Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed Eskom Kekana Substation and Loop in and Loop out powerline servitudes in Hammanskraal, Gauteng Province

Desktop Study (Phase 1)

For

Nsovo Environmental Consulting (Pty) Ltd

02 March 2024; 11 June 2024

Prof Marion Bamford
Palaeobotanist
P Bag 652, WITS 2050
Johannesburg, South Africa
Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za

Expertise of Specialist

The Palaeontologist Consultant: Prof Marion Bamford
Qualifications: PhD (Wits Univ, 1990); FRSSAf, mASSAf, PSSA
Experience: 35 years research and lecturing in Palaeontology
27 years PIA studies and over 350 projects completed

Declaration of Independence

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

Specialist: Prof Marion Bamford

Signature: *MKBamford*

Executive Summary

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the Eskom Kekana Substation and Loop in and Loop out powerline servitudes in Hammanskraal, within the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province. Three alternative sites for the substation and powerline routes are under consideration.

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

The proposed substation sites and part of the powerline servitude routes (three alternatives) lie on the highly fossiliferous Ecca Group but there is no distinguishing lithotype or fossils to refine the mapping. Most of the powerline servitudes lie on the non-fossiliferous Nebo Granite. Nonetheless, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the contractor, environmental officer or other designated responsible person once excavations for poles and infrastructure have commenced. Since the impact will be low, as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

There is no preferred site for the substation and there is no preferred powerline route.

ASPECT	SCREENING TOOL SENSITIVITY	VERIFIED SENSITIVITY	OUTCOME STATEMENT/ PLAN OF STUDY	RELEVANT SECTION MOTIVATING VERIFICATION
Palaeontology	High	Low	Paleontological Impact Assessment	Section 7.2. SAHRA Requirements

Table of Contents

1. Background

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the Eskom Kekana Substation and Loop in and Loop out powerline servitudes in Hammanskraal, within the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality, Gauteng Province. Three alternative sites for the substation and powerline routes are under consideration (Figures 1-3).

The project is located south of the town of Hammanskraal on portions of Farms Hammanskraal 112 JR, Zandkop Zyn Laagte 108 JR, Rondavel alias Schoongezicht and Sterkwater 106 JR

The proposed substation will cover an extent of 1.4 hectares (100 m by 150 m), and the associated 132kV powerline to the existing Pelly-Temba main 132kV line will be approximately 7 km long, connecting to the new Kekana Substation. Eskom has proposed three alternative servitude routes and substation areas for the assessment to select the most suitable servitude and site for the proposed land use. For Basic Assessment purposes, a 1km corridor has been proposed as a study area that includes the loop-in loop-out powerline. The proposed substation site and powerline servitudes are located within 1 km adjacent to each other and within the same vegetation type.

The project area is located approximately 50 km North of Pretoria. The residential area of Hammanskraal West and the existing Pelly-Temba Main 132kV line are located east of the proposed site. No Conservation Areas were identified within a 15km radius of the site; however, as per the South African Conservation Areas Database (SACAD 2023), the site is located approximately 30km north of Magalies Biosphere Reserve.

The proposed Kekana 132/22kV substation is designed to meet the region's growing electricity demands. It will play a critical role in enhancing the reliability and stability of the power supply network. The transmission line will ensure efficient power transfer to and from the substation, supporting the area's overall energy infrastructure

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

Table 1: National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014 (as amended) - Requirements for Specialist Reports (Appendix 6). Includes GNR 2017 requirements.

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	**Relevant section in report**
ai	Details of the specialist who prepared the report,	Appendix B

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	**Relevant section in report**
aii	The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Appendix B
b	A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page 1
c	An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
ci	An indication of the quality and age of the base data used for the specialist report: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map accessed – date of this report	Yes
cii	A description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change	Section 5
d	The date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	N/A
e	A description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process	Section 2
f	The specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the activity and its associated structures and infrastructure	Section 4
g	An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	N/A
h	A map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	N/A
i	A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 5
j	A description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives, on the environment	Section 4
k	Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 8, Appendix A
l	Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A
m	Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 8, Appendix A
ni	A reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised	Section 6
nii	If the opinion is that the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Sections 6, 8
o	A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A
p	A summary and copies of any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	Relevant section in report
q	Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A
2	Where a government notice gazetted by the Minister provides for any protocol or minimum information requirement to be applied to a specialist report, the requirements as indicated in such notice will apply.	N/A



Figure 1: Google Earth map of the general area to show the relative land marks. The Kekana project is shown by the coloured lines. (See Figure 2 for more detail).



Figure 2: Google Earth Map of the proposed Kekana Substation and power lines. Map provided by Nsovo.



Figure 3: Google Earth map of the Kekana new substation alternate sites and powerlines alternate 2. Map provided by Nsovo.

2. Methods and Terms of Reference

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

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

3. Geology and Palaeontology

i. Project location and geological context



Figure 4: Geological map of the area around the Kekana substation and powerline project indicated within the yellow rectangle. Abbreviations of the rock types are explained in Table 2. Map enlarged from the Geological Survey 1: 250 000 map 2528 Pretoria.

Table 2: Explanation of symbols for the geological map and approximate ages (Eriksson et al., 2006. Johnson et al., 2006;). SG = Supergroup; Fm = Formation; Ma = million years; grey shading = formations impacted by the project.

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Pe/Pv	Vryheid Fm, Ecca Group, Karoo SG	Shale, mudstone, coal, sandstone	Middle Permian ca 266 – 260 Ma
Mn	Nebo Granite, Lebowa Suite	granite	Palaeoproterozoic Ca 2054 Ma
Mr	Rashoop Granophyre, Lebowa Suite	Granophyre, pseudogranophyre, microgranophyre	Palaeoproterozoic Ca 2054 Ma
Vs	Schrikkloof Fm, (formerly Selons River), Rooiberg Group, Transvaal SG	Flow-banded rhyolite, quartzite	Palaeoproterozoic, end-Transvaal SG

The project lies in the eastern margin of the Transvaal Basin (Figure 4). Volcanic intrusive rocks associated with the final stages Bushveld Igneous complex are also present, as well as much younger sediments from the Karoo Basin, the Ecca Group's shales and sandstones.

In a much younger foreland basin that partially overlies the Transvaal Basin, namely the Karoo Basin that filled with meltwaters and then waters from the northern and southern highlands, the sediments of the Karoo Supergroup accumulated from the Late Carboniferous to the Jurassic. The basal-most sediments are known as the Dwyka Group diamictites and tillites and were from the glacial meltwaters. As the supercontinent moved northwards and the climate warmed the sediments filling the basin are known as the Ecca Group. In the northwestern part of the basin the Ecca sediments are divided into the basal Pietermaritzburg Group the Vryheid formation and the Volksrust Formation based on the lithofacies, ranging from mudstones to siltstones, shales and sandstones. In some parts the lithofacies are not distinct and there are no fossils to assist in distinguishing the Formations. This is the case in this region (Johnson et al., 2006).

ii. Palaeontological context

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 5. The site for development is in the undifferentiated Ecca Group (orange) while the granites have no chance of preserving fossils (grey).

The Ecca Group rocks would preserve trace fossils in a shallow lacustrine setting or fossil plants of the *Glossopteris* flora if there is a deltaic or overbank setting. If the site was deeper water then no fossils would be preserved in the dark grey shales (Cohen, 1995). In other parts of the Karoo Basin, the lowermost Pietermaritzburg Formation preserves trace fossils while the Vryheid Formation preserves a wide variety of fossil plats of the *Glossopteris* flora that includes lycopods, sphenophytes, ferns and early gymnosperms (Plumstead, 1969; Johnson et al, 2006). In contrast, the upper Volksrust Formation preserves very rare, fragmented plants or extremely rare marine bivalves (ibid).

Since no fossils have been recorded and no distinct lithotypes are present, it is unknown what fossils might occur in the project footprint. The Hammanskraal Quarries that were mined for kaolinite lie to the southeast of the town, close to the N1 highway. Fossils of the *Glossopteris* flora were collected from here in the 1970s before the quarries were flooded (Kovacs-Endrody, 1976). The quarries are in an isolated Permian basin (ibid).



Figure 5: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the proposed Kekana Substation and power lines. Red – Alternative 1 line; blue – alternative 2; yellow alternative 3. White blocks – substations alternatives 2 and 3. Background colours indicate the following degrees of sensitivity: red = very highly sensitive; orange/yellow = high; green = moderate; blue = low; grey = insignificant/zero.

4. Impact assessment

An assessment of the potential impacts to possible palaeontological resources considers the criteria encapsulated in Table 3:

Table 3a: Criteria for assessing impacts

PART A: DEFINITION AND CRITERIA		
Criteria for ranking of the SEVERITY/NATURE of environmental impacts	**H**	Substantial deterioration (death, illness or injury). Recommended level will often be violated. Vigorous community action.
	M	Moderate/ measurable deterioration (discomfort). Recommended level will occasionally be violated. Widespread complaints.

	L	Minor deterioration (nuisance or minor deterioration). Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	L+	Minor improvement. Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	M+	Moderate improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. No observed reaction.
	H+	Substantial improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. Favourable publicity.
Criteria for ranking the DURATION of impacts	**L**	Quickly reversible. Less than the project life. Short term
	M	Reversible over time. Life of the project. Medium term
	H	Permanent. Beyond closure. Long term.
Criteria for ranking the SPATIAL SCALE of impacts	**L**	Localised - Within the site boundary.
	M	Fairly widespread – Beyond the site boundary. Local
	H	Widespread – Far beyond site boundary. Regional/ national
PROBABILITY (of exposure to impacts)	**H**	Definite/ Continuous
	M	Possible/ frequent
	L	Unlikely/ seldom

Table 3b: Impact Assessment

PART B: Assessment		
SEVERITY/NATURE	**H**	-
	M	-
	L	Soils and granites do not preserve fossils; so far there are no records from the Ecca Group of plant or animal fossils in this region so it is very unlikely that fossils occur on the site. The impact would be negligible
	L+	-
	M+	-
	H+	-
DURATION	**L**	-
	M	-
	H	Where manifest, the impact will be permanent.
SPATIAL SCALE	**L**	Since the only possible fossils within the area would be fossil plants of the *Glossopteris* flora in the undisturbed shales, the spatial scale will be localised within the site boundary.
	M	-
	H	-

PART B: Assessment		
PROBABILITY	H	-
	M	-
	L	It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be found in the granites or in the loose soils and sands that cover the area and will be excavated for pole foundations. Nonetheless, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the eventual EMPr.

Based on the nature of the project, surface activities may impact upon the fossil heritage if preserved in the development footprint. The geological structures suggest that the rocks are either much too old and the wrong type (granites) or are the correct type and age to contain fossils. Furthermore, the material to be excavated is soil and this does not preserve fossils. Since there is an extremely small chance that fossils from the Vryheid Formation may be disturbed a Fossil Chance Find Protocol has been added to this report. Taking account of the defined criteria, the potential impact to fossil heritage resources is extremely low.

5. Assumptions and uncertainties

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

6. Recommendation

Based on experience and the lack of any previously recorded fossils from the area, it is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be preserved in the overlying soils of the Quaternary. There is a very small chance that fossils may occur below the ground surface in the shales of the Ecca Group so a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. If fossils are found by the environmental officer, or other responsible person once excavations for pole foundations and infrastructure have commenced then they should be rescued and a palaeontologist called to assess and collect a representative sample. The impact on the palaeontological heritage would be low, so as far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised.

Both alternative sites for the substations are on the Ecca Group but covered with soils and vegetation. Both have low sensitivity so there is no preferred site for the substations. The three powerline route alternatives are predominantly on the Nebo Granite which is non-fossiliferous so there will be no impact. There is no preferred route as far as the palaeontology is concerned.

ASPECT	SCREENING TOOL SENSITIVITY	VERIFIED SENSITIVITY	OUTCOME STATEMENT/ PLAN OF STUDY	RELEVANT SECTION MOTIVATING VERIFICATION
Palaeontology	High	Low	Paleontological Impact Assessment	Section 7.2. SAHRA Requirements

7. References

Cowan, R., 1995. History of Life. 2nd Edition. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Boston. 462pp.

Eriksson, P.G., Altermann, W., Hartzer, F.J., 2006. The Transvaal Supergroup and its precursors. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). The Geology of South Africa. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. pp 237-260.

Eriksson, P.G., Reczko, B.F.F., 1995. The sedimentary and tectonic setting of the Transvaal Supergroup floor rocks to the Bushveld complex. Journal of African Earth Sciences 21, 487–504.

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

Kovacs-Endrody, E., 1976. Notes on some *Glossopteris* species from Hammanskraal (Transvaal). Palaeontologia africana 19, 67-95.

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

Walraven, F., Hattingh, E., 1993. Geochronology of the Nebo granite, Bushveld Complex. South African Journal of Geology 96, 31-41.

Zeh, A., Wilson, A.H., Gerdes, A., 2020. Zircon U-Pb-Hf isotope systematics of Transvaal Supergroup – Constraints for the geodynamic evolution of the Kaapvaal Craton and its hinterland between 2.65 and 2.06 Ga. Precambrian Research 345, 105760. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.precamres.2020.105760

8. Fossil Chance Find Protocol

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

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

9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils from the Ecca Group.

Figure 6: Photographs of fossil plants from the Vryheid Formation to assist the Environmental Officer.

10. Appendix B – Details of specialist

Curriculum vitae (short) - Marion Bamford PhD January 2024

Present employment: Professor; Director of the Evolutionary Studies Institute. Member Management Committee of the NRF/DSI Centre of Excellence Palaeosciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

Telephone : +27 11 717 6690

Cell : 082 555 6937

E-mail : marion.bamford@wits.ac.za ; marionbamford12@gmail.com

ii) **Academic qualifications**

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:

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

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

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

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

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

iv) **Membership of professional bodies/associations**
Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa
Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards
Academy of Sciences of South Africa - Member: Oct 2014 onwards
International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991
International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+
Botanical Society of South Africa
South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016
SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+
PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative
ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+
INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

v) **Supervision of Higher Degrees**

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	13	0
Masters	13	3
PhD	13	7
Postdoctoral fellows	14	4

vi) **Undergraduate teaching**
Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year
Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 25 students per year
Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology; Micropalaeontology – average 12 - 20 students per year.

vii) **Editing and reviewing**
Editor: Palaeontologia africana: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor
Guest Editor: Quaternary International: 2005 volume
Member of Board of Review: Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology: 2010 –
Associate Editor: Cretaceous Research: 2018-2020
Associate Editor: Royal Society Open: 2021 -
Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 30 local and international journals

viii) **Palaeontological Impact Assessments**
27 years' experience in PIA site and desktop projects
Selected from recent projects only – list not complete:

- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe
- Glosam Mine 2022 for AHSA
- Wolf-Skilpad-Grassridge OHPL 2022 for Zutari
- Iziduli and Msenge WEFs 2022 for CTS Heritage
- Hendrina North and South WEFs & SEFs 2022 for Cabanga
- Dealesville-Springhaas SEFs 2022 for GIBB Environmental
- Vhuvhili and Mukondeleli SEFs 2022 for CSIR
- Chemwes & Stilfontein SEFs 2022 for CTS Heritage
- Equestria Exts housing 2022 for Beyond Heritage
- Zeerust Salene boreholes 2022 for Prescali
- Tsakane Sewer upgrade 2022 for Tsimba
- Transnet MPP inland and coastal 2022 for ENVASS
- Ruighoek PRA 2022 for SLR Consulting (Africa)
- Namli MRA Steinkopf 2022 for Beyond Heritage
- Adara 2 SEF 2023 for CTS Heritage
- Buffalo & Lyra SEFs 2023 for Nextec
- Camel Thorn Group Prospecting Rights 2023 for AHSA
- Dalmanutha SEFs 2023 for Beyond Heritage
- Elandsfontein Residential 2023 for Beyond Heritage
- Waterkloof Samancor 2023 for Elemental Sustainability
- Zonnebloem WTP 2023 for WSP
- Elders Irrigation 2023 for SRK
- Leghoya WEFS 2023 for Red Cap & SLR

ix) **Research Output**

Publications by M K Bamford up to January 2024 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 175 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 14 book chapters.
Scopus h-index = 32; Google Scholar h-index = 40; -i10-index = 121 based on 7261 citations.
Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.