RESOURCES	0	No irreplaceable resources will be impacted.		
<b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Very Low Positive</b>		
<b>CONFIDENCE LEVEL</b>				
<i>High</i>				

### 4.3 Operations Phase

Palaeontological resources may be impacted during excavation and earthworks in the operational phase.

**Table 4C. Operations phase impacts**

IMPACT ON POSSIBLE PALAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
PROJECT PHASE	<i>Operations phase</i>			
DIRECT IMPACT	<i>Destruction of fossils in the footprint</i>			
INDIRECT IMPACT				
CUMULATIVE IMPACT	<i>Loss of fossil heritage and scientific knowledge</i>			
DIMENSION	RATING	MOTIVATION	CONSEQUENCE	LIKELIHOOD
<b>PRE-MITIGATION</b>				
DURATION	4	<i>The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last more than 5 years and as such is rated as long term</i>	-5	3
EXTENT	1	<i>The extent of the impact is rated as footprint as it only affects the area in which the proposed activity will occur</i>		
SEVERITY	-1	<i>The severity of the impact is rated as Low negative as the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally affected</i>	<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Definite</b>
IMPACT ON IRREPLACEABLE RESOURCES	0	<i>No irreplaceable resources will be impacted.</i>		
<b>SIGNIFICANCE</b>	<b>-15</b>	<b>Very Low Negative</b>		
<b>PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES</b>				
<i>If fossils are found once excavations for foundations and amenities have commenced then they should be photographed, removed and put in a safe place. Photographs should be sent to a palaeontologist to assess their scientific value. If the fossils are important the palaeontologist must obtain a permit from SAHRA, visit the site and remove the fossils for curation and storage in a recognised facility such as a museum or palaeontology department in a university</i>				
<b>POST-MITIGATION</b>				
DURATION	4	<i>The duration of the activity associated with the impact will last more than 5 years and as such is rated as long term</i>	5	3
EXTENT	1	<i>The extent of the impact is rated as footprint as it only affects the area in which the proposed activity will occur</i>		
SEVERITY	1	<i>The severity of the impact is rated as Low positive as the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally improved</i>	<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Definite</b>

IMPACT ON IRREPLACEABLE RESOURCES	0	<i>No irreplaceable resources will be impacted.</i>		
SIGNIFICANCE	15	Very Low Positive		
<b>CONFIDENCE LEVEL</b>				
<i>High</i>				

#### 4.1 Decommissioning Phase

The impacts associated with the decommissioning phase are the same as those identified for the construction phase. The impact assessment in Table 4B.

#### 4.2 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts were assessed at two levels:

1. Level 1: Within the grid corridor – the cumulative impact of all development within the grid corridor
2. Level 2: Within a 30km radius of the site.

There was no difference between level 1 and level 2 cumulative impacts.

The pre-and post-mitigation ratings of cumulative impacts are the same because every potential fossil discovery has its own scientific value.

**Table 4D. Cumulative impacts**

Impact	Pre-mitigation	Post-mitigation
Destruction of fossils (level 1, grid corridor)	Very low negative	Very low positive
Destruction of fossils (level 2, 30km radius of the site)	Very low negative	Very low positive

#### 4.1 No-Go Impacts

**No-Go Impact** – none (all sites and surrounds have an equal chance of fossils being found/absent)

Based on the nature of the project, surface activities may impact upon the fossil heritage if preserved in the development footprint. The geological structures suggest that the rocks are either the wrong type to contain fossils (dolerite). Taking account of the defined criteria, the potential impact to fossil heritage resources is extremely low for the whole study site and there are no no-go areas.

### 5. Assumptions and uncertainties

Based on the geology of the area and the palaeontological record as we know it, it can be assumed that the formation and layout of the dolomites, sandstones, shales and sands are typical for the country and only some contain fossil plant, insect, invertebrate and vertebrate material. The sands of the Quaternary period would not preserve fossils.

## 6. Recommendation

Based on experience and the lack of any previously recorded fossils from the area, it is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be preserved in Jurassic Dolerite. If fossils are found by the environmental officer, or other responsible person once excavations have commenced then they should be rescued and a palaeontologist called to assess and collect a representative sample.

The impact on the palaeontological heritage would be low, so as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

**Table 6A:** Summary of palaeontological impact and recommendation

Component	Geology	Palaeontology	Action
LiLo 1	Jurassic dolerite	None	None

## 7. References

Anderson, J.M., Anderson, H.M., 1985. Palaeoflora of Southern Africa: Prodrum of South African megaflores, Devonian to Lower Cretaceous. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam. 423 pp.

Goudie, A.S., Wells, G.L., 1995. The nature, distribution and formation of pans in arid zones. *Earth Science Reviews* 38, 1–69.

Felix-Henningsen, P., Kandel, A.W., Conard, N.J., 2003. The significance of calcretes and paleosols on ancient dunes of the Western Cape, South Africa, as stratigraphic markers and paleoenvironments. In: G. Füleký (Ed.) *Papers of the 1st International Conference on Archaeology and Soils*. BAR International S1163, pp. 45–52.

Haddon, I.G., McCarthy, T.S., 2005. The Mesozoic–Cenozoic interior sag basins of Central Africa: The Late-Cretaceous–Cenozoic Kalahari and Okavango basins. *Journal of African Earth Sciences* 43, 316–333.

Johnson, M.R., van Vuuren, C.J., Visser, J.N.J., Cole, D.I., Wickens, H.deV., Christie, A.D.M., Roberts, D.L., Brandl, G., 2006. Sedimentary rocks of the Karoo Supergroup. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). *The Geology of South Africa*. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. Pp 461 – 499.

Matmon, A., Hidy, A.J., Vainer, S., Crouvi, O., Fink, D., 2015. New chronology for the southern Kalahari Group sediments with implications for sediment-cycle dynamics and early hominin occupation. *Quaternary Research*. 84 (1), 118–132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.yqres.2015.04.009>.

Netterberg, F., 1969. The interpretation of some basic calcrete types. *South African Archaeology Bulletin* 24, 117–122.

Partridge, T.C., Botha, G.A., Haddon, I.G., 2006. Cenozoic deposits of the interior. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). *The Geology of South Africa*. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. Pp 585–604.

Plumstead, E.P., 1969. Three thousand million years of plant life in Africa. Geological Society of southern Africa, Annexure to Volume LXXII. 72pp + 25 plates.

## 8. Chance Find Protocol

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

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

## 9. Appendix A – Details of specialist

### **Curriculum vitae (short) - Marion Bamford PhD January 2022**

#### **I) Personal details**

Surname : **Bamford**  
First names : **Marion Kathleen**  
Present employment: Professor; Director of the Evolutionary Studies Institute.  
Member Management Committee of the NRF/DST Centre of Excellence Palaeosciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa  
Telephone : +27 11 717 6690  
Fax : +27 11 717 6694  
Cell : 082 555 6937  
E-mail : [marion.bamford@wits.ac.za](mailto:marion.bamford@wits.ac.za) ;  
[marionbamford12@gmail.com](mailto:marionbamford12@gmail.com)

#### **ii) Academic qualifications**

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:  
1980-1982: BSc, majors in Botany and Microbiology. Graduated April 1983.  
1983: BSc Honours, Botany and Palaeobotany. Graduated April 1984.  
1984-1986: MSc in Palaeobotany. Graduated with Distinction, November 1986.  
1986-1989: PhD in Palaeobotany. Graduated in June 1990.  
NRF Rating: C-2 (1999-2004); B-3 (2005-2015); B-2 (2016-2020); B-1 (2021-2026)

#### **iii) Professional qualifications**

*Wood Anatomy Training (overseas as nothing was available in South Africa):*  
1994 - Service d'Anatomie des Bois, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgium, by Roger Dechamps  
1997 - Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France, by Dr Jean-Claude Koeniguer  
1997 - Université Claude Bernard, Lyon, France by Prof Georges Barale, Dr Jean-Pierre Gros, and Dr Marc Philippe

#### **iv) Membership of professional bodies/associations**

Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa  
Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards  
Academy of Sciences of South Africa - Member: Oct 2014 onwards  
International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991  
International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+  
Botanical Society of South Africa  
South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016  
SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+



PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative  
 ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+  
 INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

**vii) Supervision of Higher Degrees**

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	13	0
Masters	11	3
PhD	11	6
Postdoctoral fellows	15	1

**viii) Undergraduate teaching**

Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year  
 Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 45 students per year  
 Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology;  
 Micropalaeontology – average 12-20 students per year.

**ix) Editing and reviewing**

Editor: *Palaeontologia africana*: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor  
 Guest Editor: *Quaternary International*: 2005 volume  
 Member of Board of Review: *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology*: 2010 –  
 Associate Editor *Open Science UK*: 2021 -  
 Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 30 local and international journals  
 Reviewing of funding applications for NRF, PAST, NWO, SIDA, National Geographic,  
 Leakey Foundation

**x) Palaeontological Impact Assessments**

Selected from the past five years only – list not complete:

- Mala Mala 2017 for Henwood
- Modimolle 2017 for Green Vision
- Klipoortjie and Finaalspan 2017 for Delta BEC
- Ledjadja borrow pits 2018 for Digby Wells
- Lungile poultry farm 2018 for CTS
- Olienhout Dam 2018 for JP Celliers
- Isondlo and Kwasobabili 2018 for GCS
- Kanakies Gypsum 2018 for Cabanga
- Nababeep Copper mine 2018
- Glencore-Mbali pipeline 2018 for Digby Wells
- Remhoogte PR 2019 for A&HAS
- Bospoort Agriculture 2019 for Kudzala
- Overlooked Quarry 2019 for Cabanga
- Richards Bay Powerline 2019 for NGT
- Eilandia dam 2019 for ACO
- Eastlands Residential 2019 for HCAC
- Fairview MR 2019 for Cabanga
- Graspan project 2019 for HCAC
- Lieliefontein N&D 2019 for EnviroPro

- Skeerpoort Farm Mast 2020 for HCAC
- Vulindlela Eco village 2020 for 1World
- KwaZamakhule Township 2020 for Kudzala
- Sunset Copper 2020 for Digby Wells
- McCarthy-Salene 2020 for Prescali
- VLNR Lodge 2020 for HCAC
- Madadeni mixed use 2020 for EnviroPro
- Frankfort-Windfield Eskom Powerline 2020 for 1World
- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe

### **xi) Research Output**

Publications by M K Bamford up to January 2022 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 160 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 10 book chapters.

Scopus h-index = 30; Google scholar h-index = 35; i10-index = 92

Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.

## 10. Appendix B – Specialist Declaration



**environmental affairs**

Department:  
Environmental Affairs  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

**DETAILS OF THE SPECIALIST, DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND UNDERTAKING UNDER OATH**

File Reference Number:	(For official use only)
NEAS Reference Number:	DEA/EIA/
Date Received:	

Application for authorisation in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014, as amended (the Regulations)

**PROJECT TITLE**

PROPOSED LILO CONNECTION FROM SPRINGHAAS COLLECTOR SUBSTATION A TO THE BETA/HYDRA 400kV OHL, NEAR DEALESVILLE, BLOEMFONTEIN, FREE STATE

**Kindly note the following:**

1. This form must always be used for applications that must be subjected to Basic Assessment or Scoping & Environmental Impact Reporting where this Department is the Competent Authority.
2. This form is current as of 01 September 2018. It is the responsibility of the Applicant / Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to ascertain whether subsequent versions of the form have been published or produced by the Competent Authority. The latest available Departmental templates are available at <https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms>.
3. A copy of this form containing original signatures must be appended to all Draft and Final Reports submitted to the department for consideration.
4. All documentation delivered to the physical address contained in this form must be delivered during the official Departmental Officer Hours which is visible on the Departmental gate.
5. All EIA related documents (includes application forms, reports or any EIA related submissions) that are faxed; emailed; delivered to Security or placed in the Departmental Tender Box will not be accepted, only hardcopy submissions are accepted.

**Departmental Details**

**Postal address:**  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Attention: Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations  
Private Bag X447  
Pretoria  
0001

**Physical address:**  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Attention: Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations  
Environment House  
473 Steve Biko Road  
Arcadia

Queries must be directed to the Directorate: Coordination, Strategic Planning and Support at:  
Email: [EIAAdmin@environment.gov.za](mailto:EIAAdmin@environment.gov.za)

**1. SPECIALIST INFORMATION**

Specialist Company Name:	Marion Bamford Consulting		
B-BBEE	Contribution level (indicate 1 to 8 or non-compliant)	Exempt	Percentage Procurement recognition
Specialist name:	Prof Marion Bamford		
Specialist Qualifications:	PhD Palaeontology (Wits; 1990)		
Professional affiliation/registration:	FRSSAf, mASSAf, PSSA, SASQUA, INQUA, IOP. IAWA		
Physical address:	24A 8 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, Parktown North, 2193		
Postal address:	P O Box 652, WITS		
Postal code:	2050	Cell:	082 555 6937
Telephone:	011 717 6690	Fax:	-
E-mail:	Marionbamford12@gmail.com		

**2. DECLARATION BY THE SPECIALIST**

I, Marion Kathleen Bamford, declare that –

- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- all the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.

*MKBamford*  
Signature of the Specialist

Marion Bamford Consulting  
Name of Company:

13 July 2022  
Date

Details of Specialist, Declaration and Undertaking Under Oath

3. UNDERTAKING UNDER OATH/ AFFIRMATION

I, Marion Kathleen Bamford, swear under oath / affirm that all the information submitted or to be submitted for the purposes of this application is true and correct.

MKBamford  
Signature of the Specialist

Marion Bamford Consulting  
Name of Company

13 July 2022  
Date

[Signature]  
Signature of the Commissioner of Oaths

13/07/2022  
Date

- I certify that before administering the oath/affirmation I asked the deponent the following questions which were answered:  
(a) Do you know and understand the contents of this Declaration?  
(b) Do you have any objections to taking the prescribed oath?  
(c) Do you consider the prescribed oath to be binding on your conscience?

- I further certify that the deponent has acknowledged that he/she knows and understands the contents of this Declaration that was sworn to/affirmed before me and the deponents signature/mark was placed thereon in my presence

13/07/2022 Signature [Signature]  
Names Justice Danga  
Commissioner of Oaths, District of Johannesburg

Ex officio Title Donor Liaison Officer  
Faculty/Office Development and Fundraising Office  
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg  
1 Jan Smuts Avenue, Johannesburg 2001