



UMGUNGUNDLOVU DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY (UMDM)

Environmental Management Framework (EMF)

Project Steering Committee(PSC) Meeting

Meeting Minutes

30 JUNE 2016

Venue: 242 Langalibalele Street, Room F15. 14h00 – 17h00

RECORD OF MEETING

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
<p>1. Welcome, Introductions, Attendance.</p>	<p>Mandisa Khomo (MK) opened the meeting with the welcome and introductions were made by all present</p>	
	<p>The Attendance register is appended. Apologies tendered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sonja Britz - Makhambathini LM • Dev Rampal – uMngeni LM • Jan van der Vegte – uMngeni LM/Shared Services • Felicity Elliot - EKZNW • Siyabonga Buthelezi - DWS • Manisha Maharaj (Thakurdin) -DWS • Bradley Nethononda - DEA • Khanyiso Mtolo - DEA 	
<p>2. Agenda</p>	<p>Dave Cox (DC) presented the agenda. The Agenda was accepted</p>	
<p>3. Presentation of assessment methodologies (Water Quality, Water Yield, Biodiversity, Wetland Agriculture, Public Participation and Infrastructure Assessment); and Discussions.</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <p>DC introduced the project background, understanding of the ToR, project phases, deliverables and the project team.</p> <p>DC emphasised that while we are presenting the inception phase of the EMF, this project is not at the start of the EMF overall process but is building upon the completed Strategic Environmental Assessment and Management Plan (SEAMP) phases. He further highlighted the fact that the ToR were developed through a screening process undertaken by the key sector departments that considered the SEAMP resulting in a specific requirements in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental issues: Water Resources (Production, quality, wetlands, flooding), Biodiversity and Infrastructure. • Spatial focus on Key Focus Areas (KFAs) where development pressure is greatest. <p>The EMF is due for completion in 12 months. The programme taken the implications of Christmas and Easter periods for consultation into account.</p> <p>The INR had developed the refined approach and methodologies through a combination of literature review data collation and analysis (notably spatial data) and consultation with key representatives of agencies associated with the specialist focus areas.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<p>Ian Felton (IF) & MK agreed with the ToR interpretation, however IF confirmed any additional comments would be presented in the draft inception report feedback.</p>	
	<p>Water Yield & Production</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gary de Winnaar (GdW) presented the Water Yield & Production methodology explaining that in accordance with ToR, the methodology applied would be that developed for the DBSA Green Fund project. It involves use of the ACRU model for a catchment scale (quinary or smaller). • The method has been applied for the uMngeni catchment only. GdW showed that the District included sections of various catchments (Mooi, Mkomazi, Mvoti, Mlazi, Lovu, Bushmans). The catchments will need to be defined for these catchments -0 noting that it did not make sense to consider the • Jonathan Atkinson (JA) queried the soil data used; and expressed concern about the coarse scale of the ACRU model. • GdW confirmed use of the Land Type & Landform soil data and that Catherine Hughes is part of the hydrological team and is leading the modelling work being undertaken. 	
	<p>Flood Risk Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leo Quayle (LQ) presented the flood risk assessment approach – explaining that a full modelling approach would not be adopted, but that a full range of factors would be considered including topography, catchment morphology, flow etc. • IF queried if the flood risk modelling differs for the KFAs. LQ responded that due to the modelling approach, it extends to the entire District and includes all KFA's. • Rodney Bartholomew (RB) queried if the model included hardened areas. LQ replied it does not but it can be considered. • Boyd Escott (BE) suggested contacting the Department of Housing and consider the flood risk modelling/ data approach they have undertaken. 	<p>LQ: consider including hardened areas in flood risk modelling</p> <p>LQ: Follow up of Human Settlements contact Peter Wolf</p>

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Greg Moore (GM) suggested Peter Wolf from Human Settlements be contacted for information on the method. 	
	<p>Water Quality LQ presented the Water Quality approach – it involves applying the ALARM modelling approach which results in a risk surface that considers the diffuse and point source pollution inputs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BE queried the consideration of Inter-basin Transfers and the wash-out effect in the ALARM modelling approach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LQ confirmed that mean annual runoff has a dilution potential but Inter-basin Transfers will need to be built into that. • IF emphasised addressing point source data as thoroughly as possible. Include the following pollution hotspots and acquire their locations: Dairies, piggeries, chicken farmers (Enquire through farmers associations). Additionally, IF also emphasised determining the location of informal settlements and the point source of water pollution contribution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DC agreed that the point sources were important and the team would assign considerable effort to capturing as many of these as possible. GdW confirmed that the 2011 Landcover map has an Industrial Class layer that can be considered in adding industrial inputs to the point sources. 	<p>LQ: Inter-basin transfer consideration in water quality model</p> <p>LQ: Include farming and other point source pollution hotspots.</p>
	<p>Wetlands DC presented the Wetlands Assessment approach highlighting the wetland modelling approach used inside and outside the KFAs. He highlighted the value of the modelling in identifying the smaller wetlands that are normally not picked up in wetland mapping, but that cumulatively are very important. The condition of the systems will add value in the KFAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IF expressed concerns over the accuracy of the model and cautioned against an end product that is not reliable and consistent. IF recommended supplementing the modelling approach with other studies/literature review or ground-truthing to increase the confidence level of this approach particularly in the KFAs. ○ BE expressed agreement with the modelling approach and confirmed that the wetlands approach would help test the wetland modelling probability thresholds and EKZMW has only ground-truthed an 80% probability threshold thus far in certain areas. ○ BE confirmed he has the greatest confidence in this model and would recommend its use, 	<p>INR to include other studies to confirm and increase confidence in the modelling outcomes</p>

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<p>which has presented a 91% level of accuracy</p> <p>Agricultural Resources</p> <p>Leo Quayle (LQ) presented the Agricultural Resources approach (on behalf of the Agric Team members). The approach involves the inclusion of the DARD agric priority mapping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JA disagreed with the use of the provincial land potential categories, emphasising the use of the new national land categorisation that is being finalised for use in the PD ALFA (Draft policy on the preservation and development of agricultural land) and by CoGTA. He suggested that it had carried legal weight. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BE confirmed that the provincial land capability maps and coverage is the best available information. BE requested a decision on the way forward on this issue. ○ IF confirmed that as long as it is the best available information, this will be used in the EMF. He also added that the EMF would be gazetted and that the better information available from the provincial scale would therefore also have legal standing. • JA also queried the finer scale resolution and the ground-truthing methodology in the KFAs in terms of the surveying methods. He suggested that it required condition assessments using specific methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DC responded that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The resolution would not be at the scale JA referred to but would be between that and the provincial scale, further • It would confirm actual use – as it was important to know whether high potential land is under use. • It would also confirm if the provincial assessment was correct based on adjoining topography, level of alien invasive species etc. • The INR team would agree on a methodology and criteria with DARD staff before undertaking the field work. • It would also be informed by desktop assessment to refine which areas within the KFAs needed specific attention. 	<p>INR to meet with KZNDARD</p>

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<p>IF confirmed the KFA's are the focus because of the development pressures therein and therefore the need to identify agricultural land that can be precluded from development applications. IF confirmed that KZN DARD (Kurt Barichievy) would assist with the surveys and ground-truthing. However, detailed surveys are not within the specific scope of the EMF in terms of the agricultural resource and potential assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alka Ramnath (AR) suggested the inclusion of Traditional Areas to add more value to the agricultural approach. 	<p>INR to consider Traditional Areas in the Agricultural Assessment</p>
	<p>Infrastructure Assessment</p> <p>DC presented the infrastructure assessment methodology. It involves mapping the coverage and condition of the various infrastructure types and the condition/level of services. Gaps in coverage will be identified as limitations to development, and pressure on natural system due to pollution, unsustainable harvest of resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AR made input regarding the Umgeni Water Infrastructure Master Plan (2016 - 2046). DC agreed to consider the master plan further in this assessment process. BE recommended showing population density as an additional layer. DC acknowledged and will include this layer. BE also additionally, requested the defining of the Urban Edge with a 20 year ahead, expanded Urban Edge which would be a useful and ideal outcome of the EMF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MK confirmed that this can be considered in the scope of the current EMF Kasongo Kampweulu (KK) recommended the urban edge definition should include considering both the natural urban edge and the administrative urban edge. RB queried the applicability of a defined urban edge in a gazetted EMF IF confirmed that the scope of the EMF is not to develop a product that defines the urban edge – that would constitute a different process and product for formal adoption. DC agreed that this was beyond the ToR. AR indicated that solid waste is often neglected and should be considered in this assessment (Refuse removal data, status of landfill sites). Suggested including data that would show where the refuse collection is neglected and therefore to identify the areas that need to address this. Likewise the 	<p>DC: Consider the UW IMP</p> <p>INR to consider urban edge outcomes in the EMF</p> <p>INR: Liaise with Heather</p>

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<p>inclusion of cemeteries data in this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IF confirmed that solid waste needs attention in the EMF. Suggested checking census data (cemeteries) and liaising with Heather Sheard. Local municipalities should also be able to assist with solid waste data and cemetery information 	<p>Sheard. IF: Provide contact details for Heather Sheard.</p> <p>INR: Include Population Density, Solid Waste, and Cemeteries in the infrastructure assessment.</p>
	<p>Biodiversity & Natural Resources</p> <p>Gary de Winnaar (GdW) presented the Biodiversity and Natural Resources Approach. It involves refining the accuracy of the Biodiversity Sector Plan in the KFAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB expressed concern over the Standard buffer of 500-600m, requested a different focus on ground truthing to define edges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DC responded that the wording is ambiguous and the relevant report section will be reworded to be more clear. The aim of the buffer is to actually support RB's concern that important biodiversity bordering urban areas is protected in planning. • JA raised the issue of the land cover categories and the need for attribute information GdW confirmed that there was a meeting with Felicity Mitchell & Greg Moore and data has been obtained. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AR suggested justifying the use of the use of the 2011 KZN Landcover map instead of the 2014. ○ BE confirmed that the 2011 Landcover is from an environmental perspective and therefore more useful in this context ○ IF agreed that the landcover mapping must be justified more clearly in the Inception Report. • KK highlighted and queried the sensitivity of dealing with environmentally sensitive areas in traditional areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BE commented that the 1:2500 scale of aerial imagery will capture significant information that can be used in the identifying environmental sensitivities in traditional areas 	<p>DC: reword Inception Report section on buffer areas</p> <p>INR: Meet with KZN DARD to clarify land cover/categories</p> <p>LQ & GdW : Clearer justification for use of 2011 KZN Landcover Map in Inception Report.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RB suggested supplementing data gathering and ground-truthing with EIA related specialist studies that have conducted relevant research and ground-truthing already. Suggested Hillcombe Estate as an example of data rich studies done. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IF commented these are not easily accessible data and is not centrally available. It will depend on personal knowledge but it may be a considered option to aid in ground-truthing ○ GdW and DC agreed it will be considered where applicable and readily available – there is not sufficient time time to undertake a significant data trawl. 	<p>LQ, GdW: Consider EIA applications and specialist study sources.</p>
	<p>Public Participation Dianne Sennoga (DS) presented the public participation process highlighting the EMF regulated public participation process (PPP); the undertaken SEA PPP and the Proposed PPP in this phase of the EMF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF identified to two aspects: 1) Tthere is a need for 3 PSC meetings in total. The next meeting should convene before the specialist studies are conducted. 2) The traditional councillors focus meeting should be rescheduled after local elections and when new traditional councillors are appointed – to ensure engagement is meaningful and not duplicated. Suggested after the 23 October 2016. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MK recommended to cancel meetings scheduled for August due to local council/management meetings. Suggested rescheduling the proposed 2nd PSC meeting and Public Meeting • KK asked whether public meetings would be held in each LM as the EMF affected decision making on the ground and they needed to know about and understand the EMF process and its outputs.. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DC confirmed there will not be meetings in each LM due to the specific scope of the EMF phase which is on the conversion of the information into decision making outputs – which requires more technical input to the process. • JA suggested forming technical subcommittees and addressing disaster management in the EMF DC responded that there would be a specific technical team including EDTEA, UMDM, EKZNW other key role players that would meet as required, but that specific sub-technical committees would not be constituted. • IF confirmed that disaster risk management is not necessarily addressed in the scope of this EMF. 	<p>INR: Convene 2nd PSC meeting before specialist studies are conducted. Reschedule Traditional Councillors Meeting. IF : Clarify suggested dates for the Traditional councillors meeting. MK: Suggest meeting dates for the 2nd PSC meeting and the Public Meeting that is currently scheduled for August.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<p>Disaster Management would use the information and outputs of the EMF e.g. flood risk delineation.</p>	
	<p>Cross Cutting Issues DC presented the cross-cutting issues of the EMF specifically defining the KFA boundaries and integrating existing EMFs into the District EMF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF confirmed that while it would be ideal to consider the entire district as one KFA, a balance must be met with what is achievable. However, the merging of the KFAs along the R103/N3 corridor is supported. Also include Spring Grove Dam areas • KK queried the use of data collected in traditional areas for the CoGTA -led Traditional Settlement Masterplan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BE & DC suggested applying a finer scale resolution to the Traditional Areas where possible and feedback information to KK. ○ DC confirmed that we will information share as the project develops. DC recommended a meeting with KK . 	<p>INR to include SGD areas</p> <p>INR to consider finer spatial scale in Traditional Areas.</p> <p>KK to confirm meeting availability with the INR</p>
	<p>Environmental Planning Guideline</p> <p>DC presented the environmental planning guideline approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF commented on creating a listing notice 3 informed spatial layer – there is a need to workshop this idea further. • BE recommended a water abstraction layer • JA commented that this approach doesn't inform where agricultural activities can be pursued. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LQ responded that it presents an environmental constraints approach showing where different land use activities are excluded or can be done within certain conditions based on environmental sensitivities – it is not designed to show agric potential. 	<p>INR facilitate Workshop on sensitivity layers i.e listing notice 3 layers</p> <p>DC & LQ: Include water abstraction layer</p>
	<p>Decision Support Tool</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	COMMENT DETAILS	ACTION
	<p>LQ presented the DST and approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR recommended being aware of the custodianship of data used. • AR & BE queried the updating and maintenance of the DST <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LQ confirmed the data can be easily updated and layers can be changed as needed. The DST help/hotline will redirect specific issues to Khavin Sivenandan (UMDM GIS). 	<p>LQ: Include relevant spatial data legislation/regulations</p>
<p>4. Way Forward & Meeting Closure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All comments for Draft Inception Report were agreed for submission by the 11 July 2016. • Meeting was concluded at 17h00 	