

COMMUNITY Environmental FORUM
Minutes of Meeting held at 17:00 on Tuesday 14 December 2021
Via Microsoft Teams online platform

Present (as per attendance register)

Mr Adrian Somiah (AS)	eThekwini Water & Sanitation
Ms Juliet de la Rey (JdIR)	Hitachi
Mr John Peter Narayanasamy (JN)	KZN Subsistence Fisheries Forum
Ms Vivien Venter (VV)	Local Residence
Mr Brent Newman (BN)	CSIR

Secretariat

Mrs Rose Owen (RO)	Phelamanga
Ms Londeka Mhlope (LM)	Phelamanga

Apologies

Mr Sydney Masha (SM)	eThekwini Water & Sanitation
Mr Charles Leaven (CL)	Local Resident
Mr Daniel How (DHo)	SirECO
Mr Riaz Khan (RK)	KZN Subsistence Fisheries Forum

MEMBERS BY INITIALS	
AM	Alvino Munien
AR	Andy Rossell
AS	Adrian Somiah
CL	Charles Leaven
DD	Des D'Sa
DHo	Daniel How
Dhe	Derek Heale
ET	Elise Tempelhoff
IN	Innocent Ndlovu
JN	John Peter Narayanasamy
JdIR	Juliet de la Rey
KH	Kunishima Hideta
LC	Louise Colvin
LM	Lalitha Moodley
LMh	Londeka Mhlophe
NM	Nompumelelo Mdlalose
MN	Mvelo Nyuswa
MW	Marvin Watson
PM	Pele Moonsamy
RK	Riaz Khan
RM	Rod Morgan
RO	Rose Owen
SM	Sydney Masha

ACTION**1. WELCOME**

RO welcomed everyone and thanked them for making time in attending the meeting. RO requested all to introduce themselves and who they represent since there was a new gentleman in the meeting. She then asked all to ensure their device name was as correct as the MS Teams Log is downloaded as an attendance register. RO requested all to keep microphones on mute and use the raise hand function.

2. APOLOGIES

Recorded above.

3. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

The draft agenda was accepted and adopted.

4. PURPOSE AND FORMAT OF MEETING

The scope and format of the meeting were restated as follows.

4.1. Scope of meeting

1. Ensure environmental authorisations are being met and adhered to
2. Maintain accountability and responsibility for all parties involved
3. Have a transparent and honest record of the activities surrounding the project
4. Provide positive and constructive feedback from all stakeholders

4.2. Agreed format

- Quarterly or as agreed.

	<u>ACTION</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Word of mouth; anyone is welcome to attend ○ Extensive database • Meetings to focus on genuine issues • Timing: from 17h30-19h30 (as proposed) • Venue easily accessible • Attendees to submit issues prior to the meeting • Agenda to cover agreed topics 	
<p>5. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING Minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2021 were confirmed by way of raised hands.</p>	
<p>6. MATTERS ARISING</p>	
<p>6.1. Communication Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RO stated this was an ongoing matter and expressed that since SM, who was the one with feedback with regards to budget, was not in the meeting, not much can be discussed under this matter. 2. AS stated that he and SM were busy with the communication strategy and that they need to go via the communications department within the eThekweni municipality as well as management. As soon as they are done with that, they will provide feedback to the forum. 3. JdIR suggested that since L had raised that there were always questions asked by the community, how about the community submit all the questions they might have regarding the project and included in the communication strategy. 4. RO agreed that was a good point. VV, CL and LC would need to be asked if they can put together those questions, not to say they all need to be answered but they would be a starting point in terms of what should the communication strategy address. 5. AS also agreed that would help a lot with the strategy to ensure that they provide effective information to the community. 6. JdIR asked what happened to the PhD student from DUT. She noted that she saw that the student had received the questionnaire 7. RO responded that she would need to retrieve the information from the records 	RO to follow up
<p>7. OPERATIONAL UPDATE <i>[See Annexure for link to pdf version of the presentation.]</i></p> <p>7.1. Flora regrowth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JdIR thanked everyone for joining the update on operations. 2. JdIR noted that when the north easterly winds blow, the sand gets blown into the perimeter, on top of the piping and in-take pump chamber. 3. The plants they had planted to try and reduce this did not survive. 4. She reported that after spending quite some time around the area on Saturdays, they had decided to start a plant nursery on those dunes using plants existing around that area. 5. JdIR stated that what they noticed was that sand moved the whole time. Therefore, they would need to look at the gradient and put the dunes back. As soon as they completed that, they would re-plant the plants. <p>7.2. Intake and discharge Summary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The summary was from the 31 March 2020 to 30 November 2021 2. The blue line on the graph represents the daily intake they are permitted to take, which is an average of about 50 000 cubes/month. They have not over stepped that average from their intake. 3. Their intake combined with filtration, they have 711 599 cubes/L. 	

ACTION

4. Their total discharge was 692 799 cubes.
 5. Therefore, JdlR reported that they were way below what they are permitted at this stage. She hoped that the plant could increase now through December, into January and February.
 6. PST: has had numerous interruptions, as discussed in the previous summary they had access on 27 September 2021. Before that, the PST had broken down on 9 August 2021. There was access again in September, then another break down on 25 November 2021. They only resumed access on 6 December 2021.
 7. MBR: due to the multiple interruptions they restarted it on 6 December 2021.
 8. PWRO: was restarted on 13 December 2021. They had to put it off the next day because there was a broken part that needs to be replaced.
 9. They had started to produce product water on 21 October 2021. They stopped producing water on 25 November 2021 due to the breakdown of the PST.
 10. The water is quite clear as evident from the picture.
- 7.3. CPG – Contractors Participation Goal**
1. JdlR presented a table indicating all the contractors in the area working on the project. She stated that the percentage spend was required to be 11.23% on CPG in the area.
 2. She reported that the value at this stage is around 10.07%. They are well in line to spend the required 11.23% by the end of the project

8. WATER MONITORING

1. BN stated that the main purpose of the program is to determine if there any water or sediment quality impairment near the sea water intake during construction and in the operational phase.
2. They take in the water samples from 3 stations: HInt at the intake point, the HUP up-stream of the intake and HDown downstream of the intake; which are reference sites. If there is any evidence of impairment, it would likely come up from either of these two reference sites.
3. The water quality component is to see if the value or concentrations (depending on what the parameter is), are notably higher or in some cases lower than the value found in the intake site. They then compare the water quality values or concentrations to the SA Guidelines for Coastal Marine Waters where possible.
4. For sediment quality, they measure the metal concentrations using baseline concentration models that they have defined for Durban Bay.
5. Conventional indicators – salinity, pH, Dissolved Oxygen
6. Salinity: close to sea water. BN reported that the main reason they measure salinity is to check if there was any fresh water dilution in the entrance channel. The graph shows that they have had detected some fresh water coming in from the rivers or rainfall.
7. BN explained that the significance of that water was that it would be bringing in a lot of contaminants with it.
8. pH: Typically expect a variation of 8.1 – 8.3 in Durban. They have some fairly low values for pH.
9. Dissolved Oxygen: Water has been typically very well oxygenated, usually above 7.2 mg/L and has been this value for some time now.
10. Turbidity: Results show low turbidity levels which means the water is very clear. The lowest recorded was in November 2021 at 0.3 NTU.
11. Suspended Solids: Fairly high concentration levels. The range was quite the same during the construction and operational phases. There is no clear pattern to say the turbidity or SS was high at the intake site during both phases on the water quality.
12. E.coli: The results show very high faecal concentration levels. BN explained that these are bacteria that grow in the guts in warm blooded animals. The major source of these bacteria is waste water.

ACTION

13. Nutrients: Typically been low concentrations. They measure NH4 and PO4 since they tend to stunt the growth of algae in the marine environment.
14. Only 1 incident which NH4 was higher but lower than the South African Guidelines. The reason is uncertain as there were no other comparable anomalies for other nutrients.
15. Metals do occur naturally in sea water hence the need for baseline concentrations.
16. There has been typically low concentration levels for Cu, which is a highly toxic metal at high concentrations. 1 or 2 incidents where it exceeded the water quality guidelines, not at the intake site but at the upstream site.
17. Total recoverable hydrocarbons (TRH): BN reported that TRHs were never at a concentration level that exceeds the metal detection limit.
18. All the metal concentrations fall within the baseline concentration range for Durban Bay.
19. BN noted all had been normal up until about 4 months ago, when they started picking up relatively high concentrations of chromium at station H down, closest to the harbour.
20. He stated although he doesn't have a clear answer as to why this was the case, he suspects the reason to be likely natural or human related since it was irregularly distributed.
21. TRH has a high texture limit. This means that there will be some hydrocarbons in the water but at very low concentrations. The TRH test would give a clear indication if there is grease or oil contamination.
22. BN stated that if there were any water quality and sediment quality impairments, they were of very low magnitude and not alarming at all.
23. The ongoing periodic impairment is not linked to the construction phase which ceased in late 2019. And unlikely linked to the operational phase.
24. He concluded that the waters at the site has typically good quality compared to the rest of the harbour.

8.1. Discussions

1. JN noted that with regards to the high concentration of bacteria BN reported, he had recently read in an article that the recent sludge found at the Durban harbour was as a result of the breakdown of pumps however, there was a statement that it was as a result of the dredging. He requested clarity on BN thoughts on this and if the recent spike in E. Coli was a result of that?
2. BN responded that red colour JN was asking about was not dredging but coming from a storm water drain and was Berea red sand coming in from a construction site.
3. JN further asked if there was impact of arsenic from the UPL fire which contaminated the waters prompting the beaches to be closed.
4. BN responded that he doesn't believe their variations have anything to do with the UPL contamination. He explained that arsenic is a component of pesticides because of its toxicity such as rat poison. He stated that that high concentration of arsenic from the UPL had not reached their waters firstly because there is too much dilution in place between the intake site and the Umhlanga Estuary and secondly the concentrations they recorded were way below what would be expected coming from the UPL site.
5. RO thanked BN and commented that there is a very good body of information since BN had reported they conducted 37 surveys over the duration of the project and that it was good to come to the knowledge that there was nothing of great concern which was the whole point of setting up this water monitoring program

9. WATER USE LICENCE

1. RO stated that as per last meeting, the licence had been extended and is valid through to July 2023.
2. She informed the forum that she spoke to DHo, he was on site to do the audit on 11 December 2021. He was still reviewing all the documentation, currently there was

	<u>ACTION</u>
nothing of concern. In the event that changes, he would pass on the information to the forum.	
10. COMMUNITY ITEMS	
10.1. Schools Competition <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RO reported that unfortunately she had had zero response from schools. 2. She asked if JdIR would like for her to continue to chase this issue and maybe see where they would get on this in terms of the status of the project as a whole. 3. JdIR responded that she thought this should be dropped and brainstorm something else. 	
11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	
11.1. Fisherfolk Representation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RO thanked JN for being available as she was aware RK was not able to attend. RO gave a brief overview of the issue as it had been raised previously that the KZN SFF had not been in attendance and there were concerns regarding the litter and waste left behind, some of which could be attributed to the Fisher Folk. 2. RO asked if JN had been given a briefing on this item or had any way forward where there can be collaboration. 3. JdIR added that the issue littering was concerning, she had seen a lot of bread plastic bags as well as prawn and sardine boxes. She wondered if Transnet should be brought on board. 4. AS added that the area falls under Transnet therefore, they also have responsibility in terms of waste management in this area. 5. JN stated there are some fisher folk who do not indulge in cleaning up after their mess. KZN Subsistence Fisheries Forum together with SDCEA do engage in many public meetings in different areas, it is during these meetings where they give talks, raise awareness and issue out flyers, regarding the environment and looking after the sea and the coast-line including not littering. 6. JN explained that they are doing their best to educate fisher folk to keep the ocean and beaches clean. They have also done many beach clean ups. 7. RO thanked JN and noted that there will always be those people who tarnish the entire group and make it seem like the entire group is at fault. She agreed that there are multiple factors that bring in litter to the beach. 8. JN expressed the difficulty that KZN SFF face when gathering people to go and do beach clean ups. He stated that they are not able to get access to the water works. KZN SFF had asked SDCEA to assist in getting them a contact and permission to get access to the water works, they are not looking for access for everybody but some of the key KZN SFF officials. 9. RO responded neither DD nor RK had ever mentioned that and wondered if that is a discussion that can be had with Transnet. She stated that Celani Zibuqu from Transnet had joined some of the meetings before, and might be able to assist. 10. JdIR said she would send an email to a contact within Transnet (Land and Real Estate Division) 11. JN stated that there were a lot of fisher folk who come into the area who are not permit holders. He mentioned that they have confronted these guys before and they do not know how they get access to the area. 12. RO said she would reach out to her contacts in Transnet and find out what their approach is because they do have a relevant person for stakeholder engagement. 13. The way forward would be to get some feedback from Transnet in terms of their role in clean-up and management of the beach and site. In addition as mentioned by JN; KZN SFF and SDCEA should continue to engage with fishermen in the area. 	<p>JIR to follow up</p> <p>RO to follow up</p>

	<u>ACTION</u>
<p>14. JdIR suggested that a holiday such as Mandela Day would be a good opportunity to do a clean-up in the area</p> <p>15. RO noted that was a great suggestion, but there was a need for a plan of action in the interim because the next Mandela day is 7 months away, in July next year.</p> <p>16. It was agreed that RO would reach out to her contacts within Transnet as would JdIR.</p>	
<p>12. PROPOSED MEETING DATES</p> <p>RO noted that as had been previously discussed the project site was due to close in February. The next meeting date would be confirmed as soon as the status of the project is confirmed. This will be communicated to stakeholders.</p>	
<p>13. CLOSURE</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting closed at 18.55</p>	

Read and confirmed this _____ day of _____ 2019.

Facilitator

ANNEXURE

The following links to the presentations referred to above will be freely available in Phelamanga's Dropbox until the next meeting of the Forum.

PRESENTATION	LINK	FILE SIZE
Operational Report	https://www.dropbox.com/s/lxes7b0o9q1j25d/CEF%20Presentation%2020211214%20rev02.pdf?dl=0	1 125 KB
CSIR Report	https://www.dropbox.com/s/gelmlww0x3ysket/Hitachi%20Presentation_14%20Dec%202021.pdf?dl=0	2 773 KB
WUL Report	https://www.dropbox.com/s/73k9uudjzgn6zs/SIR%20ECO_Dec%202021_Hitachi_WUL%20Compliance%20Report.pdf?dl=0	1 111 KB