

Doc Ref: 03040
24 April 2018

**BASIC ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED IRT PHASE 2A TRUNK ROUTE: PORTION E1, 3.4KM OF GOVAN MBEKI ROAD, MANENBERG & KHAYELITSHA: PRE-APPLICATION MEETING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND SANITATION
KEY MEETING NOTES- FINAL**

MEETING DATE: 20 April 2018
VENUE: Department of Water and Sanitation, Bellville
TIME: 13h00 – 14h00
ARRANGED BY: Chand
CHAIR: Ms. Marielle Penwarden

1. ATTENDEES

FULL NAME	INITIAL	ORGANISATION
Mr. Warren Dreyer	WD	Department of Water and Sanitation
Ms. Shaddai Daniel	SD	Department of Water and Sanitation
Ms. Firdous Rhoda	FR	Department of Water and Sanitation
Ms. Antonia Belcher	AB	BlueScience (Pty) Ltd
Mr. Eugenio Mazzarella	EM	GIBB (Pty) Ltd
Ms. Marielle Penwarden	MP	Chand Environmental Consultants (Environmental Assessment Practitioner)

2. AGENDA

- Welcome and Introduction (MP)
- Freshwater Findings (AB)
- Discussion Regarding the DWS Requirements for the Process (All)
- Other (ALL)
- Close (MP)

3. DISCUSSION

3.1. Welcome and Introduction

- a) MP welcomed all attendees to the meeting, thanking them for their time.
- b) MP described the proposal to the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) officials, explaining that three road geometry alternatives (with respect to width) and three Lotus Canal alternatives are being assessed as part of the Basic Assessment process.

3.2. Freshwater Findings

- a) AB explained that the entire route had been assessed, specifically from a freshwater ecology perspective, and, although a number of wetlands which function purely as stormwater ponds have been found, the only area of importance is that adjacent to the Edith Stephens Nature Reserve (ESNR).
- b) AB stated that the preferred road geometry alternative (i.e. Alternative 3) would serve to completely avoid ESNR and it would encroach on a damp area, approximately 1000m² in

extent, mapped within the road reserve between the ESNR and the existing road shoulder of Govan Mbeki Road. She also noted that it is often the case that, as a result of run-off from the road, areas adjacent to the road form a "sloot" (**post-meeting note: i.e. a damp depression**).

- c) AB added that the section of the route adjacent to the ESNR is constrained by the ESNR, the Lotus Canal, as well as the fact that a station would fall within that area thus necessitating a wider cross-section.
- d) Three alternatives for construction at the Lotus Canal were summarised by EM:
 - i. Complete coverage of the Lotus Canal;
 - ii. Encroachment over the canal with a cantilevered walk-way (noting that only the sidewalk would be over the Lotus Canal); or
 - iii. Less encroachment of a cantilevered structure over the Lotus Canal.
- e) EM highlighted that option 2 was presently preferred by the City of Cape Town Catchment Management branch.
- f) It was confirmed that the impact of the station has been assessed in so far as the footprint has been considered in the freshwater impact assessment (as well as the Basic Assessment process).
- g) With respect to mitigation, it was confirmed that the mitigation hierarchy had been followed through the avoidance of the ESNR (note that road geometry alternative 1 encroaches into ESNR) as well as minimised through the proposed establishment of a dike which would prevent sub-surface and surface (i.e. stormwater) flow of water into the ESNR, noting that stormwater from the road would be direct away from ESNR to the Lotus Canal.

3.3. Discussion Regarding the DWS Requirements for the Process

- a) The DWS stated that it is likely that the proposal could be authorised under a General Authorisation (GA), however the Department requires that the risk matrix be updated to reflect only the preferred alternatives as well as the associated mitigation measures. AB agreed to provide this in the following week.
- b) AB queried whether the DWS would require wetland offsets for the infilling of the damp areas adjacent to ESNR and DWS noted that there is also a wetland further along the route (just west of the railway) where there would be infilling required. DWS stated that the Department would more than likely recommend a wetland offset and advised that the offset calculations be executed for the entire route (i.e. E1).
- c) It was confirmed that the site selected for the offset should be located within the same catchment where the wetland would be lost.
- d) The following offset options were discussed as being potentially viable:
 - i. Combining the offset required with that of the Western component (noting that this would necessitate engagement between the two appointed project teams);
 - ii. The creation of a wetland area east of the ESNR (**post-meeting note: on Erf CA 609-83**), provided that the erf falls beyond the declared area. MP committed to confirming the extent of the ESNR; or
 - iii. Inclusion of a swale in the proposed cross-section (given that the wetland functionality relates to stormwater management).
- e) As a matter of interest, the DWS informed the project team that the proposed offset for the west (which was to provide funding for rehabilitation works within the ESNR) was not considered adequate by the DWS and the "west team" is presently considering an alternative. It was further confirmed that the reason behind this decision was that the ESNR and the associated wetland is already protected and that an offset should be applied to an area which does not enjoy protection, thereby contributing to the extent of wetland in the catchment.

3.4. Other

a) E3

- i. MP confirmed that, although E3 does not have any National Environmental Management Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended (NEMA) triggers (due to the damp areas of the proposed development being located within the road reserve), there would be engagement with the DWS on infilling of certain wetlands required.

- ii. The wetlands were all identified as having low ecological value with stormwater management as their primary function.
- iii. There would be encroachment on certain wetlands, while others would not be encroached upon, but would be within 500m of the proposed development.
- iv. It was confirmed by the DWS that a risk matrix would be required for each of the wetlands and, where there would be encroachment, wetland offset calculations would be required.
- v. It was further clarified that it is likely that the NWA activities for E3 could be authorised under a GA, however the abovementioned documentation would have to be provided as part of the pre-application online application for the DWS to be certain. The DWS would consider aspects such as the functionality of the wetland, the potential edge effects and any rehabilitation which may be recommended.
- vi. With regard to the offset implemented, it was agreed that a swale within the cross-section could suffice, provided that the functionality of the wetland to be infilled is related to stormwater management and the ecological value is low.

b) E6

- i. Given that there is no encroachment into wetlands for E6, the DWS stated that it is likely that the activity could be authorised under a GA, however the risk matrix would be required as part of the online pre-application for the Department to make a final judgement call.

c) Process

- i. It was confirmed that the DWS would attempt to assign the same case officer to all applications related to the IRT Phase 2A Trunk route.
- ii. MP is to provide WD with the online reference numbers of the various online applications as they are submitted and obtained.

3.5. Close

- a) MP thanks all attendees for their time and valuable input and closed the meeting at 14h30.

4. ACTIONS

A number of actions arose from the meeting. The details thereof are tabled below.

No.	Action	Details	Responsible Party
1	Submit updated Risk Matrix to DWS	The Risk Matrix is to be updated to include only the preferred alternatives as well as the required mitigation measures. This would be used for the DWS to provide feedback on whether a GA or Water Use License Application (WULA) would be required, noting that a GA is the most likely requirement.	AB
2	Confirm DWS process requirements	DWS is to provide confirmation of the required process with respect to GA vs a WULA upon receipt of the information in 1 above.	SD/ FR
3	Provide confirmation of the boundaries of the Edith Stephens Nature Reserve	All documentation associated with the Basic Assessment process will refer to the Edith Stephens Nature Reserve (instead of the Edith Stephens Wetland Park). Post-meeting note: This has been provided to attendees via email on 24 April 2018.	MP
4	Confirm the landowner of Erf CA	The landowner of the erf was to be	MP

609-83

provided to the DWS in order to assist in considering sites for the wetland offsets.

Post-meeting note: *With reference to the gazetted ESNR provided via email as listed in item 3 above, the erf in question falls within the ESNR.*

5	Wetland Offset Calculations and offset proposal to be provided to DWS	The offset calculations for the wetlands associated with the entire route (E1) are to be completed and the project team is to propose an appropriate offset for each. This documentation is to be provided in the following phase of the online water use application.	Project team
----------	---	--	--------------