

**UPL Water Use Licence Forum**  
**Minute Note of meeting held at 13:00 on Monday 25 November 2024**  
**at Grace Family Church, 400 Umhlanga Rocks Dr**

**Present (as per the attendance register)**

Mr Luke Bodmann (LB)	Kinvig & Associates
Mr Norman Brautesth (NB)	NBA Law
Ms Bhavisthra Dukhea (BD)	DWS
Dr Mark Graham (MG)	GroundTruth
Ms Vicky King (VK)	Metamorphosis
Ms Terri Maclarty (TM)	Umhlanga Residents/Rate Payers Assoc.
Ms Colleen Moonsammy (CM)	DWS
Ms Ayanda Mpofo (AMp)	Tongaat Hulett Development
Mr Gerhard Mulder (GM)	Resolve Communications
Ms Mandisa Poswa (MP)	Tongaat Hulett
Mr Ricky Rajkaran (RR)	UPL Ltd
Ms Londiwe Satimburwa (LS)	eThekwini
Mr Rupert Sebire (RS)	GeoMeasure Group
Ms Kirsten Youens (KY)	All Rise / Youens Attorneys

<b>KEY TO INITIALS – ALL MEMBERS</b>	
AM	Andrew Mather
AMp	Ayanda Mpofo
AMpu	Azile Mpukwana
BD	Bhavisthra Dukhea
CM	Colleen Moonsammy
GM	Gerhard Mulder
GR	G Ragusammy
JB	Judy Bell
JR	J Ramnarand
KY	Kirsten Youens
LB	Luke Bodmann
LS	Londiwe Satimburwa
MG	Mark Graham
MP	Mandisa Poswa
NB	Norman Brautesth
RE	Rico Euripidou
RO	Rose Owen
RR	Ricky Rajkaran
RS	Rupert Sebire
SB	Siyabonga Buthelezi
SN	Shaun Naidoo
TB	Tandi Breetzke
TM	Terri Maclarty
TR	T Reddy
VK	Vicky King

**Secretariat**

Ms Rose Owen (RO)	Phelamanga
-------------------	------------

**Apologies**

Ms Judy Bell (JB)	Coastwatch KZN
Ms Tandi Breetzke (TB)	Coastwise Consulting
Mr Siyabonga Buthelezi (SB)	DWS
Mr Rico Euripidou (RE)	GroundWork
Dr Andrew Mather (AM)	eThekwini Municipality
Mr Shaun Naidoo (SN)	DWS
Mr J Reddy (TR)	DWS
Mr Greg Ragusammy (GR)	Tongaat Hulett Development
Mr J Ramnarand (JR)	eThekwini
Mr Brian Wright (BW)	Umhlanga UIP

	<b><u>ACTION</u></b>
<p><b>1. WELCOME, INTRODUCTION &amp; APOLOGIES</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RO welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending the meeting. RO informed the meeting that there is a Dictaphone to record the meeting for minute purposes. If anyone had anything they did not want recorded they would need to make this known.</li> <li>2. She introduced herself and asked all in attendance to introduce themselves and the organisation they represent.</li> <li>3. RO asked all to ensure they signed the attendance register and checked their details. RO confirmed that all I&amp;AP details are kept on a computer and not in the cloud. She would not share any stakeholder information with anyone. If she is aware of any processes that are relevant to any stakeholders, she will share information with them.</li> <li>4. RO asked for any apologies, these are noted above.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>2. ACCEPTANCE OF DRAFT AGENDA</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RO noted there was a draft Agenda. This was to provide a framework for the discussions. RO acknowledged that it was a difficult to determine and adopt the agenda as this is the first meeting, we need a ToR before we know what the meeting format and purpose will be, but we need a purpose for this meeting. It was noted that the purpose of the meeting is in the WUL specifically <i>“The licensee must set up a Water Use Authorisation forum within 3 months of the issuance of this license. This forum must</i></li> </ol>	

<p><i>monitor the compliance of the license issued”.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. RO asked the meeting if they had anything, they would like to see on the agenda.</li> <li>3. CM noted that part of the WUL was a requirement for setting up this forum, as a department they would like to know, how were UPL going about the setting up of the forum, the ToR, the secretary etc.? she would like that explained or was this going to be clear in the ToR?</li> <li>4. RO thanked CM and indicated this was exactly the difficulty she had in preparing the agenda and asking for it to be adopted, a ToR and purpose is needed but we need the meeting to determine this. She asked the meeting if they would be able to adopt the agenda but recognise the need for some degree of flexibility as we move through the agenda and meeting discussions.</li> <li>5. The meeting agreed and the agenda was accepted and adopted.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>3. PURPOSE AND FORMAT</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RO noted that this meeting is with regards to the UPL Water Use Licence Authorisation requirement to establish a Water Use Licence Authorisation Forum.</li> <li>2. This meeting is the first step in the establishment of the aforementioned forum, this is to prepare a proposed ToR for discussion and refinement with stakeholders.</li> <li>3. Format is an open discussion.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>4. DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE</b></p>	
<p><b>4.1. Discussion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RO provided a printout of the ToR for stakeholders present; in addition, it was projected onto the screen. (RO made Track Changes as suggestions were made)</li> <li>2. CM noted that the name of the forum needs to reflect that this is not just for the Pollution Control Dam it incorporates a lot more and the name should reflect this. It was proposed as “UPL Water Use Licence Forum”.</li> <li>3. BD also noted that the ToR indicates Cornubia, and although it is located there it is not their licence.</li> <li>4. TM noted the “referred to as...” needs to be updated accordingly. This was done.</li> <li>5. RO noted the purpose of the forum was as per the WUL.</li> <li>6. CM noted that the Forum is not mandated to carry out the legal mandate and assist DWS, the forum is to assist UPL to report.</li> <li>7. TM asked for clarity if eThekweni water had any responsibility in the licence and enforcement, if they have issued the licence. CM clarified the licence is issued by DWS and not eThekweni, they are different branches of government.</li> <li>8. RO looked at other forums that Phelamanga facilitate, she looked at the WUL Application stakeholder list and used this to inform the membership section of the ToR.</li> <li>9. MP asked for the “Landowner” to be specified as a member.</li> <li>10. RO noted that there is specification of the secretariat and that it currently is Phelamanga, this allows the forum and the department to have some say in the secretariat. RO noted that UPL has asked her to undertake this first meeting to set up the forum, they have asked her to prepare for further meetings. But this is an opportunity for stakeholders to indicate if they would prefer someone else or a different approach to the secretariat function.</li> <li>11. CM noted as a department they do not have a problem as Phelamanga is independent. She asked that the forum confirm if it is ok with them.</li> <li>12. TM indicated she would like Phelamanga to remain as secretariat for continuity. The meeting agreed.</li> <li>13. RO clarified that for the time being Phelamanga would remain as secretariat but if this needs to change it may.</li> <li>14. KY highlighted that the secondary purpose gives more than the functions, for example should the information sharing not be under the functions section, how would this occur, is it via Phelamanga as the facilitator?</li> </ol>	

15. RO noted with other forums, she shares info out to members, and it can go onto the Phelamanga website. The minutes with a Dropbox link for the presentations.
16. KY thought there is more details at the purpose than at the functions. It was further discussed and VK suggested that the Purpose title should be "Purpose and Function".
17. CM brought to the meetings attention that they are not against information sharing with the public, but it needs to be in context. If a person is not attending the meeting and understanding the conversations, then the context is lost. RO noted there is a caveat on the website to this effect.
18. RO noted there was no specific requirement for the stakeholders that are to be invited. She looked at the WUL Application stakeholder list and a draft invitation list of more than 70 stakeholders was developed and used for this meeting. and this could form the basis of the membership list. She noted there were a number of people who weren't able to attend today, so she would like to keep them included as the membership, those present would form the core membership. Her proposal is she will send a notification to all on the invite list, asking if they would like to remain on the list for future notifications or if they would like her to remove them. The meeting agreed.
19. TM asked if that meant those 70 would be deemed to automatically be on the forum, RO noted yes if the confirmed they wished to remain notified.
20. RO noted that the meeting interval was determined based on the report requirements in the WUL, the sampling frequencies etc. she indicated that if there were quarterly meetings it enabled data sets to be available and be compared.
21. LB indicated that he felt there was a need to look at when monitoring was due and what reports would be produced, and then have enough time for consultants to interpret results and stakeholders an opportunity to review, this will enable a useful meeting. he suggested we need to also identify when there are crucial reports being provided.
22. GM was in agreement with LB, also noted that there is weekly sampling and monthly reporting to monitor the functioning of the plant in the initial phases, but he agreed there is no need to meet for the sake of meeting, but there must be timeous submission and availability of the reports.
23. CM suggested that there is a need to know when the information will be submitted, before the meeting, perhaps 2 weeks before, and when will minutes be available after the meeting. time to go through information before meetings.
24. CM suggested that for the first 3 months there should be a monthly meeting. to identify any teething issues and be able to work with UPL on those issues. Thereafter a quarterly meeting.
25. TM suggested this start after December as there are holidays and shuts.
26. CM noted that if we are meeting monthly then reports need to be submitted the week before, if quarterly then reports need to be submitted 2 weeks prior.
27. MG noted that all labs close over Christmas. In addition, there needs to be understanding that they can't have data integrated into report up to date due to lags with laboratory analysis they will endeavour to include the most recent data in reports.
28. KY noted that licence indicates when monitoring needs to be done and how long after, the licence was issued on the 20 September, so they would need to be submitting around the 20<sup>th</sup> of every month.
29. KY indicated it might not work to meet monthly because of the Christmas shut downs.
30. RO noted the frequency is tricky because of the frequency changes within the report and the upcoming shut down.
31. KY asked for clarity if the WUL is valid for 20 years, if some is representing a department, they could come and go but the entity is represented, RO confirmed this is correct interpretation. KY asked if there is a change for organisations in the life of the WUL would this apply, RO noted that it could, for example authorities relevant to the WUL, the departments may change and be given mandates, so this allows for that. The ToR is a framework to assist us, it does allow for changes.

32. RO noted that in the ToR there is reference to the receipt of reports to provide comment on compliance issues. BD commented that this is incorrect that is for DWS to undertake, this should be changed to “provide comment to DWS and UPL on WUL Conditions”. The forum is set up to look at monitoring and to address any trends that are identified.
33. RO noted that sometimes the reports received, the stakeholders request that it be presented in a certain way, and all forums are different.
34. RO suggested that we may require a few meetings and reports presented for us to determine how and in what format do we receive reports.
35. RO asked KY if she had a specific wording or report format she might like. KY indicated she was concerned about the responsibility given to the forum to share information.
36. NB suggested that the paragraph headed meetings should change to “Meetings and Reporting” and 2 weeks before a meeting the report should be provided to the members of the testing and results up to date, most recent reports. The form or content of the report should be useful to the forum and provided in an accessible format. NB noted this could be difficult for the monthly meetings as there may not be much progress in that period.
37. RO asked for clarity if the suggestion is to make the meetings quarterly.
38. LB noted that meeting and reporting is going to detail itself in what is supposed to be presented as per the sampling schedule within the licence, a spreadsheet or programme that illustrates, if discharge began on this date, then this is required on the following intervals and the report was submitted to DWS on this date. So, when the forum looks at the meeting dates, for example if there have been 2 reports submitted then we need to meet and discuss and then determine when next we would need to meet. If this is all in a spreadsheet we can then tell when and where we need to meet, what reporting has been done to date and when the next report is expected. That then gives a timeframe, we are already 2 months into the licence, there is supposed to have been tox reporting every week, and water quality reporting. VK clarified it is sampling that has been done. LB agreed the monitoring programme overall that is to be drafted would also guide this. Then we can say what should happen when and where. January 2025 might be too late. There has already been 8 weeks of discharge, should we not meet before shutdown? He asked when DWS was shutting down. LB noted, even just sampling results will give some idea.

*[ POST MEETING NOTE – in discussions with the Department and confirmation of the WUL requirements; it was noted that there is sampling required monthly but reports are only required every 6 months, the Forum is to meet quarterly to receive the sampling information for that quarter, but the reports will be available as they are available to the Department]*

39. TM asked if there were any sampling results available for the meeting to receive today?
40. RO noted that there is a first report on sampling, that will be provided today.
41. GM asked that it be noted that the weekly sampling is specifically so regular to ensure that the plant is working. He noted that at 3.3.8 in the WUL monthly reporting is required and LB is correct there should be 2 reports available. Not sampling but reports. If these are not available, then there is an issue. All the test results need to be provided timeously.
42. KY agreed and noted this was in the licence as to be provided one month after the issuance of the licence so the first one should have been available on 20 October, and 20 November.
43. RO summarised that with this discussion on reports and information available it is noted that there is a report available and there will be a presentation today. She asked if the meeting receives the presentation today, is there is need for a meeting in December and then again in January? She noted it impacts on how we frame the working in the ToR.
44. TM suggested the meeting receive MG report and then decide if there is a need for a meeting and when.

45. CM noted there is a need to ask the forum what they would like to have from the meeting, the department have their reporting requirements. They can send these headings to RO and MG to ensure they are reported on, and then the forum members should also send any headings / topics they would like included in the agenda. RO agreed this would be useful to improve the agenda. And noted that there may be some items that are on the agenda but only reported on annually, she gave an example from another forum she assists with.
46. RO would further refine the ToR specifically around the meeting frequency this would then be presented to the next meeting.
47. TM asked if information and results are being received today are we already in default for the 2 months that have passed already.
48. RO asked DWS, as she noted the reports have to be submitted to DWS, the forum is established as a stakeholder opportunity to engage with those reports. And the forum had to be established within 3 months, and we are within that period.
49. TM asked if we would then be receiving reports on information that has been submitted. CM confirmed that the timeframes in the WUL are for UPL to submit to the department so even if a meeting is a month later it will be those reports and UPL will be within compliance if it has been submitted to the department.
50. RO handed over to MG for his presentation.

## **5. WUL COMPLIANCE PRESENTATION**

*[link to .pdf presentations available in the annexure]*

### **5.1. Overview and Background**

1. MG thanked all for attending. He gave a summary of the site to date. He noted there may be some who are new to the site and the project.
2. MG noted immediately after the spill there was a storm water attenuation dam on Tongaat Hulett land that received the bulk of the contaminated water coming from the firefighting efforts. The concrete structures were towers that allowed stormwater to be released in a controlled manner. However, in this instance this was highly contaminated water, and the initial responses were to firstly waterproof the dam with bentonite clay, and then seal up the towers so they weren't a free passage for the contaminated water into the environment. So, it was multiple strategies throughout the system.
3. There was then a more sophisticated version of the clay linear, a geosynthetic linear, and sandwiched between the material is an additional bentonite clay layer, this then absorbs moisture, swells and seals and becomes an impenetrable waterproof layer. This was important to limit the additional material that may go into the ground water and then reduce the risk.
4. Important to note is the monitoring of the 3 main pesticides of concern, that were more persistent pesticides, it was highlighted that since the first data set in 2021 the concentrations have been initially rapidly contained, held, and most containerised and sent for proper disposal to registered landfill sites.
5. Currently there are very low residual concentrations in the system - monitored on a regular basis.
6. It was noted this was not ideal to containerise and remove to landfill the water, as the concentrations were now so low, it was deemed that best practice would be treat it on site and this underpinned the application for the WUL. The primary objective being to manage the PCD levels, prevent it overtopping into the environment. An ultra violet and ozonation plant with granular activated carbon, a highly adsorbent compound, that binds the chemical compounds and locks them into place. Various tests and trails were undertaken to illustrate that the technology would assist, and the results are available for the pre- post testing. This gave them confidence to approach the department to apply for a WUL for the treatment plant. The WUL was granted on 20 September, has a number of licence requirements, and which are reported on today.

7. MG presented a map layout of the site and the sampling sites, and bringing to the attention of the forum that there were some important sites upstream from a control perspective, to understand the water system. They have identified a “Western Toe Seep” an old drainage line that was present before the platform was built and water continues to find its way to the drainage line and travel through the subterranean lines. The western toes seep has some pesticides present but at a very low rate of discharge into a large volume provides a high dilution. They acknowledge it is there; it has compromised the reference site at SW4, but that UPL have subsequently built in additional monitoring sites further upstream. Critically from a discharge perspective is to compare the concentrations at SW4 and SW7 – up and downstream of the discharge, to bracket what is being discharged and look at upstream and downstream and see if there is an impact uniquely attributable to the treatment and discharging.
8. The PCD is managed on a daily basis. There is a sensor on the one tower that determines the water levels and volumes using sonar. This is important for any flood events.
9. If the level is rising rapidly, and they can see it remotely, they can take actions to maintain and control the levels.
10. The current dam level as at today (25 November) is 17%, and with an anticipated 62% in the next 10 days. It will not overflow. They monitor every day to ensure it will not overflow. The rainfall forecast is presented indicating a 7 day forecast and the predicted impact this will have on the dam levels. This is real time monitoring and forecast information to prevent a surcharge or overflow.
11. In addition is the treatment process and netting this off what the plant can treat.
12. MG noted this data is available to anyone in the forum, there is a registration process and then access is provided.

## 5.2. Water Quality Results

1. Treatment volumes are capped at just under 350 cubic meters a day. MG presented the recorded treated volumes. Noting that there are days when they don't need to treat, or there are reduced volumes that need to be treated. This keeps them within the volumes specified of 4l/sec discharge rate.
2. MG noted discharge is only undertaken to keep the PCD at the required level, to prevent over topping.
3. MG presented the 24 different chemicals to be sampled for and the limits.
4. PCD water is currently 96% compliant.
5. Only failures have occurred on Iron and Suspended Solids. This occurred on two occasions, and marginally above the limits.
6. It was noted that Iron and Suspended Solids are not related to the Spill and are naturally occurring in the water. Red soil is actually iron-oxide, and it leaches into the water naturally. It is not spill related non-compliance.
7. In stream samples showed greater exceedances than the treated water. Copper marginally exceeded its limit of 10 µg/l, on 3 occasions, twice upstream of the discharge, this is a natural occurrence that is being detected. And iron regularly exceeds its limit of 30 µg/L. This is catchment wide and not related to treatment plant and the discharge water has some of the lowest iron concentrations.
8. Other compliances include total Ammonia, this only exceeds its limit at SW27 – this sampling location is near the Blackburn pump station, this station is known for surcharging sewage. MG further noted that at the pumpstation they are getting the highest exceedances for E.coli. MG noted that the forum members are well aware of the sewage issues and there are dozens of data sets in this regard now available.
9. MG noted that after treatment the water is virtually at drinking water quality.
10. RO confirmed with MG that the sampling points SW1 – 4 are before the PCD, then there is sampling at the PCD, then sampling as it comes through the treatment process, and then SW 7, 16, 21 and 27 are down stream. This then allows us to see a comparison, before the PCD, the water in the PCD, the water as it comes out after treatment and

then the water quality of the system after the PCD. MG confirmed this is correct, samples are taken from the top of the catchment and then as they move down, to the lower sections near the pump stations.

11. MG noted that for pesticides they are monitoring, amicarbizone, metolachlor and tebuthiuron. The limits are the “No Effect Concentrations” (NOEC) there have been some spikes recently, but all other samples have been within spec.
12. The SW7 sample point was the point at which the main impact from the PCD entered the river. Any main impact zone would have been measured there. It was noted that there is still some residual leaching of some of the pesticides from the soils in that area into the system.
13. Tebuthiuron exceeds the limit in raw and treated PCD water, and at sites on the tributary, there are small exceedances.
14. Amicarbizone, metolachlor are 100% complaint.
15. The NOECs for tebuthiuron are low at 13 µg/l, it is hardly detectable from an instrument perspective. And interesting to note the levels regularly exceed the limit upstream of the PCD prior to the commencement of the discharge.
16. This was noted that before the discharge and treatment into the system, this was naturally seeping into the system.
17. CM asked for clarity if SW7 was within the aquatic system? Below the discharge, why are they picking up higher pesticides if they are not discharging pesticides. MG clarified there is some tebuthiuron coming through on the discharge. CM asked if this would be further explained in the presentation noting this would be where the “Class classification” would come in, MG indicated it would be.
18. MG summarised, that importantly the discharge has not caused an increase in concentrations downstream, when compared to historical and pre-discharge concentrations.
19. MG noted there was a spike in October at SW7 and he indicated that there have been tests done on other possible sources under the slab. They have also been working with the laboratories to identify if there was any carry-over on concentrated samples to determine if it was an instrumentation spike or contaminants.
20. MG presented historical data to indicate that there is historical data showing levels prior to the discharge, illustrating that the elevations are not due to the additions of the PCD discharge.
21. Bio monitoring looks at the aquatic, macro invertebrates and diatoms, things that live in the water and are very sensitive indicators of the life of the river and how healthy the river is. This is monitored on a regular basis and includes monitoring for herbicides. If they affect plants, it will affect the plants at the base of the food chain. This includes diatoms monitoring.
22. It was noted that there was low/no impact on the instream biota with this discharge.
23. In the WUL eco toxicity is an important element, there are two levels of testing. The laboratory testing and the in-situ tanks with guppies. This came as a result of the discussions during the WUL application process, as Chris Sweidan had noted there is a lag between the lab samples and results. The tanks allow an almost immediate indication of any toxicity.
24. There are two levels of testing in situ testing and definitive testing at 3 aquatic trophic levels to provide a hazard class rating of II. Tox test provides an indication of eco toxicity to aquatic biota, this toxicity is not related to humans or other terrestrial species, it is what is living in the water.
25. MG noted that the licence conditions spoke to getting to a class I.
26. MG highlighted the hazard classifications , I, II, III, IV, V. The focus is on the II and II levels.
27. They are finding they are often getting to a class II level. The text that accompanies this is important, where there is slight or sub-lethal hazards. The effect percentage observed

- in at least 1 tox test is significantly higher than that of the control, but less than 50%. For a Class II.
28. Samples all testing at a class II. These are all control sites upstream, of the discharge point showing a natural toxicity level within the system, just from the catchment effects of a Class II.
  29. Sampling is resulting in Class II, before the PCD, in the PCD, after discharge and within the system, as it approaches the confluence with the Ohlanga it reduces to a Class I.
  30. This highlights that there are natural things occurring within the system that are causing the levels. They have also done other tests for other projects in the Ohlanga, and there is a baseline of low toxicity for some organisms at trace levels. The treated water is not amplifying this.
  31. The licence requirement is that if they do not meet this then there must be a contingency plan to meet it. They have written to the Department already explaining this.
  32. MG spoke to the ground water monitoring, there were conditions specified, the risk should meet that for water used for recreation. He showed the well locations, noting there were extensive well drilling operation all around the PCD, shallow and deep wells.
  33. Results were summarised and noted that from a pesticides perspective, they are very low and not much infiltration from the results.
  34. There has been a negligible concentration of naphthalene and other organic compounds at NW4A. Importantly all the pesticide concentrations are below the laboratory's methods of quantification limits. Effectively how detailed can they analyse for the compound. The laboratories are analysing for trace amounts of organic compounds and to clarify, these laboratories can detect trace amounts of compounds in top athletes.
  35. None of the ground water samples contained elevated concentrations of pesticides. Additionally, there are currently no Water Use Limits for pesticides or organics in the country. We are monitoring for what we see, but there are no limits defined.
  36. The metals are also being sampled for, cobalt, copper, manganese, zinc, arsenic etc. and again very low concentrations.
  37. Conductivity, pH, dissolved salts, cations and anions and fluoride, typically of geological origin and what gets leached out of rocks in the system. All low concentrations and leached out of the rocks.
  38. MG noted that arsenic has been a concern as a compound stored on the site and what has gotten into the ground and water, and it has not been detected in any of the samples and the rest are naturally occurring.
  39. Additionally, sediments were sampled, the results show that these meet the WUL requirements.
  40. There was some elevation at SS03. They are not looking to see if the pesticides have dramatically increased due to the discharge, but also understand what is in the background concentration. SS03 has traditionally been one of the residual contamination sites. There is not an additionality coming from the discharge.
  41. RS agreed and noted that these pesticides are used in the catchment on the sugar cane.
  42. MG summarised, there has been detection, but there is an agricultural aspect to it, many are below the method quantification limit, and are not of concern.
  43. Sampling is being done in accordance with the WUL.
  44. The parameters of the treated water are in spec, noting Iron and Suspended Solids are elevated but not attributable to the spill event.
  45. Tebuthiuron is elevated in the discharge water, this has not triggered an increase in downstream concentrations and has had no impact on the instream biota.
  46. Treatment plant is currently reaching a class II ecotox hazard, this is the same class as is recorded throughout the system and does not appear to be resulting in any material impacts. They have drafted a contingency plan to try and achieve a Class I with





2. RO asked the meeting if they would like to tidy up the meeting interval and the ToR.
3. It was noted that we have had a first meeting to establish the forum.
4. We have received a report and sampling results that looked at September and some October results.
5. MG noted that it depends on the laboratory, some are quick and so October is already available some it is not available yet. Where they can, they will report on the most up to date available information.
6. RO noted the initial proposal was to have meeting every month for the first 3 months. LB had highlighted it was pointless meeting for the sake of meeting, sampling may be occurring but there may not be analysed.
7. MG proposed that the monthly report is distributed and then there is a quarterly engagement on the information.
8. RO asked the forum if they were in support of this. CM responded the department were comfortable with the forum decision on the meeting interval.
9. RO noted that the ToR could reflect that the reports should be available to the forum.
10. LB proposed that reports would be available to the forum as per reporting schedule.
11. RO amended the ToR to reflect "Meetings held quarterly or as per reporting schedule. Agenda to reflect the reporting schedule. Reports available to the forum as per reporting schedule."
12. RO asked if reports should still be made available two weeks prior to the meeting?
13. LB indicated that if the reports are made available as per the reporting schedule, then it will be received the month prior as the Department has received it.
14. RO noted that the meetings would be quarterly with the agenda to reflect what must be reported on during that period. The reports would have been received during the 3 months between meetings. This should not prevent people from sending any queries in between and this can be discussed virtually and then raised onto the agenda.
15. MG noted it is going to be impossible to keep all the moving parts functioning over the Christmas period. They have been in negotiations with labs to come in during the period and do some sampling analysis. But this is still to be finalised, they will do their best but there may be some gaps during this period.
16. RO had proposed some dates, and these were presented. The forum discussed and suggested the first meeting could be, 4 February 2025, RO to then set dates quarterly thereafter.
17. RO to undertake the confirmation of venue, Grace Family Church is an option. The meeting should be in the morning 10am – 12noon.
18. RO noted there may be a need for the meeting to be moved and this will be communicated.
19. LB asked that all information to date is sent to the forum members. He would like that the reports sent to date to the Department be shared.
20. RO will share via her website; the minutes will have a Dropbox link for you to access the files. RO noted she will .pdf a file to reduce the data it uses to make it more accessible for people. If a high res report is required, this will need to be requested.
21. RO to update the ToR and distribute.
22. The Draft Agenda will be updated and shared prior to the next meeting.

VK, MG,  
RO to share

## 7. PROPOSED MEETING DATES

- 4 February 2025
- 7 May 2025
- 6 August 2025
- 3 November 2025

## 8. CLOSURE

1. RO thanked all for their attendance and participation. She again requested that they check and sign the attendance register.
2. There being no further discussions, the meeting closed at 15.20

