

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	PROJECT BACKGROUND	1-1
1.2	PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	1-1
1.3	OVERVIEW OF THE EIA PROCESS	1-2
1.4	THE APPLICANT	1-7
1.5	THE INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER	1-7
1.6	UNDERTAKING BY EAP	1-9
1.7	ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	1-9
1.8	REPORT STRUCTURE	1-9
1.9	EIA REPORT REQUIREMENTS AS PER EIA REGULATIONS GNR 982/2014	1-10
2	PROJECT MOTIVATION	2-1
2.1	NEED AND DESIRABILITY	2-1
3	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3-1
3.1	PROJECT OVERVIEW	3-1
3.2	PROJECT AREA OF INFLUENCE	3-8
3.3	PROJECT COMPONENTS	3-13
3.4	PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	3-19
4	PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	4-1
4.1	PROCESS FOLLOWED TO REACH THE PREFERRED PROJECT ALTERNATIVES	4-1
5	ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK	5-1
5.1	INTRODUCTION	5-1
5.2	ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION LEGISLATIVE PROCESS	5-1
5.3	OTHER APPLICABLE LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND/OR GUIDELINES	5-10
6	BIOPHYSICAL BASELINE	6-1
6.1	CLIMATIC CONDITIONS	6-1
6.2	AIR QUALITY	6-2
6.3	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	6-3
6.4	SOIL, LAND USE AND LAND CAPABILITY	6-3
6.5	SURFACE WATER	6-9
6.6	WETLAND ECOLOGY	6-9
6.7	GROUNDWATER	6-23
6.8	TOPOGRAPHY	6-24
6.9	VISUAL AND LANDSCAPE	6-25
6.10	NOISE	6-34
6.11	FLORA AND FAUNA	6-34
6.12	BIODIVERSITY AREAS	6-36

7	SOCIO-ECONOMIC BASELINE	7-1
7.1	<i>AREA OF INFLUENCE (AOI)</i>	7-1
7.1	<i>LAND USE</i>	7-2
7.2	<i>ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE</i>	7-5
7.3	<i>PROVINCIAL CONTEXT</i>	7-6
7.4	<i>SOCIO-ECONOMIC BASELINE FOR THE AREA OF INFLUENCE</i>	7-6
7.5	<i>POLICING AND CRIME</i>	7-12
7.6	<i>CULTURAL HERITAGE</i>	7-12
8	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	8-1
8.1	<i>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION OBJECTIVES</i>	8-1
8.2	<i>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</i>	8-1
8.3	<i>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN</i>	8-2
9	METHODOLOGY	9-1
9.1	<i>IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY</i>	9-1
10	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	10-1
10.1	<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	10-1
10.2	<i>SURFACE WATER AND WETLANDS</i>	10-2
10.3	<i>TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEMS</i>	10-9
10.4	<i>SOILS AND LAND CAPABILITY</i>	10-23
10.5	<i>SOCIO-ECONOMIC</i>	10-33
10.6	<i>CULTURAL HERITAGE</i>	10-53
10.7	<i>VISUAL AND LANDSCAPE</i>	10-56
10.8	<i>DECOMMISSIONING IMPACTS</i>	10-62
10.9	<i>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</i>	10-62
10.10	<i>CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY</i>	10-67
11	CONCLUSION	11-1
11.1	<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	11-1
11.2	<i>SUMMARY OF IMPACTS IDENTIFIED AND ASSESSED</i>	11-1
11.3	<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	11-3
12	REFERENCES	12-1

List of tables

Table 1.1	<i>The EIA Team</i>	1-8
Table 1.2	<i>List of EIA Specialists</i>	1-9
Table 1.3	<i>Legislated Content of EIA Report (GNR 982/2014) and Corresponding Sections in this Report</i>	1-10
Table 3.1	<i>Co-ordinates of the corner points of the proposed power plant boundary.</i>	3-4
Table 3.2	<i>Coordinates of the 11kV underground transmission line</i>	3-4
Table 3.3	<i>Land ownership associated with the project site</i>	3-4
Table 3.4	<i>Rational for the development of the biophysical Area of Influence (AOI)</i>	3-9
Table 3.5	<i>Solar PV power plant characteristics</i>	3-13
Table 4.1	<i>Environmental and Social Constraints Weighted Scoring System</i>	4-4
Table 4.2	<i>Environmental and Social Alternatives Assessment</i>	4-5
Table 4.3	<i>Environmental and Social Alternatives Assessment Site Rankings</i>	4-10
Table 4.4	<i>Technical Alternatives Analysis (EHL, 2017)</i>	4-11
Table 4.5	<i>Summary table of technical ranking of site alternatives.</i>	4-13
Table 5.1	<i>Listed Activities Triggered as per the NEMA EIA Regulations (Dec 2014 as Amended April 2017)</i>	5-3
Table 5.2	<i>Consolidated Permitting Requirements</i>	5-6
Table 5.3	<i>A summary of the IFC Performance Standards and an indication of their applicability to the proposed project</i>	5-12
Table 6.1	<i>Monthly Rainfall, Evaporation and Temperature data</i>	6-2
Table 6.2	<i>Desktop characterisation of the downstream receiving system</i>	6-10
Table 6.3	<i>The PES ratings assigned to the sub-quaternary reach for the Leeuspruit with confidence scores 1= low confidence and 4= high confidence</i>	6-10
Table 6.4	<i>The PES category for the wetland units assessed</i>	6-16
Table 6.5	<i>The PES categories as described by Macfarlane et al. (2009)</i>	6-16
Table 6.6	<i>Wetland HGM Regulatory Benefits Potentially Provided by the Wetland</i>	6-17
Table 6.7	<i>Table reflecting the EIS assessment scores, confidence ratings and reasons</i>	6-19
Table 6.8	<i>Risk class allocation for metrics influencing the extent of the buffer allocation</i>	6-21
Table 6.9	<i>Scenic Quality and Receptor Sensitivity</i>	6-31
Table 6.10	<i>Most Commonly Occurring Bird Species at South Deep mine area</i>	6-35
Table 7.1	<i>Population Summary</i>	7-7
Table 7.2	<i>Increase in Crime (%) over the Past Five Years</i>	7-12
Table 7.3	<i>Cultural heritage screening assessment of proposed site alternatives</i>	7-13
Table 8.1	<i>Summary of Key Comments Raised during the DSR Consultation</i>	8-6
Table 8.2	<i>Tasks undertaken as part of the EIA PP Process</i>	8-7
Table 8.3	<i>Summary of Key Comments Raised during the EIA Consultation</i>	8-8
Table 9.1	<i>Impact Characteristics</i>	9-1
Table 9.2	<i>Definitions for Likelihood</i>	9-2
Table 9.3	<i>Describing Magnitude for socio-economic Impacts</i>	9-4
Table 9.4	<i>Biological and Species Value / Sensitivity Criteria</i>	9-6
Table 9.5	<i>Socio-economic Sensitivity Criteria</i>	9-6
Table 9.6	<i>Impact Significance</i>	9-6
Table 9.7	<i>Mitigation Hierarchy</i>	9-8
Table 10.1	<i>Impacts assessed for the proposed project</i>	10-1
Table 10.2	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of chemical pollution of surface water due to solar PV power plant construction and operational activities</i>	10-3
Table 10.3	<i>Residual impact significance rating of chemical pollution of surface water due to solar PV power plant construction and operational activities</i>	10-6

Table 10.4	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of altered surface hydrology due to the construction and operation of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-7
Table 10.5	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of increased sediment load in surface water systems due to construction and operation of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-8
Table 10.6	<i>Vegetation types associated with the project footprint</i>	10-10
Table 10.7	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance of the loss of natural Rand Highveld Grassland habitat due to the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-13
Table 10.8	<i>Classification of Invasive Alien Plants Identified in the Project Site</i>	10-16
Table 10.9	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for increased risk of invasive alien plant encroachment due to clearing of grassland vegetation</i>	10-19
Table 10.10	<i>Residual impact significance rating for increased risk of invasive alien plant encroachment due to clearing of grassland vegetation</i>	10-20
Table 10.11	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for disruption of ecosystem services due to loss of natural vegetation cover</i>	10-21
Table 10.12	<i>Residual impact significance rating for disruption of ecosystem services due to loss of natural vegetation cover</i>	10-22
Table 10.13	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of susceptibility to erosion due to solar PV power plant construction activities</i>	10-24
Table 10.14	<i>Residual impact significance rating of susceptibility to erosion due to solar PV power plant construction activities</i>	10-25
Table 10.15	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of susceptibility to erosion due to solar PV power plant operational activities</i>	10-26
Table 10.16	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of the chemical pollution of soils due to solar PV power plant construction activities</i>	10-28
Table 10.17	<i>Residual impact significance rating of the chemical pollution of soils due to solar PV power plant construction activities</i>	10-29
Table 10.18	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of the chemical pollution of soils due to solar PV power plant operational activities</i>	10-30
Table 10.19	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating of the loss of land capability due to construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-32
Table 10.20	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for increased employment, local business opportunities, and skills enhancement due to the construction and decommissioning of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-35
Table 10.21	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for increased employment, local business opportunities, and skills enhancement due to the operation of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-38
Table 10.22	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for increased social benefits due to project Social Economic Development (SED) spending</i>	10-39
Table 10.23	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for loss of access to grazing land due to the construction and operation of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-41
Table 10.24	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for reduced community health and safety due to the presence of temporary construction workforce and additional job seekers</i>	10-44
Table 10.25	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for increased incidence of crime due to the increased activity associated with the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-45
Table 10.26	<i>Residual impact significance rating for increased incidence of crime due to the increase activity associated with the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	10-47

<i>Table 10.27</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation Impact Significance Rating for Increased Nuisance Factors due to the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-49</i>
<i>Table 10.28</i>	<i>Residual Impact Significance Rating for Increased Nuisance Factors</i>	<i>10-50</i>
<i>Table 10.29</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for increased risk to worker rights, health, and safety due to construction and operation of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-52</i>
<i>Table 10.30</i>	<i>Sensitive Built Environment features identified on Site 1.</i>	<i>10-53</i>
<i>Table 10.31</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for loss of cultural heritage structures due to the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-55</i>
<i>Table 10.33</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation Visual Impacts for the reduction in visual resources for the Northern Receptors due to the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-57</i>
<i>Table 10.34</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation Visual Impacts for the reduction in visual resources for the Western Receptors due to the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-59</i>
<i>Table 10.35</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation Visual Impacts for the reduction in visual resources for the Southern Receptors due to the construction of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-60</i>
<i>Table 10.36</i>	<i>Pre-mitigation impact significance rating for the degradation of the landscape to due to the construction and operation of the solar PV power plant</i>	<i>10-61</i>
<i>Table 10.37</i>	<i>Impact significance rating of the cumulative impact on Rand Highveld Grassland</i>	<i>10-64</i>
<i>Table 10.38</i>	<i>Impact significance rating of the cumulative benefits to surrounding communities within the project area</i>	<i>10-66</i>
<i>Table 10.39</i>	<i>Impact significance rating for the cumulative impact on changes in the landscape</i>	<i>10-67</i>
<i>Table 10.40</i>	<i>Summary of the significance of identified impacts in the construction and operation phase of the proposed Project (+ve = positive; -ve = negative)</i>	<i>10-68</i>
<i>Table 11.1</i>	<i>Summary of the significance of identified impacts in the construction phase of the proposed Project (+ve = positive; -ve = negative)</i>	<i>11-2</i>

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	<i>Integrated Environmental Impact Assessment Process</i>	1-3
Figure 3.1	<i>Illustration of a single axis tracking solar PV unit.</i>	3-2
Figure 3.2	<i>Aerial View of PV Solar Farm</i>	3-3
Figure 3.3	<i>Regional location of the proposed project</i>	3-5
Figure 3.4	<i>Farm portions affected by the proposed project</i>	3-6
Figure 3.5	<i>Corner points of the Project Boundary</i>	3-7
Figure 3.6	<i>Socio-economic AOI</i>	3-11
Figure 3.7	<i>Project Area Of Influence (AOI) on Biophysical receptors</i>	3-12
Figure 3.8	<i>Typical PV Arrays</i>	3-14
Figure 3.9	<i>Typical Inverter Enclosures on site</i>	3-14
Figure 3.10	<i>Typical Power Transformer</i>	3-15
Figure 3.11	<i>Solar PV plant functional layout</i>	3-16
Figure 4.1	<i>Alternative Sites Considered</i>	4-3
Figure 4.2	<i>Site Alternatives Assessment Summary</i>	4-13
Figure 6.1	<i>Soil forms found within the South Deep Solar Project Area</i>	6-5
Figure 6.2	<i>Land Capability Map for the South Deep Solar Project Area</i>	6-8
Figure 6.3	<i>Map indicating the study area in relation to the Gauteng Conservation Plan and NFEPA wetlands (Nel et al., 2004; SANBI, 2010; Nel et al., 2011</i>	6-11
Figure 6.4	<i>The Gauteng Conservation Plan within the Surface Rights Boundary</i>	6-12
Figure 6.5	<i>Map showing the different HGM units associated with the primary and secondary study area</i>	6-15
Figure 6.6	<i>Map showing the erosion potential (based in the LS factor) for the primary and secondary study areas</i>	6-22
Figure 6.7	<i>Interpolated groundwater Elevations and General Groundwater Flow at South Deep Mine Area</i>	6-23
Figure 6.8	<i>Aquifers occurring at South Deep mine</i>	6-24
Figure 6.9	<i>View of the D12324 Road located adjacent to the proposed solar PV plant site</i>	6-25
Figure 6.10	<i>Zoomed view of the northern farmstead as seen from the proposed site at a 1.2 km distance</i>	6-26
Figure 6.11	<i>Zoomed view of the western farmstead as seen from the proposed site at a 1.3 km distance</i>	6-26
Figure 6.12	<i>Zoomed view of the south western farmstead located amongst the trees as seen from the proposed site at a 1.6 km distance.</i>	6-27
Figure 6.13	<i>Vegetation Types at South Deep Mine</i>	6-28
Figure 7.1	<i>Surrounding Mining Rights</i>	7-4
Figure 7.2	<i>Administrative Structure</i>	7-5
Figure 7.3	<i>Ethnic Composition in the District and Local Municipalities</i>	7-7
Figure 7.4	<i>Sectoral Contribution to Economic Output</i>	7-8
Figure 7.5	<i>Growth of Thusanang Township</i>	7-10
Figure 7.6	<i>Location of recorded sites within the development footprint</i>	7-14
Figure 7.7	<i>Ephemeral Stone Foundations</i>	7-15
Figure 7.8	<i>Feature 1 viewed from the South</i>	7-15
Figure 7.9	<i>Feature 2 Viewed from the East</i>	7-16
Figure 7.10	<i>Feature 2 Midden 1</i>	7-17
Figure 7.11	<i>Feature 3 General site conditions</i>	7-18
Figure 7.12	<i>Feature 3 Building rubble</i>	7-18
Figure 7.13	<i>Feature 4 Viewed from the West</i>	7-19
Figure 7.14	<i>Water Trough within Feature 4</i>	7-20

<i>Figure 7.15</i>	<i>Upright standing Stones at Feature 5</i>	<i>7-21</i>
<i>Figure 7.16</i>	<i>Linear Wall at Feature 5</i>	<i>7-21</i>
<i>Figure 7.17</i>	<i>General Site Conditions Feature 6</i>	<i>7-22</i>
<i>Figure 7.18</i>	<i>Core with Removal Visible</i>	<i>7-23</i>
<i>Figure 7.19</i>	<i>Ventral View of Large Flake</i>	<i>7-23</i>
<i>Figure 7.20</i>	<i>MSA Point with Dorsal Flaking</i>	<i>7-24</i>
<i>Figure 7.21</i>	<i>Grave Viewed from the South</i>	<i>7-25</i>
<i>Figure 7.22</i>	<i>Grave viewed from the north east</i>	<i>7-25</i>
<i>Figure 7.23</i>	<i>Grave of Elisabeth Prinsloo</i>	<i>7-26</i>
<i>Figure 10.1</i>	<i>Map showing the 50m wetland buffer zone in relation to the project footprint</i>	<i>10-5</i>
<i>Figure 10.2</i>	<i>Vegetation types associated with the project footprint</i>	<i>10-11</i>
<i>Figure 10.3</i>	<i>Project footprint in relation to the Gauteng C-Plan V3.3</i>	<i>10-12</i>
<i>Figure 10.4</i>	<i>Layout of land classifications of the Gauteng C-Plan version 3.3 for the project area</i>	<i>10-17</i>
<i>Figure 10.5</i>	<i>Cultural Heritage Sites</i>	<i>10-54</i>