

PROPOSED OFFSHORE SANDWINNING FOR DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE PORT OF DURBAN, KWAZULU NATAL

Comments and Responses Report

June 2017

Final EIA Report

Prepared for: Transnet National Port Authority



Environmental, Social and OHS Consultants

P.O. Box 1673 147 Bram Fisher Drive Tel: 011 781 1730
Sunninghill Ferndale Fax: 011 781 1731
2157 2194 Email: info@nemaiconsulting.co.za

1. INTRODUCTION

Nemai Consulting was appointed to undertake the Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed offshore sandwinning for developments within the Port Of Durban.

In light of the economic importance of the Port of Durban and containerized cargo as well as the current global trends which show increasing vessel sizes, TNPA has recognized the need to prepare for future container growth. As part of this, the Port of Durban has started a process for a phased container capacity expansion programme in order to improve throughput capacity by reconfiguring and rationalising the existing Durban container terminal (DCT).

Pier 1 Phase 2 Project is part of the expansion programme and is seen as the key to the provision of medium and long term capacity. Other major expansion projects in the short term include deepening and lengthening of the North Quay, berth reconstruction and deepening at Island View and Maydon Wharf.

As part of these expansions, TNPA has recognized the need for sandwinning of approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material which will be required as part of these developments. Infill material is required mainly to infill behind new quay walls as part of these developments.

This Comments and Responses Report summarises the issues and queries raised, as well as statements made, by authorities, stakeholders and Interested and Affected Parties (IAPs) during the initial notification and subsequent Scoping and EIA phases for the proposed project. This report also attempts to address the comments through responses and input provided by the relevant members of the project team.

This report does not necessarily provide verbatim comments from meetings, but rather reflects the essence of the discussions held with IAPs. Please also note, copies of correspondence received is included in **Appendix L** of the final EIA Report.

2. DETAILED COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

2.1. Comments Received - Initial Notification

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
1.	Hi Vanessa Please refer this activity to what it is. It is sand mining. The environment does not win...	13/07/16	Judy Bell	Nemai Consulting	Hi Judy, Thank you for your email. I have registered you as an Interested and Affected Party. The term sandwinning is the technical term used for mining for offshore sand material however the activity is a type of mining and thus the BID notes a Mining Right is required. We will include a definition of sandwinning in the Scoping Report to ensure the activity is well understood.
2.	Noted, thank you.	13/07/16	Michelle Lotz Ethekewini Metropolitan Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted.
3.	Hi Vanessa The sandwinning EIA process refers. Do you already have a specialist to do the offshore wave environment specialist report? I am an oceanographer with plenty of experience in the area offshore of Durban - can send you a copy of my CV or list of services if you are interested.	13/07/16	Lisa Guastella	Nemai Consulting	The wave specialist is appointed however please send me your CVs so that I can add it to our database of specialists.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	Also, have you got the marine impact assessment specialist input covered?				
4.	<p>Dear Nicky Ah, pity! Please see attached, a flyer detailing our services, plus abbreviated CV for myself and Alan. Have also attached my full CV for bedtime reading! Please note that Alan also does palaeo assessments; we have a scientific paper in prep at the moment on KZN S coast cretaceous deposits. I am planning to upgrade the flyer and get a website going, at the moment we are both just on linked in. Please can you register me as an I&AP for the offshore sandwinning process - you will see from my CV that I have expert knowledge of the ocean currents and wave environment off Durban. Thanks & regards Lisa</p>	13/07/16	Lisa Guastella	Nemai Consulting	<p>Thank you for the information, we will add it to our database.</p> <p>We have added you to the IAP database.</p>
5.	<p>Dear Vanessa, Please register me as an interested and affected party as part of this EIA.</p>	13/07/16	Magnus Van Rooyen JG Afrika	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Magnus, Thank you for your email. I have added you to the database.</p>
6.	<p>Dear Vanessa – please could you register me as an IAP for the Sand-mining project 10451 – Port of Durban . Thanks and kind regards,</p>	13/07/16	Doug Burden Duzi uMngeni Conservation Trust	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Doug, Thank you. We will add you to the database.</p>
7.	<p>Dear Vanessa, I hope you are well. Please will you register eThekweni Municipality as an Interested and Affected Party.</p>	14/07/16	Diane Van Rensburg Ethekwini Metropolitan Municipality	Nemai Consulting	<p>Dear Diane, Thank you for your response. We will register eThekweni and I will await the consolidated comments mentioned.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	I will provide consolidated comments on the BID application.				
8.	Dear Vanessa Please see attached my registration form for the abovementioned proposed project.	14/07/16	Craig Burne NCC Environmental Services	Nemai Consulting	Hi Craig, Thank you for your registration form. We will add you to the database.
9.	Hi Vanessa Herewith completed reply form as requested.	14/07/16	Petrus May Transnet National Ports Authority	Nemai Consulting	Hi Petrus, Thank you for the completed registration form. I will add you to the database.
10.	Hello Vanessa Please find I&AP registration attached	14/07/16	Irene Hatton Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife	Nemai Consulting	Hi Irene, Thank you for the registration form. We will add you to the database.
11.	Hi Vanessa Please find attached my reply form for IAP registration	14/07/16	Tony Carnie The Mercury Newspaper	Nemai Consulting	Hi Tony, Thank you for your completed form. I will add you to the database as requested.
12.	Dear Vanessa Please see attached	14/07/16	Aslam Peer Cold Harvest Bayhead Pty (Ltd).	Nemai Consulting	Dear Aslam, Thank you for your completed reply form. We will add you to the database as requested.
13.	Thanks, noted	14/07/16	Hoosen Bobat	Nemai Consulting	Hi Hoosen, Thank you. We will add you to the database.
14.	Hi Vanessa Will you be holding any public meetings to discuss this project, and if so, have any dates been scheduled yet?	14/07/16	Tony Carnie The Mercury Newspaper	Nemai Consulting	Hi Tony, A meeting will be held to present the Scoping Report however the date and venue are not yet finalised.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					The information on the meeting will be sent out to all Interested and Affected Parties (including yourself) together with the notification of the review of the Draft Scoping Report.
15.	Vanessa Please register me as I&AP for this project.	14/07/16	Karin Loukes Coastwatch	Nemai Consulting	Hi Karin, Thank you for your completed reply form. I will add you to the database as the representative of Coastwatch.
16.	My name is Chris Hlabisa, I am registering as per the message I received last night , Thx	14/07/16	Chris Hlabisa	Nemai Consulting	Hi Christopher, Thank you. I will add you to the database.
17.	Dear Vanessa, Kindly keep me informed as activities unfold.	14/07/16	Ashok Kara Howard College Campus	Nemai Consulting	Hi Ashok, Thank you for your email. We will add you to the database so that you are informed of the process as it unfolds.
18.	Dear Vanessa, Please find attached my registrations as an I&AP for the Proposed Offshore Sandwinning For Developments Within The Port Of Durban, Kwazulu Natal	15/07/16	Brent Newman CSIR	Nemai Consulting	Hi Brent, Thank you for the completed reply form. I will add you to the database.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
19.	Dear Vanessa I would like to register as an I&AP for the proposed EIA project.	15/07/16	Ismail Banoo CSIR	Nemai Consulting	Hi Ismail, Noted. I will add you to the database as requested.
20.	Good day I wish to register as an IAP as we use the Durban Bay for sailing. Please send any pertinent information. Thanks	17/07/16	D. Brophy	Nemai Consulting	Hi Di, Thank you. We have added you to the database.
21.	Hi Vanessa Please can I register, my Department, CSCM as an I&AP for this proposed EIA. I know that the City will do so as well, but I would just like to cover my bases if need be.	18/07/16	Joe Brahmin CSCM, eThekweni Metropolitan Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Hi Joe, Thank you for your email and completed form. I will add you to the database as requested.
22.	Good Day Please receive the attached.	18/07/16	Ntombi Madibe Department of Water and Sanitation	Nemai Consulting	Hi Ntombi, Thank you for the completed form. I have added you to the database.
23.	Dear Vanessa, Find attached completed reply form to the Proposed Offshore Sandwinning developments.	18/07/16	Ramini Naidoo South African Association for Marine Biological Research	Nemai Consulting	Hi Ramini, Thank you for the completed form. We have added you to the database as requested.
24.	Dear Vanessa I read with interest the recent article in the Mercury regarding the Harbour expansion. In August, Westville Boys High School is hosting the	19/07/16	Nicky Lillywhite Westville Boys' High School	Nemai Consulting	Hi Nicky, Thank you for your email. We are currently doing the environmental authorisation process for the proposed offshore sandwinning project

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>annual Headmasters' conference and we are expecting 25 delegates.</p> <p>On Thursday 25 August, we are wanting to take the Headmasters for a tour of the harbour and are investigating various boating/cruise options. However, we would really like this to be of interest and educational to the visiting Headmasters who come from all parts of the country – are you able to suggest someone who would accompany us on the trip around the harbour and give a presentation on the expansion plans etc.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>				<p>for Transnet however we are not involved with the management of the Port itself so unfortunately we are not in a position to assist very much.</p> <p>However I will forward your email on to the project manager and perhaps they will be able to forward your request to the relevant person.</p> <p>Would you like me to add your details to the proposed offshore sandwinning project Interested and Affected Party (IAP) database so that you are notified as the project develops?</p> <p>In addition, on 10/08/2016, the following additional response was provided:</p> <p>I forwarded your request to Transnet and they have responded that the Isiponono boat on which the Port tours used to take place, is currently out of commission. They are in the process of certifying a new boat for tours and hope for it to be completed in a few weeks. They will provide more feedback once the certification process is completed and then would hopefully be able to discuss with you the date and logistics of the event.</p>
25.	<p>Good day, Please register me as an IAP for the above project. Please use this email address for any email communication</p>	19/07/16	<p>Steve Coxen Royal Natal Yacht Club</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Steve, Thank you for your email. We will add you to the database and use the email address provided for all further communication.</p>
26.	<p>Dear Vanessa Thank you for the invitation to register as an IAP on the above. Kindly receive our IAP registration form. Since</p>	19/07/16	<p>Lesla La Grange South African Heritage</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>As suggested I will create a case of SAHRA for the project but will wait for the Scoping Report to be available for review to do so.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	the need for an HIA has been identified, I have recommended that you kindly create a case on SAHRIS where all documents may be uploaded for our comment. Thanks and warm regards		Resources Agency		
27.	Please create a new case on our online platform, SAHRIS and upload associated documents.	19/07/16	Lesla La Grange South African Heritage Resources Agency	Nemai Consulting	
28.	Please include Paddy Norman from WESSA. No comments at this stage, but keep us posted.	22/07/16	Noyoliso Walingu Ugu District	Nemai Consulting	Noted. We will add him to the database.
29.	Hi Vanessa, Kindly receive Khosi Zondi's Registration	21/07/16	Zama Bhengu Transnet Pipelines	Nemai Consulting	Hi Zama, Thank you. I have registered Mrs Zondi on the database as requested.
30.	Dear Vanessa, Kindly find attached the registration form for my Manager, Noloyiso Walingo,	22/07/16	Janine Blackbeard Ugu District	Nemai Consulting	Hi Janine, Thank you for the email and reply form. I have added Noloyiso Walingo to the database as requested.
31.	Good Day Please find attached document on page 5 there is the Registration of Interested and Affected Parties (IAP'S).	28/07/16	Shanice Gomes South Durban Community Environmental Alliance	Nemai Consulting	Hi Shanice, Thank you. We have added Desmond, yourself, Priya and Essop Mohammed to the IAP database for the project as requested.
32.	Please include the following Interested and Affected Parties: - KZN Subsistence Fisher Folk Forum – Essop Mohammed	28/07/16	Desmond D'Sa South Durban Community Environmental	Nemai Consulting	

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shanice Gomes, South Durban Community Environmental Alliance - Priya Pillay, South Durban Community Environmental Alliance 		Alliance		
33.	<p>Good Day</p> <p>Please find attached document on page 5 there is the Registration of Interested and Affected Parties (IAP'S).</p>	29/07/16	<p>Shanice Gomes</p> <p>South Durban Community Environmental Alliance</p>	Nemai Consulting	
34.	<p>Dear Vanessa</p> <p>Thank you for your reply.</p> <p>I would really appreciate being added to the database.</p>	05/08/16	<p>Nicky Lillywhite</p> <p>Westville Boys' High School</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Nicky,</p> <p>I will do so</p>
35.	<p>Thank you for adding us to the IAP's database.</p> <p>I would like to know what is the date for the first commenting period for the 10451- Notice of the scoping and environmental impact assessment process for the proposed offshore sandwinning for developments within the port of Durban, KwaZulu Natal?</p> <p>Is the 15th August 2016, just for the registration for IAP's or is it also for comments?</p>	05/08/16	<p>Shanice Gomes</p> <p>South Durban Community Environmental Alliance</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Shanice,</p> <p>You can also submit your initial comments/concerns based on the Background Information Document (BID) (in addition to registering) by 15/08/2016 however there will be further opportunities to provide comments once the Scoping and EIA reports are available for public review.</p> <p>All registered IAPs will be notified of the review period of the documents.</p> <p>I hope this information assists?</p>
36.	<p>Dear Vanessa</p> <p>Attached please find our completed form for registration as I&AP for the proposed offshore sandwinning.</p>	15/08/16	<p>Arnia van Vuuren</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Arnia,</p> <p>Thank you. We will add you to the database.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
			Birdlife Port Natal		
37.	<p>As discussed, we have been requested by, and have submitted a Planning Proposal to the Durban City Engineers Department, outlining a Marina Proposal for Durban. This proposal was endorsement and recommended for further action, which to date has not been forthcoming.</p> <p>As a Planning and Architectural Practice, we have been involved in various Marina projects and have an excellent data base on the subject. Essentially, a Marina cannot be self-sustaining on a boating volume below 3000 moorings. Our proposal for dredging and protecting the North section of the present Marina Basin would generate between 3500 and 4000 moorings depending on size. We believe that the introduction of this very valuable facility would not only generate a major job creation opportunity, it would also substantially add to the tourist activities within Natal. The Durban Marina would become a 'Destination' within the City and would give us a unique opportunity to revitalize our Inner City to the level of excellence we deserve.</p> <p>On the practical side, we would be valuable and easily accessible source of sand-fill for your new Container wharf. In addition, an urgent EIA Study would have to be undertaken of the proposed Marina Project, and possibly NEMAI Consulting, with the input from Black Balance could undertake this.</p> <p>We have attached a basic layout of the proposed Marina, and as discussed, we could put our major Power Point presentation of this project into your Dropbox, for</p>	18/07/16	Willy Vandeverre	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Willy,</p> <p>Thank you for your email.</p> <p>As mentioned during our telephonic discussion, eThekwini would need to sit down with Transnet to discuss the feasibility of this and then eThekwini would need to initiate the EIA process for it.</p> <p>However, I will add your comment to the Comments and Response Report and make sure that you continue to be notified of the process as it unfolds.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	any further detail you might require. We also have attached the Aims and Objectives of Studio Fore to briefly outline precisely who we are.				
38.	<p>Thank you for notifying Coastwatch of the application for environmental authorisation and a mining licence. Please register the organisation an I&AP. Apart from noting the proposal at this stage there is not much to be said and we look forward to further information and understanding the studies which will be undertaken. Coastwatch members will likely be able to comment further down the line.</p> <p>I must however agree with colleague Judy Bell who has made the point that this is a mining operation and should be referred to as such; it is well beyond the scope of a 'sandwinning' exercise!</p>	15/08/16	<p>Carolyn Schwegman</p> <p>Coastwatch</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Carolyn,</p> <p>Thank you for your registration and for your email.</p> <p>We will note your comment in the Comments and Response Report.</p> <p>The term sandwinning is the technical term used for mining for offshore sand material however the activity is a type of mining and thus the BID notes a Mining Right is required.</p> <p>We will include a definition of sandwinning in the Scoping Report to ensure the activity is well understood.</p>
39.	<p>Background Information Document (BID) for the Proposed Offshore Sandwinning for Developments within the Port of Durban, KwaZulu-Natal</p> <p>The Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) through the sub-directive, Forestry Regulations and Support is the authority mandated to implement the National Forest Act (No 84 of 1998) by regulating the use of natural forests and protected tree species in terms of the said act.</p> <p>With regards to the BID received on 14/07/2016, the activity is confined to the Port, comprising of sand, the sea and existing structures. Furthermore, the site does not comprise of indigenous vegetation as confirmed by</p>	15/08/16	<p>Nandipha Sontangane/ Thobekile Mashele</p> <p>Directorate: Forestry Regulations - Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Thobekile,</p> <p>Thank you. As mentioned in the telephonic discussion, the proposed development is limited to the offshore sandwinning site which is approximately 1.2km east of the Port of Durban.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>the environmental consultant (Vanessa Stippel) during the telephonic discussion held on 15/08/2016. Therefore the Department has no objections towards the proposed development.</p> <p>This letter does not exempt you from considering other environmental legislation.</p> <p>Should any further information be required, please do not hesitate to contact this office.</p>				
40.	<p>Re: 10451- Notice of the scoping and environmental impact assessment process for the proposed offshore sandwinning for developments within the port of Durban, KwaZulu Natal</p> <p>Public participation An incomplete public participation process was carried out noting that with this going ahead it can destroy a critical sand bank, emphasizing the danger that faces Vetches Bay marine life which is the biggest mussel cracker bed that forms part of a marine protected area. The public participation process should therefore host a number of public meetings on the beach front. Finding a venue that is suitable to the site where the proposed sandwinning is going to be carried out. Details of activities should be listed in the relevant Gazettes such as the Mercury and the Daily news in English and isiZulu. Advertising of this project should also be in all local newspapers such as Chatsworth, Berea in English and isiZulu.</p> <p>Those that make use of the beach for fishing should also be included and informed by placing a notice in the KwaZulu Natal Subsistence Fishing Forum (KNSF)</p>	15/08/16	Desmond D'Sa South Durban Community Environmental Alliance	Nemai Consulting	<p>Hi Desmond and Shanice,</p> <p>Thank you for the comments. They will be added to the comments and response report which will form part of the Scoping Report which will be made available for review by Interested and Affected Parties (IAPs).</p> <p>The potential impacts raised by SDCEA will be assessed in the draft EIA Report. Specialist studies to be incorporated into the EIA Report will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Impact Assessment; • Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment; • Wave Modelling Study; • Sediment Analysis; and • Geophysical and Sediment Sampling Survey.

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>website. Notifications to all sporting clubs, groups that are in a range of 5km from the proposed site. This also can be communicated by knock and drop pamphlets. Notifications should also be sent out to counsellors and political parties. The background document does not give you proper information therefore there should be site visits by boats. As consultants they should be able to take people across. There should be complete information, specialist reports provided, documents available to be reviewed and the developer Transnet should pay for this review to be done.</p> <p>Specialists that have been appointed and their curriculum vitae should be open and available to be viewed to ensure that there is no bias. Look at alternative sites in other ports in KwaZulu Natal, like Richards Bay and not only in Durban. With regards to choosing the Durban Port reasons must be provided as to why they are not using other ports. It is in the best interests of all parties that the need for the dredging is explained, that the decision-making process is transparent, and that the reasons for the selection of the preferred dredging and/or disposal options are clearly understood.</p> <p>Sandwinning Sand also has an important coastal ecosystem function by constantly replenishing our beaches and sustaining the sandy beach ecosystem. Excessive removal of sand has been shown to result in depleted beaches and thus higher levels of vulnerability to storms. In law, sandwinning is in fact considered a form of mining and is regulated under the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (No. 28 of 2002). A permit must be</p>				

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>obtained from the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR) before any sand is removed.</p> <p>Changes to natural vegetation Coastal vegetation provides a protective buffer to the coast, rendering it less vulnerable to impacts, and contributing to its biodiversity and provision of goods and services. The clearing of natural vegetation for urban developments is increasingly a cause for concern. Destruction of vegetation leads to higher silt loads in our coastal waterways, causing estuaries to silt-up and leading to degradation of these systems.</p> <p>Changes in natural habitat Loss of fisheries productivity, biodiversity, and recreational potential. Severely degraded channels may lower land and aesthetic values. All species require specific habitat conditions to ensure long-term survival. Native species in streams are uniquely adapted to the habitat conditions that existed before humans began large-scale alterations. These have caused major habitat disruptions that favoured some species over others and caused overall declines in biological diversity and productivity hindering movement of fishes between pools. Channel reaches become more uniformly shallow as deep pools fill with gravel and other sediments, reducing habitat complexity, riffle-pool structure, and numbers of large predatory fishes. Habitat quality is strongly linked to the stability of channel bed and banks. Unstable ecosystems are inhospitable and that often have severe consequences for aquatic species.</p> <p>The Durban Port has its last important sand bank left; sandwinning would completely destroy the nesting</p>				

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>ground for fish and bird life found in the harbour. The complete removal of vegetation and destruction of the soil profile destroys habitat both above and below the ground as well as within the aquatic ecosystem, resulting in the reduction in faunal populations.</p> <p>We have stressed in numerous previous documents that within the Bay a mere 14% of the tidal flats remain, yet the sandbanks provide the only sheltered, marine dominated, permanent tidal sandbank habitat in KZN. Thirty species of fish and sand prawns are found here and 132 species of birds frequent the area. Despite the marine traffic, the central sandbank and mangroves remain an important nursery area for young fish. Sixty-two endangered, migratory species (in particular waders) rest and feed here.</p> <p>Transnet's own Draft Estuarine Management Plan (March 2012), points out that Durban Bay's estuarine ecosystem has been compromised to the point that it has lost resilience. The study emphasises the critical need to protect and enhance the existing estuarine habitats and stabilise the environments within the Bay over the next five year period. Existing and new developments within the catchment of the Bay have cumulative impacts on the bay ecosystem, which are increasingly compromising the integrity of the bay and pushing it to the brink of collapse. This is justification on the stress of the importance and significance of the Sandbanks and ecosystems. Preservation of the Sandbanks and ecosystem in the bay should be paramount and not be pushed for further development which causes the further destruction.</p>				

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Environmental when using the Trailing Suction Hopper Dredger (TSHD)</p> <p>A number of environmental concerns should be mentioned when using a TSHD. Given the difficulty of regulating a suction pipe, accuracy can be challenging and needs to be scrutinised by high-tech monitoring and steering equipment. Although working with a TSHD creates limited suspended sediments and turbidity compared to cutter suction dredgers, it can occur when loading takes place with an overflow of excess water containing fines. This creates a plume of fine-grained elements causing an increase in suspended sediments in the water column at the dredging site and an increase in turbidity or reduction of the light penetration through the water column may occur. Because this can have a negative impact on the benthic life, this turbidity must be carefully monitored. Nowadays, turbidity can be reduced with a number of new technologies such as using green valves, recycling (part of) overflow water, overflow with a bottom exit, or reducing the overflow.</p> <p>The TSHD is equipped with powerful engines generating significant sound levels. For those in close proximity to the TSHD, the sound levels can be expected to be high. However, a few hundred metres away from the vessel, the sound is quite a bit less and generally reduced to acceptable levels. Since TSHDs are often working at great distances from populated areas this is not often an issue for people. Underwater sound is a separate concern and the effects of machine-made sound on marine life have recently been the subject of considerable study. Acoustic modelling and measuring has helped to monitor sound and make appropriate adjustments. In general, TSHDs generate less sound</p>				

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>than some other types of dredgers and vessels.</p> <p>Climate change Climate change has not been factored in as a concern that will contribute to the awareness in preserving the environment. The coastal communities have been hit the hardest by climate change, and this has been experienced through severe thunder storms, heavy rainfall and flooding. Coastal erosion is the natural weathering of rocks and the removal of beach sand or dune sediments by wave action, tidal currents or drainage. It is driven by storm events, cyclones, erratic weather patterns, sea-level rise or a combination of these. Guarding against excessive erosion are natural areas such as dunes, wide sandy beaches, vegetation and flood plains that act as the coastal environment's natural defences. If these are lost then the ability of the coast to absorb the impacts of extreme events is reduced, placing at risk parts of the coast, including natural assets, infrastructure and properties. Removal of dune vegetation and dune systems alter and damage these natural coastal assets. Coastal erosion combined with climate change, the consequences to KZN's golden beaches could be similar to, and eventually exceed, the erosion suffered in the marine storm erosion event of 2007 (Theron <i>et al.</i> 2008).</p> <p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA) requires the permits for the mining rights document and a copy of the application for the mining rights to peruse <input type="checkbox"/> Extensive research on the sound impacts of the TSHD and its impacts on the marine life 				

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> With regard to dredging leaching of contaminants from disposal sites decrease water quality, e.g. an increase of suspended solids concentration and potential release of contaminants during dredging or disposal <input type="checkbox"/> Habitats and natural areas, e.g. habitat enhancement or creation, removal or destruction of benthos, smothering <input type="checkbox"/> Local communities, e.g. the effects of noise <input type="checkbox"/> Changes to bathymetry or topography; <input type="checkbox"/> Physical processes, e.g. waves, currents, or drainage, and hence erosion or deposition <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation, e.g. sailing, swimming and beach use <input type="checkbox"/> Impacts on subsistence fisher folk <input type="checkbox"/> The “environmental impact assessment” (EIA) should highlight both positive and negative, short- and long-term impacts. 				
41.	<p>Actually – that is the first time somebody has actually explained sandwinning to me – I think it is mis-used a lot!! Good for her. Cheers DJ</p>	15/08/16	DJ Coastwatch	Nemai Consulting	Noted. No response required.
42.	<p>eThekwini electricity made the following comments regarding the proposed development;</p> <p>HV Operations has no objections to the following proposal however, please note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant must consult eThekwini Electricity's main records to confirm whether any electrical services will be impacted upon. 2. The relocation of MV/LV services will be carried out at the expense of the applicant. 	22/08/2016	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted.
43.	The eThekwini Planning and Climate Protection Department will provide comments on the Draft Scoping			Nemai Consulting	Noted.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	Report.				
44.	The eThekweni Land Use Management Branch noted the application has no Land Use Management implications.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
45.	The eThekweni Strategic Spatial Planning Branch noted the proposed activity and reserved the right to comment once more detailed studies were submitted.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
46.	The Coastal Stormwater and Catchment Management Branch had no comments at this stage.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
47.	The eThekweni Parks, Leisure and Cemeteries Department noted that they do not oppose the proposed offshore dredging for the purposes of the central sandbank extension.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
48.	The eThekweni Geotechnical Engineering Branch noted that they had no geotechnical objections at this stage and would await the Scoping Report for more site specific details.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
49.	The eThekweni Transport Authority noted that they had no objections.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
50.	The eThekweni Health Department noted they would comment on the Draft Scoping Report.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
51.	The eThekweni Water and Sanitation Design Branch noted that the proposed work is in close proximity to the Central sewer outfall. The Pollution And Environmental Branch: Source Control North noted that potential impacts to the receiving water must be outlined and precautionary measures should be taken to prevent any effects to the water quality due to any spillages or leaks (oil, diesel) from machinery or vehicles. Should there be any spillages, major or minor, this Department must be contacted immediately at any time on 0801313013.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
52.	Durban Solid Waste noted that they had no requirements for this proposal.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
53.	No comments were received from Disaster Management or Fire Safety.			Nemai Consulting	Noted.
54.	<p>PROPOSED OFFSHORE MINING FOR PORT DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN DURBAN HARBOUR Coastwatch registered as an I&AP for the application for sand mining offshore on 15 August 2016. Please consider the following comments on behalf of Coastwatch, WESSA Durban Branch and Birdlife Port Natal in response to the Background Information Document.</p> <p>Coastwatch, WESSA Durban Branch and Birdlife Port Natal, non-governmental organisations formed by volunteers and operating with support of people interested and/or affected by issues relating to the area share interest in development and change of land use applications in the eThekweni area. The organisations serve to ensure that development in the eThekweni area is appropriate, sustainable and legally compliant. Mining Permit and Scoping and EIA Process.</p> <p>The proposed offshore ‘sandwinning’ triggers Activity 17 of GN 984 of 4 December 2014 and thus a Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is required. Also, due to the size of proposed sand winning area (between 110 hectares and 250 hectares), a Mining Right in terms of the Section 22 of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA) (Act No. 28 of 2002) is also required.</p> <p>Project Description Approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material will be</p>	23/08/2016	Coastwatch WESSA Durban Branch Birdlife Port Natal	Nemai Consulting	<p>The requisite specialist studies identified during the Scoping phase, which will be included in the EIA Report, are a Marine Impact Assessment and Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment. In addition, technical studies to be considered include a Wave Modelling Study, Sediment Analysis and Geophysical and Sediment Sampling Survey (Council for Geoscience, 2001). The findings from these studies will aim to address the matters raised by Coastwatch and WESSA.</p> <p>The key issues identified during Scoping for the Marine Impact Assessment specifically include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alteration of sediment habitat; • Impacts of dredging on water quality (increased turbidity) and related impacts on benthic organisms, fish, crustaceans and water birds; • Potential mobilisation of contaminants; • Impacts to inshore hydrodynamics; and • Potential for shoreline erosion due to change in sea floor bathymetry at offshore sandwinning site. <p>During Scoping the impact of dredging at the offshore sandwinning site on wave action and related sedimentation/erosion of nearby beaches was identified as a potential issue. This will be assessed as part of the Wave Modelling Study, which will make use of a wave refraction model, suitable software and information on the bathymetry.</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>required developments within the Port. Two potential off-shore sandwinning sites have been identified.</p> <p>A Recent History of Offshore Sand Mining Two “sand mining” exercises were carried out by eThekweni Municipality pre-2010 (seemingly without and environmental impact assessment), essentially reclamation (in order to create a wide beach for the World Cup and to protect the new beachfront promenade from possible erosion) as opposed to augmentation (ongoing beach re-nourishment). Statements were made that the sand quantity was the same amount as that mined per year for the Durban Beach Nourishment System, approx 300 000 m³ (figures were not supplied nor verified) however the sand mining done for the World Cup was done over a very short time as the sand trap was unable to provide the required amount due to the rate of replenishment being at an average rate of 500 000 m³ per year. The chosen localities and details of the surveys done to prove the existence of these offshore sand bodies was never known.</p> <p>Pumping Event 1: Boulders up to a size just slightly smaller than the issuing pipe together with chunks of stiff clay were produced which indicates that dredging was in areas devoid of sand or where sand had been removed completely. A wide variety of molluscs (species lists were to hand at the time) were pumped onto the beach along with the sand, indicative of productive reef area and not just sand bottom. Ammunitions and other items of historic interest (e.g. porcelain, silver spoons) found on Addington beach subsequent to the sand pumping also suggested that sand was removed possibly from a</p>				

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>previous dump site.</p> <p>Pumping Event 2: This event provided a better quality of sand, but still transported some cobbles and also resulted in a number of molluscs being dumped onto the beach together with sand. Following complaints from ORI & WESSA/Coastwatch it appears that more care was subsequently given to areas used for dredging sand during the second pumping event.</p> <p>COMMENTS</p> <p>The removal of sand may significantly change offshore habitats. This needs to be assessed and reported on with details of the surveys done to prove the existence and sustainability of the offshore sand bodies given.</p> <p>The removal of sand offshore changes the sand dynamics. This may lead to changes in sand movement (bedform migration) and consequently patterns of erosion and deposition. Such changes may impact on the coastline. This will need to be assessed.</p> <p>Surveys must verify that the sand bodies are adequate and can provide the resource. Impacts on areas of mixed substrate ie sand and reef must give due consideration to the marine environment with respect to sediment dynamics, habitat and marine life.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving further information.</p>				
55.	<p>Hi Vanessa Can you please register the Point Yacht Club as an I&AP on this project.</p> <p>Our main interest is as a user of the water space in and</p>	23/08/2016	Jon Marshall Point Yacht Club	Nemai Consulting	Noted.

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>around the Port of Durban. We are however also keen to ensure that the quality of the marine environment does not deteriorate further.</p> <p>Our contact details are; Physical address: 3 Maritime PI Durban 4001 Telephone: 031 301 4787 Fax: 031 305 1234 Email: addresses as above</p> <p>All official correspondence should be addressed to Craig Millar (commodore) but please also copy me in.</p> <p>Best regards Jon Marshall</p>				

2.2. Comments Received – Review of Draft Scoping Report

Note that in some instances the responses provided to comments within this section were elaborated on, based on the subsequent findings of the EIA phase (including specialist studies). These additional responses are shown in italics.

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
56. What are the potential impacts of disturbing heavy metals at the sandwinning site?	5/10/2016	Shanice Gomes SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	<p>A Sediment Analysis will be conducted and the findings will be incorporated into the EIA Report.</p> <p><i>Additional response after EIA Phase: Extract from the sediment quality assessment (refer to Appendix F5 of the draft EIA Report).</i></p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					<p><i>An assessment of the sediment quality was conducted by the Coastal Systems Research Group of the CSIR to determine whether the sediment at the alternative sandwinning sites is contaminated.</i></p> <p><i>Sediment collected at the two alternative sandwinning sites near the Port of Durban was comprised almost exclusively of sand. Metal concentrations in the sediment were very low, reflecting the fact that the sediment is comprised almost exclusively of sand, which is naturally metal deficient, and no mud was detected in the sediment. Metal concentrations in the sediment are far lower than sediment quality guidelines derived to be protective of sediment-dwelling organisms. There is thus essentially no risk that metals in sediment at the sandwinning sites were toxic to sediment-dwelling organisms and also essentially no risk metals will be released into the water column during dredging.</i></p>
57.	Requested further information and linkages with regards to the specific developments in the Port of Durban that will require fill material . How much sand is required and where will it be used?	5/10/2016	Jon Marshall Point Yacht Club	Transnet	<p>This application to DMR focusses only on sandwinning, as it is a mining-related activity.</p> <p>Projects are identified in the Transnet Long Term Planning Framework as well as the Port Development Framework. The projects that have been identified that will require infill material are Pier 1 Phase 2, Deepening and Lengthening of the North Quay, Berth Reconstruction and Deeping at Island View and Maydon Wharf.</p> <p>Projects identified in the Transnet Long Term Planning Framework and Port Development Framework are based on capacity requirements. These projects are</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					<p>subject to change based on this demand.</p> <p>The volume of sand can only be determined during the detailed design for the project. Hence, Transnet have estimated the volume based on the abovementioned projects.</p> <p>Approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material is required, based on the current estimate. The EIA and associated specialist studies are based on this volume and are assessing the corresponding area to be affected by the sandwinning activities, in accordance with the requirements of a mining right. The final volume of sand required may change, depending of the future developments. Mining will take place only if and when it is needed. Only authorised projects will use the material in the approved area.</p>
58.	Asked why sand from the existing sand trap could not be used.	5/10/2016	Alan Smith		<p>The factors to consider when sourcing sand include the following (amongst others):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of sand required; • Quality and characteristics of the sand; • Timing of sandwinning activities; and • Characteristics of the sandwinning site.
59.	What about the use of material generated inland rather than dredging offshore.	5/10/2016	Lisa Guastella Coastwatch	<p>Transnet</p> <p>Nemai Consulting</p> <p>Transnet</p>	<p>A similar suggestion was also made by DMR with regards to the possible use of spoil material from the Cornubia construction site. This may cause other impacts, such as traffic disruptions. This will be investigated further in the EIA phase.</p> <p><i>Additional response:</i> <i>Extract from Section 11.4 of the draft EIA Report.</i></p> <p><i>Extraction of land based sources of material can result</i></p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					<p><i>in long term impacts to the environment, including landscape and visual impacts and habitat loss, if a new extraction site were to be created. The sandwinning site is "self-healing" due to the natural longshore sand transportation which will rapidly fill in any depressions. Hydrodynamic and morphological studies have also shown that there will be a negligible impact on the wave climate and the coastline due to dredging at the sandwinning site.</i></p> <p><i>The use of land based sources of material would require the transportation of material from the site where it is sourced to the Port of Durban by road. The local and regional road network in and around the Port already experiences high volumes of road traffic and the transportation of the fill material would cause further congestion on the local road network.</i></p> <p><i>Given the number of truck movements required to transport materials to the site on the local road network there is also anticipated to be increased air quality and noise related impacts when compared with the use of an offshore site.</i></p> <p><i>The use of road haulage would also result in significantly greater CO2 emissions per tonne mile when compared with transportation by sea.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the cost per tonne of material from land based sources would be higher than that of material sourced from an offshore site.</i></p>
60.	What is the replenishment rate at the proposed sandwinning site?	5/10/2016	Alan Smith	Transnet	<p>This will be assessed during the EIA phase.</p> <p><u>Additional response:</u></p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					<p><i>Extract from the Wave Modelling Study (refer to Appendix F3 of the draft EIA Report).</i></p> <p><i>A Wave Modelling Study was undertaken by ZAA Engineering Projects and Naval Architecture (2016) and is appended to the Draft EIA Report. As part of this study a numerical wave refraction model was prepared to assess the effects of modifying the ocean floor as a result of dredging. Modified bathymetry for the two proposed sandwinning sites were also created. This study found that it is expected that any local increases in water depth due to dredging in the proposed areas will be reversed in a short period of time due to longshore sediment transport of approximately 1,250,000 m³ per annum.</i></p>
61.	Wave action needs to be taken into consideration.	5/10/2016	Jon Marshall Point Yacht Club	Nemai Consulting	A Wave Modelling Technical Study will be conducted in the EIA phase.
62.	The public must choose which specialists will undertake the relevant specialist studies.	5/10/2016	Shanice Gomes SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	<p>Competent specialists will be appointed who will each sign a Declaration of Independence.</p> <p>The particulars of the specialists are included in the Plan of Study in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>If you have any specific queries regarding the qualifications of the Specialist, it must be addressed directly with DEA and DMR.</p>
63.	<p>The specialist studies need to assess the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sediment, replenishment rate and possible erosion along coastline; • Impacts to marine biota and zooplankton; • Noise impacts to whales and dolphins; and • Ocean currents. 	5/10/2016	Lisa Guastella Coastwatch	Transnet	<p>To be assessed during the EIA phase through specialist studies and technical input. Existing studies will also be considered.</p> <p><u>Additional response:</u> <i>Extracts from the EIA Report that aim to address these</i></p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
			Anchor Environmental	<p>issues follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Wave Modelling Study (ZAA Engineering Projects and Naval Architecture, 2016) found that It is expected that any local increases in water depth due to dredging in the proposed areas will be reversed in a short period of time due to longshore sediment transport of approximately 1,250,000 m³ per annum.</i> • <i>The following impacts were assessed as part of the Marine Impact Assessment –</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Alteration of subtidal soft sediment habitat;</i> ○ <i>Disturbance of mobile organisms</i> ○ <i>Turbidity plumes created by sandwinning;</i> ○ <i>Smothering of benthic marine organisms;</i> ○ <i>Mobilisation of contaminants and nutrients;</i> ○ <i>Disposal of solid waste & spillage of hazardous substances;</i> ○ <i>Shoreline erosion; and</i> ○ <i>Inshore hydrodynamics.</i> • <i>Impacts of noise and vibration from dredging on marine biota are likely to be negligible as mobile organisms such as marine mammals, sharks, and fish will quickly move out of the area where the dredger is operating.</i> • <i>Simulations as part of the Wave Modelling Study (ZAA Engineering Projects and Naval Architecture, 2016) indicated that the maximum possible change in seabed elevation due to sandwinning will result in changes to local coastal significant wave heights of less than 5% of the corresponding offshore significant wave height for the full range of wave directions. For the most frequently occurring wave directions, the changes to local coastal significant wave</i>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					<i>heights were found to be less than 1.5% of the corresponding offshore wave heights. It should be noted that the biggest storms are from S to SSW which is also the most frequently occurring wave direction. For the 1:10 year storm calculations the change in local coastal significant wave heights was found to be not more than 3.3% and 2.3% of the corresponding offshore heights E/EWE and W/SSW respectively.</i>
64.	It is easier to detect impacts of land-based projects. How will this be done for the offshore sandwinning?	5/10/2016	Duncan Loukes Coastwatch	Nemai Consulting	<p>The impacts of the project will be assessed through appropriate specialist studies. These studies may recommend monitoring requirements for the pre-construction, construction and post-construction phases of the project.</p> <p><u>Additional response:</u> <i>An extract from Section 8 of the EMPr follows.</i></p> <p><i>In general, a number of monitoring requirements will be undertaken as part of the offshore sandwinning process, which includes the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A Global Positioning System (GPS) record must be kept of the route followed by the hopper.</i> • <i>The hoppers must have load indicator equipment on board to ensure that the hopper doors are not leaking and that no part of the load is being deposited anywhere other than in the Port.</i> • <i>A matrix of the site must be set up to ensure there is even dredging distribution.</i> • <i>The volumes of dredged material must be recorded.</i>
65.	Proper monitoring is required if authorisation is given. Baseline monitoring should include filming with a ROV so	05/10/2016	L Guastella	Transnet	Monitoring will be undertaken as per the Approved EMPr.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	that comparative observations can be made.		Coastwatch		
66.	<p>It must be understood that we are in no way objecting to the sandwinning proposal. Our simple intention is to request that Transnet considers adding a further sand mining site within the confines of the existing harbour.</p> <p>Annexure 1 specifically identifies the west yacht basin adjoining the existing yacht mooring facility. It must be understood that the Marina has no space left to expand, and with the proposed marina at the Point having been scrapped, there is no immediate opportunity for additional moorings. Furthermore, as The Durban Port is the largest and busiest port on the continent, it stands to reason that further expansion of the port activities westwards, would eventually eliminate the Bluff Yacht Club and moorings. As the Durban Marina is almost full to capacity, there would be no place for additional boats. The removal of the sand in the West Yacht Basin would hopefully create the opportunity to expand the capacity beyond the 3000 vessel number, which would mean that the Marina would become commercially viable.</p> <p>Annexure 2 quantifies the possible sand volumes if dredged to 5 meters below the lowest tide level. It would be hoped that sand removal would commence along the present yacht mole and continue to Wilsons Wharf.</p> <p>Annexure 3 brings into focus the Ethekewini 's future planning of the area adjoining to and interacting with the expanded West Basin Marina.</p> <p>Annexure 4 outlines the substantial benefits which would be generated from the expanded yachting and powerboat</p>	14/10/2016	Willy Cyrille Vandeverre	Nemai Consulting	<p>Refer to response provided to no. 37.</p> <p>The Marina is an eThekwini initiative and this party will consult Transnet in due time, prior to the EIA for this project, should it be pursued.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>facilities, and Annexure 5 elaborates on some of the benefits of promoting the development of the West Basin.</p> <p>Annexure 6 sums it up.</p> <p>The watersport bodies of Durban, for which the portion of the Port within the Hartley Barry line was set aside depend on Transnet's favourable involvement in this matter.</p> <p>Thank you for your considerable and favourable interest. Willy Vandeverre (for STUDIO FORE.)</p> <p><i>Annexures attached to completed Reply Form.</i></p>				
67.	<p>The Royal Natal Yacht Club is in full support of the sandwinning proposal and wishes to raise a further consideration for Transnet which it is believed will result in considerable cost savings and enhance the current project while at the same time unlocking significant development potential for the Port and City of Durban ensuring immediate job creation and providing for the development of sufficient capacity to meet the needs and demands for at least the next 50 years in line with the strategic objectives of Transnet and the Ethekewini Municipality's Bayside Redevelopment Project and the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Government Integrated Maritime Strategy.</p> <p>Additional supporting information: <u>Annexure 1 – Background Information</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club was established in 1858 and is today the oldest sports club of any kind in Africa and oldest yacht club in the Southern Hemisphere.</p>	17/10/2016	Graham Rose Royal Natal Yacht Club	Transnet	<p>The sites identified for sandwinning are based on the findings of a Geophysical and Sediment Sampling Survey undertaken by the Council for Geoscience (2001). Currently, there are no existing approved offshore sites. However, infill material from offshore sources identified as part of the aforementioned study can be used subject to the material being suitable (i.e. correct geotechnical properties), available in sufficient quantities at the right time and within close enough distance to the destination site to allow economically viable transportation.</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club is the oldest resident on the Bay and throughout its long history many of the club's members have played an active role in the development of the Port and City of Durban. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club is a founding member, and only representative from Africa, of the prestigious International Council of Yacht Clubs consisting of the world's historic and prestigious yacht clubs. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club is fully committed to the growth and development of the Ethekwini Municipality and the Provincial Government of KwaZulu-Natal and specifically the KZN Integrated Maritime Strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club and its members are significant stakeholders in the Durban Marina and are by far the largest group of active users of the current marina facilities. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club and the existing marina are important and established landmark features of Durban and contribute to its status as a busy port city and trade gateway to Africa. <p><u>Annexure 2 – Strategic Vision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club supports the promotion of the sport of sailing and the yachting lifestyle in line with international practice and in support of the growth, development and transformation of the leisure marine industry as a sub sector of the wider marine industry which creates and supplies the key drivers as inputs, including the human capital and skill, necessary for the overall economy to function successfully. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club supports the provision of additional moorings for pleasure craft and especially recreational craft. 				

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club recognizes that the only area available for the provision of additional future moorings within the area already set aside for the provision of recreational moorings and lying within the boundary of the Hartley Barry line is shown as Area "A" in Annexure 5, described as the west yacht basin. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club recognizes that the present facilities are insufficient to meet the current requirements of visiting international vessels especially super yachts and the facilities cannot meet the demands resulting from the natural organic growth of the leisure marine industry over the next 50 years. <input type="checkbox"/> The current facilities of the Durban Marina are insufficient to meet the demands of the annual cruising yachtsmen stopping over and visiting Durban, furthermore the facilities are insufficient to cater for the needs of those craft moored at the Bluff Yacht Club in the event of relocation as a result of the future westward expansion of port operations. <input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club recognizes that in order for the Ethekewini Municipality to successfully regenerate the Durban CBD and waterfront it is necessary to develop a significant world class waterfront development which will unlock the commercial and socio economic value of area. The central feature to any sustainable waterfront development is a significant and internationally recognized yacht club supported by a vibrant and functioning marina consisting of at least 3000 berths in order to optimize the economies of scale necessary to create a self sufficient micro economy which will contribute to the wider KwaZulu-Natal economy and create substantial job creation. 				

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The waterfront development must have the capacity to attract and cater for the visiting international vessels especially super yachts that are presently not catered for and must seek alternative marinas when in need of repairs, supplies or shelter during the annual cyclone season resulting in a significant financial loss to the KZN economy. Durban is an important and natural port of refuge for the entire East Coast of Africa and the neighboring Indian Ocean Islands during the cyclone season and we currently do not provide any facilities for the maritime community.</p> <p><u>Annexure 3 – Current Opportunities</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Royal Natal Yacht Club proposes that an additional sand mining site within the confines of the harbor be considered. It is proposed that the area marked as “A” and indicating the west yacht basin as shown in Annexure 5 be considered as the additional sand mining site.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The benefit of this site is an automatic and substantial cost saving to Transnet providing for the successful and timeous completion of the current project.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The additional site will provide sufficient quantities of sand volumes and sand of a similar composition and quality given the close proximity of the proposed additional site to the current project area as shown in Annexure 6.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The proposed additional site will automatically provide the capacity for the expansion of the existing marina facilities to meet the current and future requirements while at the same time unlocking the potential for the Ethekwini Municipality to redevelop the adjoining Bayside waterfront and CBD creating</p>				

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>much needed employment and social upliftment while contributing to the increase in property values and municipal rates income for the City which will provide the necessary funding to uplift and develop other regions within the city while also creating a sustainable leisure marine industry.</p> <p><u>Annexure 4 – Conclusion</u> <input type="checkbox"/> This additional proposed sand mining site marked as Areas A and B in Annexure 5 cannot be ignored as it provides a single cost efficient solution to 4 major immediate and long term challenges and projects currently confronting Transnet, the eThekweni Municipality, the Provincial Government of KwaZulu-Natal and the Royal Natal Yacht Club including the Durban Marina.</p> <p><u>Annexure 5 – Site Details</u> <i>Map included.</i></p> <p><u>Annexure 6 – Proposed Additional Sand Mining Area</u> <i>Map included.</i></p> <p>We trust you will note our support for the project and include our positive and additional proposals which we include for your favourable consideration.</p> <p>Yours faithfully G A Rose Royal Natal Yacht Club</p>				
68.	<p>The Durban Marina supports the sand mining of the area as we see this area as a future possible area for growth of the marina and its facilities. The current marina has many limitations especially in its pontoon infrastructure. The</p>	17/10/2016	Leo Kroone Durban Marina	Nemai Consulting	<p>Refer to response provided to no. 37.</p> <p>The Marina is an eThekweni initiative and this party will consult Transnet in due time, prior to the EIA for this</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>facilities do not allow for meaningful growth. We have seen a growth in superyachts visiting our shores over the last few years.</p> <p>There is a growing need to accommodate visiting these superyachts. Around the world travellers and world acclaimed races like the Oyster rally and ARC use Durban as a stop over. The marina cannot accommodate these visitors. Our own people who can afford superyachts cannot use our marina. We need to upgrade and modernise our facilities to be in line with international trends. The long term future of recreational sailing is at risk as marina space is compromised by harbour development. The bayhead area will not be viable in the long term and these yachts will need a home. The city is no longer building the marina at the point development.</p> <p>All major port cities need world class marina's to help contribute to the economy of the city. The sport and recreational needs of its citizens and world community are catered for in this growing economy. A modern marina will drive tourism and add value to the tourism product of our city.</p> <p>We would create job opportunities in boat building and maintenance fields. Our own very successful Sail Africa is promoting young development sailors who then have nowhere to continue their sailing careers in Durban. We lose this talent to other world centres. We have amazing sailing conditions off our cities warm beaches and the growing Blue Economy would be well placed in a modern marina with world class facilities.</p> <p>Herewith a list of "outsized" yachts which we have been</p>				<p>project, should it be pursued.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>able to accommodate in our Marina:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> "Ultra Vires" 23.95m length 10.56m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Tulasi" 19.60m length 5.6m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Flintstone" 25m length 6m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Ocean Adventurer 2" 24m length 9.5m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "NDS Darwin" 18.95m length 10m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Sara" 21.64m length 5.33m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Salty Dog" 18.12m length 9m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Maricea" 23.35m length 6m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "HQ 2" 22.85m length 10.55m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Amara" 17.07m length 9.7m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "SY Argo" 30m length 7m beam Marina was able to accommodate this one on the International Jetty. <input type="checkbox"/> Del Shipping has also made several enquiries regarding bringing their yachts to the Marina. We have not been able to accommodate most of their yachts as the length has exceeded 30m and were 120 tons or more: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> "Shenandoah" 40.24m length 8.28m beam <input type="checkbox"/> "Gliss" 30m length 120 tons <p><i>Slides attached with regards to the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Oyster World Rally;</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The commercial knock-on value of a marina (Durban 2022);</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Economic transformation; and</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>The future (2022 and beyond).</i> 				
69.	<p>The South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA) a registered I&AP for the application for sandwinning offshore. Please consider the comments on behalf of the SDCEA in response to the proposed offshore sandwinning developments within the port of Durban.</p> <p>SDCEA a non-governmental organisation who works with</p>	24/10/2016	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA Co-ordinator	Transnet	<p>As stated in the Scoping Report, the Port of Durban is South Africa's premier container port (handling 65% of South Africa's container traffic) and the principal port serving KwaZulu-Natal and the Gauteng region as well as the South African hinterland.</p> <p>The Transnet eThekweni Municipality Planning</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>community members from all over the south Durban and operating with support of people interested and/or affected by issues relating to the area share interest in development and change of land use applications in the eThekweni area. The organisations serve to ensure that development in the eThekweni area is appropriate, sustainable and legally compliant.</p> <p><u>Mining Permit and Scoping and EIA Process</u> The proposed offshore 'sandwinning' triggers Activity 17 of GN 984 of 4 December 2014 and thus a Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process is required. Also, due to the size of proposed sand winning area (between 110 hectares and 250 hectares), a Mining Right in terms of the Section 22 of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA) (Act No. 28 of 2002) is also required. The mining sites are old dumpsites said to be from the 1800s, early 1900s, but tests will need to be done to see what habitat will be affected.</p> <p><u>Project Description</u> Approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material will be required developments within the Port. Two potential off-shore sandwinning sites have been identified. A Recent History of Offshore Sand Mining Two "sand mining" exercises were carried out by eThekweni Municipality pre-2010 (seemingly without and environmental impact assessment), essentially reclamation (in order to create a wide beach for the World Cup and to protect the new beachfront promenade from possible erosion) as opposed to augmentation (ongoing beach re-nourishment). Statements were made that the sand quantity was the same amount as that mined per year for the Durban</p>			<p>Nemai Consulting</p>	<p>Initiative (TEMPI) undertook an economic assessment of the Port of Durban in 2007. The study found that if the infrastructure within the Port was not upgraded to respond to international trends, the Port of Durban will not maintain a competitive level of services, large vessels will make use of competitor Ports, there will be a loss of income in terms of wages and salaries and a negative economic impact on the local and national economy and a negative impact on related industries. Refer further to Section 4 of the Scoping Report for the motivation for the project.</p> <p>A previous study by the Council for Geoscience (2001) identified two potential offshore sandwinning sites, namely, Area 1 and Area 2. Based on the findings of this investigation, which included bathymetry, characteristics of the sediment, sensitivity (including presence of reefs), and underwater heritage, Area 2 was discarded. Feasible alternative locations (referred to as Site 1 and Site 2) were then identified within Area 1. A detailed appraisal of both these sites will be conducted through the specialist studies in the EIA phase.</p> <p>In accordance with the purpose of Scoping, the report does not include detailed specialist investigations on the receiving environment, which will only form part of the EIA Phase. The Plan of Study in the Scoping Report explains the approach to be adopted to conduct the EIA for the proposed project. It contains the terms of reference (general and specific) for the specialist studies identified for the EIA phase. In this regard, the requisite specialist studies 'triggered' by the findings of the Scoping process, aimed at</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>Beach Nourishment System, approx. 300 000 m³ (figures were not supplied nor verified) however the sand mining done for the World Cup was done over a very short time as the sand trap was unable to provide the required amount due to the rate of replenishment being at an average rate of 500 000 m³ per year. The chosen localities and details of the surveys done to prove the existence of these offshore sand bodies was never known.</p> <p>Pumping Event 1: Boulders up to a size just slightly smaller than the issuing pipe together with chunks of stiff clay were produced which indicates that dredging was in areas devoid of sand or where sand had been removed completely. A wide variety of molluscs (species lists were to hand at the time) were pumped onto the beach along with the sand, indicative of productive reef area and not just sand bottom. Ammunitions and other items of historic interest (e.g. porcelain, silver spoons) found on Addington beach subsequent to the sand pumping also suggested that sand was removed possibly from a previous dump site.</p> <p>Pumping Event 2: This event provided a better quality of sand, but still transported some cobbles and also resulted in a number of molluscs being dumped onto the beach together with sand. Following complaints logged it appears that more care was subsequently given to areas used for dredging sand during the second pumping event.</p> <p>COMMENTS Public Participation Those that make use of the beach for fishing should also be included and informed by placing notices on the</p>				<p>addressing the key issues and compliance with legal obligations, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Impact Assessment; and • Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment. <p>In addition, technical studies to be considered include a Wave Modelling Study, Sediment Analysis and Geophysical and Sediment Sampling Survey (Council for Geoscience, 2001).</p> <p>The Plan of Study provides details of the identified specialists, including their qualifications, number of years' experience and affiliation to professional bodies. Their respective CVs will be contained in the EIA Report.</p> <p>Details of the public participation process undertaken to date are provided in the Scoping Report. In summary, a general Interested and Affected Parties' (I&APs) database was compiled and included I&APs from the Berth 203 to 205 Expansion project as well as the Durban Bay Estuary Management Plan Database. These stakeholders were notified of the initial registration period by email and SMS. In addition, an advert was placed in the Isolezwe Newspaper and site notices were placed around the Port of Durban. Registered Interested and Affected Parties were notified of the review of the Draft Scoping Report via newspaper notices, onsite notices and emails. Onsite notices were placed around the Port of Durban and the coastal areas closest to the proposed sites.</p> <p>The Background Information Document conveys pertinent details of the project, including motivation,</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>KwaZulu Natal Subsistence Fishing Forum (KNSF) website. Form the public meeting held on the 5th October there was not one fishermen in attendance, it is the duty of Nemaï to conduct thorough public participation to notify all I&APs. Notifications to all sporting clubs, groups that are in a range of 5km from the proposed site were not present at the public meeting. The background document does not give you proper information therefore there should be site visits by boats. As consultants they should be able to take people across. There should be complete information, specialist reports provided, documents available to be reviewed and the developer Transnet should pay for this review to be done. Specialists that have been appointed and their curriculum vitae should be open and available to be viewed to ensure that there is no bias. Look at alternative sites in other ports in KwaZulu Natal, like Richards Bay and not only in Durban. With regards to choosing the Durban Port reasons must be provided as to why they are not using other ports. It is in the best interests of all parties that the need for the dredging is explained, that the decision-making process is transparent, and that the reasons for the selection of the preferred dredging and/or disposal options are clearly understood.</p> <p>Changes to natural vegetation Coastal vegetation provides a protective buffer to the coast, rendering it less vulnerable to impacts, and contributing to its biodiversity and provision of goods and services. The clearing of natural vegetation for urban developments is increasingly a cause for concern. Destruction of vegetation leads to higher silt loads in our coastal waterways, causing estuaries to silt-up and leading to degradation of these systems.</p>				<p>location, alternatives, approach to sandwinning, overview of environmental assessment (including specialist studies) and the manner in which you can become involved in the EIA process.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that this project will have any direct impacts to natural vegetation. This will be assessed as part of the Marine Impact Assessment. Natural habitat at the alternative sandwinning sites will also be evaluated as part of the aforementioned study.</p> <p>As noted in the Scoping Report, the current EIA focuses only on the offshore sandwinning activity. The use of the material within the Port will require separate authorisation(s) in terms of prevailing environmental legislation. For instance, a separate EIA process was undertaken for the Deepening, Lengthening and Widening of Berths 203 to 205 (NEAS REF NO: DEA/EIA/0000988/2012; DEA REF NO: 14/12/16/3/3/2/275) and thus the use of infill material within the Port for this project is already authorized. However other developments requiring infill material which will be obtained by sandwinning may still require authorisation.</p> <p>The EMPr, which will accompany the EIA Report, will make provision for specific monitoring requirements, which will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A GPS record must be kept of the route followed by the hopper. This record must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Time of departure from the Port; ○ Route followed by the vessel to Sandwinning area (GPS track); ○ Time of arrival at Sandwinning area;

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>Changes in natural habitat Loss of fisheries productivity, biodiversity, and recreational potential. Severely degraded channels may lower land and aesthetic values. All species require specific habitat conditions to ensure long-term survival. Native species in streams are uniquely adapted to the habitat conditions that existed before humans began large-scale alterations. These have caused major habitat disruptions that favoured some species over others and caused overall declines in biological diversity and productivity hindering movement of fishes between pools. Unstable ecosystems are inhospitable and that often have severe consequences for aquatic species. The Durban Port has its last important sand bank left; sandwinning would completely destroy the nesting ground for fish and bird life found in the harbour. The complete removal of vegetation and destruction of the soil profile destroys habitat above and below the ground as well as within the aquatic ecosystem, resulting in the reduction in faunal populations. Thirty species of fish and sand prawns are found here and 132 species of birds frequent the area. Despite the marine traffic, the central sandbank and mangroves remain an important nursery area for young fish. Sixty-two endangered, migratory species (in particular waders) rest and feed here. The study emphasises the critical need to protect and enhance the existing estuarine habitats and stabilise the environments within the Bay over the next five year period. Existing and new developments within the catchment of the Bay have cumulative impacts on the bay ecosystem, which are increasingly compromising the integrity of the bay and pushing it to the brink of collapse.</p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Position of the vessel at the time of starting to Sand Winning activities; ○ Heading and speed of the vessel at the time of starting to Sand Winning activities; ○ Position of the vessel at the time of completion of the Sand Winning Activities; ○ Heading and speed of the vessel at the time of completion of Sand Winning Activities; ○ Route followed by the vessel on the way back to the Port from the Sandwinning Site (GPS track). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The daily track plot must be recorded electronically. • The hoppers must have load indicator equipment on board to ensure that the hopper doors are not leaking and that no part of the load is being deposited anywhere other than in the Port. • A matrix of the site must be set up to ensure there is even dredging distribution. • The volumes of sand winning must be recorded. <p>Section 14.2.1 of the draft EIA Report provides a discussion on climate-related impacts. Amongst others, it is stated that the proposed offshore sandwinning does not have any direct impacts on climate. In order to ensure minimal increases in greenhouse gasses associated with fuel combustion in dredge equipment, it is recommended <i>inter alia</i> that the dredger should be well maintained and efficiently operated at all times.</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>Preservation of the Sandbanks and ecosystem in the bay should be paramount and not be pushed for further development which causes the further destruction.</p> <p>The removal of sand may significantly change offshore habitats. This needs to be assessed and reported on with details of the surveys done to prove the existence and sustainability of the offshore sand bodies given. The removal of sand offshore changes the sand dynamics. This may lead to changes in sand movement (bed form migration) and consequently patterns of erosion and deposition. Such changes may impact on the coastline. This will need to be assessed.</p> <p>Surveys must verify that the sand bodies are adequate and can provide the resource. Impacts on areas of mixed substrate i.e. sand and reef must give due consideration to the marine environment with respect to sediment dynamics, habitat and marine life. We look forward to receiving further information.</p> <p>Environmental impacts when using the Trailing Suction Hopper Dredger (TSHD) This creates a plume of fine-grained elements causing an increase in suspended sediments in the water column at the dredging site and an increase in turbidity or reduction of the light penetration through the water column may occur. Because this can have a negative impact on the benthic life, this turbidity must be carefully monitored. Nowadays, turbidity can be reduced with a number of new technologies such as using green valves, recycling (part of) overflow water, overflow with a bottom exit, or reducing the overflow. The TSHD is equipped with powerful engines generating significant sound levels. For those in</p>				<p>The key climate change and climate change-related factors which can affect offshore sandwinning include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing storm surge heights; • Possible increases in storm intensity; • Changes in seasonable precipitation amounts; • Increasingly intense precipitation events; and • Changes in the morphology of the coastal area due to climate change may induce changes in erosion and sedimentation patterns, with potential consequences for offshore dredging requirements. <p>The effects of climate change such as increased storm events may have an impact on the project. The impacts of these storms on dredging activities at the offshore sandwinning site may result in delays in the anticipated programme as the dredger will not go out in unfavourable conditions. But these will be accounted for with days set aside for inclement weather.</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>close proximity to the TSHD, the sound levels can be expected to be high. However, a few hundred metres away from the vessel, the sound is quite a bit less and generally reduced to acceptable levels. Since TSHDs are often working at great distances from populated areas this is not often an issue for people. Underwater sound is a separate concern and the effects of machine-made sound on marine life have recently been the subject of considerable study. Acoustic modelling and measuring has helped to monitor sound and make appropriate adjustments. In general, TSHDs generate less sound than some other types of dredgers and vessels.</p> <p>Climate Change Climate change has not been factored in as a concern that will contribute to the awareness in preserving the environment. The coastal communities have been hit the hardest by climate change, and this has been experienced through severe thunder storms, heavy rainfall and flooding. Coastal erosion is the natural weathering of rocks and the removal of beach sand or dune sediments by wave action, tidal currents or drainage. It is driven by storm events, cyclones,</p> <p>Project site We want know what was dumped at the Durban Harbour site previously as the Durban Harbour was referred to as a dump site. Dredging was said to dig 30 to 40 meters deep into the sea bed, and without a doubt there will be an upliftment of hazardous chemicals accumulated over the years. If it is the area where the refineries (and other industries?) dumped their mercury and lead sludge (from tank cleaning) in drums over the edge of a boat from the start of Exxon Mobil (which became Engen) and Sapref</p>				

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>Refineries, then there is a more to worry about.</p> <p>All activities for the expansion of the container terminal should have been assessed together as impacts are cumulative and incremental and not just isolating this development. The general concern is the end use of the sand to be mined i.e. what is happening within the Port is that these concerns will be overlooked as Transnet has been through several application processes for Environmental Authorisation for various projects, notably the expansion of the container berths 203 – 205; all were approved. The volumes of sand cited at this stage are a thumb suck and without Transnet being specific about its requirements it can't be specific about the length of time for the project which would make mitigation of offshore impacts difficult. Transnet are regarding the Durban Port as being old spoil sites they are considered as sacrificial so messing the area up does not matter! Therefore there is a need for marine biologists and oceanographers to assess the area thoroughly.</p> <p>Terms of reference The Terms of Reference for the various studies are comprehensive with the aims of objectives of the study being adequate for the needs of the environment. In addition to the impacts on the offshore environment you will need to consider other issues such as, in this case, shipping traffic (commercial and recreational) and safety of port users, storage of the sand which could lead to runoff impacts causing sedimentation/pollution of the Bay.</p> <p>Requests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA) requires the permits for the mining 				

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>rights document and a copy of the application for the mining rights to peruse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive research on the sound impact of the TSHD and its impacts on the marine life • With regard to dredging leaching of contaminants from disposal sites decrease water quality, e.g. an increase of suspended solids concentration and potential release of contaminants during dredging or disposal. • Habitats and natural areas, e.g. habitat enhancement or creation, removal or destruction of benthos, smothering • Local communities, e.g. the effects of noise • Changes to bathymetry or topography • Physical processes, e.g. waves, currents, or drainage, and hence erosion or deposition • Recreation, e.g. sailing, swimming and beach use • Impacts on subsistence fisher folk • The "environmental impact assessment" (EIA) should highlight both positive and negative, short- and long-term impacts 				
70.	<p>Interim Comment In terms of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)</p> <p>In order to prepare for the future container growth, the Port of Durban started a process for a phased container capacity expansion programme in order to improve throughput capacity by reconfiguring and rationalising the existing Durban Container Terminal (DCT). Pier 1 Phase 2 Project is part of the expansion programme and is seen as the key to the provision of medium and long term capacity. Other major expansion projects in the short term include deepening and lengthening of the North Quay,</p>	24/10/2016	<p>Lesa la Grange Heritage Officer South African Heritage Resources Agency</p>	<p>African Centre for Heritage Activities</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment will be included in the EIA Report, which will include the information requested by SAHRA. 2. Reference list updated to include sources for heritage information. 3. The survey conducted as part of the Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Desktop study, consisting of a database of known and suspected wrecks in the area; b. Magnetometer survey of the designated areas. The side scan sonar imagery collected by the Council for Geoscience in 2001 was layered under the mag hits. The mag hits

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>berth reconstruction and deepening at Island View and Maydon Wharf. As part of these expansions, TNPA has recognized the need for sandwinning of approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material which will be required as part of these developments. Two potential offshore sandwinning sites have been identified. Alternative Site 1 occurs approximately 1,2 km east of the Port of Durban harbour mouth and is approximately 110 hectares in size. Alternative Site 2 occurs slightly south of Alternative Site 1 and is approximately 250 hectares in size.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Scoping Report (DSR) for the proposed offshore sandwinning in for developments within the Port of Durban, KwaZulu Natal. The Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Unit at the South African Heritage Resources Agency has a mandate to protect, promote, and preserve archaeological resources, including but not limited to where these may be affected by developments. In terms of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999 (NHRA), all impacts on heritage resources as the result of development must be identified and assessed.</p> <p>The following comments on specific sections of the DSR must be considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Details regarding the Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) mentioned in Section 8 (13) of the DSR, including information on the heritage resources identified, as well as the identification of impacts on these resources, and proposed mitigation for minimising these impacts. 2. The sources for all heritage resources must be included in the reference list, i.e. Levine (1986), Turner (1988), and 				<p>were compared to the debris fields; and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> c. Diver searches on the magnetometer hits to ascertain the nature of the sites.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>CSIR (2011).</p> <p>3. A full geophysical survey (including side-scan sonar) of the area to be developed must be carried out, both to identify heritage resources and to minimise the risk of damage to plant and equipment during sandwinning. The findings of the geophysical survey must be independently reviewed by a suitably qualified archaeologist.</p> <p>Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header.</p>				
71.	<p>With reference to the abovementioned Draft Scoping Report please be advised that various Municipal Departments have had sight of the proposal and the following comments are submitted for your attention:</p> <p>1. eThekweni Electricity Department. The H.V. Operations has no objections to the following proposal however please note:</p> <p>1.1 The applicant must consult eThekweni Electricity's mains records (held in the drawing office at the eThekweni Electricity Headquarters, 1 Jelf Taylor Crescent, for the presence of underground electrical services. In addition should any overhead line and/or servitude be affected, the specific permission of the Head: Electricity must be sought regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>1.2 The relocation of MV/LV electrical services, if required in order to accommodate the proposed development, will be carried out at the expense of the applicant.</p> <p>2. Environmental Planning and Climate Protection Department.</p>	26/10/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	<p>Note that the proposed activity occurs approximately 1.2km east of the Port of Durban. However, the proposed use of the sand as fill material will take place at the Port. As noted in the Scoping Report, the current EIA focuses only on the offshore sandwinning activity. The use of the material within the Port will require separate authorisation(s) in terms of prevailing environmental legislation.</p> <p>The potential climate change and related factors which can affect offshore sandwinning will be assessed in the EIA phase.</p> <p>Specialist studies to be incorporated into the EIA Report will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Impact Assessment; • Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment; • Wave Modelling Study; • Sediment Analysis; and • Geophysical and Sediment Sampling Survey. <p>The EMPr, which will accompany the EIA Report, will make provision for specific monitoring requirements.</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>From the detail provided and the desktop assessment of the proposed site using various environmental data sets, herewith find site specific comment from the Environmental Planning and Climate Protection Department.</p> <p>The proposed site is located within the Port of Durban and it is for the offshore sandwinning for development within the existing Port. This Department is in support of the proposal by the applicant to follow the Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process and due to the publication of the NEMA EIA 2014 Regulations the Department of Mineral Resources is the competent authority for the application. The applicant is further advised not to commence with the activity until an environmental authorisation has been issued.</p> <p>Upon review of the report it had been noted that the specialist studies to be included within the application include a Marine Impact Assessment and an Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment since offshore sandwinning will result in the physical removal of the benthic community and increased turbidity which may impact visibility in the area. In addition to the aforementioned studies, a wave modelling technical study and a geotechnical assessment will also be undertaken and included in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report to provide a holistic environmental impact assessment and mitigation measures for the proposed offshore sandwinning activity.</p> <p>This Department would like to see the potential increased storm surge heights and intensities modelled within the wave modelling technical study. Potential implications for</p>			Transnet	<p>All authorities and I&APs will be notified of DMR's decision. If an Environmental Authorisation is issued by DMR, a copy will be provided to eThekweni Municipality, as requested.</p> <p>Section 14.2.1 of the draft EIA Report provides a discussion on climate-related impacts. Amongst others, it is stated that the proposed offshore</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>the underwater sandwinning activities should be highlighted. This would include mitigation and adaptation measures to compensate for climate change.</p> <p>This Department will provide further comments upon receipt of the Final Scoping Report and the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>3. Land Use Management Branch. This application has no Land Use Management implication.</p> <p>4. Strategic Spatial Planning Branch. Subsequent to the Background Information Document this Branch raises no objection to the proposed development. However, this Branch reserves the right to provide further comments if deemed necessary.</p> <p>5. Coastal, Stormwater and Catchment Management. This Department has no objection.</p> <p>6. Parks, Leisure and Cemeteries. This Department has no objections.</p> <p>7. Geotechnical Engineering Branch. No geotechnical comment.</p> <p>8. eThekweni Transport Authority. The report is in support of the Offshore Sandwinning, therefore no objection for the proposed Offshore Sandwinning for the development within the Port of Durban.</p> <p>9. Environmental Health Department.</p>				<p>sandwinning does not have any direct impacts on climate. In order to ensure minimal increases in greenhouse gasses associated with fuel combustion in dredge equipment, it is recommended inter alia that the dredger should be well maintained and efficiently operated at all times.</p> <p>The key climate change and climate change related factors which can affect offshore sandwinning include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing storm surge heights; • Possible increases in storm intensity; • Changes in seasonable precipitation amounts; • Increasingly intense precipitation events; and • Changes in the morphology of the coastal area due to climate change may induce changes in erosion and sedimentation patterns, with potential consequences for offshore dredging requirements. <p>The effects of climate change such as increased storm events may have an impact on the project. The impacts of these storms on dredging activities at the offshore sandwinning site may result in delays in the anticipated programme as the dredger will not go out in unfavourable conditions. But these will be accounted for with days set aside for inclement weather.</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>This Department has no objection to the proposed Offshore Sandwinning for developments within the Port of Durban subject to the following mitigation measures being taken:</p> <p>9.1 All harmful pollutants dredged from the seabed must be deposited in such a manner so as not to become a health concern to the residents of eThekweni Municipality.</p> <p>9.2 It is important to note that the proposed sandwinning must be conducted in such a manner so as not to impose undue risk or negative impacts on the quality of lives of the employees or the surrounding Industrial or Residential community. Should any problems arise as a result of the proposed activity, this Department reserves the right to call for further mitigatory measures.</p> <p>Compliance with the above must be effected in liaison with this Department.</p> <p>10. eThekweni Water and Sanitation Department. No comment from Pollution and Environment Branch.</p> <p>11. Durban Solid Waste. This Department has no requirement for this proposal.</p> <p>12. Disaster Management. No comment from this Department.</p> <p>13. Fire Safety. No comment received.</p> <p>Should you seek clarification on any of the above issues, please contact the writer on telephone: 031 - 3117136 or</p>				

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	via e-mail: diane.vanrendburg@durban.gov.za . In addition, the Department requests that a copy of the Environmental Authorisation be emailed to the same address.				

2.3. Comments Received – Review of Final Scoping Report

Note that in some instances the responses provided to comments within this section were elaborated on, based on the subsequent findings of the EIA phase (including specialist studies). These additional responses are shown in italics.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
72.	Coastwatch, WESSA Durban Branch and Birdlife Port Natal, non-governmental organisations formed by volunteers and operating with support of people interested and/or affected by issues relating to the area share interest in development and change of land use applications in the eThekweni area. The organisations serve to ensure that development in the eThekweni area is appropriate, sustainable and legally compliant. The following comments are submitted on behalf of these organisations. Coastwatch, in collaboration with the abovementioned organisations, has noted the proposed specialist studies to be undertaken and we raise the following issues which we believe need to be addressed.	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch		Responses to individual comments follow.
73.	1. The scoping report (SR) states that the application relates only to mining sand in either of the two sites	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman	Transnet	The proposed projects that are to be delivered at the Ports are provided in the Long Term Planning

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>identified and the use of the mined material by Transnet is beyond the scope of the application. Notwithstanding that legal processes allow for this separation in terms of the receiving environment the projects are allied. We consider Transnet's approach of splitting up of projects to gain incremental approval, while allowable within current legislation, is wrong and it does not allow adequate assessment of cumulative impacts. Transnet needs to be fully transparent and adopt a holistic approach to assessing its potential impacts on the environment.</p>		Coastwatch		<p>Framework (LTPF) by Transnet and the National Ports Plan by Transnet National Ports Authority. The timing of these proposed projects is dependent upon the demand and various approvals, e.g. environmental. To obtain approval of all the projects at once is impossible as the timing is different for each project.</p> <p>Each and every project requiring the use of the sand from this site will however undergo an Environmental Assessment as per the latest EIA Regulations if required.</p>
74.	<p>2. Cumulative Impacts</p> <p>The primary concern for this project is the cumulative effects that are not adequately discussed. It is not enough to just assess within the footprint of the sandwinning area. Resultant sediment plumes from the dredging process as well as the destabilization of sediments in the area are likely to have much further reaching impacts. Additionally, 3.5 million m³ of sediment will be dumped at sea due to the dredging required for the Berth 203-205 project. As mentioned in the SR Durban and its surrounds are already highly impacted with numerous pipeline outfalls, a large anchorage and offshore dumpsite. It is thus imperative to fully understand what is present in the area and what may be lost due to the intended dredging process.</p> <p>Using the excuse that the area does not fall into a critical biodiversity area (CBA) is inadequate and only occurs because of the limited research that has been undertaken in the area. This does not constitute an argument if it is not actually known what is there. It simplistically suggests that all other areas are sacrificial.</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Anchor Environmental	<p>The cumulative marine environmental impacts emanating from the proposed project are primarily related to soft-bottom benthic habitat alteration, turbidity, smothering and beach erosion. The results of the Marine Impact Assessment Study indicate that the sections of soft-bottom benthic habitat that will be disturbed during sandwinning are represented elsewhere in Durban Bay and are not unique in terms of species composition, biomass or abundance.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Because an area is not within a CBA or MPA does not reduce its importance, especially in highly impacted area.</p> <p>A desktop marine impact assessment for the area is not sufficient; additionally, baseline studies of these areas require at least a full year of sampling due to seasonal variability. It is suggested that the EAP consult a person with previous knowledge and recent data for the area. Additionally, SANBI has taken ROV footage for inclusion in their Offshore MPA plans and may be able to highlight sensitive features.</p>				
75.	<p>3. Motivation and Volumes to be extracted</p> <p>Transnet plans to dredge 4.5 million m³ but is unable or unwilling to explain how this figure was derived. Where is it to be used?</p> <p>A concern is that “blanket” mining over 30 years will facilitate further development (beyond that which is already approved through the EIA process) with the easy availability of a resource resulting in further infilling of Durban Bay.</p> <p>A previous project entailed a four phase development plan for additional container facilities and authorisation was issued, in part, on 29 July 1999. In authorising Phase 3 of the plan Condition 1.3 was set and it reads as follows: “Authorisation is granted on condition that there is no further loss of water area in the future as a result of infilling”.</p> <p>While clarification around the RoD for the port in 1999 has been provided, we remain concerned that this</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Nemai Consulting Transnet	<p>The application to DMR focusses only on sandwinning, as it is a mining-related activity. The developments within the Port will need to seek separate approval from DEA in terms of NEMA, as required.</p> <p>Projects are identified in the Transnet Long Term Planning Framework as well as the Port Development Framework. The projects that have been identified that will require infill material are Pier 1 Phase 2, Deepening and Lengthening of the North Quay, Berth Reconstruction and Deepening at Island View and Maydon Wharf.</p> <p>Projects identified in the Transnet Long Term Planning Framework and Port Development Framework are based on capacity requirements. These projects are subject to change based on this demand.</p> <p>The volume of sand can only be determined during the detailed design for the project. Hence, Transnet have estimated the volume based on the abovementioned projects.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>aspect of the actual RoD remains vague and unmeasurable. There must be a process through the Department of Environmental Affairs to amend the RoD to provide clear and enforceable conditions that are in line with the Department's intention.</p> <p>The SR states that "sand winning will occur for a number of developments within the port" (pg 18). Our calculations show that the amount, 4.5 million m³ equates to approximately 4% of the current open water area of the harbour calculating that it will be laid 20 m deep, or 2 km of new harbour will with new working area 50 m behind it.</p> <p>Detail is required on the motivation and how the amount of 4.5 million m³ was derived.</p>				<p>The sandwinning project will enable other proposed developments within the Port.</p> <p>Approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material is required, based on the current estimate. The EIA and associated specialist studies are based on this volume and are assessing the corresponding area to be affected by the sandwinning activities, in accordance with the requirements of a mining right. The final volume of sand required may change, depending of the future developments. Mining will take place only if and when it is needed. Only authorised projects will use the material in the approved area.</p>
76.	<p>4. It is not clear from the SR whether either of the proposed alternative sites have been used for the deposition of spoil or waste in the past. If they are historical dump sites from harbour dredging they will likely contain hazardous substances accumulated over the years and may include dumped waste from the refineries (and other industries?) with mercury and lead sludge which was contained in drums and deposited from vessels in the early days of Mobil (which became Engen) and Sapref.</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Nemai Consulting	<p>The findings of the Sediment Analysis will be included in the EIA Report. This study includes sediment sampling followed by physical and chemical analysis.</p> <p>An extract from the Council for Geoscience Report dated 2001 follows. Area 1 has two sand mounds. A North mound and a South mound. The North mound measures approximately 2000m in length, 750m in width and 10 m in height. The southern mound measures approximately 1500m in length, 700m in width and 2 – 3 m in height. They are oriented in a southwest – northeast direction. They represent the old dredge dumping ground which saw active dumping 10 – 15 years during the late 1800s and early 1900s. Based on this comment it is unlikely that the sites are contaminated.</p> <p><i>Additional response:</i> <i>Refer to response provided to no. 56 with regards to the</i></p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
				Anchor Environmental	<p><i>assessment of the sediment quality was conducted by the CSIR.</i></p> <p>Sand-winning is likely to stir up subtidal marine sediments that may contain contaminants (e.g. trace metals, hydrocarbons) and excess nutrients, which can negatively impact marine biota in the surrounding area. Harmful substances can cause mortality of invertebrates, while excess nutrients can cause algal blooms, decreased dissolve oxygen concentrations and local eutrophication. This impact is rated as 'very low' due to the low mud content of the sediment which results in decreased surface area for the attachment of contaminants. Although two potential sources of pollution are located in the vicinity of the alternative sandwinning area, they are unlikely to contaminate mined sediment. This is due to sewage effluent pipelines discharging much further offshore and the adjacent historical offshore disposal site being unlikely to retain any fine particles originating from the Port of Durban since decommissioning in the 1900's.</p>
77.	<p>5. Alternatives Sand Sources</p> <p>There needs to be a closed loop. Port operations and new projects necessitate the removal of sediment and spoil. Mining new sites therefore needs to be rationalised as part of the motivation for the proposed mining, particularly as the proposed new site is just seaward of the existing dredge site, the area needing ongoing dredging to keep the harbour mouth open. Has it been established if any of the sand from this existing dredge site is available and can be used?</p> <p>Concern: An alternative source of sand, the</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Transnet	<p>The soil used for backfill for quaywall construction must have good engineering properties.</p> <p>The existing dredge site is used for beach replenishment as per the Transnet/ eThekwini Memorandum of Understanding. This material is deposited on to the beaches as and when eThekwini require. Transnet has to provide 500 000 m³ per annum. The volume of dredge required may impact on this MoU hence the site was not evaluated.</p> <p>Dredging of the basin will however contribute almost 1,000,000 m³ towards the sandbank extension. The</p>



	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	Esplanade/Wilson's Wharf sand bank, was put forward at the public meeting and seemingly met with some interest. The ecological importance of the remaining sandbanks within the Bay has been recognised and Coastwatch would be extremely concerned if this was investigated further, particularly if it is not aligned with the objectives of the Durban Bay Estuary Management Plan (now signed by the Minister).				<p>estimated quantity of sand to be dredged and placed is approximately 1,300,000 m³. Based on the geotechnical investigations that have been conducted, in particular as recorded in ZAA 1370-RPT-031- Soil Material for Reclamation of the Central Sandbank, it is expected that approximately 300,000 m³ of this sand will be newly reclaimed material from the designated off-shore borrow areas and the major portion of 1,000,000 m³ will come from material selected from the dredging of the basin to -16,5 m CDP.</p> <p>The Esplanade/Wilson's Wharf sand bank has not been considered in this EIA due to the environmental sensitivity of the sandbanks. All IAPs have a right to propose mitigation measures that they feel could work.</p>
78.	<p>6. Sand Replenishment (i.e. sustainable mining)</p> <p>Transnet is seeking authorisation for mining over a 30 year period without aligning the removal of the resource to specific projects. What of the rate of extraction? Is it sustainable – how will this be determined?</p> <p>What is the sand replenishment rate at the proposed new dredge site? This information is required to determine the "rate of mine" and avoid over exploitation of the resource. The sand "ore body" at the proposed new site appears to be very thin (a few metres). If it is stripped to rock the substrate may change, with impacts on the benthic community.</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Transnet	A Wave Modelling Study was undertaken. Local deepening has been characterised as short term based on anticipated replenishment caused by natural longshore sediment transport. It is expected that any local increases in water depth due to dredging in the proposed areas will be reversed in a short period of time due to longshore sediment transport of approximately 1,250,000 m ³ per annum.
79.	<p>7. Environmental Impact: Turbidity</p> <p>Increased turbidity has been identified as one of the main impacts, and it will be monitored. The SR section 12.10 explains that there is little data available on</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Anchor Environmental & Transnet	The likely magnitude of the turbidity plume associated with the proposed sandwinning activities was not modelled as part of the turbidity modelling studies. This was not deemed necessary by engineers due to the fact that the volume of suspended sediment is far greater for

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>turbidity in the vicinity of the study area so studies will need to obtain sufficient data to determine what an “acceptable” level is. If turbidity is found to increase above acceptable levels what will be done to deal with it and avoid recurrence of the impact?</p>				<p>the dumping of dredged material in comparison to that of sandwinning. Hence, modelling was only undertaken for sediment plumes resulting from offshore disposal of dredged material (ZAA Engineering Projects and Naval Architecture, 2012). These models were run for the prevailing wind directions (south-west and north-east) at a velocity of 39 knots. Due to these prevailing winds, material disturbed on the bottom or released into the water column at the proposed sandwinning sites is likely to be carried in a north-easterly direction for the majority of the time but on occasion may also be carried towards the south-west. Given the small magnitude of the plume predicted from these studies, even under worst-case scenario conditions, it was concluded that additional modelling work for the sandwinning operations was not required. As sediment within the sites is relatively coarse, only a small plume area is likely to result from sandwinning operations.</p> <p>Under north easterly wind conditions dispersion of the sediment plume during dumping was predicted to be more rapid due to the increased current velocity toward the south west, although the predicted TSS concentration of 5 mg/L four hours after discharge are highly unlikely to reach the shoreline. This added to the background turbidity of 8.7 mg/L, falls below the low risk TSS level of 20 mg/L (Steffani et al., 2003). Despite the unavoidably high but localised turbidity at the dredge head, the perceived impact is considered to be of ‘low’ risk.</p>
80.	<p>8. How will the dredging operations minimise disturbance at sensitive times such as the sardine run and whale migrations. Have any studies been undertaken on marine mammals such as the humpback</p>	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Anchor Environmental	<p>During dredging, the fast swimming mobile fish, marine mammals (whales and dolphins) and elasmobranchs (sharks, rays and skates) will be able to move to adjacent areas, while most slow swimming fish, crabs</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	dolphins, a threatened species found in inshore waters and seen in the vicinity of the harbour mouth, even within Durban harbour?				and benthic infauna are unlikely to be able to move out of the way of the dredger and mortality of these animals is expected to be high. Given the low diversity and abundance of birds and high intensity of human activity on the Durban beachfront and offshore shipping traffic, we anticipate a negligible impact on avifauna of the region.
81.	9. "The proposed offshore sandwinning will affect the bathymetry of the site and this may have impacts on the waves and related deposition rates of sand on the beaches" SR page 84. This is a major concern as erosion is already experienced from Durban main beaches and northwards. This would need to be adequately assessed and if any doubt is identified regarding beach erosion and stability it would constitute a fatal flaw.	6/11/2016	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Transnet	<p>The simulations have indicated that the maximum possible change in seabed elevation due to sandwinning will result in changes to local coastal significant wave heights of less than 5% of the corresponding offshore significant wave height for the full range of wave directions.</p> <p>For the most frequently occurring wave directions, the changes to local coastal significant wave heights were found to be less than 1.5% of the corresponding offshore wave heights. It should be noted that the biggest storms are from S to SSW which is also the most frequently occurring wave direction. For the 1:10 year storm calculations the change in local coastal significant wave heights was found to be not more than 3.3% and 2.3% of the corresponding offshore heights E/EWE and W/SSW respectively.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that such minor differences in wave height under normal conditions will result in any negative impact on shoreline stability and sediment transport anywhere along the coastline in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>It is expected that any local increases in water depth due to dredging in the proposed areas will be reversed in a short period of time due to longshore sediment</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					transport of approximately 1,250,000 m ³ per annum.
82.	<p>Section 8.10.2 indicates impacts on seabirds was assessed as part of the Marine Impact Assessment.</p> <p>If this was done, how so, by who and can a copy of the Marine Impact Assessment (MIA) study be provided to me as an I&AP?</p> <p>If the MIA is still to be done or is underway, the Final Scoping Report is ambiguous as written in its current state. The word 'was' should really have been written as 'will be'.</p>	17/11/2016	<p>Craig Burne</p> <p>NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>A draft Marine Impact Assessment was compiled during the Scoping phase and is currently under review by the project team. The comments received during Scoping from authorities and IAPs may further influence the scope of this study. The report will only be available in the EIA phase (to be appended to draft EIA Report).</p> <p><i>Additional response after EIA Phase: Refer to Appendix F1 of the draft EIA Report.</i></p>
83.	<p>Section 8.11.2 indicates impacts of the proposed activity on biodiversity was assessed as part of the Marine Impact Assessment.</p>	17/11/2016	<p>Craig Burne</p> <p>NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd</p>		Refer to response provided to no. 82.
84.	<p>Section 12.1.2 states the proposed activity will not have any impact on climate change.</p> <p>This is strictly not true when looked at in a broader context, taking into account expansion of the harbour to allow more and larger shipping traffic/volumes.</p> <p>The cumulative effects & impacts of the proposed sandwinning activity on climate change, even though it is a stand-alone activity in the broader context of the overall Durban harbour upgrades & developments, are not addressed in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>If they may be addressed in the EIA phase and EIR, a conclusive remark as stated in section 12.1.2 should not</p>	17/11/2016	<p>Craig Burne</p> <p>NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd</p>	Nemai Consulting	<p>Any expansion project the Port would need to undergo an environmental assessment process during which the climate change implications will be discussed for each project.</p> <p>No climate change specialist study was recommended because the Offshore Sandwinning Application did not have an impact on climate change. Refer to response provided to no. 71.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>have been made.</p> <p>My point is that any uncertainties or unknowns should be stated. Rather state that the effects of the activity on climate change have not or will not be quantified and/or will not be investigated. Perhaps they will be addressed in the Final EIR? Perhaps Transnet will investigate such impacts as part of a SEA in the future? But as an I&AP, this statement is subjective and unfounded as is currently written.</p>				
85.	<p>Section 12.4.2 final sentence indicates the Marine Impact Assessment will assess impacts related to turbidity.</p> <p>Has the MIA been done? Or will it be done? Scoping report misleading in this regard.</p>	17/11/2016	Craig Burne NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd	Nemai Consulting	<p>The Marine Impact Assessment will be undertaken in the EIA phase, the findings of the study will be presented at the EIA public meeting.</p> <p><i>Additional response after EIA Phase: Refer to Appendix F1 of the draft EIA Report.</i></p>
86.	Section 12.8.2 indicates a Marine Impact Assessment will be done as part of the EIA Phase.	17/11/2016	Craig Burne NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd	Nemai Consulting	Refer to response provided to no. 85.
87.	Section 12.9.2 indicates impacts on avifauna were assessed as part of the Marine Impact Assessment.	17/11/2016	Craig Burne NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd	Nemai Consulting	Refer to response provided to no. 85.
88.	<p>Section 12.9.2 states the MIA has assessed impacts related to turbidity.</p> <p>If so, can I be provided with a copy of the MIA study? Or was it the intention of only ever doing a desktop MIA? If so, better to have stated such. Otherwise same</p>	17/11/2016	Craig Burne NCC Environmental Services (Pty) Ltd	Nemai Consulting Anchor Environmental	<p>Refer to response provided to no. 82.</p> <p>The likely magnitude of the turbidity plume associated with the proposed sandwinning activities was not modelled as part of the turbidity modelling studies. This</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	comment as Item 1.				was not deemed necessary by engineers due to the fact that the volume of suspended sediment is far greater for the dumping of dredged material in comparison to that of sandwinning. Hence, modelling was only undertaken for sediment plumes resulting from offshore disposal of dredged material (ZAA Engineering Projects and Naval Architecture, 2012). These models were run for the prevailing wind directions (south-west and north-east) at a velocity of 39 knots and are presented in Figure 34. Due to these prevailing winds, material disturbed on the bottom or released into the water column at the proposed sandwinning sites is likely to be carried in a north-easterly direction for the majority of the time but on occasion may also be carried towards the south-west. Given the small magnitude of the plume predicted from these studies, even under worse-case scenario conditions, it was concluded that additional modelling work for the sandwinning operations was not required. As sediment within the sites is relatively coarse, only a small plume area is likely to result from sandwinning operations.
89.	<p>Thank you for forwarding the abovementioned application to Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (Ezemvelo) for review and comment.</p> <p>Ezemvelo will not be providing comment on this application, but trust that all significant biodiversity related concerns have been clearly identified and made known in this assessment together with appropriate measures to safeguard the ecological integrity (viz. avoid, mitigate and thereafter ameliorate) of the developable area.</p> <p>Please be advised that the potential impacts upon</p>	22/11/2016	A Blackmore Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife	Nemai Consulting	Noted

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>biodiversity will be evaluated by the Competent Authority who may, upon receipt, refer the application this organization for evaluation and advice prior to making a decision. In such case, the environmental principles prescribed in the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998, the objectives of the National Environmental Management Biodiversity Act 10 of 2004 and best practice will be applied.</p> <p>Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife wishes you well with your assessment.</p>				
90.	With reference to the abovementioned Final Scoping Report please be advised that various Municipal Departments have had sight of the proposal and the following comments are submitted for your attention:	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	-	Responses to individual comments follow.
91.	<p>1. eThekweni Electricity Department. The H.V. Operations has no objections to the following proposal however please note:</p> <p>1.1 The applicant must consult eThekweni Electricity's mains records (held in the drawing office at the eThekweni Electricity Headquarters, 1 Jelf Taylor Crescent, for the presence of underground electrical services. In addition should any overhead line and/or servitude be affected, the specific permission of the Head: Electricity must be sought regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>1.2 The relocation of MV/LV electrical services, if required in order to accommodate the proposed development, will be carried out at the expense of the applicant.</p>	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Transnet	Noted.
92.	<p>2. Environmental Planning and Climate Protection Department. The Department provided comments regarding the above mentioned project, however it is noted that the</p>	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	<p>The findings of the specialist studies will be included in the EIA Report.</p> <p>The key climate change and climate change-related</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	comments have not been addressed in the Final Scoping Report. Therefore this Department will provide further comments upon receipt of the EIA Report.				<p>factors which can affect offshore sandwinning include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing storm surge heights; • Possible increases in storm intensity; • Changes in seasonable precipitation amounts; • Increasingly intense precipitation events; and • Changes in the morphology of the coastal area due to climate change may induce changes in erosion and sedimentation patterns, with potential consequences for offshore dredging requirements. <p>The effects of climate change such as increased storm events may have an impact on the project. The impacts of these storms on dredging activities at the offshore sandwinning site may result in delays in the anticipated programme as the dredger will not go out in unfavourable conditions. But these will be accounted for with days set aside for inclement weather.</p>
93.	3. Land Use Management Branch. This application has no Land Use Management implication.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted
94.	4. Strategic Spatial Planning Branch. Subsequent to the Draft Scoping Report this Branch acknowledges the need for such expansion but this Branch's support is conditional/subject to support of the Environmental Planning and Climate Protection Department, Environmental Health Department and eThekweni Water and Sanitation Department.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted
95.	5. Coastal, Stormwater and Catchment Management. No comments received.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted
96.	6. Parks, Leisure and Cemeteries. No comments received.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg	Nemai Consulting	Noted

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
			eThekwini Municipality		
97.	7. Geotechnical Engineering Branch. No geotechnical comment.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekwini Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted
98.	8. eThekwini Transport Authority. Please be advised that the Proposed Offshore Sand winning for developments within the Port of Durban as described in the Final Environmental Scoping Report is supported by this Department.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekwini Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted
99.	9. Environmental Health Department. The Final Scoping Report has no response to the comments provided by this Department and therefore this Department's previous comments remain applicable.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekwini Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Responses to the comments received from this Department were included in the Comments and Responses Report, which was appended to the Final Scoping Report. Further information regarding sediment characteristics, and possible associated water quality risks, are included in the EIA Report. <i>Additional response:</i> <i>Refer to response to no. 88 with regards to the potential turbidity plume.</i> <i>Refer to response provided to no. 56 with regards to the findings from the sediment quality assessment.</i>
100.	10. eThekwini Water and Sanitation Department. No comment from Pollution and Environment Branch.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekwini Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted.
101.	11. Durban Solid Waste. This Department has no requirements for this proposal.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekwini Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
102.	12. Disaster Management. No comment from this Department.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted.
103.	13. Fire Safety. No comment received.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted.
104.	Should you seek clarification on any of the above issues, please contact the writer on telephone: 031 - 3117136 or via e-mail: diane.vanrenburg@durban.gov.za. In addition, the Department requests that a copy of the Environmental Authorisation be emailed to the same address.	12/12/2016	D van Rensburg eThekweni Municipality	Nemai Consulting	All authorities and I&APs will be notified of DMR's decision. If an Environmental Authorisation is issued by DMR, a copy will be provided to eThekweni Municipality, as requested.

2.4. Comments Received – Review of Draft EIA Report & Public Meeting

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
105.	Enquired about the timeframes associated with the dredging operations. He also asked how many dredgers will be used.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA)	Transnet	It was indicated that the contractor will determine how many dredgers will be used. The contractor has not been appointed yet.
				Nemai Consulting	It was noted that as part of the project description in the EIA report the typical dredging cycle times are presented, which reflects an overall cycle time of 2.66 hours.
106.	Stated that the presentation by Transnet did not contain information with regards to other options that had been considered, apart from sandwinning. He also asked how	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	It was explained that this project is different from other EIAs as it entails mining of fill material offshore for construction associated with developments within the

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	the two proposed sandwinning sites included in the EIA were determined.				Port of Durban. However, each development within the Port can only proceed if the project has a positive Environmental Authorisation. In other words, this EIA is to authorise the offshore sandwinning operation by DMR while each development project in the Port can only use the offshore material if DEA has authorised the development. During the meeting the Berths 203 to 205 Project was used as an example to further explain the difference between the DMR and DEA authorisation.
				Transnet	It was indicated that Transnet appointed an independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) and through the EIA process the impacts associated with the alternative sites needed to be investigated. The EIA presentation will contain information regarding the rationale for identifying the proposed alternatives sites.
107.	Stated that this rationale needed to be provided by Transnet and not the consultant. He queried the reason for seeking a mining license, which is a national responsibility. He stated like any other mining in this country it will be destructive and the marine life will be destroyed. He indicated that this is a critical issue that needs to be addressed. He reiterated that the reasons for offshore sandwinning needed to be explained by Transnet.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	It was indicated that Transnet had presented the need for the material for future projects in the Port of Durban. The EAP presented the summary of the information contained in the EIA Report, however, Transnet did present the project background and motivation before the EAP's presentation.
108.	Expressed concern as currently there is legal process to seek approval for the mining of sand, and he wants to know the rationale behind this decision to undertake offshore sandwinning. He also expressed concern that once the licence is received Transnet will continue to mine to source material for whatever projects they have within the harbour. He requested further details in terms of Transnet's decision to pursue offshore sandwinning.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	It was noted that the EIA Report explains how the proposed alternative sandwinning sites were identified, based on previous studies. It was suggested that during the EAP's presentation the specific slide that deals with this matter could be explained further by Transnet.
109.	Emphasised that Transnet needed to respond to this, as it forms part of their presentation. He stated that it is unethical	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa	Transnet	It was explained that sand with appropriate characteristics is required for construction purposes. It

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>for the consultant to respond on behalf of Transnet as they should be independent. He indicated that in his view it shows collusion.</p> <p>Expressed concern that the true facts were not being presented and that the answers are not relevant to the questions being asked. He requested that it be recorded that Transnet's presentation does not contain all the information.</p>		SDCEA		was noted that other sites for sourcing construction material were not deemed to be suitable. Reference was made to investigations into possible sandwinning areas that had already been conducted in 2001, which lead to the identification of the current two sites.
110.	Expressed concern that Transnet is applying for an undefined project and they will continue to mine for 100 years.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Nemai Consulting	It was explained that the mining right application is valid for 30 years and it was emphasised that the material cannot be used if the project in the Port is not authorised.
111.	Asked how people had been invited to the public meeting and where was it advertised.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	It was indicated that as part of the announcement phase of the EIA site notices and a newspaper advert had been placed, and Background Information Documents had been distributed to IAPs. It was noted that the database from the Berths 203 – 205 EIA had also been taken into consideration. All parties who had registered as IAPs were included in the database. The notification for the review of the Draft EIA Report and public meeting had been sent via email to the registered IAPs.
112.	Stated that the database from another project could not be used for this EIA. He noted that there is no basis for assuming that the people involved in the Berths 203 – 205 EIA should be involved in this EIA.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	It was stated that Mr D'Sa misunderstood what was previously stated. It was explained that the EIA Regulations required that the project is advertised and that notices are provided to directly affected parties. This was undertaken. However, as an additional attempt to inform as many people as possible the IAPs registered as part of the Berths 203 – 205 Expansion EIA were also informed. This was done over and above what is required by the Regulations.
113.	Asked what was approved to date.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Nemai Consulting	It was explained that the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR) had accepted the Scoping Report and Plan of Study for the EIA, which allowed for the

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					commencement of the EIA phase of the overall process.
114.	Asked if Transnet had advised Nemaï on which sites to assess.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Nemaï Consulting	It was explained that Nemaï Consulting had received the project information from Transnet, which is included in the EIA Report. It was noted that this included the Geophysical and Sediment Sampling Survey that was undertaken by the Council for Geoscience in 2001, which identified and evaluated two possible sandwinning sites referred to as Area 1 and Area 2. It was indicated that Area 1 was identified as the preferred site as part of this study due to various reasons, which included the sensitivity of Area 2 and the occurrence of better material at Area 1. It was further explained that Area 1 was subsequently divided into 2 areas, known as Site 1 and Site 2, based on underwater heritage and that these two sites were taken forward in terms of the EIA.
115.	Queried why DMR is the competent authority and not the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA).	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Nemaï Consulting	It was indicated that according to the 2014 EIA Regulations DMR is the Competent Authority in terms of mining related activities. It was noted that the relevant activity triggered in terms of Listing Notice 2 is activity number 17, which pertains to projects that require a mining right. It was reiterated that the use of the material for different projects will require separate approval, where the current application is only for mining.
116.	Enquired about the distance of the proposed dredging from the harbour mouth, as well as the North and South Pier.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemaï Consulting	It was indicated that Site 1 occurs approximately 1.2 km east of the Port of Durban harbour mouth. It was also noted that the sailing distance at sea for a round trip by the dredger to Site 1 is approximately 5.5 nautical miles.
117.	Sought clarification with regards to the rate of replenishment considering that the proposed volume required is 4.5 million m ³ .	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Nemaï Consulting	It was stated that the area will be replenished in a short period of time due to longshore sediment transport.
				Transnet	It was clarified that the total volume required will be mined over the validity period of the Mining Right and not in a single dredge event.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
118.	Asked about the volume of material required for Berths 203 - 205. Asked if approval for this had already been granted by DMR.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Transnet	It was indicated that approximately 800 000 m ³ will be required.
				Nemai Consulting	It was explained that the DMR application is only for the mining of the sand offshore and that the use of the sand in the Port requires its own Environmental Authorisation. It was indicated that the Berths 203 – 205 Expansion EIA Project was authorised by DEA. However, the offshore sandwinning had not been approved yet by DMR.
119.	<p>The EAP made an error with the rate of replenishment therefore he would have expected the various Specialists to present their respective studies and not the EAP. He indicated that he was expecting to question the specialists on the reports and not the EAP. He was concerned that the opinion of the EAP and the scientist may differ. He stated that the EAP's interpretation of the studies gives the impression that there will not be any impacts to marine life. He stated that if the EAP presents the specialists' reports it shows bias towards the project. He expressed concern that the EAP will present the findings in a manner that is not correct. He indicated that it is wrong to present someone else's work and that the specialists should be presenting.</p> <p>Noted that the specialists have put their names on the reports which has been summarized by someone else, and the public were not given an opportunity to pose questions to the specialists. He stated that the process being followed is not professional.</p>	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	<p>It was explained that the EAP is presenting an overview of the EIA Report, which includes a summary of the specialist studies. The summary of the Specialist Studies in the EIA Report is prepared by the EAP while the full Specialist Studies are contained as Appendices to the EIA Report.</p> <p>It was stated that 3 Specialist Studies were undertaken namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Impact Assessment by Anchor Environmental; • Sediment Analysis Study by the CSIR; and • Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment by the African Centre for Heritage Activities. <p>It was stated that both the Marine Specialist and the CSIR were present to answer any questions regarding their studies. The HIA Specialist was not available however any queries for the HIA Specialist will be provided in the Comments and Responses Report. Transnet appointed ZAA to undertake the Engineering scope of work which included the Wave Modelling Study. Transnet were present to answer any Engineering related queries. It was reiterated that attendees were encouraged to raise their queries directly with the</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					Specialists who are present and they will respond. It was also explained that all IAPs had until 08/06/17 to raise queries.
				Transnet	It was noted that all specialists have signed their reports and that these reports are attached to the EIA Report. It was indicated that there is a 30-day commenting period during which questions could be raised, which would be responded to.
120.				Anchor Environmental	Specialists from Anchor Environmental were comfortable that the presentation delivered by the EAP provided an accurate summary of the findings of their specialist study. One of the authors of the specialist report (Dr Megan Laird) was available to answer any further questions but was prevented from doing so or presenting any additional information by the respondent.
121.				African Centre for Heritage Activities	The specialist from African Centre for Heritage Activities confirmed that the presentation made at the public meeting was accurate in terms of the Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment.
122.				CSIR	The specialist from CSIR confirmed the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was not prevented by Nema Consulting in providing responses at the public meeting; and • The key findings of the study that we performed were accurately represented in the public meeting.
123.	Asked if the 30-day commenting period started on the day of the meeting.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Transnet	It was mentioned that the commenting period started on 8 May 2017.
				Nema Consulting	It was explained that the EIA Report has been available since 8 May 2017 and that IAPs have until 8 June 2017 to comment on the document. It was noted that all registered IAPs have been notified that the document is available for public review. It was noted that the public

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					meeting is a presentation of the draft EIA Report. It was further indicated that the specialist studies are attached to the document and that the presentation was a summary of the findings. It was indicated that the summaries included in the presentation are taken directly from the Specialist Studies.
124.	Queried why the mining right cannot be applied for on a project-by-project basis. Transnet has not been a trusted partner in the past. He indicated that he is concerned that a general application is being made when Transnet is uncertain about what the dredged material is going to be used for.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Nemai Consulting	It was explained that the Mining Right is issued for a specific period of time and that the material can only be used in projects that have a positive Environmental Authorisation such as the Berths 203 to 205 Expansion Project. If a future project in the Port is not approved by DEA then there will be no use for the mined material.
125.	The EIA Report states that over time sediment will replenish, however, if organisms return they will not have a chance to recover due to ongoing mining. He stated that the Marine Impact Assessment report did not mention the endemic marine species that are under serious threat and did not assess the impacts to those species.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Nemai Consulting	It was explained that the total volume of material will not be mined all at once. It will be mined as and when required.
				Anchor Environmental	We acknowledge that benthic marine communities that colonise the sediment following each sandwinning event will be eliminated during each successive sandwinning event. The area affected is very small though and to the best of our knowledge does not contain any rare, range restricted or threatened species.
126.	Transnet only requires a portion of the volume they are applying for however they are applying for a larger volume because of future plans, which results in a lack of trust and honesty in the process.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Transnet	It was explained that in terms of the Port Development Framework, which is also a public document, you will see the expansions proposed for the Port of Durban. Each expansion study will undergo an environmental process and if the project is authorised then the material sourced offshore will be used.
127.	Is the proposed sandwinning area near the dump site, which is contaminated with heavy metals.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	CSIR	It was confirmed that the dump site is further offshore. The location of the sandwinning site in relation to the offshore disposal site was indicated on a map at the meeting.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
128.	I have seen a dredger dump material at the south pier.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	CSIR	It was explained that this is not the case, and that it is a vessel dredging at the sand trap.
129.	HB asked if the longshore sediment transport that will replenish the dredged area would also bring material from the dump site.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	CSIR	It was indicated that the dump site is located further away and that material will not be sourced from the dump site. It was also noted that the CSIR has conducted many surveys in that area and that the dump site is surprisingly uncontaminated.
130.	Asked if the sand that is dredged needed to be sorted before it is used.	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Transnet	It was indicated that the sand is ready for use and that it does not need to be treated.
131.	Mentioned that if a Mining Right is for a period of 30 years and you do not know what you are going to use the sand for then how do you know what quality of sand you will need. He also asked how Transnet knows that the sand from this site is going to be suitable or if there is a general standard for construction related material.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Transnet	It was explained that in terms of the Port Development Framework, which is also a public document, you will see the expansions proposed for the Port of Durban. It also shows the possible development of the Durban Dig-Out Port but this application is only for material required for developments within the Port of Durban. It was stated that this framework contains the future projects within the Port of Durban, and that it indicates projects that will be planned in the short and long term. It was noted that the dredged sand material will be suitable for all these developments within the Port.
				Nemai Consulting	It was emphasised that all projects that are planned in the future will need to go through their own EIA process.
132.	Has Transnet used sand from offshore sources previously.	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Transnet	It was confirmed that Transnet has used sand from offshore sources previously.
133.	Will sand from the old Durban Airport site be used for the Berths 203 - 205 Expansion Project. He also queried if sand from inland sources could be used instead of only using an offshore source. He noted that Transnet has done it before and asked why they are not investigating it in this instance.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Transnet	It was mentioned that there was a concern raised that illegal mining was taking place at the old airport site, which is being investigated by Transnet. It was stated that it has nothing to do with the proposed developments at the Port.
		18/05/17			It was indicated that the characteristics of the sand required for the Port developments needed to be suitability for construction purposes.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					It was indicated that wherever the sand is sourced from, Transnet will still need to seek approval to use the sand.
				Nemai Consulting	It was mentioned that the option of using sand from inland sources was raised during the Scoping Phase. It was explained that this option was discarded due to traffic impacts related to the hauling of the material. It was noted that a further response to this query will be provided in the Comments and Responses Report.
134.	Stated that they attended the meeting with the understanding that they would be getting the full report from the specialists. He noted that one specialist did not attend, one didn't present and the third read a summary done by the consultant. He requested an extension until 18 June 2017 to review the draft EIA Report, as there are a lot of unanswered questions and inconsistencies in what was heard at the meeting. He stated that he would like to send the report to their specialists for comment. He stated that the specialists that are present at the meeting were not allowed to present. He indicated that they need to compile questions to send to the specialists.	18/05/17	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	<p>It was reiterated that the specialists that are present can respond to questions.</p> <p>It was indicated that Nemai Consulting cannot provide an extension as the EIA timeframes are now mandatory. It was confirmed that Nemai Consulting will request an extension from DMR based on the concerns raised by Mr D'Sa. For clarification, it was confirmed that Mr D'Sa would like an extension for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EAP presented the findings of the Specialist Studies and not the Specialists themselves; • 2 of the 3 Specialists were present and Mr D'Sa wanted all 3 to be present; • The Specialists that were present were prevented from speaking; and • SDCEA would like an extension so that their Specialist could review the EIA Report. <p>In addition, it was asked that Mr D'Sa highlight the unanswered questions and inconsistencies in what was heard at the meeting so that the team can respond. No response was provided.</p> <p>It was noted that Nemai Consulting will apply for an</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					extension, however, comments must still be submitted by 8 June 2017 should DMR not grant the extension.
135.	Although Nemaï Consulting has stated that the entire report is available, it is very different from when it is being presented. He expressed his disappointment with the meeting. He asked who would check the impacts of the projects in the distant future, and queried whether anyone has gone back to look at the impacts that the widening of the mouth has had on marine life as many species have disappeared.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat Mr D'Sa	Nemaï Consulting	It was asked what differences were identified between the EIA Report and the presentations made. No response was provided.
136.	Ms Naidoo encouraged the attendee to raise their questions directly to the Specialist however Mr Bobat stated that it was too late to ask the specialists questions. Mr D'Sa also stated that it was unfair to fix a problem that was created at the beginning, as this issue was raised upfront and Nemaï Consulting persisted with doing the presentation. He indicated that he needed to leave the meeting as he needed to go to hospital. He stated that he was present during the majority of the meeting and that they were denied presentations by the specialists. He indicated that he was thus requesting an extension to the review period. He noted that he will submit a request in writing in this regard. He also indicated that he will submit a letter to DMR stating that the process has been unfair, that Nemaï Consulting did not allow the specialist to present and that they were not given the opportunity to pose questions to the specialists.			Nemaï Consulting	It was indicated that the meeting was scheduled to end at 18h30 and that it was only 18h10 therefore there was still sufficient time for the specialist to answer questions. It was further indicated that the recording of the meeting will be made available to DMR if they would like to confirm if the Specialists were denied an opportunity to respond. The CSIR did their own presentation and the EAP presented a summary of the Marine Impact Assessment and the Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment. The EAP also presented the findings of the Wave Modelling Study conducted by ZAA.
137.				Anchor Environmental	Refer to response to no. 120.
138.				CSIR	Refer to response to no. 122.
139.	Mr Burne stated that he is at the meeting in his personal capacity and would like to engage with the specialists present until the meeting is closed. He enquired about the methodology that was employed by the specialist to	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Anchor Environmental	It was indicated that a desktop study was conducted and that sampling was not undertaken. It was noted that they had considered existing studies in the study area. It was mentioned that no vulnerable or threatened species had

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	conduct the Marine Impact Assessment.				been identified in previous studies that had been done in that area.
140.	Mr Bobat stated that this renders the process flawed.	18/05/17	Hoosen Bobat	Nemai Consulting	Noted
141.	Asked if the Final EIA Report will be made available for public review.	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Nemai Consulting	It was indicated that the Final EIA Report will be made available for review via Dropbox, but that comments needed to be submitted directly to DMR.
142.	Recommended that Transnet undertakes a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Port of Durban, considering the planned projects in the Port.	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Nemai Consulting	It was indicated that Transnet is in the process of developing an SEA for the Port of Durban.
143.	Asked if the comments made at the meeting will be included in the Comments and Response Report. He also enquired whether comments from the Scoping phase would be included in the Final EIA Report.	18/05/17	Craig Burne	Nemai Consulting	It was confirmed that all comments from the meeting will be incorporated into the updated Comments and Responses Report, which will be appended to the Final EIA Report. It was also noted that the Comments and Responses Report contains various sections for comments received during the previous stages of the EIA process.
144.	Before Mr D'Sa and Mr Bobat left the meeting at 17H30 due other engagements, Ms Naidoo encouraged them to forward their comments on the draft EIA Report before the 08/06/17. She thanked them for their attendance and the public meeting continued until 18H30.	18/06/17	N Naidoo	N/A	N/A
145.	Dear Donovan Further to our discussions at the Public Meeting held on the 18th May 2017 which appeared to have been disrupted by a minority of very vocal attendees we wish to record our support for the above mentioned project. Furthermore we remain optimistic that our previous submissions to you will provide your client with a number of opportunities to unlock the economic potential of an underutilized asset. To this end we will be delighted to	23/05/2017	Graham Rose Royal Natal Yacht Club	Nemai Consulting	Any development in the Port would need to be discussed with eThekweni Municipality.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>discuss the matter with the appropriate representatives.</p> <p>In the event that we can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>				
146.	I was sorry to miss the entire presentation which looked comprehensive. Is there any chance of forwarding a pdf version?	23/05/2017	Jon Marshall Point Yacht Club	Nemai Consulting	A copy of the presentation was provided on 23 May 2017.
147.	<p>One thing that struck me during the part of the presentation that I saw was given that technology has made dredging operations relatively accurate, the fact that development is likely to be staged over decades and the relatively rapid replenishment of dredged trenches in two to three years, is it not possible to be more focused in terms of the dredged area. This might result in grading the mining area to ensure that, if sand is available, the same trench area is dredged repeatedly in order to minimise the disturbed area.</p> <p>I also attach a link to a recent video which illustrates wave conditions that occur at the harbour mouth from time to time as the sea builds up due to cyclones and wave refraction at the headland. I think that this is more a port operations issue than recreational boating but it does illustrate that the wave action issue is not necessarily related to impacts on the general coastline but probably more relevant to conditions at the harbour mouth.</p> <p>https://video.search.yahoo.com/yhs/search;_ylt=A0LEVvIWoiNZ0hoAFBwPxQt.;_ylu=X3oDMTByMjB0aG5zBGNvbG8DYmYxBHBvcwMxBHZ0aWQDBHNIYwNzYw--?p=boat+entering+south+african+port+you+tube&fr=yhs-avg-fh_lsonswrow&hspart=avg&hsimp=yhs-fh_lsonswrow#id=28&vid=c4cd743510fab660f86af6cee71ad9c2&action=view</p>	23/05/2017	Jon Marshall Point Yacht Club	ZAA Engineering Projects & Naval Architecture	<p>While it is correct that dredging with a TSHD is relatively accurate, it will most probably not be practical to narrow the sand winning site, with a trench effectively serving as a sand trap, as the monitoring and management of this would be very difficult and costly.</p> <p>Conditions at the Harbour Mouth have been taken into account in all the ZAA Hydrodynamic analyses.</p>

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>You may already have these points covered.</p> <p>I will ensure that both Coastwatch and the Point Yacht Club forward their comments in due course.</p>				
148.	<p>Dear Mr Henning</p> <p>Thank you for forwarding the abovementioned application to Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (Ezemvelo) for review and comment.</p> <p>Ezemvelo will not be providing comment on this application, but trust that all significant biodiversity related concerns have been clearly identified and made known in this assessment together with appropriate measures to safeguard the ecological integrity (viz. avoid, mitigate and thereafter ameliorate) of the developable area.</p> <p>Please be advised that the potential impacts upon biodiversity will be evaluated by the Competent Authority who may, upon receipt, refer the application this organization for evaluation and advice prior to making a decision. In such case, the environmental principles prescribed in the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998, the objectives of the National Environmental Management Biodiversity Act 10 of 2004 and best practice will be applied.</p> <p>Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife wishes you well with your assessment.</p>	23/05/2017	A Blackmore Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife	Nemai Consulting	Noted
149.	<p><u>Violation of public participation at public meeting on the 18th of May 2017.</u> The South Durban Community Environmental Alliance, as</p>	26/05/2017	Chadley Joseph SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	The information contained in the presentation was extracted from the specialist studies, as contained in the draft EIA Report. The specialists who undertook the

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>well as other civil society groupings attended a public participation meeting that took place on the 18th of May 2017, at the Royal Natal Yacht Club.</p> <p>We bring to your attention, which you have promised to record, a number of violations that took place at this meeting.</p> <p><u>Participation of the consultant/ Facilitator</u> We would like to bring to your attention the role the facilitator and consultant Nicky Naidoo and Donavan Henning of Nema Associates played in this presentation. Almost the entire presentation of the independent appointed experts was conducted by Mr Donovan Henning who is part of the consulting firm that is responsible for the process. We believe this was biased as this was not their duty to perform. It is if they were referee and player. This shows collusion between the developer and the consulting firm.</p> <p><u>The experts did not or were not allowed to present their work</u> Experts that were present at the meeting were not allowed to present their own work, after numerous requests by Dr Desmond D'Sa and Mr Bobat. We needed experts to present their findings as the consultant did not properly grasp the complex research and made mistakes such as the critical issue of the cubic meters required. We were not allowed to ask questions while Mr Donovan Henning read out these reports and informed by Ms Nicky Naidoo to do so at the end.</p> <p><u>The use of an old database, no public advertisement</u></p>				<p>Marine Impact Assessment and the Assessment of Sediment Quality were both present at the meeting to answer questions pertaining to their respective studies. The Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment, which confirmed that Site 1 (preferred site) is free of magnetic anomalies, was not present at the meeting. The preferred Site is the Site recommended by this Specialist.</p> <p>Transnet appointed the Engineering Team and Transnet was present to respond to technical queries related to the Wave Modelling Study.</p> <p>After the EAP presented the summary of the Marine Impact Assessment Mr D'Sa raised his objection. The specialist from the CSIR thereafter presented his own study. Attendees were encouraged to raise their queries directly with the specialist present, however, both Mr Bobat and Mr D'Sa indicated that they had to leave early therefore they could not raise their queries. Please see the responses from the Specialists below regarding this issue.</p> <p>The public participation process was undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations (2014). An advert was placed in a local newspaper and on-site notices were placed. In addition, Nema Consulting informed all IAPs on the Berths 203 to 205 Expansion database of the project. The intention was to reach as many IAPs as possible. A copy of the database was included in the draft Scoping and EIA Reports for review.</p> <p>A newspaper advertisement was placed during the initial notification and a copy was included in the Scoping</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>The consulting firm Nemai used an old database of people that attended the 203 and 205 EIA meeting. They admitted to not advertising in any local media (print or electronic) to inform the public of this large development. Which was evident by the attendees at the meeting as only 5 people represented the civil society. This development will affect a lot more people and yet was deemed not necessary to advertise.</p> <p><u>The impact on marine life</u> The Nemai consultant downplayed the impacts as being insignificant on marine life, and when prodded, admitted marine life in the proposed area would be destroyed during the dredging process.</p> <p><u>Request for an extension</u> Finally, with one expert absent and the others not allowed to present their findings to the public, we request an extension on the EIA to the 18th of June 2017. We disagree that an exemption should be provided as there is a huge risk involved in this proposed project. All recommendations by scientists must be peer reviewed and paid for by TRANSNET as we did not get the opportunity to discuss them in the meeting. We would also like the opportunity to present these findings to our public experts to ensure the data is independent, accurate and unbiased.</p> <p><u>Questions we feel were not answered adequately</u> We would like to bring to your attention, these questions we feel were not properly answered by Nemai or Transnet.</p>				<p>Report. As per the EIA Regulations (2014), Registered IAPs and authorities were notified of the review of the Draft EIA Report via email. Proof of notification, the advert and notices were included in the draft EIA report out for public review.</p> <p>The potential impacts to marine ecology that were presented during the public meeting were extracted from the Marine Impact Assessment. The specialist was available for questions during the meeting. The presentation made at the public meeting is included in the final EIA Report</p> <p>Nemai Consulting liaised with DMR regarding SDCEA's request for extension. DMR did not grant an extension as the Regulations did not preclude the EAP from presenting the findings of the Specialist Studies. DMR requested that all proof of notification the draft EIA Report was available for review to be included in the final EIA Report. Feedback was provided to Mr D'Sa via email together with the notes of the discussion with DMR.</p>
150.			Nemai Consulting	The listed activity associated with the proposed sandwinning that has been applied for is for a mining right, as contemplated in Section 22 of the Mineral and

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA), 2002 (Act No. 28 of 2002). According to the MPRDA, a mining right may not exceed 30 years.
151.	Why is the site in question, the one being used?			Transnet	Refer to responses to no. 106, 109 and 114.
152.				Nemai Consulting	As discussed in Section 11 of the draft EIA Report, a previous study undertaken by the Council for Geoscience in 2001 identified two potential offshore sandwinning sites, namely Area 1 and Area 2. Area 2 was discarded as part of this study for various reasons. Area 1 was divided into the alternative offshore sandwinning sites (Site 1 and Site 2) based on underwater heritage features, and these sites were assessed further as part of the EIA.
153.	How many dredges will be used in this process?			Transnet	The number of dredgers will be determined by the contractor.
154.	Have Transnet looked at other alternatives (other than dredging) to get these materials?			Nemai Consulting	The following alternatives to source material are discussed in the EIA Report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 11.4 – material from land based sources. This alternative was not deemed to be favourable due to impacts associated with road haulage. Section 11.5 - material from existing offshore sources. Currently there are no existing approved offshore sites.
155.	What is the thought process they have made to go down this route (sandwinning)? Where did it start, how did it start and what is its purpose?			Transnet	Refer to response to no. 131 regarding the Port Development Framework, as well as the introduction of the EIA Report.
156.	How close from the Piers will they be dredging?			Transnet	Refer to response to no. 116.
157.	What impact do the dredgers have on marine life in the area?			Anchor Environmental	A total of eight potential environmental impacts were assessed as part of the Marine Impact Assessment, ranging from habitat alteration to shoreline erosion (Table 14 in the draft EIA Report). Impact assessments for Site

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					1 and Site 2 were grouped together as no differences in marine life or sediment quality are expected. Identified impacts ranged from 'moderate' to 'insignificant' severity. Results from previous sediment plume analysis and shoreline stability specialist studies predicted no significant impacts associated with increased turbidity levels and beach erosion. Impacts on benthic macrofauna and fish are likely to be temporary and full recovery of the impacted area is expected within a one to two year period following the final sandwinning event. Details of the potential impacts are discussed further in Section 14.2 of the draft EIA Report.
158.	How will the dredges dispose of their waste?			Nemai Consulting	<p>Specific provisions with regards to waste management are included in the EMPr, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable handling and disposal protocols for solid waste; • Implementation of the 'reduce, reuse, recycle' ethos; • Adequate spill protection for fuel and oil; • Strict monitoring of vessels for fuel leaks; and • Implementation of a rigorous environmental management and control plan for the spillage of hazardous substances. <p>There are no associated infrastructure and services required for the proposed offshore sandwinning activity. Existing services will be used within the Port, where necessary. In addition, due to the nature of the proposed activity, no specific construction camp for offshore sandwinning will be in place. Instead, management of site camps, ablutions, and landside waste will be authorised as part of the respective Port development activities.</p>
159.	How much time will the site be given to recover?			Anchor Environmental	The Marine Impact Assessment found that impacts on benthic macrofauna and fish are likely to be temporary

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
					and full recovery of the impacted area is expected within a one to two year period following the final sandwinning event.
160.	How will they replenish the dredged site?			Transnet	Refer to response to no. 81.
161.	Did Transnet use material/ sand from the old airport site?			Transnet	No.
162.	What effect will the proposed dredging project have on the fish in the area, which is the livelihood of subsistence fisherfolk?			Anchor Environmental	<p>The proposed sandwinning will take place approximately 1 - 2km east of the Port of Durban.</p> <p>Based on the findings of the Marine Impact Assessment, most fish fauna associated with the sandy habitats off Durban are expected to be displaced from the sandwinning area whilst active sandwinning is taking place. Larger fish, elasmobranchs and cetaceans will probably swim away from the area of active sandwinning area and will not be susceptible to entrainment in the dredging equipment. Consequently, the anticipated impact of active sandwinning for larger mobile fauna is disturbance rather than mortality. Smaller cryptic species that shelter on or in the sediment and have more limited mobility (e.g. small sole, tonguefish, lizardfish and flounder) may get sucked up by the dredger and perish.</p> <p>The assessment of the sediment quality undertaken by CSIR (refer to Section 13.6 in the draft EIA Report) concluded that there is essentially no risk that metals in sediment at the sandwinning sites were toxic to sediment-dwelling organisms and also essentially no risk metals will be released into the water column during dredging.</p>
163.	Why there was no social enhancement study done to ascertain the number of people and groups affected and to			Nemai Consulting	The project site is approximately 1.2km east of the Port of Durban offshore. There is no immediate social

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	what extent?				environment that is affected by the project. However, potential impacts to the social environment are discussed in Sections 14.2.11 (noise), 14.2.12 (visual/seascape impacts), 14.2.13 (impairment of recreational activities) and 14.2.15 (socio-economic environment) of the EIA Report.
164.	<p>In order to prepare for the future container growth, the Port of Durban started a process for a phased container capacity expansion programme in order to improve throughput capacity by reconfiguring and rationalising the existing Durban Container Terminal (DCT). Pier 1 Phase 2 Project is part of the expansion programme and is seen as the key to the provision of medium and long term capacity. Other major expansion projects in the short term include deepening and lengthening of the North Quay, berth reconstruction and deepening at Island View and Maydon Wharf. As part of these expansions, TNPA has recognized the need for sandwinning of approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material which will be required as part of these developments. Two potential offshore sandwinning sites have been identified. Alternative Site 1 occurs approximately 1,2 km east of the Port of Durban harbour mouth and is approximately 110 hectares in size. Alternative Site 2 occurs slightly south of Alternative Site 1 and is approximately 250 hectares in size.</p> <p>Transnet National Ports Authority (TNPA) has recognized the need for sandwinning of approximately 4.5 million m³ of offshore material which will be required as part of preparations for the expansion of the Port of Durban, East Coast, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.</p>	05/06/2017	<p>Lesa la Grange</p> <p>South African Heritage Resources Agency</p>	Nemai Consulting	Noted. Introductory section of letter.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>An Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment (UHIA) was conducted to assess the viability of two offshore areas for sandwinning to assist in identifying the least potentially destructive alternative from a heritage point of view.</p> <p>SAHRA thanks the applicant for the opportunity to comment on the aforementioned UHIA, and expects that the following specific points must be noted and adhered to:</p>				
165.	<p>1. On the basis of the findings of the specialist contracted to conduct the UHIA, the MUCH unit at SAHRA insists that offshore sandwinning zone 'Alternative 1' is preferred from a heritage and operational perspective. The presence of known shipwrecks protected under the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), No. 25 of 1999, and the greater relative frequency of magnetometer anomalies found in Alternative 2, increases the likelihood of irreversible disturbance to underwater heritage resources. Should Alternative 2 be used, SAHRA considers it definite that permits shall be required to work in the vicinity of known or suspected shipwrecks.</p>			Nemai Consulting	This concurs with the findings of the UHIA, which concluded that Site 1 is preferred.
166.	<p>2. Although it is noted that much of the heritage material in Alternative 1 is likely ex-situ, SAHRA nonetheless deems the material significant and insists that no shipwreck or associated cargo or debris may be disturbed without a valid NHRA Section 35 permit. It is often the case that underwater heritage material is of secondary context, due to the very nature of the dynamic underwater environment, but even disturbed underwater heritage material can give great insight to our maritime history. SAHRA will therefore assess the potential impacts, as determined by a suitably qualified maritime archaeologist, of disturbance and issue such</p>			Nemai Consulting	<p>The recommendations that emanated from the UHIA were included in the EMP, which included the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of MUCH sites against vandalism, destruction and theft. • The preservation and appropriate management of new discoveries in accordance with the NHRA, should these be discovered during dredging activities. • The dredgers should be notified and held to the no-dredge zone to avoid destroying MUCH sites. • The contractors and workers should be notified that

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	permits as may be necessary, possible, and expedient on the basis of the significance of the material to be disturbed.				<p>archaeological sites might be exposed during the dredging activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should any heritage artefacts be exposed during dredging, work on the area where the artefacts were discovered, shall cease immediately and the Transnet Environmental Officer shall be notified as soon as possible. • All discoveries shall be reported immediately to a heritage practitioner so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. Acting upon advice from these specialists, the Transnet Environmental Officer will advise the necessary actions to be taken. • Under no circumstances shall any artefacts be removed, destroyed or interfered with by anyone on the site. • Contractors and workers shall be advised of the penalties associated with the unlawful removal of cultural, historical, archaeological or palaeontological artefacts, as set out in the NHRA, Section 51(1). • Transnet must take responsibility to contact the heritage practitioner to assess any sites uncovered during the project. • If the proposed dredge area is accepted, the co-ordinates of the new dredge area should be programmed into the dredger position fixing equipment.
167.	3. Given that a greater relative frequency of magnetic anomalies occurs at the northern edge of Alternative 1, particular care must be taken during dredging along this aspect. Magnetic anomalies must be investigated prior to employing the dredger in the vicinity. Any area within Alternative 1 which has magnetic anomalies is			African Centre for Heritage Activities	The mag hits are between 80 and 90 m off of the edge of Alternative 1. Care must be taken in the vicinity and any discoveries will be reported for investigation.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	hereby declared a no-dredge zone, and dredging within 50 (fifty) meters of the edges of the magnetic 'hit' (whether detected during an earlier survey or any subsequent survey) must be avoided.				
168.	4. Should any cultural heritage material be found and be in danger of unavoidable disturbance, SAHRA must be notified immediately AND work must cease and may not commence until feedback has been received from SAHRA.			Nemai Consulting	Refer to response provided to no. 166. The recommendation is included in Section 12.11 of the EMPr.
169.	5. All efforts must be made to avoid disturbance of cultural heritage material.			Nemai Consulting	Refer to response provided to no. 166. The recommendation is included in Section 12.11 of the EMPr.
170.	Please provide the letter from the Department of Minerals Resources you have spoken about in your email. We need your presentation and the specialist reports as agreed at the meeting to be sent to us the next day as we need this to be reviewed .This a blatant disregard of a request and in violation of the EIA regulations. We await your responses and we cannot guarantee that we will be able to send any comments through as you have delayed providing the information. Once you have provided we will then send this through to our experts to discuss and provide a response. if need be based on our experts we will then look at the response time?	05/06/2017	Desmond D'Sa SDCEA	Nemai Consulting	We had a telephonic discussion with the DMR KZN Regional Manager: Mineral Regulation (Karooon Moodley) and he indicated that the extension could not be granted. He also stated that we needed to notify SDCEA in this regard. Please find attached a copy of the presentation from the public meeting. The Draft EIA Report, which contains the Specialist Studies, can be downloaded from the following link: https://www.dropbox.com/s/p7jaxw6168alai3/10451-20170502-OSW%20dEIR%20%28Scanned%29.pdf?dl=0 .
171.	Please can you provide the comment in writing from the department . As you are aware the law is very strict and would need this in writing for any future case we might take on review .You either provide any written correspondence whether it is a letter or email or you provide notes of the				Please find attached correspondence sent to DMR, as confirmation of our discussion with them with regards to this matter. <i>Content of email to DMR:</i>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
meeting with Karoon Moodley with days times and what was discussed and his contact numbers,				<p><i>Dear Karoon</i></p> <p><i>Our telephone conversation today has reference.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. D D'Sa requested an extension to the review period because 1 of the 3 Specialists was not present at the public meeting and that the EAP presented the summary of the Specialist Studies. Both the CSIR and the Anchor Environmental were both present to answer questions on their studies however the Heritage Specialist was not present.</i> <i>2. Transnet appointed the Engineers and Transnet was present to answer technical questions.</i> <i>3. We will response to the queries raised by D D'Sa in the Comments and Response Register that the Regulations do not require the Specialists to present their reports and that Desmond can forward his queries regarding the Specialist Studies to us by 08/06/17.</i> <p><i>Thank you for your guidance on the matter.</i></p>
<p>172. Dear Sirs</p> <p>Point Yacht Club is a recreational sports club committed to providing water sports opportunities for the people of South Africa and particularly the Durban area. We are lucky to have access to Durban Bay for our members and we work with the authorities to ensure that recreational water sports are undertaken in a safe manner that co-exists with port operations. Our main focus with this and other projects is to ensure that we have a safe and clean environment in which to undertake our activities.</p>	05/06/2017	Darryl Williams Point Yacht Club	Nemai Consulting	Noted. Introductory section of letter.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>PROPOSED OFFSHORE SANDMINING FOR DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE DURBAN HARBOUR DMR Reference No: KZN30/5/1/1/2/00070BP Applicant: Transnet National Port Authority</p> <p>COMMENT ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT (May 2017):</p> <p>We are pleased to have been given the opportunity of participation in this process and are pleased to provide the following comments on the draft Environmental Impact Assessment report.</p>				
173.	<p>1. Our main concern relates to safety. We note that dredging may take place intermittently over a substantial period. Whilst recreational boaters are trained to take all operational activities into account as they pass through and close to the harbor mouth, we request that notice is given to recreational users through the established clubs prior to commencement of each dredging period. The clubs can then ensure that their members are informed.</p>			Transnet	<p>Safety is of paramount importance to Transnet. All shipping and/or recreational boat users must be in constant contact with the TNPA control tower regarding movement in and out of the Port.</p> <p>A notice will be sent to all recreational users through the established clubs prior to the commencement of each dredging period.</p>
174.	<p>2. We are pleased that using dredged material from existing sandbanks within the harbor as was suggested by a stakeholder at the scoping meeting was not considered as an alternative. Our view is that this is likely to have a negative impact on biodiversity within the estuary.</p>			Nemai Consulting	Comment noted.
175.	<p>3. Siltation within the harbour is an important issue for us with moorings at each end of the bay becoming negatively affected. We note that the effect of northerly and southerly wind conditions were considered in the sediment study. The tidal effect of water flowing in and</p>			ZAA Engineering Projects & Naval Architecture	<p>The tidal effect of water flowing into and out of the Bay has been taken into account in all of the following studies which formed part of the EIA and the design for Pier-2 Berth Deepening:</p> <p>1. Transnet Soc Ltd, Feasibility Study (FEL3) for the</p>

COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
<p>out of the bay does not seem to have been considered however. This effect can be felt a long distance offshore particularly during the larger tidal cycles and it regularly carries a substantial amount of material both into and out of the harbor. Whilst the deposition of dredged material in the bay may be of greater concern, the specialist should perhaps also consider this aspect.</p>				<p>Deepening of Berths 203 to 205, Port of Durban, Dredging, Turbidity and Physical Impact Study, ZAA 1370-RPT-008 Rev G;</p> <p>2. Transnet Soc Ltd, Feasibility Study (FEL3) for the Deepening of Berths 203 to 205, Port of Durban, Report on Wave and Current Measurements,, ZAA 1370-RPT-033 RevT00, May 2016; and</p> <p>3. Transnet Soc Ltd, Feasibility Study (FEL3) for the Deepening of Berths 203 to 205, Port of Durban, Amended EIA Report: Response to Interested and Affected Parties Queries Regarding Storm Surge and Cyclones, ZAA 1370-RPT-047 Rev B.</p> <p>The following Report addressed wave conditions for three tidal states, being LAT (0.0 metres), Mid-Tide (1.11 metres) and High Tide (HAT 2.3 metres): Transnet Soc Ltd, Port of Durban, Sand Winning Site Study, ZAA 1411-RPT-048 Rev B, 27 May 2016. <i>This report was appended to the Draft EIA Report (see Appendix F3).</i></p>
<p>176. Coastwatch, WESSA Durban Branch and Birdlife Port Natal, non-governmental organisations formed by volunteers and operating with support of people interested and/or affected by issues relating to the area share interest in development and change of land use applications in the eThekwin area. The organisations serve to ensure that development in the eThekwin area is appropriate, sustainable and legally compliant. The following comments are submitted on behalf of these organisations.</p> <p>PROPOSED OFFSHORE SANDMINING FOR DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE DURBAN HARBOUR DMR Reference No.: KZN30/5/1/1/2/00070BP Applicant: Transnet National Port Authority</p>	07/06/2017	Carolyn Schwegman Coastwatch	Nemai Consulting	Noted. Introductory section of letter.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>COMMENT ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REPORT (May 2017):</p> <p>Coastwatch, in collaboration with the abovementioned organisations, has reviewed the draft document and we raise the following issues which we believe need to be addressed;</p>				
177.	1) Neither Section 10, Need and Desirability, nor Section 11, Alternatives, addresses the possible use of material that Transnet currently dredges from the "Sand Trap" which is located just south of the southern breakwater. This issue was raised during scoping but does not appear to have been addressed.			Transnet	Refer to response provided to no. 77.
178.	2) The desktop marine impact assessment is insufficient as it does not actually tell us what is on site. The data is gleaned from numerous historic studies some of which date from the 1990s. We would expect that at least a brief physical survey would be undertaken in order to verify conclusions drawn on the desk top study.			Anchor Environmental	We acknowledge that it would be ideal to have access to primary data regarding faunal and floral communities present at all sites where development takes place. However, the costs of acquiring such information must be weighed up against the potential risks posed by the development. In this instance, our specialists were comfortable that sufficient information was available on the communities in the effected environment to enable the project to be undertaken at a desktop level.
179.	3) We were informed at the recent public meeting that the material applied for would, if removed uniformly in one operation, result in a depression approximately 4 - 5m deep and that this depression would naturally re-fill over a small number (2-3) of years. We were also informed that this situation was highly unlikely to arise and that Transnet is likely to extract small amounts of material as Port projects proceed. Given that technology has made dredging operations relatively accurate, the fact that development is likely to be staged over decades and the relatively rapid			Nemai Consulting	It was not suggested at the public meeting that all material will be removed at one time. See presentation attached to minutes of meeting in Appendix K of the Final EIA Report.
180.				Transnet	While it is correct that dredging with a TSHD is relatively accurate, it will most probably not be practical to narrow the sand winning site, with a trench effectively serving as a sand trap, as the monitoring and management of this would be very difficult and costly.

	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	DATE	RAISED BY	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY	RESPONSE
	replenishment of dredged trenches, is it not possible to be more focused in terms of the dredged area? This might result in grading the mining area to ensure that, if sand is available, the same trench area is dredged repeatedly in order to minimise the footprint and ecological disturbance.				Conditions at the Harbour Mouth have been taken into account in all the ZAA Hydrodynamic analyses.
181.	Notified DMR and Nemai Consulting that consolidated comments from the eThekweni Metropolitan Municipality will only be provided the following week.	12/06/17	Diane Van Rensburg Ethekwini Metropolitan Municipality	Nemai Consulting	Noted.