

CONSULTATION SCOPING REPORT

IKAMVA LETHU AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE REMAINDER OF FARM 653, SUNLAND, SUNDAYS RIVER VALLEY MUNICIPALITY

March 2018



Prepared for:

Ikamva Lethu Farms (Pty) Ltd
Private Bag X24
Addo
6105

Prepared by:

Sandy Wren, Marisa Jacoby and Zandri Grobbelaar
Public Process Consultants
PO Box 27688, Greenacres, PE, 6057
120 Diaz Road, Adcockvale, PE 6001
Phone: 041 – 374 8426 Fax: 041 - 373 2002
Email: sandy@publicprocess.co.za



Title:	Consultation Scoping Report, Ikamva Lethu Agricultural Development on the Remainder of Farm 653, Sunland, Sundays River Valley Municipality (March 2018)
Purpose of this report:	<p>This Scoping Report forms part of a series of reports and information documents that are being provided during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed agricultural development for Ikamva Lethu Farms (Pty) Ltd, on the Remainder of Farm 653, Sunland, in the SRVM. As per Appendix 2 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended), the objectives of the Scoping Process are to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify relevant policies and legislation relevant to the activity; • motivate the need and desirability of the proposed activity in the context of the preferred location • identify and confirm the preferred activity, technology alternative and/ or site alternative; or if no alternatives, including location alternatives were investigated, the motivation for such; • identify the key issues to be addressed in the assessment phase; • confirm the level of assessment, methodology and expertise required as well as the extent of further consultation to be undertaken to determine the impacts and risks the activity will impose on the preferred site to inform the location of the development footprint within the preferred site; and • identify suitable measures to avoid, manage or mitigate identified impacts and to determine the extent of the residual risks that need to be managed and monitored. <p>The primary objective of this Scoping Report is to present (to key stakeholders and affected organs of state) an overview of the project, including key issues, as well as to confirm the preferred alternative that requires assessment in the EIA phase.</p>
Prepared for:	Ikamva Lethu Farms (Pty) Ltd Private Bag X24 Addo 6105
Prepared by:	Public Process Consultants PO Box 27688, Greenacres, 6057 Phone: 041 - 374 8426 Fax: 041 - 373 2002
Authors:	Sandy Wren, Marisa Jacoby and Zandri Grobbelaar
Date:	March 2018
To be cited as:	Wren S, Jacoby M and Grobbelaar Z, March 2018. Consultation Scoping Report - Ikamva Lethu Agricultural Development on the Remainder of Farm 653, Sunland, Sundays River Valley Municipality.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The applicant, Ikamva Lethu Farms (Pty) Ltd, intends to transform ~920ha of the Remainder of Farm 653 (hereafter referred to as '**Farm 653**'), measuring ~1191ha in extent, to plant ~708ha of a variety of citrus and install associated infrastructure. Associated infrastructure includes, internal roads, laydown areas, windbreaks and dams. In addition, an area of ~5.6ha will be disturbed to accommodate the installation of two irrigation pipelines across the following properties, not located on Farm 653:

- Remainder of Farm 714
- Portion 3 of Farm 558
- Portion 39 of Farm 558
- Portion 6 of Farm 558

Sections of the proposed pipeline is required to be installed in the reserve of a proclaimed public road (MR00470). The farm portions included in this assessment are located within the SRVM and the nearest town is Sunland, ~3.5km northeast of Farm 653.

In terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended), published in GN R326, 327, 325 and 324, promulgated under Chapter Five of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) ("NEMAA"), and published in Government Gazette 40772 on the 7 April 2017, the project requires full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (Scoping and EIA), prior to the commencement of any activities on the site due to amongst others, activities listed in GN R325, namely: *"15. The clearance of an area of 20 hectares or more of indigenous vegetation, excluding where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for -..."*

Chapter Four of the Consultation Scoping Report (CSR) provides details of the listed activities which require Environmental Authorisation. The project applicant has appointed Public Process Consultants as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake the Scoping and EIA for the project. The competent authority who must consider and decide upon this application is the Provincial Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEDEAT), Cacadu Region.

Subject to the outcome of the assessment process, specialist studies, technical input and consultation process, the project applicant, Ikamva Lethu Farms (Pty) Ltd, intends to utilise the agricultural potential of the land for the establishment of citrus orchards. Farm 653 measures ~1191ha in extent and is zoned for agriculture.

In order to provide irrigation water to the proposed agricultural development the applicant also proposes the installation of two irrigation pipelines over a length of ~8km. The total footprint area that will be disturbed by the installation of the pipelines is conservatively estimated at ~5.6ha (7m x 8000m). It is further proposed, that an existing dam (current capacity ~17 000m³) be expanded to a capacity of ~45 000m³ and that three new dams with a capacity of ~45 000m³ each, be constructed in order to supply the required irrigation water for the proposed development. The combined water storage capacity of the expanded, as well as three newly constructed dams will total ~180 000m³.

Existing infrastructure on Farm 653 is proposed to be renovated and used for the storage of vehicles, pesticides, herbicides and to provide administrative support to the agricultural development as well as accommodation for five individuals.

The proposed agricultural development on the Farm 653 can be divided into the following phases, which are outlined in more detail in the sections below:

- Preconstruction;
- Construction; and
- Operational

Preconstruction Phase

Prior to the commencement of construction activities on the site a preconstruction phase (planning) is required. For the planting of citrus, seed used in production of crops must be booked in advance and is then imported to a certified nursery for a grow-out period, during which the seeds are germinated and the seedlings grown to sapling stage. Thereafter, saplings must be planted annually in the last quarter of the year, between September to December. Thus, site preparation (outlined in the section below) needs to be complete prior to the planting of the saplings in the last quarter of the year.

The preconstruction phase for securing the block seed and growing of the saplings occurs in parallel to site preparation which is outlined below. Site preparation needs to be completed to coincide with the planting of the saplings. Thus, the timing between the purchase of the seed, grow-out period, preparation of the site and establishment of the orchards is critical.

Construction Phase

The project will entail the clearing of vegetation, levelling of the site, and the installation of the drip/micro irrigation system, prior to the planting of the saplings. Once the site is prepared, citrus orchards will be established (refer to the operational phase of the development). It is anticipated that vegetation clearing, landscaping, site preparation and planting will be done both by hand and with the aid of suitable earth moving equipment (excavators, bulldozers, TLBs). No workers' accommodation will be provided on site during the construction phase.

Site preparation will entail the following activities on site:

- Clearing of indigenous vegetation;
- Landscaping and levelling the site for citrus orchards;
- Securing the site (e.g. erecting appropriate fencing);
- Establishment of internal unpaved service roads and a new access point;
- Installation of irrigation pipelines (~8km) from the canal, across the Sundays River to Farm 653;
- Construction of three new irrigation dams and expansion of an existing dam;
- Installation of internal water reticulation and irrigation infrastructure;
- Planting of orchards and windbreaks (if required); and
- Renovation of existing structures to be utilised for administrative purposes.
- Installation of new supporting infrastructure (e.g. water reticulation, conservancy tanks).

The applicant has obtained a water use licence for the taking of water from a water resource in terms of section 40 of the National Water Act which entitles them to utilise 675ha of water from the LSRWUA canal system. The applicant, therefore, has sufficient irrigation water for the proposed development of ~708ha of citrus.

Operational Phase

Once the site is suitably prepared the area will be utilised for the establishment of citrus orchards. Equipment required for the new operations will be stored in the renovated storage sheds and workshop areas on site. The following operational phase activities are associated with the project:

- Water for the development will be supplied from the LSRWUA canals which will be reticulated from the proposed new/ expanded balancing dams; and
- It is anticipated that a number of additional seasonal and permanent employment opportunities will be created by the project.

For more detail regarding the project description see Chapter Two of the CSR.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The area proposed for cultivation is located on Farm 653, which is situated ~3.5km southwest of Sunland, in the Sundays River Valley Municipality (SRVM). The nearest boundary of the Addo Elephant National Park is located ~ 9.7km north-east of the site. The site is currently undeveloped and zoned for

Agriculture, measuring ~1191ha in extent. The site can be accessed off the gravel “Sunland” road (MR00470) which extends between the R336 and the R75.

Apart from the partially cultivated properties adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Farm 653, which includes existing citrus orchards, the remaining surrounding properties all resemble untransformed land and the land use is predominantly game farming. Further north (towards the “Valley”) of the area under assessment (along the proposed irrigation pipeline route), however, the landscape becomes largely agricultural, with a focus on citrus production.

The previous landowner of Farm 653, operated a small-scale sausage casing facility in existing sheds on the property, these activities have subsequently ceased and the previous landowner has vacated the farm. In addition, through consultation with the previous owner and based on site observations, it was determined that the farm was previously utilised for various agricultural activities. For example, the existing buildings on site include poultry facilities, kraals, vegetable tunnels, various outbuildings and sheds. The degradation and modification of portions of the vegetation is also indicative of livestock grazing and browsing which may have occurred in the past, as well as intensive cultivation which occurred historically.

The vegetation on Farm 653 was observed to be a combination of Sundays Spekboom Thicket (majority), Bontveld and Koedoeskloof Karroid Thicket. Numerous access tracks traverse the Farm, which has led to severe modification of land cover in these areas, across all the vegetation units. Edge effects have also resulted, due to the permanent removal of natural vegetation along these routes. Some degradation of portions of the Farm, particularly in the Bontveld and Koedoeskloof Karroid Thicket, were observed. This is likely due to wildlife and livestock grazing and browsing. The prevalent occurrence of *Opuntia ficus-indica* and *Opuntia aurantiaca* across the Farm, is another indication of disturbance, possibly by grazers and browsers. The degradation can be seen throughout all three of the identified vegetation types, but is most visible in the woody Thicket areas. As noted above, the Bontveld unit appears to have been degraded due to wildlife and livestock grazing and browsing, resulting in a moderately low species diversity, limited Fynbos and Grassland species, lack of rare or threatened species, and the relative abundance of *Pentzia incana*, *Felicia filifolia* and *Felicia muricata*; including patches of *Cynodon dactylon*.

The Sundays Spekboom Thicket has been severely modified on portions of the Farm immediately north and south of the MR00470, as well as on smaller pockets on the Farm, due to intensive cultivation that took place approximately six years ago. However, based on species diversity, intactness and impenetrability, and despite the presence of *Opuntia ficus-indica*, *Opuntia aurantiaca* and transformed access tracks, most of the Sundays Spekboom Thicket remains in a relatively good ecological state.

A preliminary site visit, conducted by an aquatic specialist, indicated eleven wetland habitats, six ephemeral drainage areas (surface water run-off areas) and one un-named, non-perennial watercourse/ river on Farm 635. These observations were supplemented by the review of relevant aerial imagery and planning frameworks for Farm 653.

The irrigation pipeline route is proposed to cross the Sundays River at a single point. Near the river and along the banks, the dominant vegetation is near-natural Riparian vegetation. Sections of the irrigation pipeline is also proposed to be installed in the reserve of a proclaimed public road (MR00470), as well as through private property. Most of the vegetation along the road reserve has been modified. The presence of the three FEPA wetlands identified along the proposed irrigation pipeline route, using the FEPA mapping resources, was confirmed during the site visit. A wetland occurs instream of the Sundays River. While the Sundays River is not classified as a NFEPA river the associated wetland habitat at the point of the crossing is classified as a NFEPA wetland (channelled valley-bottom). The unchannelled valley-bottom wetlands along the pipeline route have been identified as two farm dams, located either side of the MR00470.

For further information regarding the affected environment see Chapter Three of the CSR.

OVERVIEW OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This Scoping and EIA Process is being implemented in four phases, the details of which are outlined in Chapter Four of the CSR:

- Pre-Application Scoping Phase
- Application and Scoping Phase (***we are here***)
- Environmental Impact Assessment Phase
- Decision Making and Appeal Period

Notice of Intention to commence with Scoping and EIA was submitted to the competent authority and sent to all identified Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) and Organs of State on 18 October 2016. Notification was provided in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 published in Government Notice R982, 983, 984 and 985 on the 4 December 2014 in Government Gazette 38282. These regulations have subsequently been amended by the publication of GN R326, 327, 325 and 324 in Government Gazette 40772 on the 7 April 2017. Therefore, the proposed Scoping and EIA process is being undertaken in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended).

Copies of comments and issues that have been raised to date, as well as appropriate responses that have been provided by the EAP, are included in the Comments and Responses Trail contained in Chapter Four of the CSR.

In order to commence the legislated portion of the Scoping and EIA process, an Application Form for Environmental Authorisation in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) has been submitted to the competent authority, together with the release of the CSR for the legislated 30-day consultation period. All registered I&APs have been notified in writing of the release of the CSR for the legislated 30-day comment period.

The Final Scoping Report (FSR), together with the Plan of Study (PoS) for EIA, will be prepared for submission to the Provincial DEDEAT for their decision-making, within 44 days of submission of the Application Form. The FSR will include all the comments received from I&APs during the Pre-Application Phase, as well as the review of the Draft Consultation Scoping Report (Draft CSR) and CSR. Should DEDEAT accept the FSR and approve the PoS for EIA, the assessment process will enter into the EIA Phase.

Public Process Consultants has been appointed as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to conduct the Scoping and EIA, including public participation for this application.

For further detail regarding the Scoping and EIA process including public participation see Chapter Four of the CSR.

Identification of Issues

Issues and concerns identified for inclusion in the Scoping Report that require specialist assessment in the environmental assessment phase of the EIA have been identified using the following methods:

- Site Visit
- Preliminary input from specialists
- Desktop review of regional planning documentation and frameworks
- Scoping of issues and concerns with I&APs, including authorities and affected Organs of State, through correspondence received (emails, comment forms) in response to the project announcement, as well as the release of the Draft CSR.

Based on issues identified thus far in the process, the table below indicates the specialist studies/ input required for the EIA Phase of the Assessment Process:

SPECIALIST STUDY	BROAD SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT	PROPOSED SPECIALIST
Biophysical Assessment	To include an assessment of the potential impacts on vegetation and fauna (desktop), as well as the delineation of sensitive no-go areas, and determination of buffer zones. An aquatic assessment will be undertaken to assess the impacts on aquatic features identified on the site, including wetlands, watercourses and drainage areas. To determine the PES of the site and confirm the mapping of CBAs and ESAs, as included in various biodiversity planning frameworks, including the ECBCP and NFEPA mapping resources. To provide recommendations for management/ mitigation of residual impacts.	Deborah Vromans, Vegetation and Aquatic Specialist Zandri Grobbelaar, Public Process Consultants
Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment	To identify archaeological and palaeontological features on site and assess the potential impacts on these features. To provide recommendations for management/ mitigation of residual impacts.	Dr Lloyd Rossouw, Paleo Field Services
Soil Suitability Reconnaissance Survey	Soil suitability assessment to determine the agricultural potential for commercial citrus production and provide amelioration measures for soil limiting factors.	Dr Freddie Ellis
Traffic Impact Assessment	Traffic impact statement regarding access and egress from the site onto the MR00470 road (Sunland Road) as well as the potential impact of the additional trip generation.	Cary Hastie, Engineering Advice and Services
Visual Impact Assessment	Determine any changes in the “sense of place” and visual landscape as a result of the proposed development	Henry Holland, MapThis
Bulk Services Report	To confirm that the existing capacity of the services on site (water, effluent, stormwater management). To provide recommendations if upgrades to the existing facilities are required.	Jaco Spies, JJ Spies Civil Engineers
Security Risk Assessment	Evaluation of potential elevated security risk posed by the proposed development on rhino and exotic game in the area.	Rodney Visser
TECHNICAL TEAM		
Irrigation Infrastructure	Estimate the quantity of water required to irrigate the proposed development, to be stored on site in new dams that are required to be constructed/ expanded. To confirm associated irrigation infrastructure layout including pipe diameters and length, as well as dam dimensions and design.	Project applicant through their irrigation specialist

The full specialist Terms of Reference (ToR) are contained in Chapter Six of the CSR. The results of the specialist studies and other relevant project information will be integrated into the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (Draft EIA).

Current Stage in the Process

This project is currently at the stage where an Application Form for Environmental Authorisation has been submitted to the competent authority, together with the release of the **Consultation Scoping Report (CSR)** for the legislated minimum **30-day** competent authority and I&AP review period. The next step in the process will be the submission of the FSR to the competent authority within 44 days of submission of the Application Form. No comment period is proposed for the FSR.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1.1
1.1 BACKGROUND AND PROJECT OVERVIEW	1.1
1.1.1 About the Project Applicant	1.4
1.2 PROJECT NEED AND DESIRABILITY	1.4
1.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR SCOPING AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	1.8
1.4 EIA TEAM	1.9
1.5 DETAILS AND EXPERTISE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER AND EXPERTISE TO CARRY OUT SCOPING AND EIA	1.9
1.6 OBJECTIVES OF THE SCOPING PROCESS	1.10
CHAPTER TWO: PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2.1
2.1 INTRODUCTION	2.1
2.1.1 Proposed Project Location	2.2
2.2 PROPOSED PROJECT SCOPE AND ACTIVITIES	2.6
2.2.1 Preconstruction	2.8
2.2.2 Construction	2.8
2.2.2.1 <i>Vegetation Clearing and Landscaping</i>	2.8
2.2.2.2 <i>Securing the Site</i>	2.9
2.2.2.3 <i>Internal Roads and Access</i>	2.9
2.2.2.4 <i>Installation of Irrigation Infrastructure and Construction of Dams</i>	2.9
2.2.2.5 <i>Renovation of Existing Structures</i>	2.10
2.2.2.6 <i>Windbreaks</i>	2.11
2.2.3 Operational	2.11
2.2.3.1 <i>Orchard Establishment</i>	2.12
2.2.3.2 <i>Water Use Entitlements and Availability</i>	2.12
2.3 CAPITAL INVESTMENT AND EMPLOYMENT GENERATION	2.12
2.4 PROJECT SCHEDULE	2.12
2.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS	2.13
CHAPTER THREE: DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3.1
3.1 INTRODUCTION	3.1
3.2 GEOGRAPHICAL CONTEXT	3.2
3.2.1 Site Locality and Overview	3.2
3.2.2 Surrounding Land-use	3.4
3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ATTRIBUTES	3.6
3.3.1 Biological	3.6
3.3.1.1 <i>Aquatic Vegetation</i>	3.6
3.3.1.2 <i>Terrestrial Vegetation</i>	3.10
3.3.1.3 <i>Fauna</i>	3.17
3.3.2 Physical	3.17
3.3.2.1 <i>Climate</i>	3.17
3.3.2.2 <i>Geohydrology and Surface Water</i>	3.18
3.3.2.3 <i>Geology and Topography</i>	3.18
3.3.2.4 <i>Agricultural Potential</i>	3.20
3.3.3 Heritage and Cultural	3.22
3.3.4 Socio-economic (Social and Economic)	3.22
3.4 ON – SITE OBSERVATIONS	3.23
3.4.1 Sausage Casing Facility	3.23
3.4.2 Other Existing Buildings and Infrastructure	3.24
3.4.3 Vegetation on Site and Levels of Degradation	3.24
3.4.4 Fauna	3.27
3.4.5 Geohydrology and Surface Water	3.27
3.4.6 Heritage and Cultural	3.27
3.5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3.29

CHAPTER 4: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION		4.1
4.1	INTRODUCTION	4.1
4.2	LEGAL CONTEXT FOR THIS EIA	4.1
4.3	LEGISLATION AND GUIDELINES APPLICABLE TO THIS EIA	4.6
4.3.1	National Legislation	4.6
4.3.1.1	<i>The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996):</i>	4.6
4.3.1.2	<i>NEMAA (as amended) and the EIA Regulations 2014 (as amended) published under Chapter 5 of NEMA (GN R326, GN R327, GN R325 and GN R324):</i>	4.6
4.3.1.3	<i>National Environmental Management Biodiversity (NEMBA) (Act 10 of 2004):</i>	4.7
4.3.1.4	<i>National Forests Act (NFA) (Act 84 of 1998)</i>	4.7
4.3.1.5	<i>National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (Act 25 of 1999)</i>	4.8
4.3.1.6	<i>National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998)</i>	4.8
4.3.1.7	<i>National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003)</i>	4.9
4.3.1.8	<i>Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (Act 43 of 1983)</i>	4.10
4.3.1.9	<i>Other Applicable National Legislation</i>	4.10
4.3.2	Provincial and Local Legislation	4.10
4.3.2.1	<i>Cape Nature and Environmental Conservation Ordinance (19 of 1974)</i>	4.10
4.3.2.2	<i>Eastern Cape Heritage Resources Act (Act 9 of 2003)</i>	4.11
4.3.2.3	<i>Other Applicable Provincial and Local Legislation</i>	4.11
4.3.3	Policies and Guidelines	4.11
4.4	OVERVIEW OF THE SCOPING AND EIA PROCESS	4.12
4.4.1	Principles for Scoping and Public Participation	4.13
4.4.2	Authority Consultation	4.14
4.4.3	Database Development and Maintenance including Information Sharing	4.15
4.5	PRE-APPLICATION SCOPING PHASE	4.17
4.5.1	Project Announcement and Registration of I&APs	4.17
4.5.2	Draft Consultation Scoping Report Review	4.18
4.6	APPLICATION AND SCOPING PHASE (current stage in the process)	4.19
4.6.1	Submission of Application Form for Environmental Authorisation to DEDEAT	4.19
4.6.2	Consultation Scoping Report Review (current stage)	4.19
4.6.3	Submit Final Scoping Report to DEDEAT	4.20
4.7	SCOPING AND IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES	4.20
4.8	CONCLUDING REMARKS	4.65
CHAPTER FIVE: IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES		5.1
5.1	APPROACH TO THE ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES	5.1
5.2	NO-GO ALTERNATIVE	5.2
5.3	PROPERTY/ LOCATION ALTERNATIVES	5.3
5.3.1	Skietnek (RE and Portion 3 of Farm 82 and RE of Farm 81)	5.3
5.3.2	Remainder of Farm 653	5.5
5.4	LAND USE/ ACTIVITY ALTERNATIVES	5.6
5.4.1	Grazing (not preferred)	5.6
5.4.2	Citrus Production (preferred alternative)	5.7
5.5	LAYOUT ALTERNATIVES	5.8
5.5.1	Alternative 1 (not preferred)	5.9
5.5.2	Alternative 2 (preferred)	5.11
5.6	IRRIGATION INFRASTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES	5.14
5.6.1	Alternative 1 (not preferred)	5.14
5.6.2	Alternative 2 (preferred)	5.17
5.7	CONCLUDING REMARKS	5.20
CHAPTER SIX: PLAN OF STUDY FOR EIA		6.1
6.1	INTRODUCTION	6.1
6.2	OVERVIEW OF THE APPROACH TO THIS EIA	6.2
6.2.1	The NEMA EIA Regulations 2014 (as amended)	6.3
6.3	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT (EIA) AND EMPr	6.3
6.3.1	Public Participation Process	6.3

6.3.1.1	<i>Compile Draft EIA Report and EMPr</i>	6.4
6.3.1.2	<i>Review of Draft EIA (and EMPr) and Ongoing Communication</i>	6.4
6.3.1.3	<i>Comments and Responses Trial</i>	6.4
6.3.1.4	<i>Compilation of the Final EIA and EMPr and Submission to Authorities</i>	6.5
6.3.1.5	<i>Decision on Application and Appeal Period</i>	6.5
6.3.1.6	<i>Authority Consultation during the EIA Phase</i>	6.5
6.3.2	Generic Terms of Reference for the Assessment of Impacts	6.6
6.3.3	Specific Aspects to be Addressed in Specialist Studies	6.9
6.3.3.1	<i>Biophysical Assessment</i>	6.10
6.3.3.2	<i>Heritage Assessment</i>	6.11
6.3.3.3	<i>Soil Suitability Assessment</i>	6.11
6.3.3.4	<i>Traffic Impact Assessment</i>	6.11
6.3.3.5	<i>Visual Impact Assessment</i>	6.12
6.3.3.6	<i>Security Risk Assessment</i>	6.12
6.3.4	Technical Input	6.12
6.3.4.1	<i>Irrigation Water Infrastructure</i>	6.12
6.3.4.2	<i>Roads and Wet Services Report</i>	6.12
6.3.5	Proposed Scheduling of EIA Phase	6.13
MAPS		
Map 1.1	The location of the area under assessment which includes the Remainder of Farm 653 and the properties affected by the proposed irrigation pipeline corridor.	1.3
Map 2.1	A plan indicating the coordinates of the boundary of the Remainder of Farm 653 upon which the agricultural development is proposed to take place.	2.3
Map 2.2	A plan indicating the northern (north of the R336) portion of the pipeline route and the coordinates of the sections thereof which trigger listed activities.	2.4
Map 2.3	A plan indicating the southern (south of the R336) portion of the pipeline route and the coordinates of the sections thereof which trigger listed activities.	2.5
Map 2.4	Existing infrastructure which will be renovated in order to be utilised as storage sheds, workshops, and administrative areas on the Remainder of Farm 653.	2.6
Map 3.1	Locality map of the Remainder of Farm 653 and the properties affected by the irrigation pipeline route.	3.3
Map 3.2	Properties (yellow outline) adjacent to the Remainder of Farm 653 (red outline), indicating the current surrounding land use.	3.4
Map 3.3a	The current land-use of the properties north of the R336 road (purple outline), which are affected by the proposed irrigation pipeline corridor (blue outline), as well as properties which surround the pipeline where it falls within the road reserve (yellow outline).	3.5
Map 3.3b	The current land-use of the properties south of the R336 road (purple outline), which are affected by the proposed irrigation pipeline corridor (blue outline), as well as properties which surround the pipeline where it falls within the road reserve (yellow outline).	3.6
Map 3.4	The Remainder of Farm 653 (red outline) and the proposed irrigation pipeline route (purple) does not fall within a Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area, in terms of the NFEPA Mapping resources.	3.7
Map 3.5	The affected properties and proposed irrigation pipeline route, do not fall within a National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area. However, two Wetland FEPAs are mapped along the proposed irrigation pipeline route.	3.8
Map 3.6	The affected properties (indicated in red) and proposed irrigation pipeline route (indicated in blue), in terms of the ECBCP Aquatic CBA mapping resources.	3.10
Map 3.7	The affected properties (indicated in red) and proposed irrigation pipeline route (indicated in blue), as mapped in the NSBA mapping resources, showing the vegetation types present on site.	3.11
Map 3.8	The affected properties (red outline) and proposed irrigation pipeline route, in terms of the ECBCP Terrestrial CBA mapping resources.	3.12
Map 3.9	The affected properties and proposed irrigation pipeline route, as mapped in terms of the Sundays River Valley Municipality Biodiversity Sector Plan.	3.14
Map 3.10	The affected properties and proposed irrigation pipeline route, as mapped in the STEP mapping resources, showing the vegetation types present on site.	3.16
Map 3.11	The affected properties (red outline) and proposed irrigation pipeline route (blue), do not fall within a Biodiversity Corridor (purple) or a Protected Area (bright green), as identified in the STEP mapping resources.	3.17

Map 3.12	Fossil Sensitivity of the affected properties (red outline) and proposed irrigation pipeline route (blue).	3.19
Map 3.13	Contour map (5m contour intervals) showing topography of the affected properties and proposed irrigation pipeline route (red outline).	3.20
Map 3.14	The affected properties and proposed irrigation pipeline route, Agricultural Land Capability (AGIS, 2007, www.agis.agric.za).	3.21
Map 3.15	Location of a single grave site identified on the Remainder of Farm 653.	3.28
Map 5.1	Location of the farms collectively referred to as Skietnek.	5.3
Map 5.2	Opportunities and Constraints map prepared during the Rapid Environmental Risk Assessment for the farms collectively referred to as Skietnek.	5.4
Map 5.3	Location of the Remainder of Farm 653.	5.5
Map 5.4	Opportunities and Constraints map prepared during the Rapid Environmental Risk Assessment for the Remainder of Farm 653.	5.6
Map 5.5	Alternative 1 (not preferred) proposed to clear ~920ha of indigenous vegetation for the establishment of citrus orchards, including associated infrastructure, the expansion of an existing dam and the construction of three new dams. This alternative was based on the initial proposal, along with preliminary specialist and technical input. This layout was amended subsequent to additional specialist and technical input, and public participation.	5.10
Map 5.6	Alternative 2 (preferred) proposes to clear ~920ha of indigenous vegetation for the establishment of 708ha of citrus orchards, including associated infrastructure, the expansion of an existing dam and the construction of three new dams. This preferred alternative is based on additional specialist and technical input, as well as public participation.	5.12
Map 5.7	Proposed logistical services layout, including existing buildings to be utilised on site.	5.13
Map 5.8	Irrigation Infrastructure Alternative 1 (not preferred), northern section of the pipeline corridor. Showing the single irrigation pipe (500mm diameter), single crossing of the Sundays River, as well as the properties affected by the pipeline corridor.	5.15
Map 5.9	Irrigation Infrastructure Alternative 1 (not preferred), northern section of the pipeline corridor. Showing the single irrigation pipe (500mm diameter), single crossing of the Sundays River, as well as the properties affected by the pipeline corridor.	5.16
Map 5.10	Irrigation Infrastructure Alternative 2 (preferred), northern section of the pipeline corridor. Showing the double irrigation pipeline (2 x 450mm diameter pipes), single crossing of the Sundays River (single, 630mm diameter pipe), as well as the properties affected by the pipeline corridor.	5.18
Map 5.11	Irrigation Infrastructure Alternative 2 (preferred), southern section of the pipeline corridor. Showing the double irrigation pipeline (2 x 450mm diameter pipes) and the termination of the pipeline on the RE of Farm 653, as well as the properties affected by the pipeline corridor.	5.19
PHOTOS		
Photo 2.1	Example of internal service roads on an existing citrus farm in the Sundays River Valley.	2.9
Photo 2.2	Existing warehouse which is required to be renovated to be utilised for the storage of vehicles and machinery etc.	2.11
Photo 2.3	Existing buildings to be utilised for storage of equipment and for administrative facilities.	2.11
Photo 3.1	Vegetable tunnels.	3.24
Photo 3.2	Poultry Facilities.	3.24
Photo 3.3	Shed.	3.24
Photo 3.4	Outbuildings.	3.24
Photo 3.5	Presence of <i>Opuntia ficus-indica</i> , indicated with white arrows, on a Portion of the Remainder of Farm 653, indicating a level of disturbance, possibly due to grazers and browsers.	3.25
Photo 3.6	Severely modified Sundays Spekboom Thicket and Koedoeskloof Karroid Thicket, indicated with red circles, on portions of the Farm to the north of the MR00470.	3.26
Photo 3.7	Proposed irrigation pipeline route crossing of the Sundays River, showing near-natural Riparian Vegetation.	3.26
Photo 3.8	A Section towards the north of the R336 road, where the irrigation pipeline is proposed to be installed in the road reserve indicating the modification in the vegetation.	3.27
Photo 3.9	The single grave site identified on the Remainder of Farm 653.	3.28

TABLES		
Table 1.1	EIA Team and Specialists.	1.9
Table 1.2	Summary of where requirements for a Scoping Report (in terms of GN R326, Section 2 in Appendix 2 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended) are provided for in this report.	1.11
Table 2.1	Project cadastral information.	2.2
Table 2.2	Proposed project schedule.	2.13
Table 3.1	Activities on the land adjacent to the Remainder of Farm 653.	3.4
Table 4.1	Listed activities according to GN R327, 325 and 324 requiring Environmental Authorisation in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended).	4.2
Table 4.2	Summary of Issues Raised.	4.23
Table 4.3	Comments and Responses Trail.	4.24
Table 6.1	Proposed list of specialist studies and specialists.	6.2
Table 6.2	Authority consultation schedule.	6.6
Table 6.3	Rating of impacts.	6.9
Table 6.4	Proposed EIA schedule.	6.13
FIGURES		
Figure 1.1	Extract from the National Development Plan, 2011, page 197.	1.6
Figure 1.2	Google Earth Image indicating the boundaries of the Remainder of Farm 653 (red) and its proximity to the cultivated "Valley" area.	1.7
Figure 3.1	Breakdown of the Employment Sector for the Sundays River Valley Municipality (Final SRVM IDP 2015/2016).	3.23

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Project EAP CV
APPENDIX B	Correspondence with DEDEAT
APPENDIX C	Advert and Site Notice Boards
APPENDIX D	Project Databases
APPENDIX E	Correspondence sent to I&APs
APPENDIX F	Correspondence from I&APs
APPENDIX G	Water Use License
APPENDIX H	Locality Plan
APPENDIX I	DAFF Permit
APPENDIX J	Memorandum of Advice
APPENDIX K	Security Risk Assessment

ABBREVIATIONS

CARA	Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act
CBA	Critical Biodiversity Area
CSR	Consultation Scoping Report
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
DEA	National Department of Environmental Affairs
DEDEAT	Provincial Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism
DWS	Department of Water and Sanitation
EA	Environmental Authorisation
ECBCP	Eastern Cape Biodiversity Conservation Plan
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIS	Ecological Importance and Sensitivity
EMPr	Environmental Management Programme
ESA	Ecologically Sensitive Area
FEPAs	Freshwater Ecosystems Priority Areas
FSR	Final Scoping Report
I&AP	Interested and Affected Party
LSRWUA	Lower Sundays River Water Users Association
NBA	Nation Biodiversity Assessment (2011)
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998), as amended
NEMAA	National Environmental Management Amendment Act (Act 107 of 1998)
NFEPA	National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)
NMBM	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality
NPAES	National Protected Areas Expansion Strategy
PES	Present Ecological State
PoS	Plan of Study
SABIF	South African Biodiversity Information Facility
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency
SDF	Spatial Development Framework
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
STEP	Subtropical Thicket Ecosystem Project
S24G	Section 24G Assessment
ToR	Terms of Reference