Botanical Assessment for the proposed Harmony Dam and agricultural area at Farms Houdenbek 415 and Winkel Haak RE/224, near Op-die-Berg, Witzenberg Municipality, Western Cape Province



Botanical Surveys & Tours

Dr David J. McDonald Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC. 14A Thomson Road, Claremont, 7708 Mobile: 082-876-4051

**Prepared for EnviroAfrica** 

March 2019; amended April / May 2025

# National Legislation and Regulations governing this report

This is a 'specialist report' and is compiled in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998), as amended, and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014, as amended.

# **Appointment of Specialist**

David J. McDonald of Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC was appointed by EnviroAfrica CC first in June 2017 and subsequently in early 2024, to provide specialist botanical consulting services for the assessment of the areas of the proposed Harmony Dam (First Phase) and an area for cultivation (Second Phase) on the farms Houdenbek 415 and Winkel Haak RE/224, near Op-die-Berg, Ceres District, Witzenberg Municipality, Western Cape Province.

# **Details of Specialist**

Dr David J. McDonald Pr. Sci. Nat. Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC 14A Thomson Road Claremont 7708 Mobile: 082-876-4051 e-mail: dave@bergwind.co.za Professional registration: South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions No. 400094/06

# Expertise

Dr David J. McDonald:

- Qualifications: BSc. Hons. (Botany), MSc (Botany) and PhD (Botany)
- Botanical ecologist with over 40 years' experience in the field of Vegetation Science.
- Founded Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC in 2006
- Has conducted over 1000 specialist botanical / ecological studies.
- Has published numerous scientific papers and attended numerous conferences both nationally and internationally (details available on request).

Curriculum Vitae – Appendix 2

# Independence

The views expressed in the document are the objective, independent views of Dr McDonald and the study was carried out under the aegis of, Bergwind Botanical Surveys and Tours CC. Neither Dr McDonald nor Bergwind Botanical Surveys and Tours CC have any business, personal, commercial or other interest in the proposed development apart from fair remuneration for the work performed.

# Conditions relating to this report

The content of this report is based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge as well as available information. Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC, its staff and appointed associates, reserve the right to modify the report in any way deemed fit should new, relevant or previously unavailable or undisclosed information become known to the author from on-going research or further work in this field, or pertaining to this investigation.

This report must not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of the report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports, including main reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must reference it. If these form part of a main report relating to this investigation or report, the report must be included in its entirety as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

# **Declaration of independence:**

I David Jury McDonald, as the appointed Specialist hereby declare/affirm the correctness of the information provided or to be provided as part of the application, and that I:

- in terms of the general requirement to be independent:
  - other than fair remuneration for work performed in terms of this application, have no business, financial, personal or other interest in the development proposal or application and that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity; or
- in terms of the remainder of the general requirements for a specialist, have throughout this EIA process met all of the requirements;
- have disclosed to the applicant, the EAP, the Review EAP (if applicable), the Department and I&APs all
  material information that has or may have the potential to influence the decision of the Department or
  the objectivity of any report, plan or document prepared or to be prepared as part of the application; and
- am aware that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 48 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

Signature of the specialist: Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC

16 May 2025

# CONTENTS

1. Introduction	5
2. Terms of Reference	5
3. Study Area	6
3.1 Locality	6
3.2 Topography and Geology	10
3.3 Climate	14
4. Methods	14
4.1 Field Sampling	14
4.2 Desk-top analysis and reporting	14
5. Limitations and Assumptions	14
6. Development Options	15
6.1 Harmony Dam	15
7. Disturbance regime	17
7.1 Harmony Dam	17
8.1 The vegetation in context	20
8.2 The vegetation of the Harmony Dam area	21
9. The Harmony Agricultural Area	26
10. Ecosystem Sensitivity	31
10.1 National Web-based Environmental Screening Tool	31
10.2 Red Listed Ecosystems	33
11. Conservation Status	34
11.1 Plant Species of Conservation Concern (SCC)	34
11.2 Endangered Habitat	34
11.3 Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan	34
12. Impact Assessment	35
12.1 'No-Go' Alternative	35
12.2 Direct Impacts	
12.2.1 Direct Impacts of the proposed Harmony Dam	
12.2.2 Direct Impacts of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area	40
13. General Assessment and Recommendations	41
14. Conclusions	42
15. References	42
Appendix 1: Impact Assessment Methodology	44
Appendix 2: Curriculum Vitae	47

# 1. Introduction

EnviroAfrica CC was appointed by the Applicant, Môrester Estates, to conduct the environmental assessment process for the construction of the proposed Harmony Dam on the farms Houdenbek 415 and Winkel Haak RE/224, near Op-die-Berg, Ceres District, Witzenberg Municipality in the Western Cape Province. Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC ('Bergwind') was appointed to carry out the botanical assessment in 2019 in what is now called the 'First Phase'. A second appointment was made in early 2024 for the study to be revisited with additional fieldwork and reporting to accommodate more recent developments in the proposal.

The study is conducted in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (No.7 of 1998) as amended and the 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC was in turn appointed by EnviroAfrica, on behalf of the Applicant, to carry out a botanical assessment of the areas on the designated property to inform the environmental impact assessment process.

The principles, guidelines and recommendations of CapeNature and the Botanical Society of South Africa for proactive assessment of the biodiversity of proposed development sites have been followed (Brownlie 2005, Cadman *et al.* 2016). Procedures for the assessment and minimum criteria for reporting on identified environmental themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, when applying for environmental authorisation (Government Gazette, 2020) have been observed in this investigation.

# 2. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference are:

Undertake a site visit to the study area and compile a specialist report that addresses the following:

- Take cognizance of, and comply with, the substantive content requirements outlined within Appendix
   6 of GN R982, as amended, which outlines the legal minimum content requirements for specialist studies in terms of the 2014 NEMA EIA Regulations;
- The local and regional context of the vegetation communities and plant species within the affected areas, taking cognizance of the relevant biodiversity plans, bioregional planning documents, Environmental Management Frameworks etc.
- The ecosystem status and conservation value of the vegetation communities, including whether the
  potentially affected areas comprise critically endangered or endangered ecosystem(s) listed in terms
  of section 52 of the NEMBA;
- Any rare or endangered species encountered or likely to be or have been present;
- The presence of and proximity of the proposed site to protected area(s) identified in terms of NEMPAA and proximity to a Biosphere Reserve (where relevant).
- Confirm the approximate area (m<sup>2</sup>) of indigenous vegetation (as defined in the NEMA EIA Regulations) that would be cleared for the proposed project.

- A description of the direct, indirect, residual and cumulative botanical impacts (both before and after mitigation) and an assessment of the significance of the impacts (on a nominal scale of Neutral/ Negligible, Very Low, Low, Medium, High) by evaluating: (a) nature of the impacts (positive/ negative), (b) extent of the impacts (zero/ site specific/local/ regional/ national/ international), (c) magnitude of the impacts (zero/ Very Low/Low/ Medium/ High), (d) duration of the impacts (none/ short/ medium/ long term) and (e) probability of occurrence of the impacts (none/ unlikely/ possible/ definite). In addition, (f) the level of confidence in findings relating to potential impacts, (g)reversibility of potential impacts (i.e. the degree to which the impact can be reversed); and (h) the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.
- An indication of the degree (very low/ low/ medium/ high) to which the impacts can be avoided, managed and mitigated, a description of the measures to mitigate any impacts, and an indication of whether or not the measures (if implemented) would change the significance of the impact, for the construction and operational phases of the project;
- Take cognizance of the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) Guideline for Involving Biodiversity Specialists in the EIA Process and the requirements of the Botanical Society of South Africa (BotSoc) in developing an approach to the botanical investigation.

# 3. Study Area

#### 3.1 Locality

#### 3.1.1 Harmony Dam

Initially two alternative dam sites were considered. The first was on the stream Tuinskloof on the neighbouring Vaalboskloof 221/RE. Use of this site would have required consent from and compensation to the landowner, so this alternative was abandoned prior to the commissioning of this study. The second alternative is on the stream flowing northwards from Vaalbokskloof 221 onto Houdenbek 415. This second alternative (occasionally referred to as the Harmony #2 Dam) has been pursued (location indicated in Figures 1--3), for which four dam wall options were proposed (see below).

The site proposed for the Harmony Dam is in the southeast corner of Houdenbek 415 at the lower end of a small catchment that lies mainly on the adjacent property Vaalbokskloof 221. The dam site is in a narrow kloof vegetated with fynbos shrubland on either side of a perennial stream. The substrate is sandstone, and a prominent ridge of bedrock sandstone is found on the east side of the stream. The northern section of the dam site has old fields on sandstone alluvium.

Owing to the probable flooding of rock paintings by the proposed Harmony #2 Dam, resulting from the concurrent Heritage Assessment (J. Kaplan pers. comm.), the proposed dam wall is now (as of 2024) at a lower position in the catchment, such that the high-water-level of the dam would not directly affect the rock paintings.



**Figure 1.** Location of the proposed Harmony Dams (red icon) at farm Houdenbek 415 and the Harmony Agricultural Area at RE Winkel Haak 224, Ceres.

# 3.1.3 Harmony Agricultural Area

The proposed Harmony Agricultural Area is located southeast of the Harmony Dam site, mostly on the property Remainder Winkel Haak 224 (Figure 1, green dot).



**Figure 2.** Aerial image (Google Earth <sup>™</sup>) showing the location of the proposed Harmony Dam and the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area in relation to the Houdenbeks River and the close proximity of the latter area to the Riet River.



Figure 3. Topographical Map showing the location of the proposed Harmony Dam and Agricultural Area (green square) northeast of Houdenbeksberg, Kouebokkeveld.

# 3.2 Topography and Geology

#### 3.2.1 Harmony Dam

The Option 1 site (preferred) as well as the Option 3 site of the Harmony Dam are located on sandy shale and siltstone with sandstone bands, becoming mainly quartzitic sandstone, of the Bidouw Subgroup, Witteberg Group, Cape Supergroup (Figure 4). The preferred site is in an incised valley whereas the Option 3 site is located on more open, even terrain.

Soils at the Harmony Dam preferred site (Option 3) are classified as rocky, being mainly of the Glenrosa and Mispah soil forms. In contrast, the soils of the Option 3 site are soils labeled ED, with limited pedalogical development.

The topography of the Harmony Dam site is on slopes with shallow gradient with aspect west-facing and east-facing (Figure 6)

#### 3.2.2 Harmony Agricultural Area

The proposed Harmony Agricultural Area is underlain by rocks of the Witpoort Formation of the Weltevrede Subgroup, Witteberg Group, Cape Supergroup (Figure 4). The topography is gently undulating and the aspect mostly northeast-facing (Figure 6).

The soils of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area are a mix of alluvial soils (grey regic sands) in the south-eastern part and rocky soils of the Glenrosa and Mispah soil forms as found at the Harmony Dam site (Figure 5).



Figure 4. Geological map with the proposed Harmony Dam located in the Witteberg Group and the proposed Toeka Dam at the contact in the Ceres Subgroup, Bokkeveld Group. The Harmony Agricultural Area is on the Witpoort Formation, Weltevrede Subgroup, Witteberg Group.



Figure 5. Broad soil types with the proposed Harmony Dam at a site with rocky soils and the Toeka Dam at a site with soils having a plinthic catena. The Harmony Agricultural Area is mapped as having regic sands.



Figure 6. The aspects of the terrain of the Toeka and Harmony Dams and the Harmony Agricultural Area.

#### 3.3 Climate

The study area falls within the Winter Rainfall Region of the Western Cape Province. It experiences a Mediterranean-type climate with cool to cold, wet winters and hot, dry summers. The climate diagram for Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos (Figure 7) most closely approximates the climate of the Houdenbek study area.



**Figure 7.** Climate diagram for Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos, the principal vegetation type in the study area (Rebelo *et al.* in Mucina & Rutherford, 2006) showing MAP – Mean Annual Precipitation; ACPV = Annual Precipitation Coefficient of Variance; MAT = Mean Annual Temperature; MFD = Mean Frost Days; MAPE = Mean Annual Potential Evaporation; MASMA = Mean Annual Soil Moisture Stress.

# 4. Methods

#### 4.1 Field Sampling

The field-work for the assessment of the Harmony Dam site was conducted on 30 June 2017 and took approximately 5 hours and then the site was visited again on 17 December 2018, 4 March 2019 and lastly on 6 August 2024, when the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area (Figure 2) was also surveyed. The Harmony sites were accessed from the gravel road between Houdenbek 415 and RE Winkel Haak 224, Ceres.

#### 4.2 Desk-top analysis and reporting

The photographs obtained in the field as well as available literature and Google Earth Pro <sup>™</sup> were used for the description of the vegetation presented in this report. The National Vegetation Map (SANBI, 2024) (referred to as VEGMAP) was used as the 'base-map' to determine the principal original vegetation types.

# 5. Limitations and Assumptions

Since the first survey took place in June i.e. winter, it was expected that the vegetation would be in good condition. However, with the significantly dry winter during a long drought prior to the site visit in 2017, the vegetation was not in optimal condition. However, a meaningful survey was still possible since the fynbos shrubland is not as dependent on winter rainfall for it to be successfully surveyed because the vegetation is perennial, and most of the plant species could be seen.

A second site visit was conducted on 17 December 2018 and then a third site visit on 4 March 2019 to augment the date collected in June 2017.

A final site visit was conducted on 6 August 2024 but provided not much more data for the Harmony Dam site but new information for the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area.

Only the Option 1 location for the proposed Harmony Dam was investigated in 2017, since the Options 2, 3 and 4 had not been proposed by the time of the field survey. The Options 2, 3 and 4 were only proposed after the Heritage Assessment (Heritage CTS, 2018) had taken place.

The Option 3 dam site, now elected as the preferred site, for the Harmony Dam was surveyed on 6 August 2024 but a GPS track was not recorded. This is not considered to be a limitation since only the dam wall area was surveyed, the remainder of the area that would be inundated by a future Harmony Dam has been adequately covered by the first three site visits and surveys. There has been very little change, with the vegetation being in much the same condition.

# 6. Development Options

#### 6.1 Harmony Dam

Once it had been determined that the only feasible location of the Harmony Dam would be at the socalled Harmony No. 3 site, four development options were considered (together with the 'No Go' alternative) (Figure 8). They are as follows:

- (i) Option 1 (the main area surveyed in this study) was the preferred option for reasons pertaining to construction and potential water storage capacity.
- (ii) Option 2 would be with the wall moved further north than Option 1; this option has not been pursued since the capacity of the dam would be too small for it to be viable.
- (iii) Option 3 would be with the wall moved further north but with the wall curved to increase storage capacity.
- (iv) Option 4 would be as for Option 1 but with an additional wall to the south to protect the identified heritage resources. The cost of the additional wall renders this option unviable.



Figure 8. Four proposed alternatives for the Harmony Dam. Option 3 is the preferred site (Diagram supplied by Sarel Bester Engineers).

# 7. Disturbance regime

# 7.1 Harmony Dam

The Option 1 dam proposal – now **not preferred**, for the Harmony Dam is hardly disturbed. The only disturbance is a two-spoor farm track. Selection of this option would result in flooding of pristine fynbos in the dam inundation area (Figure 9), and as was determined, sensitive heritage sites with rock paintings.



**Figure 9.** A view of the typical proteoid-restioid shrubland on sandstone substrate in the valley where the proposed Harmony Dam would be constructed.



Figure 10. The lower part of the catchment where the Harmony Dam wall would be located.

The Option 3 site, which is now the preferred, however, is much more disturbed. From historical images obtained from Google Earth Pro<sup>™</sup> that there has been some agricultural activity in the area where the dam wall would be constructed (Figure 10). Given that Option 3 (preferred as of 2024) is being pursued, the dam water would flood an area that has partly been disturbed (Figure 14) and is partly undisturbed fynbos (Figures 15–17).



**Figure 11.** Marker for the dam wall (white arrow) on the west side at the overflow location.



**Figure 12.** Lower edge of the proposed Harmony Dam wall would reach (arrow).



**Figure 13.** White arrows indicate markers for the Harmony Dam wall on the east side.



**Figure 14.** The disturbed area at the lower end of the catchment that would be impacted by the wall of the Harmony Dam.



Figure 15. Aerial image (Google Earth ™ of 3 March 2004 with the Option 3 dam wall superimposed.



**Figure 16.** Aerial image (Google Earth <sup>™</sup>) of 17 June 2010 with the Option 3 dam wall superimposed.



**Figure 17.** Aerial image (Google Earth <sup>™</sup>) of 5 July 2017 with the Option 3 dam wall superimposed.

# 8.1 The vegetation in context

According to the Vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho, and Swaziland (eSwatini) (Mucina, Rutherford & Powrie, 2005), the vegetation that occurs at the proposed Harmony Dam site (all options) is Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos (Figure 18). It is a vegetation type that is widespread on the sandstone substrates of the Kouebokkeveld plateau and mountains, including Houdenbek Mountain, the Agter-Witsenberg and parts of the Groot Winterhoek Mountains. Rebelo *et al.* (2006) describe the Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos as follows:

"Vegetation is mainly closed restioland in deeper, moister sands, with low, sparse shrubs that become denser and restios less dominant in the drier habitats. Proteoid and ericaceous fynbos are found on higher slopes while asteraceous fynbos is more common on lower slopes. Cape thicket is prominent on the lowest slopes."

A concern has been raised by Dr Brian du Preez (botanist) that the proposed Harmony agricultural development would potentially affect the newly described *Aspalathus jardinii* Du Preez & C.H.Stirt. that

occurs on 'dune sands' of the Rietrivier and possibly surrounding areas. This possibility was considered but the species in question was not found during this investigation. However, the close proximity of the Harmony Agricultural area to the Riet Rivier which is the type locality of *A. jardinii* suggests that this locally endemic species could be affected as speculated by Dr du Preez (see also below under Section 11.1).



**Figure 18.** Portion of the *Vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho, and Swaziland* (Mucina, Rutherford & Powrie, 2005) showing the two vegetation types originally or still occurring at the proposed Harmony Dam and agricultural development sites.

#### 8.2 The vegetation of the Harmony Dam area

The following notes were compiled at the respective sample waypoints at the Option 1 location of the proposed Harmony Dam. The Option 3 location was subsequently investigated in August 2024.

#### Waypoint HD1: S 32° 59' 50.5" E 19° 27' 39.1"

At the two-spoor track on the west side of the valley. The vegetation is uniform in the dam footprint (Figure 19). It consists of an open to mid-dense, tall proteoid stratum, dominated by *Protea laurifolia*, with a low closed (dense) restioland understorey. Species recorded include: *Centella* sp., *Cymbopogon marginatus*, *Ehrharta ramosa*, *Myrovernix gnaphaloides*, *Hypodiscus argenteus*, *Ischyrolepis* sp., *Leucadendron* sp., *Leucospermum calligerum*, *Metalasia densa*, *Muraltia spinosa*, *Passerina obtusifolia*, *Phylica* sp., *Protea* sp., *Restio* sp., *Stoebe capitata*, *Tetraria capillacea*, *Thamnochortus* sp.



**Figure 19.** View up the valley where the proposed Harmony Dam would be located in Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos.

#### Waypoint HD2: S 32° 59' 52.9" E 19° 27' 39.3"

Area with localized large sandstone boulders (Figure 20). The same vegetation community is found as at waypoint HD1 but with some additional species namely, *Anaxeton* sp., *Asparagus capensis, Cliffortia ruscifolia, Diospyros glabra, Felicia filifolia, Lobostemon* sp. and *Stoebe plumosa.* 



Figure 20. Large sandstone boulders are found in part of the study area.

#### Waypoint HD3: S 32° 59' 54.1" E 19° 27' 38.6"

This area has a mid-dense stand of *Protea laurifolia* in the upper stratum, 1—2.5 m tall. The lower stratum is strongly restioid and the plant community is the same as at waypoint HD1 and HD2 but with the additional presence of *Phylica sp.* and *Protea laevis* (Figure 21).



**Figure 21.** The area around waypoint HD3.

#### Waypoint HD4: S 32° 59' 57.0" E 19° 27' 38.8"

This waypoint is located on a two-spoor track at the upper end of the Option 1 and Option 2 dam footprint (inundation area) (Figure 22). The vegetation is the same proteoid fynbos as found at waypoints HD1—HD3. In addition, *Leucadendron salignum* and the ground protea *Protea laevis* (Figure 23) were found here.



**Figure 22.** A two-spoor track leads up the valley through the site proposed for the Harmony Dam.



Figure 23. Protea laevis.

#### Waypoint HD5: S 32° 59' 59.0" E 19° 27' 40.0"

This waypoint was recorded at the dry stream channel (Figure 24). Species include *Asparagus aethiopicus, Cannomois* sp. – dominant, *Cliffortia juniperifolia, Cliffortia strobilifera, Cymbopogon marginatus, Dicerothamnus rhinocerotis, Eragrostis curvula, Erica* sp. – very small flowers, *Imperata cylindrica, Muraltia spinosa, Myrovernix gnaphaloides, Rhodocoma gigantea, Searsia undulata* and *Willdenowia* cf. *incurvata.* 



Figure 24. The seasonal stream channel with dominant Restionaceae.

Waypoint HD6: S 32° 59' 56.3" E 19° 27' 42.3"

Open grassy area on alluvium. Vegetation is almost exclusively *Eragrostis curvula* (Figure 25). Near the sandstone cliffs is a third community dominated by *Searsia undulata* with *Asparagus retrofractus* (entwined in the shrubs) (Figure 26).



**Figure 25.** Open grassy area on alluvium with a shrubby thicket community next to the sandstone cliffs.



Figure 26. Asparagus retrofractus



#### Waypoint HD7: S 32° 59' 53.2" E 19° 27' 45.4"

This waypoint was recorded at a soil pit more or less where the Option 1 dam wall would be (Figure 27). The Option 3 (preferred) would result in most of the area seen here being inundated. The vegetation on the sandy alluvium is dominated by restios, mainly *Willdenowia incurvata*. No *Protea laurifolia* occurs at this location. *Leucadendron brunioides* var. *brunioides* was recorded here (Figure 30); this subspecies is not threatened.



**Figure 27.** Area of the proposed Harmony Dam Option 1 site. Most of this area would be inundated by the Option 3 site as well.



Figure 28. Leucadendron brunioides var. brunioides

# 9. The Harmony Agricultural Area

The proposed Harmony Agricultural Area lies parallel to the Houdenbek to Winkel Haak gravel road, a short distance east of the site of the proposed Harmony Dam. It may be described as an elongate obtuse-ended strip of varying width, determined by rocky outcrops, and would be 29 ha in extent. The survey of the vegetation in the proposed agricultural area was conducted on 6 August 2024, when the area had had good winter rain. Consequently, the vegetation was in good condition. The site was sampled at ten waypoints, HA1—HA10 (Figure 29).



**Figure 29.** Annotated satellite aerial photo (Google Earth <sup>™</sup>) showing the proposed Harmony Dam in relation to the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area .The red line within the agricultural area is the survey track with waypoints.

Waypoint	Latitude	Longitude
HA1	S 33° 0' 21.31"	E 19° 29' 2.58"
HA2	S 33° 0' 19.79"	E 19° 28' 52.68
HA3	S 33° 0' 17.20"	E 19° 28' 52.36
HA4	S 33° 0' 2.63"	E 19° 28' 33.92
HA5	S 33° 0' 2.59"	E 19° 28' 33.27
HA6	S 33° 0' 2.73"	E 19° 28' 31.58
HA7	S 33° 0' 0.04"	E 19° 28' 21.83
HA8	S 33° 59' 51.86"	E 19° 28' 19.53
HA9	S 33° 59' 53.91"	E 19° 28' 24.67
HA10	S 33° 0' 14.04"	E 19° 28' 56.49

Table 1. The coordinates of the waypoints in the Harmony Agricultural Area.

Notes were compiled and plant species recorded at the sample waypoints with the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area, investigated in August 2024.

The vegetation of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area is a mix of Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos and Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos (see Figure 18). The Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos is the same

as that described for the Harmony Dam site. This fynbos is characterized by the presence of *Protea laurifolia* (Figures 30 & 31) stands on the slightly elevated 'upper' rocky areas whereas this species is absent from the 'lower' areas on more alluvial soil that is fine-grained alluvial sand, silt with many pebbles and boulders on the soil surface (Figure 34).



Figure 30. Protea laurifolia.



Figure 31. The strong distinction between the Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos in the foreground with the Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos with *Protea laurifolia* the dominant tall shrub.

The Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos has two strata, the low stratum in the eastern part of the site is dominated by Restionaceae, particularly *Thamnochortus* sp., *Restio capensis* and *Hypodiscus alboaristatus* (Figure 32), sedges in the genus *Tetraria* were also present but a more detailed search would be necessary to record the species. The shrub stratum is dominated by *Leucadendron glaberrimum* subsp. *glaberrimum* (Figure 35).



Figure 32. The eastern part of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area is dominated by restios.



Figure 33. Leucadendron glaberrimum subsp. glaberrimum. Female cone left and male plant right.

In the western part of the site, the vegetation is much grassier than in the eastern part with *Pentameris* cf. *macrocalycina* (Figure 35) being the co-dominant with the restions mentioned above, and more visible grass species (Figure 36). This may be attributed to rockier terrain in the west. *Muraltia spinosa* is a prominent shrub in the western part of the site (Figure 37).



Figure 35. Pentameris macrocalycina.



**Figure 36.** The white grasses seen here are plants of *P. macrocalycina* that are much more prevalent in the western part of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area.



**Figure 37**. *Muraltia spinosa* is a midhigh shrub prominent in the western part of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area.

Plant species not mentioned above that were encountered in the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area include the following:

Adromischus sp., Aspalathus sp. (1) (very spiny), Aspalathus sp. (2), Aspalathus sp. (3) (bushy low shrub), Aspalathus sp. (prostrate forb), Asparagus capensis, Babiana sp., Brunsvigia sp., Clutia sp., Cotula bipinnata, Ehrharta ramosa, Erica nudiflora, Eriocephalus africanus, Eriospermum sp., Euphorbia tuberosa, Ficinia sp., Gazania krebsiana, Haplocarpha lanata, Helichrysum sp., Hypodiscus argenteus, Lachenalia sp., Lampranthus sp., Leucadendron brunioides var. brunioides, Lobostemon sp., Lotononis pungens, Myrovernix gnaphaloides, Othonna ramulosa, Oxalis obtusa, Passerina obtusifolia, Pauridia serrata, Pelargonium triste, Phylica sp. (1) – upright shrub, Phylica sp. (2) - low, many branched shrublet, Polygala microlopha, Romulea tortuosa, Senecio sp. (1), Senecio sp. (2), Seriphium cf. capitatum, Tenaxia stricta.

# **10. Ecosystem Sensitivity**

# 10.1 National Web-based Environmental Screening Tool

The National Web-based Environmental Screening Tool was applied to a polygon that covers the areas of interest in this study i.e. the Harmony Dam site and Harmony Agricultural Area. The outcome for this 'combined site' is that the 'PLANT SPECIES THEME' is **MEDIUM SENSITIVITY** (Figure 38)

Many plant species are listed by the screening tool, these being those species regarded as sensitive that may occur (see list in Figure 38). Most of the species listed were not recorded in this study and that is ascribed to the fact that the surveys have been 'snapshots' and not sustained plant surveys in all seasons over more than one year. An example of this is that there may be autumn-flowering geophytes that were not recorded at all. Despite the numerous species listed in Figure 38, the result of the screening tool for plant sensitivity is <u>only</u> **MEDIUM**, whereas from the field surveys there is strong indication that the sensitivity <u>should be</u> HIGH.

The result of the screening tool for the 'TERRESTRIAL BIODIVERSITY THEME' is **VERY HIGH SENSITIVITY**. This is based on several 'features' listed in Figure 39. The most important of the 'features' is undoubtedly the **Critically Endangered** status of both Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos and Kouebokkeveld Shale Fynbos.



**Figure 38.** The map of Relative Plant Species Sensitivity with sensitive species list for the Harmony area.

- 1				
		🔺 🛛 🏹 🗍		
			- Na 💊.	
			and the first	
			and have	
			- A	
			No.	R
<b>_egend:</b> ■ Very High				
.egend: ■ Very High ■ High			Servers Brit (1885, frank) Mittig	te wrey, in PERIOD 11 / HEIDar
<mark>∙egend:</mark> Very High High Medium Low			A rota salarity for a second s	a minory, all Phatelabel 11. Allenance for Marcey, Red Charlos de José arren, red diss. Old Maar Foresan
egend: Very High High Medium Low			Sources step (MM, Panda; Auto, Ia Apar, MML bet Mar () or g Frag, A Specification (A) - engla	es mings, 10.152 (Addulf in 1980) In Status, 50.052 (Addulf in 1980) In Status, 50.072 (Addulf in 1980) Status, red files (El: Vaco) Access
egend: Very High High Medium Low	28	Southars	Sources and Likit, Standay Likit, A Apar, MRIL bit Man D ang Pang Spacebookkay enabled	senier, is Mildell II, Milae Is nier, is Mildell II, Milae Is How, is the Oscillad, Sect Senier, and the Old New Count
egend: Very High High Meddum Low	nsitivity	conten High sensitivity	Son over sing (1682, "Marship A More) an Appen, Affeld Set Mars (1692, 16944, 1694, 1694, 1694, 1694,	Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High Modium Low Very High set X	î	Constances High sensitivity	Anternetian (1816, Marake Aleman Apare Aleman San Darag Baray) OpenAlemakan medda Medium sensitivity	es energy, 10 TERMANUS / Electron es energy, 10 TERMANUS / Electron es follows, 5 and Charling, 5 and energy, val disk of 2 Mary Pressed Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High Low Very High set X Sensitivity F	nsitivity reatures:	amer	Anne men ade ( fall é n'a read e . Mart a la Agres al 1011 bet his n'a read e . Beges al 1001 bet his n'a read da Medium sensitivity	te news, to attend of its officers of the second officer offic
Legend: Vary High High Low Very High set X Sensitivity F	nsitivity reatures:	Cornters High sensitivity	Anne sons store ( latti a "ann da s Anton in Apare store store ( latti a "ann da s Anton in Apare store store store store store store store operations of a s more store	Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High Low Very High ser X Sensitivity F Sensitivity	nsitivity eatures:	Constant High sensitivity	Serves an ISS - Serves - Serve	Every of CEREGOUSE To Allow an above, See Challenge To Allow and Shore, See Challenge To Allow Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High Medium Low Very High set X Sensitivity F Low	nsitivity reatures: Feature Low Sen:	High sensitivity	Ane one add ( 1884 - Market e Hart e d Appen all the data p angle a gal Construction match	es earry, to the Held With or Allenand the Holenay, and the Allenand I have energy and the Hill Held I have the With Held Held I have Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High How Low Very High set X Sensitivity F Low Very High		High sensitivity  (5)  sitivity kkeveld Mountain Catch	Anno one det ( lidit d' mende et ere de la	Low sensitivity
egend: Very High High Low Very High set X Sensitivity F Sensitivity Low Very High Very High	reatures: Features: Low Sen: ESA 2: Rt	eternites High sensitivity e(s) sitivity kkeveld Mountain Catch store from other land u	Automa and falls, change, short an Appendix and a Dirac South Security States and a Dirac South Medium sensitivity ment Area Se	George, M. CHERGIAU, V. Alticae on Alexan, and See (CherGiand, United and Search and See (CherGiand, United and Search and Search and Search Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High Medium Low Very High set X Sensitivity F Low Very High Very High Very High	reatures: Features: Koue Bol ESA 2: Rr ESA 2: Rr	High sensitivity High sensitivity e(s) sitivity kkeveld Mountain Catch estore from other land u	Ause and a field of the series	Low sensitivity
Legend: Very High High Medium Low Very High set X Sensitivity F Low Very High Very High Very High	reatures: Koue Bol ESA 2: Rr CBA 1: Ti CBA 1: Ti	Eorders High sensitivity e(s) sitivity kkeveld Mountain Catch estore from other land u errestrial	Aver one stell lätid näm är i höra för Aver oce stell lätid näm är i höra för op utövd är i model Medium sensitivity	course, in State day of the Alexan of a harmy set of the two between wear, and disk of the basis between Low sensitivity

**Figure 39.** The map of Relative Terrestrial Biodiversity Sensitivity, indicating very high sensitivity.

# **10.2 Red Listed Ecosystems**

In 2021 the National Biodiversity Assessment was updated and emanating from that was the mapping of threatened ecosystems, for practical purposes called the **Red List of Ecosystems** (RLE) for the terrestrial realm of South Africa (SANBI, 2021; Skowno & Monyeki, 2021). This database reflects the current remaining natural extent (remnants) of 458 ecosystems and is mapped for the Houdenbek-Winkelhaak area investigated here (Figure 40). Examination of the map shows that for the Harmony Dam most of the affected habitat falls in habitat of least concern with only a small area in critically endangered habitat. Most of the Harmony Agricultural Area is classified and mapped as having mostly habitat of least concern, with small areas in the northeast and southeast being classified and mapped as having critically endangered habitat. This is disputed since there is much more critically endangered habitat within the Harmony Agricultural Area than is indicated on this map as determined in this study.



**Figure 40.** A map of the Red Listed Ecosystems in Houdenbek-Winkel Haak area of the Kouebokkeveld. The study area is encompassed by a black boundary line.

# 11. Conservation Status

# 11.1 Plant Species of Conservation Concern (SCC)

No Red List species (i.e. species of conservation concern, or SCC), were encountered r at the proposed Harmony Dam site, however at the Harmony Agricultural Area it is possible that the recently described 'new' *Aspalathus jardini*, (Endangered) could occur. Several species of *Aspalathus* were recorded in this study but they were all without flowers so not identifiable in the field. It would be necessary to sample those plants when they are flowering to obtain accurate identifications. The precautionary principle is therefore invoked with the recommendation that a focused search for *A. jardini* should be undertaken to confirm if the species occurs in the Harmony Agricultural Area or not.

# 11.2 Endangered Habitat

The list of Threatened Terrestrial Ecosystems (Government Gazette, 2022) was checked for the vegetation types occurring in the study area. Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos which is **CRITICALLY ENDANGERED B1(i)** may be marginally affected by the Harmony Dam. However, the Harmony Agricultural Area principally supports Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos of <u>extremely high conservation</u> <u>value</u>. An extract from the abovementioned Government Gazette reads as follows:

Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos Fynbos Fynbos Fynbos Fynbos Critically Endangered B1(i) B1(i) B1(i) Critically Endangered Critically Endangered Critically Endangered Critically Endangered Critically Endangered Critically Endangered Critically Critically Endangered Critically Critical Cr
---

It is thus incontrovertible that development of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area would trigger the requirement of a Conservation Offset.

# 11.3 Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan

The most recent version of the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (Cape Nature, 2024) depicted in Figure 41 shows that for the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area, <u>the entire area is classified as</u> <u>CBA1</u>. This follows from the critically endangered status of Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos.



**Figure 41.** Critical Biodiversity Areas map from CapeNature 2024. The Harmony Dam would lie well within the Koue Bokkeveld Mountains Catchment Area [protected] (green). The Harmony Agricultural Area is classified as CBA1 & CBA2.

# 12. Impact Assessment

Impacts on the vegetation are assessed for the construction and operation of the proposed dams. For the Harmony Dam, four options (alternatives) and the No Go are assessed. In addition, the 'No-Go' alternative and 'construction' i.e. clearing of vegetation and operation of the Harmony Agricultural Fields is also assessed.

#### 12.1 'No-Go' Alternative

In the case of the "**No Go**" alternative, both the Harmony Dam would not be built and there would be no change to the *status quo*. The natural veld would persist in the catchment where the Harmony Dam would be built and agriculture would be pursued, probably mainly grazing by cattle. The 'no development' alternative or 'No Go' alternative would thus have a **Negligible** impact on the natural vegetation with no significant further loss in the short- to long-term. The **"No-Go" alternative** for the Harmony Agricultural Area would mean that the habitat would remain intact for the foreseeable future.

The 'No Go' alternative is included in Tables 2 & 3.

# **12.2 Direct Impacts**

Direct impacts are those that would occur directly on the vegetation of the proposed Harmony Dam one site and where agricultural development would be practiced. The rating system used is given in Appendix 1. In addition to determining the individual impacts using various criteria, mitigation is also brought into the assessment.

The impacts of the proposed dam and agricultural area on the vegetation and habitat are considered with respect to loss of vegetation type and habitat including plant species due to construction and operational activities. Ecological processes are intrinsic to the habitat and are not separated here for assessment but rather the assessment incorporates the effect on ecological processes as part of the affected habitat.

The assessment is not made with respect to the desirability or undesirability of an 'in-stream dam'. That assessment resides in the realm of the freshwater specialist since cumulative effects of the dams on downstream flows must be assessed. This assessment is restricted to the 'terrestrial' vegetation.

# 12.2.1 Direct Impacts of the proposed Harmony Dam

# 12.2.1.1 Loss of vegetation type and habitat including plant species (including ecological processes) due to construction and operation of the proposed Harmony Dam (Table 2).

#### Option 1.

The Option 1 construction of the Harmony Dam would have the greatest negative impact on undisturbed natural vegetation (Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos) since the largest area of intact fynbos would be affected by the wall construction and inundation by the dam. The impact is rated as **High Negative**.

# Option 2.

From a botanical perspective, the Option 2 construction of the Harmony Dam would have a marginally lower negative impact than Option 1 due to a smaller dam wall, but it would still be **High Negative**.

# Option 3.

**Option 3 is the preferred option**. The wall would be constructed lower in the catchment in an area that is more disturbed than higher in the catchment. Marginally less proteoid fynbos (and intact undisturbed fynbos) would be inundated by the dam and hence the impact would be less negative. However, since the dam would still fall within a protected area the negative impact cannot be rated as less than **Medium Negative**.

# Option 4.

The Option 4 dam would result in the loss of the most undisturbed vegetation and habitat and is not desirable. The impact would be **High Negative**.

# 12.1.1.2 Mitigation

Proposed mitigation would be rehabilitation (restoration of vegetation) of the dam wall. No mitigation would be possible on the footprint of the dam wall and in the inundation area.

# Table 2. Impact and Significance – Loss of natural vegetation and habitat during construction and operational phases for the Harmony Dam.

CRITERIA	IRIA 'NO GO' ALTERNATIVE		Opti	on 1	Option 2		Option 3 (Preferred alternative)		Option 4	
Nature of direct impact (local scale)	Loss of Winte	Loss of Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos								
	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION
Extent	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local	Local
Duration	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term
Intensity	Low	Low	High	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	High	High
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable
Confidence	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High	High
Significance	Negligible	Negligible	High negative	High negative	High negative	High negative	Medium negative	Medium negative	High negative	High negative
			<b>G</b>		<b>4</b>		· •		· • •	
Nature of Cumulative impact	Loss of Winte	erhoek Sandsto	ne Fynbos							
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low negative	Low negative								
Degree to which impact can be reversed	Not reversible	Not reversible								
Degree to which impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Low									
Degree to which impact can be mitigated	Low									

Proposed	Mitigation not possible in the dam inundation area. The only mitigation would be to revegetate the dam wall.
mitigation	
Cumulative	
impact post	Low negative
mitigation	
Significance of	
cumulative	
impact (broad	Low negative
scale) after	
mitigation	

# 12.2.2 Direct Impacts of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area

# 12.3.1.1 Loss of vegetation type and habitat including plant species (including ecological processes) due to construction (clearing) and operation of the proposed Harmony Agricultural Area (Table 3).

The proposed development of the Harmony Agricultural Area (**only one alternative-preferred**) would result in the complete loss of a tract of critically endangered Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos. The result is that the impact of clearing this 29 ha for crop production (analogous to the construction phase) would be **Very High Negative**. No further loss of this vegetation type would occur during the operational phase (Table 3).

In the case of the "No-Go" scenario for the Harmony Agricultural Area, the 29 ha of critically endangered fynbos would remain intact and contribute to the conservation of this critically endangered habitat.

CRITERIA	'NO GO' ALT	ERNATIVE	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE		
Nature of direct impact (local scale)	Loss of critically endangered Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos				
	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION	WITHOUT MITIGATION	WITH MITIGATION	
Extent	Local	Local	Local	Local	
Duration	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	Long-term	
Intensity	Low	Low	Very High	High	
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Probable	Probable	Probable	
Confidence	High	High	High	High	
Significance	Negligible	Negligible	Very High Negative	High Negative	
Nature of Cumulative impact	Loss of critically e	endangered Kouel	bokkeveld Alluvium	Fynbos	
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Very High Negative	)			
Degree to which impact can be reversed	Not reversible				
Degree to which impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Very High				
Degree to which impact can be mitigated	Very Low				
Proposed mitigation	Only a Conservatio	n Offset would prov	vide mitigation		
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium negative				
Significance of cumulative impact (broad scale) after mitigation	High				

# Table 3. Impact and Significance – Loss of natural vegetation and habitat during construction (clearing) and operation of the Harmony Agricultural Area.

# 12.3.1.2 Mitigation

No effective local mitigation measures would be possible to compensate for the loss of natural vegetation and habitat. Consequently, a Conservation Offset would be the only (and required!) mitigation.

# 12.4 Indirect impacts

Indirect impacts occur away from the 'action source' i.e. away from the development site. The impacts assessed here are specifically how the proposed dam and agricultural cultivation area would have an indirect impact on <u>vegetation and flora</u> away from the development site. No indirect impacts for terrestrial vegetation and flora were identified. The indirect impacts pertain mainly to downstream effects of the dams that are not evaluated in this study. If implemented, the Harmony Agricultural Area could have negative impacts on the remaining habitat of Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos since the same since ecological processes such as pollination and consequent geneflow could be affected.

# 12.5 Cumulative impacts

The receiving environment into which the proposed Harmony Dam would be imposed is only minimally disturbed at the Harmony Dam site. Good fynbos habitat would be lost but at a local scale. The Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos would in no way be threatened by the construction of the dam and the contribution of the loss of vegetation and habitat due to the construction of the Harmony Dam would have a <u>low to very low cumulative effect.</u> The Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos is widespread and well protected in the Kouebokkeveld Mountain Catchment Area and is not generally under threat.

In the case of the Harmony Agricultural Area, the loss of 29 ha of critically endangered habitat would have a **large negative cumulative** impact since so little of this habitat type remains in the Kouebokkeveld.

# **13. General Assessment and Recommendations**

- Good condition Winterhoek Sandstone Fynbos occurs at the Harmony Dam site.
- The impact of a dam at the Harmony Dam site (preferred option Option 3) would result in a Medium Negative impact at a <u>local scale</u>. Scale is important in this case because the vegetation type is not threatened and in a cumulative sense the loss of vegetation and habitat would be relatively small. The construction of the Harmony Dam (Option 3) is supported, but not Options 1, 2 & 4.
- The loss of Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos in the Harmony Agricultural Area would result in High to Very High Negative impacts. <u>The precautionary principle should be invoked</u>.

The precautionary principle is a framework for risk management that suggests taking preventive measures when there's potential for harm, even if the scientific understanding of the risk is not fully established. It's essentially an approach of "better safe than sorry," emphasizing caution and the need for proactive measures when there's a threat of serious or irreversible damage.

<sup>•</sup> There is a strong possibility that the loss of Kouebokkeveld Alluvium Fynbos in the Harmony Agricultural Area would trigger the requirement of a Conservation Offset.

• It is recommended that a focused search for *Aspalathus jardinii* (as well as other sensitive plant species) in the Harmony Agricultural Area should be carried out in the season when the plants are most likely in flower.

# 14. Conclusions

For the Harmony Dam site, due to the relatively low level of disturbance, the important question is whether the dam is desirable or acceptable in a protected mountain catchment area? This question is not addressed here since the impacts are only based on the merits of the site in the local and immediate context of the vegetation found.

Construction of dams at the Harmony Dam Option 3 site is supported when looked at purely from the terrestrial vegetation perspective.

The proposed Harmony Agricultural Area has natural habitat that although allied to the other fynbos in the general study area, is a separate vegetation type and should be carefully considered due to its ecological and conservation sensitivity. The requirement of a Conservation Offset for the use of the 29 ha Harmony Agricultural Area would be unavoidable.

# 15. References

- Brownlie, S. 2005. Guideline for involving biodiversity specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1. CSIR Report No. ENV-S-C 2005-053 C. Provincial Government of the Western Cape: Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning.
- Cadman, M. 2016. (ed.) Fynbos Forum Ecosystem Guidelines for Environmental Assessment in the Western Cape, Edition 2. Fynbos Forum, Cape Town, 201pp.

CapeNature, 2024. 2023 Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan and Guidelines. Unpublished Report.

- Cedar Tower Services, 2018. HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (In terms of Section 38(8) of the NHRA) for the Proposed Development of the Houdenbek Dams, Western Cape Heritage. Unpublished report.
- Government Gazette No. 43110. 2020. Procedures for the assessment and minimum criteria for reporting on identified environmental themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, when applying for environmental authorisation.
- Government Gazette No. 47526. 2022. The revised National List of Ecosystems that are Threatened and in need of Protection.

- Mucina, L., Rutherford, M.C., & Powrie, L.W. (Eds.). 2005. Vegetation map of South Africa, Lesotho, and Swaziland 1:1 000 000 scale sheet maps. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria. ISBN 1-919976-22-1.
- Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. (eds.) The Vegetation of South Africa. Lesotho & Swaziland. *Strelitzia* 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.
- Rebelo, A.G., Boucher, C., Helme, N., Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2006. Fynbos Biome. In: Mucina,
  L. & Rutherford, M.C. (eds.) The Vegetation of South Africa. Lesotho & Swaziland. *Strelitzia* 19. South African National Biodiversity Institute, Pretoria.
- Skowno, A. L. & Monyeki, M.S. 2021, South Africa's Red List of Terrestrial Ecosystems (RLEs). Land 10. 1048.
- South African National Biodiversity Institute . 2021 Red List of Ecosystems (RLE) for terrestrial realm for South Africa remnants [Vector] 2021. Available from the Biodiversity GIS website.
- South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) 2024, Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland [vector geospatial dataset] 2024. Available from the Biodiversity GIS website.

Report submitted: 16 May 2025

# Appendix 1: Impact Assessment Methodology

The assessment of impacts needs to include the determination of the following:

- The nature of the impact see Table 1.1
- The magnitude (or severity) of the impact see Table 1.2
- The likelihood of the impact occurring see Table 1.2

The degree of confidence in the assessment must also be reflected.

Term	Definition
Impact nature	
Positive	An impact that is considered to represent an improvement on the baseline or introduces a positive change.
Negative	An impact that is considered to represent an adverse change from the baseline, or introduces a new undesirable factor.
Direct impact	Impacts that result from a direct interaction between a planned project activity and the receiving environment/receptors (e.g. between occupation of a site and the pre-existing habitats or between an effluent discharge and receiving water quality).
Indirect impact	Impacts that result from other activities that are encouraged to happen as a consequence of the Project (e.g. in-migration for employment placing a demand on resources).
Cumulative impact	Impacts that act together with other impacts (including those from concurrent or planned future third party activities) to affect the same resources and/or receptors as the Project.

 Table 1.1
 Impact assessment terminology

# Assessing significance

There is no statutory definition of '*significance*' and its determination is, therefore, somewhat subjective. However, it is generally accepted that significance is a function of the magnitude of the impact and the likelihood of the impact occurring. The criteria used to determine significance are summarized in *Table 1.2* 

Table 1.2	Significance	criteria
-----------	--------------	----------

Impact magnitude	
Extent	On-site – impacts that are limited to the boundaries of the rail reserve, yard or substation site.         Local – impacts that affect an area in a radius of 20km around the development site.         Regional – impacts that affect regionally important environmental resources or are experienced at a regional scale as determined by administrative boundaries, habitat type/ecosystem.         National – impacts that affect nationally important environmental resources or affect an area that is nationally important/ or have macro-economic consequences.
Duration	<ul> <li><i>Temporary</i> – impacts are predicted to be of short duration and intermittent/occasional.</li> <li><i>Short-term</i> – impacts that are predicted to last only for the duration of the construction period.</li> <li><i>Long-term</i> – impacts that will continue for the life of the Project, but ceases when the Project stops operating.</li> <li><i>Permanent</i> – impacts that cause a permanent change in the affected receptor or resource (e.g. removal or destruction of ecological habitat) that endures substantially beyond the Project lifetime.</li> </ul>

Intensity BI Se Lo fu M ar Hi wi U U S of br M Lo pr M Iiv Hi m	OPHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT: Intensity can be considered in terms of the ensitivity of the biodiversity receptor (ie. habitats, species or communities). egligible – the impact on the environment is not detectable. bw – the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural nctions and processes are not affected. edium – where the affected environment is altered but natural functions ind processes continue, albeit in a modified way. igh – where natural functions or processes are altered to the extent that it ill temporarily or permanently cease. '/here appropriate, national and/or international standards are to be sed as a measure of the impact. Specialist studies should attempt to uantify the magnitude of impacts and outline the rationale used. DCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT: Intensity can be considered in terms if the ability of project affected people/communities to adapt to changes ought about by the Project. egligible – there is no perceptible change to people's livelihood ow - People/communities are able to adapt with relative ease and maintain re-impact livelihoods. edium - Able to adapt with some difficulty and maintain pre-impact relihoods but only with a degree of support. igh - Those affected will not be able to adapt to changes and continue to aintain-pre impact livelihoods.
Impact likelihood (Probabi	lity)
Negligible T	he impact does not occur.
Low T	he impact may possibly occur.
Medium	maat is likely to occur under most conditions

Once a rating is determined for magnitude and likelihood, the following matrix can be used to determine the impact significance.

#### Table 7.5 Example of significance rating matrix

SIGNIFICANCE RATING							
	LIKELIHOOD	Negligible	Low	Medium	High		
MAGNITUDE	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Low	Low		
	Low	Negligible	Negligible	Low	Low		
	Medium	Negligible	Low	Medium	Medium		
	High	Low	Medium	High	High		

In *Table 7.6*, the various definitions for significance of an impact is given.

#### Table7.6 Significance definitions

Significance definitions		
Negligible significance	An impact of negligible significance (or an insignificant impact) is where a resource or receptor (including people) will not be affected in any way by a particular activity, or the predicted effect is deemed to be 'negligible' or 'imperceptible' or is indistinguishable from natural background variations.	

Minor significance	An impact of minor significance is one where an effect will be experienced, but the impact magnitude is sufficiently small (with and without mitigation) and well within accepted standards, and/or the receptor is of low sensitivity/value.
Moderate significance	An impact of moderate significance is one within accepted limits and standards. The emphasis for moderate impacts is on demonstrating that the impact has been reduced to a level that is as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP). This does not necessarily mean that 'moderate' impacts have to be reduced to 'minor' impacts, but that moderate impacts are being managed effectively and efficiently.
Major significance	An impact of major significance is one where an accepted limit or standard may be exceeded, or large magnitude impacts occur to highly valued/sensitive resource/receptors. A goal of the EIA process is to get to a position where the Project does not have any major residual impacts, certainly not ones that would endure into the long term or extend over a large area. However, for some aspects there may be major residual impacts after all practicable mitigation options have been exhausted (i.e. ALARP has been applied). An example might be the visual impact of a development. It is then the function of regulators and stakeholders to weigh such negative factors against the positive factors such as employment, in coming to a decision on the Project.

Once the significance of the impact has been determined, it is important to qualify the **degree of confidence** in the assessment. Confidence in the prediction is associated with any uncertainties, for example, where information is insufficient to assess the impact. Degree of confidence can be expressed as low, medium or high.

# Appendix 2: Curriculum Vitae

# Dr David Jury McDonald Pr. Sci. Nat.

Name of Company: Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC. (Independent consultant)

Work and Home Address: 14 A Thomson Road, Claremont, 7708

Mobile: 082-876-4051

E-mail: <u>dave@bergwind.co.za</u>

Website: www.bergwind.co.za

Profession: Botanist / Vegetation Ecologist / Consultant / Tour Guide

Date of Birth: 7 August 1956

#### Employment history:

- 19 years with National Botanical Institute (now SA National Biodiversity Institute) as researcher in vegetation ecology.
- Five years as Deputy Director / Director Botanical & Communication Programmes of the Botanical Society of South Africa
- Nineteen years as private independent Botanical Specialist consultant (Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC)

Nationality:	South African (ID No. 560807 5018 080)
Languages:	English (home language) – speak, read and write
	Afrikaans – speak, read and write

#### Membership in Professional Societies:

- South Africa Association of Botanists
- International Association for Impact Assessment (SA)
- South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (Ecological Science, Registration No. 400094/06)
- Field Guides Association of Southern Africa

#### Key Qualifications:

- Qualified with a M. Sc. (1983) in Botany and a PhD in Botany (Vegetation Ecology) (1995) at the University of Cape Town.
- Research in Cape fynbos ecosystems and more specifically mountain ecosystems.
- From 1995 to 2000 managed the Vegetation Map of South Africa Project (National Botanical Institute).
- Conducted botanical survey work for AfriDev Consultants for the Mohale and Katse Dam projects in Lesotho from 1995 to 2002. A large component of this work was the analysis of data collected by teams of botanists.
- **Director: Botanical & Communication Programmes** of the Botanical Society of South Africa (2000—2005), responsible for communications and publications; involved with conservation advocacy particularly with respect to impacts of development on centres of plant endemism.

- Further tasks involved the day-to-day management of a large non-profit environmental organisation.
- Independent botanical consultant (2005 to present) over 1000 projects have been completed related to environmental impact assessments in the Western, Southern and Northern Cape, Karoo and Lesotho. A list of reports (or selected reports for scrutiny) is available on request.

#### **Higher Education**

Degrees obtained	
and major subjects passed:	B.Sc. (1977), University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg Botany III Entomology II (Third year course)
	B.Sc. Hons. (1978) University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg Botany (Ecology /Physiology)
	M.Sc (Botany), University of Cape Town, 1983. Thesis title: 'The vegetation of Swartboschkloof, Jonkershoek, Cape Province'.
	PhD (Botany), University of Cape Town, 1995. Thesis title: 'Phytogeography endemism and diversity of the fynbos of the southern Langeberg'.
	Certificate of Tourism: Guiding (Culture: Local) Level: 4 Code: TGC7 (Registered Tour Guide: WC 2969).
Employment Record:	

January 2006 – present: Independent specialist botanical consultant and tour guide in own company: **Bergwind Botanical Surveys & Tours CC** August 2000 - 2005 : Deputy Director, later Director Botanical & Communication Programmes, Botanical Society of South Africa January 1981 – July 2000 : Research Scientist (Vegetation Ecology) at National Botanical Institute January 1979—Dec 1980 : National Military Service

Further information is available on my company website: <u>www.bergwind.co.za</u>