

**Application for Environmental Authorization for the Proposed Establishment of an
Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal Province**

APPENDIX E PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

Compiled by:



NULEAF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PTY LTD

On behalf of:

The Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

JANUARY 2019

Contents

SECTION 1: PRE-APPLICATION NOTIFICATION.....	1
APPENDIX E.1.1 Process notices and advertisements	1
Newspaper advertisement	1
Site notices	2
BID	4
APPENDIX E.1.2 Key stakeholders.....	14
Proof of Notification	14
Read Receipts	16
Replies and Registration	18
APPENDIX E.1.3 Pre-Application Comments and Response Register	20
APPENDIX E.1.4 Correspondence and Minutes of Meetings	23
SECTION 2: DRAFT SCOPING REPORT	31
APPENDIX 2.1 Draft Scoping Report:	31
Proof of notification & invitation to comment (Stakeholders and Compliance Organizations)	31
Read Receipts	33
APPENDIX E.2.2 Comments and response register.....	36
APPENDIX E.2.3 Correspondence and Minutes of Meetings	60
APPENDIX E.4 List of Registered Interested and Affected Parties.....	74
SECTION 3: FINAL SCOPING REPORT	77
APPENDIX E.3.1 Final Scoping Report:.....	77
Proof of notification & invitation to comment (Stakeholders and Compliance Organizations)	77
Read Receipts	79
APPENDIX E.3.2 Comments and Response Register	83
SECTION 4: DRAFT EIR.....	92

SECTION 1: PRE-APPLICATION NOTIFICATION

APPENDIX E.1.1 Process notices and advertisements

Proof of Placement

Newspaper advertisement

A newspaper advertisement was placed in the Zululand Observer on 18 August 2017.

18 AUGUST 2017
ZO CLASSIFIEDS 33

0915
SALE IN EXECUTION

AUCTION NOTICE OF SALE
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA, KWAZULU-NATAL DIVISION, PIETERMARITZBURG.
CASE NUMBER: 18845/2014, STANDARD BANK OF SOUTH AFRICA LIMITED / HENQUE 4214 CC. Registration Number: 2001/039354/23 & R CARSTENS.

This is a sale in execution pursuant to a judgment obtained in the above Honourable Court in terms of which the following property will be sold in execution on 30 AUGUST 2017 AT 12H00, IN

NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORIZATION PROCESSES: USUTHU TEMBE FUMBI BUSH LODGE ACCOMMODATION

Notice hereby given in terms of Regulation 41(2)(c) published in the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (as amended) of the intention to carry out listed activities requiring environmental authorization under Section 24(5) read with Section 44 of the Act. In terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations contained within the Act (07 April 2017), environmental authorization must be obtained by Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife by the Department of Environmental Affairs.

Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife is proposing the construction of a new camp and related facilities, which include a lodge, tented chalets and a guard house within Tembe Elephant Park within uMhlathuze Local Municipality.

All Interested and Affected Parties are requested to register with NZINGWE CONSULTANCY (Independent Environmental Practitioner), to raise issues, concerns, comment no later than 14 days of this advert.

Nzingwe Consultancy: Zamandaba B. Sibiba
P O Box 939, Shelly Beach, 4265
Tel: 039 315 7751, Fax: 039 315 4737
Email: enviro@nzingwe.co.za

FRONT OF THE OFFICE OF SHERIFF HLABISA & NONGOMA, LOT 51 JAN SMUTS AVENUE, MUTUBATUBA, ZONING: BUSINESS RESIDENTIAL (NOTHING GUARANTEED) the material terms are 10% deposit, balance payable on transfer, guarantees within 21 days of sale. The

ROOMS, TOILET, SHOWER, KITCHEN & CONCRETE WALL. Physical address is LOT 51 JAN SMUTS AVENUE, MUTUBATUBA. ZONING: BUSINESS RESIDENTIAL (NOTHING GUARANTEED) the material terms are 10% deposit, balance payable on transfer, guarantees within 21 days of sale. The

pre-requisite subject to conditions, inter alia: A) Registration as a Buyer in the matter between VOLTEX (PTY) LTD T/A WACO DURBAN Execution Creditor And PERSIAN STAR INVESTMENTS 30 CC T/A JOZINI HARDWARE First Execution Debtor AUCITION In pursuance of a judgement in the Magistrate's Court for the district of Ubombo, held at Ubombo in the above-mentioned case, and by virtue of a Writ of Execution issued thereon, the goods listed hereunder will be sold by public auction to the highest bidder for cash, at Persian Star/Jozini Hardware, Main Road, Jozini on 23rd August 2017, at 14H00 in the forenoon, or so soon thereafter. Goods: All stock in trade Only cash or bank guaranteed cheques will

DISTRICT OF UBOMBO HELD AT UBOMBO
CASE NO. 3302015
In the matter between:
VOLTEX (PTY) LTD T/A WACO DURBAN
Execution Creditor
And
PERSIAN STAR INVESTMENTS 30 CC
T/A JOZINI HARDWARE
First Execution Debtor
AUCITION
In pursuance of a judgement in the Magistrate's Court for the district of Ubombo, held at Ubombo in the above-mentioned case, and by virtue of a Writ of Execution issued thereon, the goods listed hereunder will be sold by public auction to the highest bidder for cash, at Persian Star/Jozini Hardware, Main Road, Jozini on 23rd August 2017, at 14H00 in the forenoon, or so soon thereafter. Goods: All stock in trade Only cash or bank guaranteed cheques will

INVITATION TO TENDER

Tenders are hereby invited for the following tenders:

CONTRACT DESCRIPTION	CIDB REQUIREMENT	PREFERENTIAL PROCUREMENT METHOD
1) TENDER 8/2/1 UMH134/16/17: RENOVATIONS OF HLANGANANI OFFICE	3GB or higher	80:20 method for amounts below R50 000 000,00
2) TENDER 8/2/1 UMH137-16/17: CONSTRUCTION OF FENCE WALL AT VULINDELELA OFFICE	3GB or higher	80:20 method for amounts below R50 000 000,00

NB: Failure to submit all compulsory documents with the tender document on the closing date will lead to disqualification.

NB: Regulation 44 of the Supply Chain Management Regulations states that the Municipality may not make any award to a person who is in the service of the state, and if that person is not a natural person, of which any Director, Manager, Principal, Shareholder or Stakeholder is a person in the service of the state, or who is an advisor or consultant contracted with the municipality or municipal entity.

NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS: PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A LAND-BASED AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE IN AMATIKULU, KWAZULU-NATAL

The proposed development entails the establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone (ADZ) to the north of the Amatikulu estuary in KwaZulu-Natal. The ADZ will entail the establishment of aquaculture facilities that will be used for the farming of a range of species, which could include Dusky Kob, Barramundi, Scallops, Sea Cucumbers, marine and freshwater Ornamental Fish and Ornamental Plants, Tilapia, Catfish and Nile Crocodile. Phase 1 will comprise the refurbishment of earthen ponds and tunnel based tank systems that were historically used for Prawn and Ornamental Fish culture (activities will include the installation of water supply for farming, a facility to grow fingerlings, building of a feed store, other storage and offices). Phase 2 will entail the extension of the aquaculture facilities and the installation of civil infrastructure that will allow for the establishment of a range of production systems, for the range of species. Infrastructure for the ADZ will include administration buildings, storage areas, fish processing and packaging facilities, access roads, electricity and water reticulation, sea water supply and discharge, pump stations, reservoirs and fencing.

The full scoping and environmental impact report process provided for in Regulations 21 and 23 read with Appendices 2 and 3 of GN R326 of 7 April 2017 of the EIA Regulations, as amended, under NEMA will be followed for the application.

Notice is given in terms of section 24(5) read with Section 44 of the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA) of intent to apply for Environmental Authorisation to undertake the following listed activities:

Listing Notice 1: 3(iii), 4 (iii), 6 (i) (ii) (iii), 8, 9 (i) (ii), 10 (i) (ii), 12 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xi) (xii) (a) (c), 13, 15, 17 (i) (iii) (v) (f), 18, 19, 19A (i) (ii) (iii), 25, 27, 30, 34 (iii), 41 (i) (ii) (iii) (No. R.327, 7 April 2017),

Listing Notice 2: 6, 14 (iii) (a), 15 (No. 325, 7 April 2017) and

Listing Notice 3: 2 (d) (v) (vii) (xii) (aa) (bb), 4 (d) (i) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb), 12 (d) (iv) (v) (vi) (viii) (xiii), 13 (d) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii) (x), 14 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xii) (a) (c); (d) (i) (iv) (vii) (x) (aa) (bb), 18 (d) (v) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb), 23 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xii) (a) (c); (d) (iii) (iv) (vii) (x) (aa) (bb), 24 (d) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii) (x) (No. R.324, 7 April 2017).

If you are an Interested and / or Affected Party and would like to register as part of the public participation process, please provide your name, contact details, and the nature of your interest in the project to the person below by no later than Monday 18 September 2017.

To register or for more information, please contact Bryony van Niekerk (NuLeaf Planning and Environmental), 8a Trevor Street, Murrayfield, 0184. Tel: 012 753 5792; Fax: 086 571 6292; Email: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za

ma011717-17©

NOTICE OF APPLICATION IN TERMS OF SECTION 42(1)(b) AND REGULATION 5(2) OF ACT Kwazulu-Natal Liquor Licensing Act, 2010 (Act No. 6 of 2010)

KZNLA 4

Notice is hereby given that it is the intention of the person whose details are set out below to lodge an application for a **Tavern Licence** with the secretary of the local committee of **Zululand District**.

- Full names and surname of the applicant: NELUSWE GRACE DUBAZANA
- Intended trading name: DLULUNGENE TAVERN
- Identity number or Registration number: ID: 420060915 085
- Full address and address of the premises: OKUKU RESERVE, NO. 14376, DINGI AREA 5, Type of licence applied for: SECTION 39(A)(VIII) TAVERN
- Names and nature of educational institutions within a radius of 500 metres of the premises: NONE
- Names and distances to similar licensed premises within a radius of 500 metres of the premises: NONE
- Places of worship within a radius of 500 metres from the premises: NONE
- The notices have been displayed at the proposed premises, visible to all passers-by: YES

Contact number: 083 341 4554

NB: Objections should be lodged with the local committee in the district from where the application emanates or the Station Commander of the local SA Police Station within 21 days from the date of the display.

251 Utrecht Street
EDTECA Offices
Vryheid
Tel: 034 989 5102
Email: Nkosinathi.Mosia@kznqla.co.za

NOTICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS: PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A LAND-BASED AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE IN AMATIKULU, KWAZULU-NATAL

The proposed development entails the establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone (ADZ) to the north of the Amatikulu estuary in KwaZulu-Natal. The ADZ will entail the establishment of aquaculture facilities that will be used for the farming of a range of species, which could include Dusky Kob, Barramundi, Scallops, Sea Cucumbers, marine and freshwater Ornamental Fish and Ornamental Plants, Tilapia, Catfish and Nile Crocodile. Phase 1 will comprise the refurbishment of earthen ponds and tunnel based tank systems that were historically used for Prawn and Ornamental Fish culture (activities will include the installation of water supply for farming, a facility to grow fingerlings, building of a feed store, other storage and offices). Phase 2 will entail the extension of the aquaculture facilities and the installation of civil infrastructure that will allow for the establishment of a range of production systems, for the range of species. Infrastructure for the ADZ will include administration buildings, storage areas, fish processing and packaging facilities, access roads, electricity and water reticulation, sea water supply and discharge, pump stations, reservoirs and fencing.

The full scoping and environmental impact report process provided for in Regulations 21 and 23 read with Appendices 2 and 3 of GN R326 of 7 April 2017 of the EIA Regulations, as amended, under NEMA will be followed for the application.

Notice is given in terms of section 24(5) read with Section 44 of the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA) of intent to apply for Environmental Authorisation to undertake the following listed activities:

Listing Notice 1: 3(iii), 4 (iii), 6 (i) (ii) (iii), 8, 9 (i) (ii), 10 (i) (ii), 12 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xi) (xii) (a) (c), 13, 15, 17 (i) (iii) (v) (f), 18, 19, 19A (i) (ii) (iii), 25, 27, 30, 34 (iii), 41 (i) (ii) (iii) (No. R.327, 7 April 2017),

Listing Notice 2: 6, 14 (iii) (a), 15 (No. 325, 7 April 2017) and

Listing Notice 3: 2 (d) (v) (vii) (xii) (aa) (bb), 4 (d) (i) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb), 12 (d) (iv) (v) (vi) (viii) (xiii), 13 (d) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii) (x), 14 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xii) (a) (c); (d) (i) (iv) (vii) (x) (aa) (bb), 18 (d) (v) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb), 23 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xii) (a) (c); (d) (iii) (iv) (vii) (x) (aa) (bb), 24 (d) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii) (x) (No. R.324, 7 April 2017).

If you are an Interested and / or Affected Party and would like to register as part of the public participation process, please provide your name, contact details, and the nature of your interest in the project to the person below by no later than Monday 18 September 2017.

To register or for more information, please contact Bryony van Niekerk (NuLeaf Planning and Environmental), 8a Trevor Street, Murrayfield, 0184. Tel: 012 753 5792; Fax: 086 571 6292; Email: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za

ma011717-17©

shauhin@mb.co.za
18-08-2017

AND THINK

AUCTION NOTICE OF SALE IN EXECUTION IN THE MAGISTRATE'S COURT FOR THE

Civic Offices
Private Bag X1004
RICHARDS BAY
3900
MNS4/2017
(DMS1207003)

DR N J SIBEKO
MUNICIPAL MANAGER

1

Site notices

Site notices were placed at the following locations in and around the site on 11 August 2017:



Dokodweni Beach picnic spot

Latitude: 29; 4; 48.6245

Longitude: 31; 38; 38.0259



Entrance gate to the Site

Latitude: 29; 4; 17.4302

Longitude: 31; 38; 49.1633



Along the access road leading to the Site

Latitude: 29; 4; 22.1681

Longitude: 31; 38; 39.3786



At a local liquor store in the surrounding community

Latitude: 29; 4; 15.8509

Longitude: 31; 38; 31.8942



Tribal Office

Latitude: 29; 7; 4.3949

Longitude: 31; 30; 0.1510

BID

The following document was circulated to identified Stakeholders, Compliance Authorities and Interested and Affected Parties on 15 August 2017.



Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KwaZulu-Natal

BACKGROUND INFORMATION DOCUMENT

August 2017

In terms of the 2014 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, as amended, published in terms of Section 24(5) of the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA), the Project Applicant, **The Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF)**, hereby gives notice of its intention to apply for Environmental Authorisation from the **National Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA)** as the Competent Authority, for the proposed establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone (ADZ) in Amatikulu, KwaZulu-Natal.

The Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Report process provided for in Regulations 21 and 23 read with Appendices 2 and 3 of GN R326 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, published under NEMA will be followed for the application for Environmental Authorisation.

By virtue of location, you have been identified as a potential **Interested and / or Affected Party (I&AP)** to this process, and are hereby invited to participate.

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT TELLS YOU

This Background Information Document (BID), provides you, as a potential I&AP, with background information on the proposed project, as well as, information regarding the **Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Process** that is currently underway to assess the potential environmental impacts (i.e. positive and negative; as well as, direct; indirect and cumulative) of the proposed project.

It further indicates how you can become involved in the project, receive information and raise issues that may concern and/or interest you. The sharing of information forms an important component of the Public Participation Process and not only provides you with the opportunity to become actively involved, but also to provide information that may be of value for the proposed development.

BACKGROUND

In 2009, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries completed a project aimed at identifying suitable land and sea space surrounding South Africa's coastal provinces for the establishment of Aquaculture Development Zones (ADZ's).

An ADZ is an area that has been earmarked specifically for aquaculture activity. The purpose of an ADZ is to encourage investor and consumer confidence, create incentives for industry development, provide aquaculture services, manage risk associated with aquaculture, as well as to provide skills development and employment for coastal communities. The development of ADZs supports the Aquaculture Policy objective aimed at creating an enabling environment that will promote growth and sustainability of the aquaculture sector in South Africa, as well as to enhance the industry's contribution to economic growth.

PROPERTY & PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Amatikulu site is situated in the KwaZulu Natal province, approximately 120 km north of Durban. The site has an area of approximately 108.37 Ha in size. The site is situated north east from the Amatikulu estuary and is characterized by a low lying estuarine coastal zone with tropical vegetation and predominantly sandy substrate.

Current infrastructure on the site consists of gravel roads, tanks and ponds in various states of functionality, a range of buildings and a fence that encloses parts of the site. Operations currently being undertaken on the site include the following:

1. *Amatikulu Pet Products* which consists of an administrative building and a factory facility that manufactures pet products, as well as a pack house and storeroom.
2. *Amatikulu Aquarium Plants*, which consists of a hatchery, workshop, and a number of tunnels and water supply infrastructure for ornamental fish and plants.
3. A water treatment facility.

The proposed development entails the establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone (ADZ) to the north east of the Amatikulu estuary in KwaZulu-Natal. The ADZ will entail the establishment of aquaculture facilities that will be used for the farming of a range of species, which could include Dusky Kob, Barramundi, Scallops, Sea Cucumbers, marine and

freshwater Ornamental Fish and Ornamental Plants, Tilapia, Catfish and Nile Crocodile. Phase 1 will comprise the refurbishment of earthen ponds and tunnel based tank systems that were historically used for Prawn and Ornamental Fish culture (activities will include the installation of water supply for farming, a facility to grow fingerlings, construction of a feed store, other storage facilities and offices). Phase 2 will entail the extension of the aquaculture facilities and the installation of civil infrastructure that will allow for the establishment of a range of production systems for a range of species. Infrastructure for the ADZ will include administration buildings, storage areas, fish processing and packaging facilities, access roads, electricity and water reticulation, sea water supply and discharge, pump stations, reservoirs and fencing.

PROJECT MOTIVATION

The main purpose of the ADZ seeks to address poverty and unemployment in the coastal area of Amatikulu by creating skill-based employment. The infrastructure development on the site will require a labour force which will be sourced from the surrounding local disadvantaged communities. Once the farm has been established, people from the surrounding community will have an opportunity to develop skills in the farming of aquatic organisms.

Job creation and skills development in the rural area of Amatikulu is pertinent owing to the high level of unemployment.

THE FULL SCOPING & EIR ASSESSMENT PROCESS

NuLeaf Planning and Environmental Pty Ltd has been appointed by DAFF to undertake the Full Scoping and EIR Assessment Process for the proposed activities. The EIA Regulations, as amended, and its associated Listing Notices; Listing Notice 1 (GN R327), Listing Notice 2 (GN R325) and Listing Notice 3 (GN R324) specify the activities that require a Basic Assessment or Full Scoping & EIR. The activities triggered by the proposed development include the following listed activities:

Number and date of the relevant Listing Notice:	Activity Number (s) (in terms of the relevant Listing Notice):	Description of each listed activity as per the detailed project description
GN R. 327	3 (iii)	The development and related operation of facilities or infrastructure for the slaughter of animals with (iii) wet weight product throughput of fish, crustaceans or amphibians exceeding 20 000 kg per annum
	4 (iii)	The development and related operations of facilities or infrastructure for the concentration of animals for the purpose of

(Listing Notice 1)		commercial production in densities that exceed (iii) 30 square meters per crocodile at any level of production and more than 20 crocodiles per facility
6 (i) (ii) (iii)		Development and related operation of facilities, infrastructure or structures for aquaculture of (i) finfish, reptiles or amphibians, where such a facility, infrastructure or structures will have a production output exceeding 20 000 Kg per annum, (ii) molluscs and echinoderms exceeding 30 000 Kg per annum and (iii) aquatic plants where such a facility, infrastructure or structures will have a production output exceeding 60 000 kg per annum (wet weight)
9 (i) (ii)		The development of infrastructure exceeding 1000 m in length for the bulk transportation of water or storm water (i) internal diameter of 0,36 m or more or (ii) peak throughput of 120 liters per second or more
10 (i) (ii)		The development and related operation of infrastructure exceeding 1000 metres in length for the bulk transportation of sewage, effluent, process water, waste water, return water, industrial discharge or slime under the assumption of : (i) Structure with an internal diameter of 0,36 metres or more; (ii) With peak throughput of 120 litres per second or more
12 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xi) (xii); (a) (c)		The development of (i) canals (ii) channels (iii) bridges (iv) dams (v) weirs (vi) bulk storm water (x) buildings (xi) boardwalks (xii) infrastructure where all exceed 100 square meters in size where such development occurs within (a) a watercourse (c) within 32 meters of a watercourse
13		The development of facilities or infrastructure for the off-stream storage of water, including dams and reservoirs, with a combined capacity of 50 000 cubic metres or more
15		The development of structures in the coastal public property where the development footprint is bigger than 50 square meters
17 (i) (iii) (v) (f)		Development (i) in the sea, (iii) littoral active zone, (v) within a distance of 100 m inland of the high water mark of the sea or estuary in respect of (f) infrastructure or structures with a development footprint of 50 square meters or more
18		The planting of vegetation or placing of any material on dunes or exposed sand surfaces of more than 10 square meters, within the littoral active zone for the purpose of preventing the free movement of sand, erosion or accretion
19		The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from (i) a watercourse (ii) the seashore (iii) the littoral active zone, an estuary or a distance of 100 m inland of the highwater mark of the sea or estuary
19A (i) (ii) (iii)		The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 5 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 5 cubic metres from (i) a watercourse (ii) the seashore (iii) the littoral active zone, an estuary or a distance of 100 m inland of the highwater mark of the sea or estuary
25		The development and related operation of facilities or infrastructure for the treatment of effluent, wastewater or

		sewage with a daily throughput capacity of more than 2000 cubic meters but less than 15 000 cubic meters
	27	The clearance of 1 hectare or more, but less than 20 hectares of indigenous vegetation
	30	Any process or activity identified in terms of section 53(1) of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No 10 of 2004)
	34 (iii)	The expansion or changes to an existing facilities or infrastructure for any process or activity where such expansion or changes will result in the need for a permit or license or an amended permit or license in terms if national or provincial legislation governing the release of emissions, effluent or pollution but excluding (iii) the expansion is directly related to aquaculture facilities or infrastructure where the wastewater discharge capacity will be increased by 50 cubic meters or less per day
	41 (i) (ii) (iii)	The expansion and related operation of facilities, infrastructure or structures for aquaculture of (i) Finfish, crustaceans, reptiles or amphibians, where such facility, infrastructure or structures will have a production output exceeding 20 000 kg per annum (wet weight) (ii) molluscs and echinoderms where the annual production output of such facility, infrastructure or structures will be increased by 30 000 Kg or more and (iii) aquatic plants where the annual production output of such facility, infrastructure or structures will be increased by 60 000 Kg or more (wet weight)
GN R. 325 (Listing Notice 2)	6	The development of facilities or infrastructure for any process or activity which requires a license in terms of national or provincial legislation governing the generation or release of emissions, pollutant or effluent, excluding: (a) Activities which are identified and included in Listing Notice 1 of 2014; (b) Activities which are included in the list of waste management activities published in terms of Section 19 of NEMWA, in which case NEMWA applies; or (c) The development of facilities or infrastructure for the treatment of effluent, wastewater or sewage where such facilities have a daily throughput capacity of 200 cubic metres or less.
	14 (iii) (a)	The development and related operation of (iii) any structure or infrastructure on, below or along the sea bed excluding (a) development of facilities, infrastructure or structures for aquaculture purposes
	15	The clearance of an area of 20 hectares or more of indigenous vegetation
	2 (d) (v) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb)	The development of reservoirs for bulk water supply with a capacity of more than 250 cubic meters (v) in an estuarine functional zone (vi) in a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (viii) Critical biodiversity area (xii) outside urban areas in (aa) areas within 10 km from National Parks of 5 km from any terrestrial protected area (bb) areas seawards of the development setback line or within 1 km from the high-water mark of the sea
	4 (d) (i) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb)	The development of a road wider than 4 meters with a reserve less than 13,5 meters in (d) Kwazulu-Natal (i) in an estuarine

GN R. 324 (Listing Notice 3)		functional zone (vi) in a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (viii) Critical biodiversity area (xii) outside urban areas in (aa) areas within 10 km from National Parks of 5 km from any terrestrial protected area (bb) areas seawards of the development setback line or within 1 km from the high-water mark of the sea
	12 (d) (iv) (v) (vi) (vii) (viii) (xiii)	The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for is for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan. (d) Kwazulu-Natal (iv) within any critically endangered or endangered ecosystem listed in terms of section 52 of the NEMBA or prior to the publication of such a list, within an area that has been identified as critically endangered in the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment 2004; (v) Within critical biodiversity areas identified in bioregional plans; (vi) Within the littoral active zone or 100 metres inland from high water mark of the sea or an estuarine functional zone, whichever distance is the greater, excluding where such removal will occur behind the development setback line on even in urban edges. (vii) On land, where, at the time of the coming into effect of this Notice or thereafter such land was zoned open space, conservation (viii) a protected area in terms of NEMPAA (xiii) in an estuarine functional zone
	13 (d) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii) (x)	The development and related operation of facilities of any form of aquaculture (d) Kwazulu-Natal (iv) in an estuarine functional zone (v) in a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (vii) areas on the watercourse side of the development setback line or within 100 m from the edge of a watercourse (viii) areas within a watercourse or wetland (x) critical biodiversity area
	14 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xii) (a) (c); (d) (i) (iv) (vii) (x) (aa) (bb)	The development of (i) canals exceeding 10 square meters (ii) channels exceeding 10 square meters in size (iii) bridges exceeding 10 square meters (iv) dams including infrastructure and water surface area exceeds 10 square meter in size, (v) weirs exceeding 10 square meters (vi) bulk storm water outlets exceeding 10 square meters (x) buildings exceeding 10 square meters in size, (xii) infrastructure or structures exceeding 10 square meters or more where development occurs within (a) a watercourse (c) within 32 m of a watercourse in (d) Kwazulu-Natal (i) in an estuarine functional zone, (iv)a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (vii) critical biodiversity areas (x) outside urban areas in (aa) areas within 10 km of National Parks of 5 km from any terrestrial protected area (bb) areas seawards of the development setback line or within 1 km from the high water mark of the sea
	18 (d) (v) (vi) (viii) (xii) (aa) (bb)	The widening of a road by more than 4 meters or the lengthening of a road by more than 1 Km in (d) Kwazulu-Natal (v) in an estuarine functional zone (vi) a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (viii) critical biodiversity areas (xii) outside of urban areas aa) areas within 10 km of National Parks of 5 km from any terrestrial protected area (bb) areas seawards of the

		development setback line or within 1 km from the high water mark of the sea
23 (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi) (x) (xii) (a) (c); (d) (iii) (iv) (vii) (x) (aa) (bb)		The expansion of (i) canals expanded by 10 square meters (ii) channels expanded by 10 square meters in size (iii) bridges expanded by 10 square meters (iv) dams including infrastructure and water surface area expanded by 10 square meter in size, (v) weirs expanded by 10 square meters (vi) bulk storm water outlets expanded by 10 square meters (x) buildings expanded by 10 square meters in size, (xii) infrastructure or structures expanded by 0 square meters where such development expansion occurs within (a) a watercourse (c) within 32 m of a watercourse (d) Kwazulu-Natal (iii) in an estuarine functional zone, (iv) a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (vii) critical biodiversity areas (x) outside urban areas in (aa) areas within 10 km of National Parks of 5 km from any terrestrial protected area (bb) areas seawards of the development setback line or within 1 km from the high water mark of the sea
24 (d) (iv) (v) (vii) (viii) (x)		The expansion and related operation of facilities of any size for any form of aquaculture in (d) Kwazulu-Natal (iv) in an estuarine functional zone (v) in a protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA (vii) areas on the watercourse side of the development setback line or within 100 m from the edge of a watercourse (viii) areas within a watercourse or wetland (x) critical biodiversity area

- An independent **Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)** must undertake the process on behalf of the applicant to ensure objectivity.
- The EAP will conduct a Public Participation Process and afford any and all persons interested and /or affected by the proposed development an opportunity to register and participate in the process. A **30 day registration period** is allowed for, as well as, an opportunity to ask questions, submit concerns etc.
- An **Application for Environmental Authorisation** will be submitted to the Competent Authority, which in this case is the National Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA).
- The EAP must prepare a **Draft Scoping Report** which describes both the project and the environment and assesses the anticipated impacts of the project on the environment and make recommendations in terms of mitigation and management.
- Once complete, the Draft Scoping Report will be circulated to all registered I&APs who are entitled to submit written comments in respect thereof. A **30 day comment period** is allowed for.
- Once all comments from registered I&APs have been addressed, the EAP will submit the **Final Scoping Report** to the Competent Authority (DEA) for consideration.

- The Competent Authority is then required to accept/deny the Scoping Report and advise the applicant on whether to proceed with the environmental impact report.
- The EAP must then prepare a **Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)**, inclusive of specialist reports and a draft Environmental Management Programme (EMPr).
- Once complete, the Draft EIR will be circulated to all registered I&APs who are entitled to submit written comments in respect thereof. **A 30 day comment period** is allowed for.
- Once all comments from registered I&APs have been addressed, the EAP will submit the **Final EIR** to the Competent Authority (DEA) for consideration.
- The Competent Authority is then required to make a decision on the application for Environmental Authorisation (i.e. either positive or negative).
- Once the Competent Authority has made a decision on the Final EIR, the EAP must communicate the outcome thereof to all I&APs who registered during the Public Participation Process.
- I&AP's have the right to **Appeal** against the decision of the Competent Authority should they feel the need to do so, in which case, the Competent Authority will review and reconsider the application. The appeal process is regulated in terms of the 2014 National Appeal Regulations published in terms of GN R993 on 8 December 2014 under NEMA.

ROLE OF INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES

You have been identified as a potential Stakeholder or Interested and Affected Party, and are hereby invited to participate in this EIA Process. If you would like to be consulted during the process described above, comment on draft reports, provide input, raise concerns, or simply remain informed of the project process, please register as a Stakeholder via a return email, fax or post.

**Registration as a Stakeholder or Interested and Affected Party must reach the
Environmental Assessment Practitioner listed below by no later than
Monday 17 September 2017**


Bryony van Niekerk
NuLeaf Planning and Environmental Pty (Ltd)
 8a Trevor Street
 Murrayfield

Pretoria, 0184

T: 012 753 5792

F: 086 571 6292

email:bryony@nuleafsa.co.za



APPENDIX E.1.2 Key stakeholders

Proof of Notification

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Bryony van Niekerk <bryony@nuleafsa.co.za>
Sent: 15 August 2017 09:18
To: 'bryony@nuleafsa.co.za'
Cc: 'Peter Velcich'; 'Etienne Hinrichsen'
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Attachments: BID Amatikulu final.pdf

Tracking:	Recipient	Read
	'bryony@nuleafsa.co.za'	Read: 2017/08/15 09:25
	'Peter Velcich'	Read: 2017/08/15 09:54
	'Etienne Hinrichsen'	
	'sizwe.khuzwayo@mandeni.gov.za'	
	'temba.mjuz@mandeni.gov.za'	
	'masupha.mapthenjwa@ilembe.gov.za'	
	'nonhlanhla.gamede@ilembe.gov.za'	
	'gerald.dlamini@kzndard.gov.za'	
	'pillayr@dws.gov.za'	
	'jmphepya@environment.gov.za'	
	'Lfikizolo@environment.gov.za'	
	'anaidoo@environment.gov.za'	
	'MakhuvhaM@kznded.gov.za'	
	'Mustaq.Hoosen@kzndard.gov.za'	
	'sinxotot@kznded.gov.za'	
	'Theo.vanrooyen@kzndard.gov.za'	
	'Muzi.Mdamba@kzndae.gov.za'	
	'phoarchaeology@amafapmb.co.za'	Read: 2017/08/15 11:50
	'mathabapmt@gmail.com'	
	'MakhathiniS@ingonyamatrust.org.za'	
	'pa2ceo@ingonyamatrust.org.za'	
	'MadlophaF@ingonyamatrust.org.za'	
	'guy@aquariumplants.co.za'	Read: 2017/08/15 10:30
	'matthew@amatikulu.co.za'	
	'mecpa@kzncogta.gov.za'	
	'dinesree.thambu@kznwildlife.com'	
	'dokodwenibeachccamp@gmail.com'	

Dear Interested and Affected Parties,

Notice is given in terms of section 24(5) read with section 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) of intent to carry out the following activity:

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE IN AMATIKULU, KWAZULU-NATAL

1

The proposed development entails the establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone (ADZ) to the north east of the Amatikulu estuary in KwaZulu-Natal. The ADZ will entail the establishment of aquaculture facilities that will be used for the farming of a range of species, which could include Dusky Kob, Barramundi, Scallops, Sea Cucumbers, marine and freshwater Ornamental Fish and Ornamental Plants, Tilapia, Catfish and Nile Crocodile. Phase 1 will comprise the refurbishment of earthen ponds and tunnel based tank systems that were historically used for Prawn and Ornamental Fish culture (activities will include the installation of water supply for farming, a facility to grow fingerlings, construction of a feed store, other storage facilities and offices). Phase 2 will entail the extension of the aquaculture facilities and the installation of civil infrastructure that will allow for the establishment of a range of production systems for a range of species. Infrastructure for the ADZ will include administration buildings, storage areas, fish processing and packaging facilities, access roads, electricity and water reticulation, sea water supply and discharge, pump stations, reservoirs and fencing.

As an identified Interested and Affected Party, you are given the opportunity to provide your input and comment on the above mentioned development.

The attached background information document provides further information pertaining to the proposed project.

Please do note that you have until the **17th September 2017** to register.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Regards,

Bryony van Niekerk (BSc Hons. EMA)



Tel: +27 12 753 5792

Fax: +27 86 571 6292

bryony@nuleafsa.co.za



Read Receipts

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Guy Upfold (aquariumplants.co.za) <guy@aquariumplants.co.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 15 August 2017 10:30
Subject: Return Receipt (displayed) -Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

This is a Return Receipt for the mail that you sent to guy@aquariumplants.co.za.

Note: This Return Receipt only acknowledges that the message was displayed on the recipient's computer. There is no guarantee that the recipient has read or understood the message contents.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: PA to the CEO <pa2ceo@ingonyamatrust.org.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 15 August 2017 10:06
Subject: Read: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Your message

To: PA to the CEO
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2017 9:18:10 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Tuesday, August 15, 2017 10:05:31 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: mathabapmt@gmail.com
Sent: 15 August 2017 09:41
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read report : Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Recipient: mathabapmt@gmail.com
Time of reading : 15/08/2017 09:41 AM
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Dear Interested and Affected Parties, Notice is given in terms of section 24(5) read with section 44 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) of intent to carry out the

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Themba Mjuza <Themba.Mjuza@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 15 August 2017 09:42
Subject: Read: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Your message

To: Themba Mjuza
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2017 9:28:58 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Tuesday, August 15, 2017 9:40:54 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: HESTER <phoarchaeology@amafapmb.co.za>
To: 'Bryony van Niekerk'
Sent: 15 August 2017 11:50
Subject: Read: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Your message

To: Unknown
Subject:

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Mustaq Hoosen <Mustaq.Hoosen@kzndard.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 18 August 2017 10:40
Subject: Read: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Your message

To: Mustaq Hoosen
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2017 9:18:10 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Friday, August 18, 2017 10:39:53 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Fikisiwe Madlopha <MadlophaF@ingonyamatrust.org.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 18 August 2017 13:33
Subject: Read: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Your message

To: Fikisiwe Madlopha
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal
Sent: 15 August 2017 09:18:10 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on 18 August 2017 01:32:58 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Theo Vanrooyen <Theo.Vanrooyen@kzndard.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 21 August 2017 07:26
Subject: Read: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Your message

To: Theo Vanrooyen
Subject: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal
Sent: Tuesday, August 15, 2017 9:18:10 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Monday, August 21, 2017 7:26:05 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Replies and Registration

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Guy Upfold (aquariumplants.co.za) <guy@aquariumplants.co.za>
Sent: 15 August 2017 10:39
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Re: Notification of Full Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment Process - Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, Kwazulu-Natal

Hello Bryony, I would obviously like to be kept informed.

Thanks

Guy Upfold
Amatikulu Aquarium Plants cc
Phone: 082 3333996
Email: guy@aquariumplants.co.za

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Frans Van Der Walt <frans@qs2000plus.co.za>
Sent: 21 August 2017 11:56
To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Subject: PROPOSED LAND-BASED AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE, AMATIKULU

Dear Bryony van Niekerk,

Further to the recent Notice in the media about the above project, I would appreciate if you could add me as Interested and Affected Party for the Public Participation process. Please can I also request all background information, locality details, etc. be forwarded ?

I look forward to hearing more and being involved in the EIA process going forward.

Regards,

Frans van der Walt (B.Sc (QS), Pr.QS (2167), PMAQS, MRICS)
QS2000 Plus (Quantity Surveyors & Project Managers)

QS2000 is a Certified **BBBEE level 4 Contributor**.



Contact numbers : Tel : +27 (35) 753 4184 / 5, Fax : +27 (35) 753 4185, Cell : +27 82 4600 875
E-mail : frans@qs2000plus.co.za
Postal : P.O. Box 10376, MEERENSEE, 3901
Physical : 22 Pompano Place, MEERENSEE, 3901
Website : www.qs2000plus.co.za **Skype :** fransvanderwalt



Bryony van Niekerk

From: Wendy Forse <twiga@iafrica.com>
Sent: 26 August 2017 13:21
To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Cc: Neil Davies Evans; 'Doggy Kewley'; 'Mike Butler'; Theo Mostert; 'Balmer, Anne'; Daff Untiedt; 'Kim Steinberg'; 'Barbara Chedzey'
Subject: Amatikulu Aquaculture development zone IAP registration

Hi Bryony

Please would you register the Mtunzini Conservancy as an Interested and Affected Party for this application for environmental authorisation for the Amatikulu Aquaculture Zone project.

Our chairperson is Neil Evans (see email address above) and I deal with the development and planning portfolio. It would be appreciated if you could send correspondence to my email address below with a cc to Neil Evans EvansN@unizulu.ac.za and we will copy to the rest of the committee and membership.

Regards
Wendy

Wendy Forse
P.O. Box 611
Mtunzini 3867
Tel: 035 – 340 2586
Cell: 082 722 3333
Email: twiga@iafrica.com

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Coastwatch <coastwatch@telkomsa.net>
Sent: 02 September 2017 11:14
To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Subject: Scoping and EIA Process - Proposed establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu

Dear Bryony

Would you kindly register COASTWATCH KZN as an I&AP in respect of the above project.

Kind regards

(Mrs) Di Jones

Co-Ordinator

COASTATCH KZN

APPENDIX E.1.3 Pre-Application Comments and Response Register

Below is a summary of the comments received during the pre-application process:

I&AP, DATE AND MEDIUM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Pre-Application Meetings		
Millicent Solomons-DEA (5 March 2018)	This seems to be a very sensitive site. Have any alternative been considered?	No alternatives have been proposed as of yet, however, we are aware that this needs to be looked into. An alternative site just to the north of the proposed site has undergone a desktop review. It has very similar environmental sensitivities bar for the estuary.
Omar Parack-KZNEDTEA (12 March 2018)	Have any alternatives been proposed? From the information presented, it appears that the site has several fatal flaws. The option of layout alternatives should be explored. Additionally, the socio-economic viability of the project needs to be examined. Aquaculture projects have been tried along this coastline before and have not worked out.	No alternatives have been proposed as of yet, however, we are aware that this needs to be looked into.
Irene Hatton-KZN Wildlife (12 March 2018)	Why is the project constrained to this site? Is there a reason you can't move the site 50m to the west? If this was done, then the site becomes viable and the ecological sensitives are avoided.	The proposed site is owned by the Tribal Authority and has been selected in a long consultation process. As far as we are aware, the land to the west is privately owned. This would have to be verified.
Omar Parack-KZNEDTEA (12 March 2018)	Abstraction and discharging into the estuary is a problem. The Amatikulu estuary is classified as an open/closed mouth estuary. Currently the estuary mouth is closed. When it does open again, it will most likely open further south than where the proposed pipelines lie. Therefore, the pump will have no water to pump and will run dry. The Provincial Department will not readily support the abstraction from and subsequent discharge into the estuary.	Noted.
Santosh Bachoo- KZN Wildlife (12 March 2018)	The abstraction from the estuary will also be an issue for the Amatikulu Nature Reserve.	Noted.
	The possibility of permanently opening the estuary is definitely not an option. The estuary is in pristine condition, the water quality is exceptional and opening the mouth will	Noted. An estuarine impact assessment has been recommended and is being commissioned.

	change the nature of the ecosystem. The effluent discharges could also have an impact on the wildlife, such as crocodiles, upstream.	
Omar Parack-KZNEDEA (12 March 2018)	Has an estuarine specialist study been conducted? This study would be able to tell you everything that you need to know re the estuary and the sensitivity thereof. If you are planning on including the option of abstraction from and discharge into the estuary, then the Province would require an estuarine study to be submitted.	No estuarine study has been conducted as of yet, however, it was recommended in the draft scoping report that one be commissioned in order to fully understand the impacts that could potentially occur on the estuarine system. This report will be included in the environmental impact report.
	Where are the boreholes located on site? What would happen to the freshwater tunnels if the aquifer ran dry? Do you know the volumes of water that the boreholes can supply?	Do not know the exact locations offhand of the boreholes. Do not know the current volumes of water that the boreholes provide.
	Will the operation be PP or government driven? There is also the assumption that the developer will go with what has been authorized. Many times there are amendments etc. will they be happy with the proposed layout and infrastructure applied for?	The developer will be subject to the authorisation, which will be issued to DAFF.
Masuphe Matheywe (12 March 2018)	This EIA process should align with the tourism planning that is currently happening in the area. A local area-based plan has been developed for the area as well. We, as the local municipality, have been battling to manage this area environmentally for some time- there is veld burning, cattle grazing. Need to manage this area in terms of the MPA and this project.	Agreed. The EMPr will contain all mitigation measures to help effectively manage the site and operations.

APPENDIX E.1.4 Correspondence and Minutes of Meetings

Two (2) pre-application authority meetings were held in March 2018; one on 5th March 2018 in Cape Town and one on 12th March 2018 in KwaZulu Natal.



agriculture, forestry & fisheries

Department:
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

BRANCH: FISHERIES MANAGEMENT
AMATHIKULU AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE EIA
PRE-APPLICATION MEETING
Date: Monday, 05 March 2018, Time: 12:00 –14:00, Venue: DAFF Offices in CT,
Chairperson: Etienne Hinrichsen
MINUTES

No.	Item	Responsibility
1.	Opening & Welcome	
	The chairperson welcomed all.	
2.	Present & Apologies	
	<p>Present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Etienne Hinrichsen (EH) 2. Bryony van Niekerk (BvN) 3. Michelle Pistorius (MP) 4. Kishan Sankar (KS) 5. Belemane Sem (BS) 6. Millicent Solomons (MS) 7. Maxhiba Jezile (MJ) 8. Andrea Bernatzeder (AB) 9. Funanani Ditinti (FD) 10. Makhale Andani (MA) 11. Zimkita Magangana (ZM) 12. Zimasa Jika (ZJ) <p>Apologies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 	
3.	Finalisation of agenda	ALL
	Agenda was adopted.	
4.	Matters arising	
4.1	<p>EH and BvN gave a brief presentation on the proposed project in terms of the background, layout, water abstraction and discharge methods, specialist findings and issues identified. The floor was then opened for discussion:</p> <p><u>Alternatives:</u></p> <p>MS- This seems to be a very sensitive site. Have any alternative been considered?</p>	

EH- No alternatives have been proposed as of yet, however, we are aware that this needs to be looked into. An alternative site just to the north of the proposed site has undergone a desktop review. It has very similar environmental sensitivities bar for the estuary.

MS- I think this site needs to be looked at in detail.

BS- There is a document which details all of the areas identified for ADZ. This site was chosen because it was/is already a fish farm. We can provide motivation for why there is only one site and no alternatives.

MS- Must note that this EIA may be refused.

Site:

AB- This site is the only area along the coast which is not protected.

Estuary:

BS- Why can't we discharge into the estuary?

EH- It's a closed estuary. Estuary is in good condition and the Ecologist recommends that this isn't done.

BS- We can apply for a dredging license to open the estuary permanently.

Setback line:

MS- The local municipality must deal with the decision of the setback line. DEA will accept what they say in this regard (in terms of development in front of the setback line). What are the tradeoffs? I'm concerned about how the adoption of the development setback line will impact on the EIA process. If you are proposeing to develop in front of the setback line, compensation must be looked at and incorporate offsets (as a last resort) into the planning process.

KS- Maintenance of the dunes could be a mitigation measure.

FD- Why was the setback line placed there? What is the reasoning behind it?

Species:

FD- What species will be farmed?

EH- Baramundi, Tilapia, sea cucumbers, Catfish



agriculture, forestry & fisheries

Department:
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

BRANCH: FISHERIES MANAGEMENT
AMATIKULU AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE: EIA
PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

Date: Monday, 12 March 2018, Time: 10:00 –12:00, Venue: EDTEA Offices in
Stanger KZN,

Chairperson: Etienne Hinrichsen

MINUTES

No.	Item	Responsibility
1.	Opening & Welcome	
	The chairperson welcomed all.	
2.	Present & Apologies	
	<p>Present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Etienne Hinrichsen (EH)2. Bryony van Niekerk (BvN)3. Omar Parak (OP)4. Irene Hatton (IH)5. Kashrina Sookraj (KAS)6. Santosh Bachoo (SB)7. Nombulelo Zungu (NZ)8. Simon Bundy (SBu)9. Michelle Pistorius (MP)10. Kishan Sankar (KIS)11. Linda Sibiya (LS)12. Masuphe Matheywe (MM)13. Thandeka Thusi (TT)14. Langalakhe Msomi (LM) <p>Apologies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Malcolm Moses (MM)	
3.	Finalisation of agenda	ALL
	Agenda was adopted.	
4.	Matters arising	
4.1	EH and BvN gave a brief presentation on the proposed project in terms of the background, layout, water abstraction and discharge methods, specialist findings and issues identified. The floor was then opened for discussion:	

<p><u>Alternatives:</u></p> <p>OP- Have any alternatives been proposed? From the information presented, it appears that the site has several potential fatal flaws. The option of layout alternatives should also be explored. Additionally, the socio-economic viability of the project needs to be overtly substantiated. Aquaculture projects have been tried along the KZN coastline before and have, on the whole, not been very successful.</p> <p>EH- No alternatives have been proposed as of yet, however, we are aware that this needs to be looked into.</p> <p><u>Site:</u></p> <p>IH- Why is the project constrained to this site? Is there a reason you can't move the site 50m to the west? If this was done, then the site becomes viable and the ecological sensitives are avoided.</p> <p>EH- The proposed site is owned by the Tribal Authority. As far as we are aware, the land to the north is privately owned. This would have to be verified. There are no ancestral graves or heritage concerns pertaining to the current site.</p> <p><u>Application:</u></p> <p>NZ- Will an integrated application be submitted (waste license application together with the EIA application)?</p> <p>EH- No, a standard Application process will be submitted. We do not know the quantities or types of waste that will be generated at this stage. Therefore, it will be the responsibility of the Developer to apply for a waste license.</p> <p><u>Estuary:</u></p> <p>OP- Abstraction and discharging into the estuary is a problem. The Amatikulu estuary is classified as a temporarily open/closed estuary (TOCE). If the system comes down in flood, the mouth will most likely open further south than where the proposed pipelines lie. Therefore, the pump will have no water to pump and will run dry. The Provincial Department will not readily support the abstraction from and subsequent discharge into the estuary.</p> <p>SB- The abstraction from the estuary will also be an issue for the Amatikulu Nature Reserve.</p> <p>EH- From this point of the view, the estuary is then a red flag.</p> <p>SB- Definitely, the estuary abstraction and discharge option is no good.</p>	
--	--

<p>KIS- There have been discussions from our side regarding possibly applying to permanently open the mouth of the estuary in order to abstract seawater.</p> <p>SB- That is definitely not an option. The estuary is in pristine condition, the water quality is exceptional and opening the mouth will change the nature of the ecosystem. The effluent discharges could also have an impact on the wildlife, such as crocodiles, upstream.</p> <p>OP- Agree with SB. Opening of the estuary mouth will not be supported by EDTEA's Coastal Management Unit.</p> <p>IH- In agreement with SB and OP. Do not support the manipulation of the mouth.</p> <p>KIS- Is there an Estuary Management Plan for the Amatikulu Estuary?</p> <p>SB- Currently there is no estuary management plan. At this point, due to the shifting nature of the mouth, a joint management plan would be required. The mouth used to be located within the Amatikulu Nature Reserve and is the meeting point of the Nyoni and Amatikulu Rivers.</p> <p>OP- The estuary would likely form part of the proposed Operation Phakisa Thukela Marine Protected Area (MPA).</p> <p>OP- Has an estuarine specialist study been conducted? This study would be able to tell you everything that you need to know re the estuary and the sensitivity thereof. If you are planning on including the option of abstraction from and discharge into the estuary, then the Province would require an estuarine study to be undertaken by a suitably qualified estuarine specialist.</p> <p>EH- This study has not been done as of yet. However, if we remove the option of the estuary then that specialist study may not be necessary?</p> <p>OP- Correct – this would be motivation provided for no estuarine specialist study being required.</p> <p><u>Wetland:</u></p> <p>MM- A wetland, ecological system has been created. How can this be dealt with. Do we retain the wetland or not?</p> <p>EH- Is the site so sensitive that it must be retained? It's a man-made system.</p> <p>NZ- Need to assess the functionality of the wetland to determine the process.</p> <p>SBU- If you had to cut the water emanating from the existing aquaculture project to the wetland, the dune would take over the area. The wetland would cease to exist.</p>	
--	--

<p><u>Water Availability:</u></p> <p>OP- Where are the 3 boreholes located on site? What would happen to the freshwater tunnels if the aquifer ran dry? Do you have the volumes of water that the boreholes can supply?</p> <p>EH- Do not know the exact locations offhand of the boreholes. Do not know the current volumes of water that the boreholes provide.</p> <p>SB: Saline intrusion could pose a challenge.</p> <p>OP- A contingency plan needs to be thought of and be provided in the assessment as there is a critical assumption that the freshwater supply to the aquaculture project will solely be derived from the boreholes.</p> <p><u>Setback line:</u></p> <p>OP- Risk lines for the KZN coast have recently been drafted, and in terms of that, the ecological setback line that SBU has proposed does not look too bad. SBU has actually been conservative and this approach is supported.</p> <p>IH- The site is a critical linkage line, therefore I am much happier with SBU line that the draft risk lines. Best to keep that wide linkage corridor.</p> <p>OP- Important to note that draft risk lines haven't taken into account the extreme erosion that has occurred in the area over the last few years. I am also happy with SBU lines. It should however be noted that the current risk lines will inform coastal management lines, for which SBU has already proposed a setback buffer.</p> <p>KIS- Aquaculture is one of the few activities that can occur behind the setback line due to the nature of the activity. Strict mitigation must just be in proposed.</p> <p>OP- We would like to see that a more risk averse approach to development along the coastline be taken as opposed to solely relying on the draft provincial risk lines (of which the related "setback" is still to be determined. Province is still developing a management line. SBU has developed a setback line behind which the development footprint is confined. The province doesn't have a setback determination as yet – merely the risk line. The related shapefiles will be made available to SBU.</p> <p><u>Species:</u></p> <p>SB: Will any exotic species be brought in? This would be a concern. We also have a policy of no bottom fishing. Harvesting of broodstock from the coast could also be potentially be an issue. Also to note, there is a snail infestation currently in the area.</p> <p>IH- The report needs to be worded in such a way that no inappropriate</p>	
---	--

	<p>species are included at all.</p> <p><u>Operation:</u></p> <p>OP- Will the operation be a public-private partnership or solely government driven? There is also the assumption that the developer will go with what has been authorized. Many times there are amendments etc. - will a potential investor be 100% satisfied with the proposed layout and infrastructure that would have been applied for?</p> <p>KIS- The developer will have to be happy with what is authorized in the EA and fall in line.</p> <p>SB- Will this proposed operation be in competition with the other aquaculture facilities in the area such as Umlalazi or will it be a joint venture per se? This project obviously has government backing so has an advantage.</p> <p>KIS- DAFF is not in the business of putting other aquaculture operations out of business. They are in talks with other operations in KZN.</p> <p><u>Other issues:</u></p> <p>SB- Will the movement of the sand and the seawater abstraction pipeline not be an issue?</p> <p>SBu- This would be an issue, I would recommend that the pipeline be placed in the rip current located north of the site.</p> <p>OP: Any pipeline to sea/estuary for abstraction/discharge will likely require a lease from Province (EDTEA) in terms of the Sea Shore Act. The site may also be bound by Admiralty Reserve on the seaward (eastern) side.</p> <p>MP: DAFF has experience with lease-related matters from an aquaculture project implemented in the Eastern Cape.</p> <p>EH- Where is the blue flag beach? Blue flag beach is up to the mouth of the estuary</p> <p>OP- Access to the blue flag beach is a challenge.</p> <p>MM- Access is a challenge; you basically have to cross the estuary to access the beach. Plan is to move the beach access to the north. However, this would have to be planned, budgeted and managed accordingly.</p> <p>MM- This EIA process should align with the tourism planning that is currently happening in the area. A local area based plan has been developed for the area as well. We, as the local municipality, have been battling to manage this area environmentally for some time_- there is veld burning and cattle</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>grazing. Need to manage this area down the line in terms of the MPA and this project.</p> <p>IH- There has been mention of a waterpark in the past?</p> <p>MM- There is also a map of the area indicating where all proposed activities are to be taking place. The town planner has it.</p> <p>OP- There is a proposed new public [boat] launch site just to the north of the proposed site. This could pose public access implications for the proposed facility.</p> <p>MM- The launch site is going ahead but it is more north of the proposed site. However, the most viable access route to the proposed launch site has yet to be determined.</p>	
5	Way Forward	
	<p>OP to send SBU draft risk lines.</p> <p>MM to provide local area development plan and map indicating all proposed tourism facilities in the area.</p>	

SECTION 2: DRAFT SCOPING REPORT

APPENDIX 2.1 Draft Scoping Report:

Proof of notification & invitation to comment (Stakeholders and Compliance Organizations)

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Bryony van Niekerk <bryony@nuleafsa.co.za>
Sent: 29 June 2018 15:04
To: 'bryony@nuleafsa.co.za'
Cc: 'Etienne Hinrichsen'
Subject: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Tracking:	Recipient	Read
	'bryony@nuleafsa.co.za'	
	'Etienne Hinrichsen'	Read: 2018/06/29 15:21
	'sizwe.khuzwayo@mandeni.gov.za'	
	'Themba Mjuza'	
	'nonjabulo.ngwane@mandeni.gov.za'	Read: 2018/06/29 20:44
	'Patience Sibisi'	
	'nokuthula.fakude@mandeni.gov.za'	
	'mzimelah@unizulu.ac.za'	
	'Masupha Mathenjwa'	
	'nonhlanhla.gamede@ilembe.gov.za'	
	'gerald.dlamini@kzndard.gov.za'	
	'pillayr@dws.gov.za'	
	'jmphepya@environment.gov.za'	
	'Lfikizolo@environment.gov.za'	
	'anaidoo@environment.gov.za'	
	'MakhuvhaM@kznded.gov.za'	
	'Mustaq.Hoosen@kzndard.gov.za'	
	'sinxotot@kznded.gov.za'	
	'theo.vanrooyen@kzndard.gov.za'	
	'Muzi.Mdamba@kzndae.gov.za'	
	'muziwandile.mdamba@kzndedtea.gov.za'	
	'phoarchaeology@amafapmb.co.za'	
	'mathabapmt@gmail.com'	
	'MakhathiniS@ingonyamatrust.org.za'	
	'pa2ceo@ingonyamatrust.org.za'	
	'Madlophaf@ingonyamatrust.org.za'	
	'Guy Upfold (aquariumplants.co.za)'	
	'matthew@amatikulu.co.za'	
	'mecpa@kzncogta.gov.za'	
	'dinesree.thambu@kznwildlife.com'	
	'dokodwenibeachcamp@gmail.com'	
	'blueflag@wessa.co.za'	
	'Frans Van Der Walt'	Read: 2018/06/30 07:13
	'Coastwatch'	
	'twiga@iafrica.com'	
	'Neil Davies Evans'	

Recipient	Read
'betheulstholem@gmail.com'	
'Neil Zini Fish Farms'	Read: 2018/06/29 18:07
'Lucinda Sinclair'	
'Kashrina Sookraj'	
'Irene Hatton'	
'Omar Parak'	
'santosh.bachoo@kznwildlife.com'	
'Nombulelo Zungu@kznedtea.gov.za'	
'inda.sibiya@kznedtea.gov.za'	

Dear Compliance Authority & Interested and Affected Parties,

Please follow the link below to access a digital copy of the Draft Scoping Report on the NuLeaf website for the above mentioned project.

<http://www.nuleafsa.co.za/downloads/amatikulu-adz-draft-scoping/>

Kindly submit all comments on the Draft Scoping Report **in writing** by no later than close of business on the **01 August 2018**.

Please mark all comments for the attention of:

Bryony van Niekerk
 Email: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
 Tel: (012) 753 5792
 Fax: (086) 571 6292

Should you be unable to access the document, please do not hesitate to contact me so an alternative can be arranged.

Regards,

Bryony van Niekerk (BSc Hons. EMA)



Tel: +27 12 753 5792
 Fax: +27 86 571 6292
bryony@nuleafsa.co.za



Read Receipts

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Frans Van Der Walt <frans@qs2000plus.co.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 30 June 2018 07:13
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Gerald Dlamini <Gerald.Dlamini@kzndard.gov.za>
Sent: 02 July 2018 06:32
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN
Attachments: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an... (8,86 KB)

[KZNDARD]

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Hendrick Mabutho Mduzuzi Mzimela <MzimelaH@unizulu.ac.za>
Sent: 02 July 2018 10:17
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Linda Sibiyi <Linda.Sibiyi@kznedtea.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 01 July 2018 16:09
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Masupha Mathenjwa <Masupha.Mathenjwa@ilembe.gov.za>
Sent: 02 July 2018 16:02
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Neil Stallard <neil@zinifishfarms.co.za>
To: 'Bryony van Niekerk'
Sent: 29 June 2018 18:07
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Cc: 'Etienne Hinrichsen'
Subject: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN
Sent: 2018/06/29 15:04

was read on 2018/06/29 18:06.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Nonjabulo Ngwane <Nonjabulo.Ngwane@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 29 June 2018 20:44
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Patience Sibisi <patience.sibisi@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 02 July 2018 10:35
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Themba Mjuza <Themba.Mjuza@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 02 July 2018 10:29
Subject: Read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

To: Themba Mjuza
Subject: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 3:04:26 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Monday, July 2, 2018 10:27:37 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Sheivine Datadin <Blueflag@wessa.co.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 02 July 2018 10:14
Subject: Not read: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN

Your message

To: Sheivine Datadin
Subject: Notification of Draft Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN
Sent: Friday, June 29, 2018 3:04:26 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was deleted without being read on Monday, July 2, 2018 9:45:07 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

APPENDIX E.2.2 Comments and response register

Below is a summary of the comments received during the duration of the public participation process for the draft scoping report.

.

I&AP, DATE AND MEDIUM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Comments on Draft Scoping Report		
DEA (24 July via email)	<p>This Department has noted the use of the word "may", when describing the project activity that triggers the listed activities applied for. The use of this word show that the EAP/applicant is not confident and/or is uncertain as to why the listed activities applied for are being triggered by the proposed activity. You are therefore requested to rephrase all project activity descriptions to refrain from the use of these words. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that only the applicable listed activities are included in the application.</p> <p>A full assessment of impacts and proposed mitigation thereto of all the triggered activities must be provided in the final SR.</p>	Noted. This has been rectified. Please refer to the amended application form and page 10 of the final scoping report.
	Please ensure that the relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that they can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description.	Noted. This has been rectified. Please refer to the amended application form and page 10 of the final scoping report.
	If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the final SR, an amended application form must be submitted. Please note that the Department's application form template has been amended and can be downloaded from the following link https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms .	Noted. Please refer to the amended application form and page 10 of the final scoping report.
	Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the draft SR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed in the Final SR. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be	Noted. Please refer to Appendix B.3 for the comments and response report, as well as, B.5 for the minutes of meetings held.

<p>Please provide a description of any identified alternatives for the proposed activity that are feasible and reasonable, including the advantages and disadvantages that the proposed activity or alternatives will have on the environment and on the community that may be affected by the activity as per Appendix 2 (1) (c) (d) and 2 (h) of GN R.982 of 2014 as amended. Alternatively, you should submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 2 (2)(x)(xi).</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 3 of the Final SR for a discussion on alternatives.</p>
<p>In accordance with Appendix 2 (2) (a) of the EIA Regulations 2014, the details of-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the EAP who prepared the report; and (ii) the expertise of the EAP to carry out Scoping and Environmental Impact assessment procedures; must be submitted 	<p>Noted. Please refer to Section 1.2 on page 1 of the final scoping report for the details of the EAP who prepared the report and Appendix A for the expertise and CV of the EAP.</p>
<p>Please ensure that the final SR includes a legible site layout map; an environmental sensitivity map indicating all environmental sensitive areas and features; a map combining a layout map superimposed (overlain) on the environmental sensitivity map; and a regional map of the area.</p>	<p>Please refer to Appendix D for the requested maps.</p>
<p>You are further reminded that the final SR to be submitted to this Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 and Regulation 21 {1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014 as amended, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been granted in terms of Regulation 3(7).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Neil Stallard (10 July 2018 via email)	There was also a fish feed factory on the site producing flakes and pellets. The flaking unit could still be in use.	Noted.
	I am vehemently opposed to Barramundi being cultured in KZN and the Eastern Cape.	An Ecological Risk Assessment (in terms of the framework for such assessments provided in the Alien and Invasive Species Regulations) has been completed for the Eastern Cape and has received approval in relation to the farming of Barramundi. A similar risk assessment is being completed for the Amatikulu ADZ site, will be submitted to the DEA Biodiversity section for consideration, and will be appended to the Environmental Impact Report for the EIA.
	As far as I know these are well-points and not boreholes. To run the current footprint of old ponds as through flow will require more than three of these well-points	The potential delivery of these well points needs to be determined. This point raises the need to consider recirculation of water back into the production systems as opposed to flow-through. This alternative has been considered in Section 3 of the final Scoping Report.
	A constructed wetland would be a more appropriate form of drainage treatment. This can be incorporated into an Integrated Multi-trophic Aquaculture system.	A constructed wetland will be considered for dealing with drainage treatment. This wetland can cater for multi-trophic inclusion, but is not likely to be used for actual aquaculture production
	The site from the northern border with EKZNW, south to the Amatikulu estuary has been seriously altered and impacted by anthropological activity since the 1950s. The difference in the habitat between the EKZNW and community areas is clearly distinguishable through overhead imagery. Thus to label the proposed ADZ area as CBA and ESA is illogical.	The site has been classified as a critical biodiversity area by the KZN Biodiversity Sector plan, 2014.

<p><i>Fresh water will be supplied to the fresh water tunnels via the three (3) boreholes currently operated on site- With the current through-flow system design this is not enough.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Consideration will be given to the recirculation of water as a preferred alternative.</p>
<p>Some energy calculations are needed to compare the energy to run the propose system and that required to pump directly to the ponds.</p>	<p>The energy needs for all pumping requirements have been calculated in the design of the energy reticulation system.</p>
<p>How was the demand for the freshwater calculated?</p>	<p>The demand for freshwater was calculated by making allowance for a 10% displacement of total freshwater volume per day over a maximum pond / production system footprint and taking domestic freshwater supply needs into consideration.</p>
<p>Why use a pipe? Rather use open drainage canals where blockages won't occur and bioremediation can take place.</p>	<p>Agreed. Piped drainage will be redesigned to open channels as a preferred alternative.</p>
<p>The site substrate lends itself to infiltration back into the aquifer and thus the water will be borrowed from the water source instead of being consumed.</p>	<p>Noted. Any marine systems will have to be contained or lined to prevent saltwater contamination of the aquifer.</p>
<p>In terms of Eskom power has the current infrastructure been assessed for its supply rating compared to the consumption demand after the site has been established?</p>	<p>MBB. No. A total demand assessment has been done, but further consideration has to be given to the supply potential in the area.</p>
<p>Is the vegetation on site indigenous?</p>	<p>According to the NEMA Regulations Indigenous Vegetation is defined as: 'vegetation consisting of indigenous plant species occurring naturally in an area, regardless of the level of alien infestation and</p>
<p>The area is seriously disturbed. Surely an assessment of the quality of vegetation should be considered.</p>	<p>Noted. The quality of the vegetation has been assessed in the ecological study.</p>

<p>There appears to be an attitude of estuaries are a no go zone regarding development. I understand their sensitive nature but they do provide services which can be used sustainably. The big issue is that their assimilative capacity has been compromised through siltation from bad agricultural practices. The Amatikulu estuary is in a healthy state regarding siltation and thus it has a reasonable assimilative capacity that can be provide an ecosystem-based service to the ADZ. What would be needed is guidelines on better management practices to be developed for the ADZ to follow.</p>	<p>An estuarine impact assessment has been recommended and will be commissioned. This study will have a look at how the proposed ADZ could impact on the estuary and the results will aid in further decision making. The EMPr will also include better management practices for the ADZ</p>
<p><i>Pertaining to 190 employment opportunities created-</i> This would be a monthly salary bill of around R1.75 million. I don't think that this will give rise to a viable model.</p>	<p>The 190 employment opportunities is linked to full occupation of the entire ADZ, which can result in significant employment and a viable aquaculture business cluster at scale.</p>
<p><i>The site is classified as a Critical Biodiversity Area and an Ecological Support Area-</i> Incorrect classification by some irrational and over-zealous greeny.</p>	<p>This statement is incorrect. The site has been classified as a critical biodiversity area by the KZN Biodiversity Sector plan, 2014.</p>
<p><i>The site is a critical linkage corridor-</i> Correct but any animal or plant in that corridor is going to be consumed by the community using the land for grazing.</p>	<p>Critical Linkage corridors are important as they provide for landscape connectivity and continuity. This is especially important in the area, as the proposed site allows connectivity between the uMlalazi Nature Reserve to the east and the Amatikulu Nature Reserve in the west.</p>
<p><i>Vegetation on site is classified as Endangered-</i> That is ludicrous. There are probably more alien invasive spp. there than indigenous.</p>	<p>According to the NEMA Regulations Indigenous Vegetation is defined as: 'vegetation consisting of indigenous plant species occurring naturally in an area, regardless of the level of alien infestation and where the topsoil has not been lawfully disturbed during the past 10 years.' Some areas (historical ponds) have been disturbed, while other areas contain indigenous vegetation as defined.</p>

What about extending the footprint right up to Talmage Pan = the boarder with EKZNW?	This is not possible as the Tribal Authority only authorized the 108 Ha site to be used for the development.
This (referring to wetlands on site and the estuary) is an excellent water source for the seed supply of many soft water ornamental species and needs to be factored in to the water supply for the viability of ornamental production.	This is noted. The retention and expansion of the ornamental fish farming activities that are currently on site is envisaged.
The presence of pond environments will increase the habitat for such species (frogs etc.).	This would only be the case post construction. During the construction phase, the habitat will be destroyed and the species currently residing there would be negatively impacted upon (displacement, destruction of habitat, possible death). This is particular concern for the Critically Endangered <i>H. pickersgillii</i> frog which has been confirmed to occur within in the old relic grow out ponds on site
Using open canals, instead of a closed piping system, for returning water will increase the suitable sedge habitat.	Agreed. Piped drainage will be redesigned to open channels as a preferred alternative.
This "CBA" has been severely impacted through anthropological activities since the 1950s. Refer to aerial imagery of the surrounding uMlalazi reserve to the north and the Amatikulu reserve to the south.	While this may be the case, the area has been classified as a critical biodiversity area by the KZN Biodiversity Sector Plan, 2014.
The Amatikulu estuary is not visited by tourists, only shore anglers. Their focus is on the sea and catching fish and I doubt that they would have any negative sentiments to seeing a fish farm; probably the opposite.	Noted.
One should establish if the existing wetlands are natural or as a result of previous and existing aquaculture activities.	Many of the wetlands, although they may have been present historically, have been extended and modified by the historic aquaculture activities on the site.

<p><i>Install a drainage diversion system to divert clean runoff around areas of potential pollution, e.g. batching areas, workshops, etc.</i> -The high permeability of the substrate make this suggestion irrelevant.</p>	<p>Noted. Measures will however be included to protect groundwater from pollution.</p>
<p>I do not understand how the placing of pipes will have such a large probability of impacting the ecological and hydrological functioning of the estuary. The probability of this occurring should be ranked as 1.</p>	<p>The Amatikulu Estuary is in good ecological state, therefore disturbance to the banks and nature of the estuary will most definitely have an impact on the system. It is not just the pipeline itself, but also the construction vehicles, soil compaction and other indirect impacts. We have recommended that an estuarine impact assessment be conducted. This report will help to inform the project.</p>
<p>The soil/sea sand at the site will not generate dust.</p>	<p>The roads and areas where the existing infrastructure is located, is on ground. Therefore, any disturbance to this ground will result in the generation of dust. It is important to use a dust abatement programme to ensure that the neighbouring properties and residents are not adversely affected during the construction phase</p>
<p>No development to take place on any dunes; i.e. leave all dune areas alone.</p>	<p>The dunes have been marked as open space, whereby no development will occur on them. The exception is the possible placement of the seawater abstraction pipelines beneath the dune area.</p>
<p>Need to include a section on fire. Fires regularly run through the area and will negatively impact any development. There needs to be a buffer zone established around the ADZ to protect it from fire.</p>	<p>Fire management will be included in the environmental management programme (EMPr).</p>
<p>Guidelines for "Better Management Practices" should be developed.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be included in the environmental management programme (EMPr).</p>
<p>Need a baseline study to establish "ground zero" parameters.</p>	<p>The baseline condition of the site has been assessed.</p>

<p>Buffer zones to prevent runoff into culture ponds.</p>	<p>The design and construction of the ponds will be done in such a manner as to prevent infiltration by run-off (i.e. the ponds perimeter will be higher than the surrounding ground level. Run-off water will be led into the same channels that are used to drain the ponds.</p>
<p>Undertake Bi-monthly water monitoring tests at least until a seasonal and/or production cycle trend is established.</p>	<p>Noted. Will be included into the environmental management programme (EMPr).</p>
<p>Impacts on the estuary are going to be minimal if better management practices are employed during the operational phase. Estuarine water can be used for the grow out of marine species and is in most species a preferable salinity for optimal growth. The levels of inorganic wastes in discharge water can be minimised through correct, sustainable aquaculture practices; to the point where grow out ponds could become remediation areas for polluted water by other users of the estuary</p>	<p>Agreed. Best practices will be advocated through the EMPr to ensure optimisation of positive remediation through the design of the farming systems.</p>

Neil Stallard (12 July 2018 via email)	The ecological state of the land from the Amatikulu estuary to the boarder with EKZNW in the north is of a similar disturbed nature. Thus limiting the footprint to the proposed area I find unreasonable.	This is not possible as the Tribal Authority only authorized the 108 Ha site to be used for the development.
	Barramundi in my opinion is too high a risk to be considered, no matter how biosecure a facility is designed. There are plenty of higher value indigenous species to culture.	Agreed. Indigenous species such as cob will be promoted. An ecological risk assessment will be conducted around the use of Barramundi, and an application made to DEA.
	I disagree with refurbishment. Use the old footprint but redesign.	This will largely be determined by the new tenants for the site.
	The beach at Mtunzini is still showing accretion. The regression shown is at the Thugela mouth. What is the situation at Amatikulu?	I have seen beach accretion at Mtunzini over the last 24 – 36 months (moderate to htn rainfalls) but I see long term dune transgression. This implies that the dune is feeding the beach with sediment at least in part. Amathikhulu is relatively inflated, however the Casuarina stabilisation and other factors may be masking variation along the shoreline (Simon Bundy)
	No consideration has been given to the barrier reef system called Glenton Reef, which is situated directly off the Amatikulu ADZ development and extends for a considerable distance north.	We are aware of the reef, however this is outside the EIA process. Future planning/assessment may consider this reef as a suitable point to which a marine abstraction pipe can be anchored.
	<i>Should the disposal of water from the aquaculture facility cease much of the surface hydrology and habitat associated with the area would change-</i> I disagree with this point as the water for the current aquaculture site is not coming from an external source.	There are a significant number of drains feeding the secondary dune slack and serve to deliver surface water towards the dune cordon. A significant disposal pond is evident within the dune slack – Psammoserai vegetation – dune habitat – responds to surface water availability. The fish farm serves to relocate deep waters to surface (Simon Bundy).

	Casuarina are actively harvested for fire wood. If this practice was stopped then they would re-establish and the transgression of the dunes would stop.	I do not agree. Dune transgression is abated by Casuarina but will not stop. Dune transgression is driven by a number of factors including sediment supply, slr and meteorological factors (Simon Bundy).
	The current operations draw water from the aquifer in this dune slack area, thus not adding to the total water available; just borrowing a large portion with a fraction lost to evaporation. The water level in this area is impacted most by rainfall.	There is a significant groundwater lens at this point and historical imagery does not support this argument. As above – dune stability is influenced by surface water availability (Simon Bundy)
	This water source is of a significant different quality to the water in the dune slack aquifer. It is critical to have access to this source for the production of soft water ornamental species.	Agreed. Measures will be implemented (i.e. lining of all marine systems) to prevent groundwater contamination, so that this water remains suitable for ornamental species.
	Extraction of water from HGM 3 has historically occurred for the production of soft water ornamentals.	Noted. See above.
	Through construction of wetlands and canals instead of using piping, the habitat for these species (Critically Endangered Pickers Gills Frog) can be increased and become more permanent in nature.	This would only be the case post construction. During the construction phase, the habitat will be destroyed and the species currently residing there would be negatively impacted upon (displacement, destruction of habitat, possible death). This is particular concern for the Critically Endangered <i>H. pickersgillii</i> frog which has been confirmed to occur within in the old relic grow out ponds on site. Difficult to forecast as little is known about these populations as they are fragmented and may not be able to repopulate disturbed areas. Precautionary approach as above is agreed.
	The extraction pipe does not have to enter the sea. Well points in the intertidal zone are adequate.	This will be subject to future feasibility assessment.
	<i>Water should not be drawn from the Amathikhulu estuary, nor disposed into the estuary- Disagree.</i>	Although this is not my competency, the estuary is one of the better functioning systems in the

	<p>The "pristine" nature of the estuary, and presumably low level of siltation give it good assimilative capacities that can provide a good ecosystem service to the ADZ.</p> <p>The location of the potential extraction and discharge points would be in close proximity to the mouth, thereby increasing the dispersive ability of the estuary. Water samples of a similar aquaculture project on the uMlalazi estuary indicate that, if correct management procedures are implemented, the ADZ can return water with lower TSS and inorganic chemical concentrations than the water that is extracted.</p>	<p>Province and should be allocated some level of increased conservation significance. The abstraction option does however beg further consideration and the potential impact assessed through as estuarine impact assessment.</p>
	<p>There has been in the region of 75m of accretion at the Mtunzini beach which is closer to the Amatikulu mouth than the Thukela region.</p>	<p>I am not sure of the statement – this is not the regional case and does not appear to be the case in Tugela. While there may be accretion at points, the overall evidence points at regression. The 'elasticity' of the sand sharing system is the factor that must be measured and considered.</p>
	<p>I disagree, as stated above, the current aquaculture practices extract water from the same resource that they discharge into. Thus variations in the water level in the dune slack area is purely a function of rainfall.</p>	<p>Disagree – this is not supported by historical information nor on site imagery. Dune system stability is driven by surface water availability – therefore moving water from a sub-surface source for disposal on or near the dune surface will change the drivers in the psammo-sere (dune habitat).</p>
	<p>The dunes to the north of the site are still populated by trees and thus more stable. The extraction of wood for fuel in front of the existing operations has destabilised the dunes in this area; more natural historically but requiring a more exaggerated set back line.</p>	<p>The historical imagery and eco-morphology of the site suggests that the eastern extent of the ADZ is in the sand sharing system. The area is naturally a dunefield.</p>
	<p>Ponds should be constructed above the water table, but the water table can be used for extraction which will only result in predominately borrowing.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>Coastal set back line could be reduced if dunes allowed to re-establish.</p>	<p>The setback line is based on historical and eco morphological states. The likelihood of dunes re-</p>

		establishing is contrary to the norm along the KZN coastline
	Piping through the dunes, if required, should be facilitated through hydro-mining as was achieved with the optic fibre cables at Mtunzini.	Noted and will be considered as a less invasive means of construction.
	Removal of <i>Eucalyptus grandis</i> for firewood should be stopped and their re-establishment allowed to preserve the area of the ADZ.	This would perhaps be beneficial in some ecological aspects but I am unsure how this would “preserve: the ADZ.
	The abandonment of the site has not lead to the reinstatement of dune transgression. This has been the result of numerous fires and subsequent use of Cassurina for fire wood by the feed factory.	The casuarinas were present long before the ADZ site was established. The overall response to the Casuarina planting in the area has been dune stabilisation – as sediment influx dwindles and beaches deflate the dune sand repository will respond with increased transgression (Simon Bundy).
	The recommended footprint can be extended with mitigating better aquaculture management practices. Implementing such strategies can enhance the ecology of, and surrounding, the proposed ADZ.	Noted. The currently proposed footprint optimised production while considering ecological sensitivities.
	During the peak period of operation, 1990 – 1998, the infrastructure was not visible from any vantage point. This was assisted by the low-lying nature of the site and the height of the vegetation that existed at that time.	The environment and landscape are not static, it is constantly changing. It should be noted that the visual impact assessment is done at a ‘worst case scenario,’ meaning that no vegetation is taken into consideration. Therefore, the visual impact of the proposed ADZ is anticipated to be low.
	Zini Fish Farms could be an alternative or an additional area for development and support of aquaculture development in KZN.	Noted. This will be passed on to DAFF as the national custodian authority.
	The abstraction from and return back to the estuary worked well in the prawn farming days. Surely this should support the same application again? Environmentalists are very sensitive about estuaries without giving thought to the real sources of	This point has merit. The option of utilising the estuary should be explored further (Simon Bundy) and will be subjected to an estuarine impact assessment.

	<p>impacts being siltation through bad agricultural practices. They also do not understand the benign impacts of commercial aquaculture, especially semi-intense culture where the majority of waste assimilation takes place in the culture environment.</p>	
	<p>The mouth opens from time to time. Seawater extraction should only be done for the purpose of seed production = relatively low volumes which can be accommodated through well points on the beach. Estuarine water (brackish) is perfect for the grow out part of the production cycle.</p> <p>The "National Estuarine Management Protocol", gazetted on 10 May 2013, in the last sentence of the first paragraph of section 2 states "The EMPs seek to achieve greater harmony between ecological processes and human activities while accommodating orderly and balanced estuarine resource utilization". This does not talk to exclusionary, preservationist thinking but rather to the discipline of ecosystem-based management to which South Africa is a signatory through the Convention of Biological Diversity. The FAO also promotes this way of thinking.</p>	<p>This is noted. The estuarine impact assessment will guide the preferred alternative to water supply which considered both production activities and environmental sensitivities.</p> <p>Agreed. This approach has been considered and will be further informed by the estuarine impact assessment.</p>
	<p>Is 1 X holding reservoir sufficient for one day's use at 20% recharge? If so, this indicates that total production facility capacity is 12.5 million litres. If semi-intensive pond culture is employed then this is not a lot of space. Area M5 looks like it covers the historic prawn pond area which = 10ha. Thus the total marine area looks to be about 35ha which at a depth of 1.5m = 525000 cubic meters. This will equate to a 0.5% daily exchange rate.</p> <p>To facilitate a 20% daily exchange rate the reservoir footprint will be inhibitive and thus a direct supply to the ponds would be better. Through better management practices the required</p>	<p>The full water supply demand will be determined by the final design. However, an aquaculture development area of 35 Ha is not anticipated. Moreover a double reservoir facility has been allowed for in accordance with the anticipated production area and volumes.</p>

	daily exchange can be significantly reduced, though establishing this for this site and the culture systems and species used will take a few years of experience and data gathering.	
Omar Parak- EDTEA Coastal Unit (Received 6 August 2018 via email)	The Seashore Act is not included in the Legal Framework. Any proposed abstraction and discharge pipeline/s may require a lease from EDTEA in terms of the Sea Shore Act.	The Sea-Shore Act is now included under the Legal Framework. Please refer to pg 14 of the Final Scoping Report. The required marine discharge permitting process is in application
	The report is unclear how the relevant landowners (onshore and offshore) are to be engaged and landowner consent sought.	DAFF has been engaging with the local community (and the Ingonyama Trust) who owns the land for the past year. A landowner letter of consent from the Macambini Traditional Council was included in the application form.
	A coastal waters discharge permit will be required from DEA for the discharge of brine and related into the coastal and marine environment.	An application for a coastal waters discharge permit is being undertaken.
	The report is not clear and overt regarding how estuarine impacts will be assessed and there is no reference that any estuarine specialist study is to be undertaken (other than reference to a feasibility study which will determine the preferred option) – unless this [estuarine] option is since removed off the table. As stated during our meeting of 12 March 2018, the EDTEA: Coastal Unit will not support any abstraction or disposal into the estuary.	Noted. We have recommended that an estuarine impact assessment be conducted. This report will inform the EIR phase of the process.
	Pg. 37 of the report makes no reference to a marine impact study to be commissioned relating to abstraction and discharge and the related methodology to be applied – including the related expertise needed in compiling such a report.	A marine impact assessment has been recommended and will inform the EIR phase of the process.
	The list of regional planning documents (pg. 13) makes no reference to the protected area management plan of the Amatikulu Nature Reserve.	Noted. This has now been included. Please refer to page 15 of the final scoping report.

	<p>The aspects and implications of existing and future coastal access on the project, including public access to the sea for boating and bathing purposes have not been outlined in the report for further unpacking. The beach to the immediate south of the proposed site is a Blue Flag beach. These issues are also not outlined in the Social Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>Coastal access will not be affected as the development does not impact on the existing coastal access route. The social dimensions related to the development and the beach access have been flagged for further attention in the EIR phase.</p>
	<p>It is unclear if there will be any freshwater alternatives and/or top up, over and above the 3 boreholes identified.</p>	<p>There are no other freshwater sources in the area. Measures to recycle water will be added to the design phase so as to better ensure adequacy in supply volume.</p>
<p>Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (Received via email on 17 August 2018)</p>	<p>It has been acknowledged that the proposed site was historically used as an ornamental fish, plant and prawn farm which has since fallen into disrepair. It is unclear from the Draft Scoping Report if the reasons for the failure (technical or market) of the previous facility has been determined and if lessons learnt there will be incorporated into this new venture.</p>	<p>The old prawn hatchery used to yield a single prawn harvest per year. Competitive markets in warmer climates were able to yield two harvests per year and the prawns could be imported cheaper than those produced locally, which resulted in the prawn hatchery closing. Were prawns to be farmed again, the farming technology will be different to allow for the production of a competitive crop.</p> <p>The ornamental fish and aquatic plant business has declined, but not closed or failed. Although global demand has decreased, the farming of ornamental fish and aquatic plants remains viable. The specific species farmed at Amatikulu has been taken into consideration and if ornamental fish farming were to continue it will focus on species that remain economically viable.</p>

<p>The total reliance on boreholes to meet freshwater demand is of concern especially given that the freshwater demand vs the borehole yields remain unknown. Guaranteed freshwater supply to facilities of this nature is critical for its continued operation and the risk of groundwater depletion (and possible saline intrusion) does bring the viability of this project into question. It is expected that the necessary hydrological studies will be commissioned to assess the risk of groundwater depletion during the operational phase of the facility, however this does not address the concern at that late stage should there be insufficient fresh water.</p>	<p>A geohydrological study was conducted for the proposed ADZ.</p>
<p>Greater clarity on the species to be farmed is required. There is great concern that any exotic species may become invasive, especially given that (a) the aMatikulu estuary is a vital component of the Amatikulu Nature Reserve, a proclaimed provincial protected area and (b) the ADZ borders the proposed uThukela Marine Protected Area (MPA) which is also a result of the Operation Phakisa process and contains critical biodiversity that needs to be considered. Due to the risk of (larval or adult) escape, EKZNW will not support exotic or hybrid species being farmed.</p>	<p>Although a range of ornamental fish species have been farmed at Amatikulu historically, no non-indigenous species will be introduced without the approval of an Alien and Invasive Species Risk Assessment and the issuing of an Alien and Invasive Species Permit. Probably species that are being considered at this stage are Dusky Cob, Grunter and Nile Tilapia (pending an AIS permit / if issued).</p>
<p>EKZNW will also not support the harvesting of any broodstock from the aMatikulu estuary for this commercial venture. Details on source and method of acquisition of broodstock are lacking and need to be determined upfront. It must be noted that the method of broodstock acquisition may also be subject to additional authorisations e.g. if beach driving is required, a separate application will have to be made to the Department of Environmental Affairs (Oceans and Coasts).</p>	<p>No broodstock harvesting will be done from the aMatikulu estuary. Broodstock will be obtained from reliable captive bred stocks that will be scrutinized by DAFF.</p>
<p>Harvesting of broodstock from a proposed MPA is an activity that is in conflict with the objectives of such as area. When the proposed uThukela MPA does get proclaimed, broodstock harvesting in that area may have to be revisited and alternatives should be considered upfront. This has not been done.</p>	<p>No broodstock harvesting will be done from the MPA.</p>

<p>EKZNW would like to reiterate that it will not support any abstraction from and any discharge into the aMatikulu estuary. Discharge into the coastal zone is also a concern, given that this is within a potential MPA. More consultation with the DEA and EKZNW will be required gauge the desirability of the marine option and a marine impact study may also have to be commissioned to guide the placement and management (during both the construction and operational phases) of the abstraction and discharge lines. Thoughtful consideration must be given to the treatment of effluent to special standards prior to discharge and use of the existing discharge line to convey effluent derived from any other purposes or processes other than the proposed aquaculture plant will not be supported. It must also be noted that an application for a coastal discharge permit will have to be lodged with the Department of Environmental Affairs (Oceans and Coasts).</p>	<p>An estuarine impact assessment was commissioned to determine the impacts of abstraction from and discharge into the Amatikulu Estuary. Based on the findings of this report, the EAP has recommended that the abstraction from, and discharge into the Amatikulu Estuary will not be supported. Please refer to Appendix D for the full specialist report.</p> <p>A marine impact assessment was also commissioned to determine the impacts of the intake and discharge pipelines, as well as, the discharge of effluent into the ocean. Discharged effluent will have to meet DWAF (1995) Water Quality Guidelines (WQG) for coastal marine waters, and a comprehensive monitoring program implemented. Additionally, numerical monitoring must be undertaken to inform the optimal design of the outfall to ensure the best placement and that impacts remain low. Please refer to Appendix D for the full report.</p> <p>A coastal discharge permit has been applied for.</p>
<p>The current mouth dynamics of the Amatikulu estuary renders the intake and discharge lines at risk, above and beyond those posed by coastal zone dynamics. The mouth of the Amatikulu estuary has been steadily migrating in a northerly direction. Careful consideration must be given to the proposed placement of the pipes, as EKZNW will not support (a) any engineering to “fix” the estuary mouth in a given position and (b) the manipulation of the estuary mouth to protect any of the aquaculture infrastructure. The construction of a single trench for both intake and outfall pipelines should be considered so as to reduce the environmental implications.</p>	<p>An estuarine impact assessment was commissioned to determine the impacts of abstraction from and discharge into the Amatikulu Estuary. Based on the findings of this report, the EAP has recommended that the abstraction from, and discharge into the Amatikulu Estuary will not be supported. Please refer to Appendix D for the full specialist report.</p>

	<p>The current challenges of enforcement of the Marine Living Resource Act (1998) in KZN bear reference. It remains uncertain if the current deployment of DAFF officials to KZN will also be able to monitor the facility to ensure compliance with conditions of operation. Monitoring of the effluent to ensure compliance with coastal waters discharge permits is also critical. The option of an advisory forum should also be considered which has members of civil society and Government to assist with this function.</p>	<p>Both an advisory forum and monitoring committee have been included into the EMPr.</p>
<p>Stakeholder Meetings- Draft Scoping Report, July 2018</p>		
<p>Maxwell Myeza (24 July at public meeting)</p>	<p>is the site located along the coast? I think this development is a good thing. People are desperate for jobs and opportunities. The site also doesn't touch/ affect any neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Sipho Mbonambi (24 July at public meeting)</p>	<p>Jobs are really needed in the area. Once the EIA process is complete, can the Government help the local people to take up the business side and be involved?</p>	<p>The Government has many initiatives aimed at helping people, such as Operation Phakisa.</p> <p>DAFF will be paying for the set up/ construction of the ADZ. Afterwards, once this is complete, we will invite various people/companies to setup businesses within the ADZ. It is important to note that DAFF will not own the businesses that setup in the ADZ so we cannot force them to employ locals, however we do strongly encourage them to do so and to provide training by offering businesses incentives etc.</p>
<p>Constance Ntuli (24 July at public meeting)</p>	<p>There is no mention of anything about educating the youth in aquaculture. I think it would be a good thing if there was a place or school set up locally which educated youth on fish farming. Then by the time the ADZ is up and running, there will be enough skilled people to do the work.</p>	<p>That is an excellent idea, however, we don't want to pre-empt anything. The DEA can still deny the project, or if it does get approved, it could take another 10 years before the project is developed.</p>

		We don't want to be in a position where we have all these skilled people but no jobs or opportunities.
Sipho Mbonambi (24 July at public meeting)	I am concerned about after the project starts- we are using freshwater. Will we be accommodated or will it only be marine?	Both freshwater and marine aquaculture is proposed for the site.
	When there was prawn farming on the site many years ago, the freshwater/ groundwater was badly polluted/contaminated. It took many, many years for it to get better. What are you going to do to prevent this from occurring again?	We definitely do not want there to be any contamination of groundwater, so all ponds and marine systems will have to be lined properly. This will be included in the EMP and design.
Guy Upfold (24 July at public meeting)	We need a buffer between the freshwater and marine tunnels, which currently as the design stands, there is not one.	We might not be able to put in a buffer owing to the space constraints of the site. The importance of separation is however noted, and these areas will be kept separate.
	There is plenty of water on site so don't think that would be an issue. I do think that throughflow would be the best way to utilize and recycle the water. Additionally, marine wastewater needs to be pumped offsite and not put back into the site.	Noted. Marine discharge will not be allowed to contaminate on-site freshwater.
	Can the layout not be moved 200 m to the south?	This is not possible. The primary dune is very sensitive and cannot be developed on. It is a no-go area and will be left to natural open space.
Maxwell Myeza (24 July at public meeting)	How is the ADZ going to impact on the current businesses on the site, specifically the Pet products? We use chemicals and they can go underground and into the water.	We can't really say at this point how the current businesses will be affected. The current businesses will have to apply to use the area and the tribal community and DAFF will make a decision. However, the chemicals will have to be contained properly so that they do not affect other businesses in the ADZ.
Mpume Mhlongo- KZNDARD (24 July at public meeting)	The Provincial Agriculture Department is busy looking at aiding vulnerable people in the local communities. What challenges occurred that lead to the failure of the old prawn	It is proposed that viable species be used. If prawns were to be farmed, new techniques would have to be employed.

	farm on the site and what measures are in place to avoid that happening again?	
	Is the ADZ on the old site. If not, what will happen to the old infrastructure?	The old infrastructure will be reused/refurbished as much as possible, however, most of it is not in a good state. It is not proposed that everything be built from scratch.
	You mentioned disturbance to the wetlands on site. In 2014-April 2016 we had a terrible drought. What mitigation measures are in place to address this issue?	The wetland on site is as a result of the old prawn ponds, but regardless it is a sensitive system and the water table there is very high and the design of the facility must take this into consideration to avoid any issues. These measures will also be contained in the EMPr.
	No pollution control (noise, waste etc.) was mentioned in the presentation. Need to include mitigation measures. There are also positives that arise from waste in terms of agriculture.	There will be 3 wastewater treatment facilities on site to ensure that the treated water is up to standard. The best practice would be to pump the waste water back into the ADZ. If this is not an option, then it will be discharged into the ocean or estuary. I do agree, we need to look at how to reuse the wastewater effectively.
	Range of species to be farmed. We need to know what species would thrive in our own climatic conditions.	An analysis was done on a wide range of species so that the developers would be able to pick which species they would like to farm with. We would like to support the existing ornamental fish farming.
M Ntuli (24 July at public meeting)	We have been trying for many years to get developers in to develop the land, since 2011. DAFF first approached us but then, they withdrew, but now are back to set up the ADZ. In 2009 we refused to let the people from Dubai develop on the land because they wanted to take over all of the tribal land. We have reserved the area from the estuary to Mtunzini for projects that will generate jobs for the local community. So I implore you to please make the process fast and speedy. 40% unemployment rate is too high.	Noted. Please note that these issues fall outside the scope of the EIA process. This matter is noted, but needs to be taken up with the mandated authorities overseeing the reserve.

	The Traditional Council also does not want the Nature Reserve. It is not generating anything for the local people or benefiting anyone.	
Jeremy Nottingham (24 July at public meeting)	Did the study that was done to determine the ADZs, include the current aquaculture farm (Zini Fish farms) to see if it was feasible?	The Zini Fish Farm was not identified in the initial ADZ report for land-based sites, however the criteria used was very specific and was based on location, size, social impacts and land ownership etc. This should be taken up by Zini Fish Farms with DAFF.
Neil Stallard (24 July at public meeting)	The original ADZ footprint used to extend all the way to the District boundary. Why did this change?	The larger area was requested by the DAFF but the Tribal community only approved the 108ha area which was previously surveyed.
Giles Churchill (24 July at public meeting)	Will the EA for the project be to farm x amount of tons of fish? Any developer who comes in won't have to go through another EIA process?	Correct. If the EA is granted, a developer will be able to start right away.
Clive Vivier (24 July at public meeting)	Have any measures been included to enhance and protect the birdlife in the immediate area? There are a lot of protected and endangered birds in the site.	There are no specific measures in place yet. The birds may be drawn to the area by the fish so precautionary measures will have to be put in place in the EMP. Enhancing the fish farm environment may create additional habitat for birds.
Jeremy Nottingham (24 July at public meeting)	The area here at Mtunzini, we are busy losing coastal forest due to dune encroachment.	The coastline used to be prograding up until recently, now it is receding (the sea is coming closer and the dunes are receding). Tugela lost 96 m in coastline in 9 years. In general, we are losing 4 m a year of coastline. This process has been taken into consideration.
Shaun Minners (24 July at public meeting)	What tourism do you have planned for the area? Perhaps something worth looking into is having restaurants that can serve the fish from the ADZ and perhaps have a market to sell the fish as well.	Tourism activities do not form part of the ADZ EIA, this is outside of the scope of the EIA. Yet the suggestion is noted and will be communicated to the applicant.

Neil Stallard (24 July at public meeting)	<p>If an ecosystem environmental approach is taken with the ADZ, then positive impacts on the environment will be experienced.</p> <p>The ADZ can still be utilized as an environmental corridor. It won't be a concrete jungle. The wetlands on site can be used to attract birds and frogs.</p> <p>Can also look into using a wave action pump if seawater is abstracted from the ocean. Can anchor it on the Glenton Reef.</p>	Noted. These features have been taken into consideration in the design.
Clive Vivier (24 July at public meeting)	Lean more towards a green economy- farm fish that are threatened in the ocean can be farmed (SASSI classified some farmed fish as green).	Noted. Indigenous and "green" SASSI species are encouraged.
Shaun Minners (24 July at public meeting)	Have you had any in depth discussions with the locals? It's a very volatile situation here. Have they indicated exactly what they would like to see?	DAFF have been liaising with the local community and the tribal authority for many years and they are on board with the development.
Wendy Forse (24 July at public meeting)	Will antibiotics be used on the fish? This poses great issues as they can be released back into the water and environment.	Very low chance of using antibiotics as the cost of it is very high. However, it is a potential risk and measures should be addressed in the EMPr. The fish will also be exported and not only used locally, therefore there is a high level of accountability.
Clive Vivier (24 July at public meeting)	Use of chemicals and other antibiotics in the fish pose threats to other animals. When they die, the vultures eat them and then they die as well.	This is obviously a great concern and chemicals and fish disposal will be covered in the EMPr.
Wendy Forse (24 July at public meeting)	Who will manage the overall ADZ?	DAFF will be responsible for the overall management of the ADZ. DAFF also has annual permit conditions that have to be renewed and met on an annual basis, which covers the concern regarding the use of antibiotics. There is also a food safety concern which is covered by the Shellfish and Finfish Monitoring programs. The ADZ will be

		management by the DAFF as the holder of the EA, but the DAFF plans to include management committees which comprise of Government and the Public sectors.
Jeremy Nottingham (24 July at public meeting)	Will the ADZ be successful? What track record do we have in South Africa that shows that a facility like this is feasible? No use spending all this money if it is going to fail.	While it's true that Aquaculture has a long history of failure in South Africa, there is definitely merit. Various ADZ initiatives such as Qolora in KZN and Saldanha Bay in the Western Cape have received EA. DAFF has also commissioned feasibility studies which can be circulated on the DAFF website, for different aquaculture species.
Neil Stallard (24 July at public meeting)	There is provincial resistance to using the estuary. Need to take a closer look at the technologies and methods being utilized overseas. They all promote aquaculture in sensitive areas and the impacts have been negligible. ADZ are even in marine protected areas.	This is noted, Best management practices will be included as per the EMPr.
Terry Stallard (24 July at public meeting)	What mitigation measures re in place to prevent the seepage of seawater into the freshwater?	All ponds and other marine infrastructure will have to be lined or isolated effectively.

APPENDIX E.2.3 Correspondence and Minutes of Meetings



environmental affairs

Department:
Environmental Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X 447· PRETORIA · 0001· Environment House · 473 Steve Biko Road, Arcadia, PRETORIA

DEA Reference: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Enquiries: Ms Constance Musemburi
Telephone: (012) 399 9416 E-mail: Cmusemburi@environment.gov.za

Mr Etienne Hinrichsen
NuLeaf Planning and Environmental
8A Trevor Street
MURAYFIELD
0184

Tel No: 082 822 1236
Email: etienne@aquaeeco.co.za

PER E-MAIL / MAIL

Dear Mr Hinrichsen

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE IN AMATIKULU, KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCE.

The draft Scoping Report (SR) received by this Department on 02 July 2018 and the acknowledgement letter for the draft SR issued by this Department on 03 July 2018 refers.


This Department has the following comments on the abovementioned application:

- i. This Department has noted the use of the word "may", when describing the project activity that triggers the listed activities applied for. The use of this word show that the EAP/applicant is not confident and/or is uncertain as to why the listed activities applied for are being triggered by the proposed activity. You are therefore requested to rephrase all project activity descriptions to refrain from the use of these words. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that only the applicable listed activities are included in the application. A full assessment of impacts and proposed mitigation thereto of all the triggered activities must be provided in the final SR.
- ii. Please ensure that the relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that they can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description.
- iii. If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the final SR, an amended application form must be submitted. Please note that the Department's application form template has been amended and can be downloaded from the following link <https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms>.
- iv. Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the draft SR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed in the Final SR. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the Final SR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments. The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014 as amended.
- v. Please provide a description of any identified alternatives for the proposed activity that are feasible and reasonable, including the advantages and disadvantages that the proposed activity or alternatives will have on the environment and on the community that may be affected by the activity as per Appendix 2

- (1) (c) (d) and 2 (h) of GN R.982 of 2014 as amended. Alternatively, you should submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 2 (2)(x)(xi).
- vi. In accordance with Appendix 2 (2) (a) of the EIA Regulations 2014, the details of—
- (i) *the EAP who prepared the report; and*
 - (ii) *the expertise of the EAP to carry out Scoping and Environmental Impact assessment procedures; must be submitted.*
- vii. Please ensure that the final SR includes a legible site layout map; an environmental sensitivity map indicating all environmental sensitive areas and features; a map combining a layout map superimposed (overlain) on the environmental sensitivity map; and a regional map of the area.
- viii. You are further reminded that the final SR to be submitted to this Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 and Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended.
- ix. Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014 as amended, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been granted in terms of Regulation 3(7).

You are hereby reminded of Section 24F of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No 107 of 1998, as amended, that no activity may commence prior to an environmental authorisation being granted by the Department.

Yours sincerely



Mr Sabelo Malaza
Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations
Department of Environmental Affairs
Signed by: Mr. Wayne Hector
Designation: Deputy Director: Strategic Infrastructure Developments
Date: 24/07/18

cc: Ms Zimasa Jika	DAFF	Tel no: 021 402 3065	Email: ZimasaJ@daff.gov.za
--------------------	------	----------------------	----------------------------

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Omar Parak <Omar.Parak@kznedtea.gov.za >
Sent: 06 August 2018 13:55
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Cc: 'Irene Hatton'; 'Etienne Hinrichsen'; Malcolm Moses; Kashrina Sookraj; Alfred Matsheke; Nombulelo Zungu; santosh.bachoo@kznwildlife.com
Subject: RE: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN: Stakeholder Meeting

Dear Bryony,

Find below my comments. Kindly note these exclude any other comments to be received from another EDTEA office.

1. The Seashore Act is not included in the Legal Framework. Any proposed abstraction and discharge pipeline/s may require a lease from EDTEA in terms of the Sea Shore Act.
2. The report is unclear how the relevant landowners (onshore and offshore) are to be engaged and landowner consent sought.
3. A coastal waters discharge permit will be required from DEA for the discharge of brine and related into the coastal and marine environment.
4. The report is not clear and overt regarding how estuarine impacts will be assessed and there is no reference that any estuarine specialist study is to be undertaken (other than reference to a feasibility study which will determine the preferred option) – unless this [estuarine] option is since removed off the table. As stated during our meeting of 12 March 2018, the EDTEA: Coastal Unit will not support any abstraction or disposal into the estuary.
5. Pg. 37 of the report makes no reference to a marine impact study to be commissioned relating to abstraction and discharge and the related methodology to be applied – including the related expertise needed in compiling such a report.
6. The list of regional planning documents (pg. 13) makes no reference to the protected area management plan of the Amatikulu Nature Reserve.
7. The aspects and implications of existing and future coastal access on the project, including public access to the sea for boating and bathing purposes have not been outlined in the report for further unpacking. The beach to the immediate south of the proposed site is a Blue Flag beach. These issues are also not outlined in the Social Impact Assessment.
8. It is unclear if there will be any freshwater alternatives and/or top up, over and above the 3 boreholes identified.

Kind regards,
Omar
EDTEA: Coastal Unit

From: Bryony van Niekerk [mailto:bryony@nuleafsa.co.za]
Sent: 02 August 2018 12:58 PM
To: Omar Parak
Cc: 'Irene Hatton'; 'Etienne Hinrichsen'; Malcolm Moses; Kashrina Sookraj; Alfred Matsheke; Nombulelo Zungu; santosh.bachoo@kznwildlife.com
Subject: RE: Proposed Establishment of an Aquaculture Development Zone in Amatikulu, KZN: Stakeholder Meeting

Afternoon Omar,

I would just like to know if I can still expect your comments on the Draft Scoping Report?

Regards,



Scientific Services

Enquiries: Santosh Bachoo

Your Ref: Amatikulu ADZ (No EIA Number provided)

Ms Constance Musemburi
Department of Environmental Affairs

OFFICIAL COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED AMATIKULU AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE, AMATIKULU, KZN: DRAFT SCOPING REPORT

Context of Review and Official Comments:

Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (Ezemvelo) has had the opportunity to review the Draft Scoping Report for the above proposed development zone. Ezemvelo is the trade name for the KwaZulu Natal Nature Conservation Service¹, which in turn is the implementing agency for the KwaZulu Natal Nature Conservation Board². Ezemvelo is the mandated KwaZulu Natal provincial nature conservation authority and as such has provided input on the proposed development.

The duties of Ezemvelo as the provincial nature conservation authority include the protection of the biodiversity of KwaZulu Natal both within and outside protected areas, and as such has provided comments and concerns regarding the proposed development below:

Need and Desirability

It has been acknowledged that the proposed site was historically used as an ornamental fish, plant and prawn farm which has since fallen into disrepair³. It is unclear from the Draft Scoping Report if the reasons for the failure (technical or market) of the previous facility has been determined and if lessons learnt there will be incorporated into this new venture.

Freshwater Supply

The total reliance on boreholes to meet freshwater demand is of concern especially given that the freshwater demand vs the borehole yields remain unknown. Guaranteed freshwater supply to facilities of this nature is critical for its continued operation and the risk of groundwater depletion (and possible saline intrusion) does bring the viability of this project into question. It is expected that the necessary hydrological studies will be commissioned to assess the risk of groundwater depletion during the operational phase of the facility, however this does not address the concern at that late stage should there be insufficient fresh water.

¹ Established in terms of Chapter 4 of the KwaZulu Natal Nature Conservation Management Act 9 of 1997.

² Established in terms of Chapter 3 of the KwaZulu Natal Nature Conservation Management Act 9 of 1997.

³ Visual Impact Assessment (Page 8)

Species for Aquaculture and Broodstock Acquisition

Greater clarity on the species to be farmed is required. There is great concern that any exotic species may become invasive, especially given that (a) the aMatikulu estuary is a vital component of the Amatikulu Nature Reserve, a proclaimed provincial protected area and (b) the ADZ borders the proposed uThukela Marine Protected Area (MPA) which is also a result of the Operation Phakisa process and contains critical biodiversity that needs to be considered. Due to the risk of (larval or adult) escape, EKZNW will not support exotic or hybrid species being farmed.

EKZNW will also not support the harvesting of any broodstock from the aMatikulu estuary for this commercial venture. Details on source and method of acquisition of broodstock are lacking and need to be determined upfront. It must be noted that the method of broodstock acquisition may also be subject to additional authorisations e.g. if beach driving is required, a separate application will have to be made to the Department of Environmental Affairs (Oceans and Coasts).

Harvesting of broodstock from a proposed MPA is an activity that is in conflict with the objectives of such an area. When the proposed uThukela MPA does get proclaimed, broodstock harvesting in that area may have to be revisited and alternatives should be considered upfront. This has not been done.

Abstraction and Discharge

EKZNW would like to reiterate that it will not support any abstraction from and any discharge into the aMatikulu estuary. Discharge into the coastal zone is also a concern, given that this is within a potential MPA. More consultation with the DEA and EKZNW will be required gauge the desirability of the marine option and a marine impact study may also have to be commissioned to guide the placement and management (during both the construction and operational phases) of the abstraction and discharge lines. Thoughtful consideration must be given to the treatment of effluent to special standards prior to discharge and use of the existing discharge line to convey effluent derived from any other purposes or processes other than the proposed aquaculture plant will not be supported. It must also be noted that an application for a coastal discharge permit will have to be lodged with the Department of Environmental Affairs (Oceans and Coasts).

Pipeline Placement

The current mouth dynamics of the Amatikulu estuary renders the intake and discharge lines at risk, above and beyond those posed by coastal zone dynamics. The mouth of the Amatikulu estuary has been steadily migrating in a northerly direction. Careful consideration must be given to the proposed placement of the pipes, as EKZNW will not support (a) any engineering to "fix" the estuary mouth in a given position and (b) the manipulation of the estuary mouth to protect any of the aquaculture infrastructure. The construction of a single trench for both intake and outfall pipelines should be considered so as to reduce the environmental implications.

Monitoring and Compliance

The current challenges of enforcement of the Marine Living Resource Act (1998) in KZN bear reference. It remains uncertain if the current deployment of DAFF officials to KZN will also be able to monitor the facility to ensure compliance with conditions of operation. Monitoring of the effluent to ensure compliance with coastal waters discharge permits is also critical. The option of an advisory forum should also be considered which has members of civil society and Government to assist with this function.

Summary

At this time the report appear deficient in a number of areas and requires substantial information to be gathered and included in the Final Scoping Report / EIA stage.

Yours Sincerely



pp

Santosh Bachoo

For A/CEO Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife

DATE : 17th August 2018

cc Bryony van Niekerk
Omar Parak

NuLeaf
KZN EDTEA

bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Omar.Parak@kznedtea.gov.za

Two (2) stakeholder meetings were held on 24th July 2018; one at 10 am at the Tribal Authority and one at 5 pm at the Mtunzini Country Club in KwaZulu Natal.



**AMATIKULU AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE:
STAKEHOLDER MEETING
DRAFT SCOPING REPORT**

Date: Tuesday, 24 July 2018, Time: 10:00 –12:30, Venue: Traditional Council, KZN
Chairperson: Etienne Hinrichsen

MINUTES

No.	Item
1.	Opening & Welcome
	EH opened the meeting at 10:30 and welcomed all present. Mr Ntuli acted in the role of the interpreter.
2.	Present & Apologies
	<p>Present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Etienne Hinrichsen (EH) 2. Bryony van Niekerk (BvN) 3. Michelle Pistorius (MP) 4. Mpume Mhlongo (MM) 5. Guy Upfold (GU) 6. Constance Ntuli (CN) 7. Cynthia Ntuli (CyN) 8. Vincent Sokhula (VS) 9. Maxwell Myeza (MaM) 10. Siphon Mbonambi (SM) 11. M Ntuli (MN)
3.	Draft Scoping Report Presentation
	<p>EH discussed the Draft Scoping Report as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Purpose of the meeting b. Background and history c. Proposed activity d. Feasible and reasonable alternatives e. Need and desirability f. Property description g. Biodiversity h. Heritage i. Visual j. Socioeconomic character k. Identified impacts l. Public participation m. Conclusions and recommendations

4.	Discussion
4.1	<p>Following the presentation, the floor was then opened for discussion:</p> <p>MaM- is the site located along the coast? I think this development is a good thing. People are desperate for jobs and opportunities. The site also doesn't touch/ affect any neighbouring properties.</p> <p>SM- I echo MaM sentiments, jobs are really needed in the area. Once the EIA process is complete, can the Government help the local people to take up the business side and be involved?</p> <p>EH- The Government has many initiatives aimed at helping people inclusive of providing funding, such as Operation Phakisa.</p> <p>MP- DAFF will be paying for the set up/ construction of the ADZ. Afterwards, once this is complete, we will invite various people/companies to setup businesses within the ADZ.</p> <p>MM- Through Operation Phakisa, the Government is looking at the empowerment of local communities so that they can form part of the process and not be excluded. In this regard, MP and I should communicate further and see how best to work together.</p> <p>MP- I just want to note that DAFF will not own the businesses that setup in the ADZ so we cannot force them to employ locals, however we do strongly encourage them to do so and to provide training by offering the businesses incentives etc.</p> <p>CN- I haven't heard you mention anything about educating youth in aquaculture. I think it would be a good thing if there was a place or school set up locally which educated youth on fish farming. Then by the time the ADZ is up and running, there will be enough skilled people to do the work.</p> <p>EH- That is an excellent idea, however, we don't want to preempt anything. The DEA can still deny the project, or if it does get approved, it could take another 10 years before the project is developed. We don't want to be in a position where we have all these skilled people buy no jobs or opportunity.</p> <p>SM- I am concerned about after the project starts- we are using freshwater. Will we be accommodated or will it only be marine?</p> <p>EH- Both freshwater and marine aquaculture is proposed for the site.</p> <p>SM- When there was prawn farming on the site many years ago, the freshwater/ groundwater was badly polluted/contaminated. It took many, many years for it to get better. What are you going to do to prevent this from occurring again?</p> <p>GU- The prawn ponds were not lined at all.</p> <p>EH- We definitely do not want there to be any contamination so all ponds will have to lined properly. This will be included in the EMPr and design.</p> <p>GU- We need a buffer between the freshwater and marine tunnels, which currently as the design stands, there is not one.</p> <p>EH- We might not be able to put in a buffer owing to the space constraints of the site.</p> <p>MP- Have you done any water quality tests on the groundwater?</p>

GU- Not lately and not for contaminants. It is a very brackish water which is not good for drinking but is suitable for the ponds.

MP- Think we should do a test to see if the water will be feasible to use.

EH- The volumes needed per day for the site once in operation may be issue as well.

GU- There is plenty of water on site so don't think that would be an issue. I do think that throughflow would be the best way to utilize and recycle the water. Additionally, marine wastewater needs to be pumped offsite and not put back into the site.

GU- Can the layout not be moved 200 m to the south?

EH- This is not possible. The primary dune is very sensitive and cannot be developed on. It is a no-go area and will be left and natural open space.

MaM- how is the ADZ going to impact on the current businesses on the site, specifically the Pet products?
We use chemicals and they can go underground and into the water.

EH- We can really say at this point how the current businesses will be affected. The current businesses will have to apply to use the area and the tribal community and DAFF will make a decision. However, the chemicals will have to be contained properly so that they do not affect other businesses in the ADZ.

MP- The land belongs to the Community Trust. DAFF will be issued the EA and the responsibility of enforcing it will be on us. If the project gets approved then we will have to put an agreement in place between the current land users, the new companies and the community.

MM- the Provincial Agriculture Department is busy looking at aiding vulnerable people in the local communities. What challenges occurred that lead to the failure of the old prawn farm on the site and what measures are in place to avoid that happening again?

EH- Having looked the historical prawn farm, we definitely won't make the same mistakes. We do not want to farm prawns but use new species that we know are viable and will thrive. If prawns were to be farmed, new techniques would have to be employed.

MM- Is the ADZ on the old site. If not, -what will happen to the old infrastructure?

EH- The old infrastructure will be reused/refurbished as much as possible, however, most of it is not feasible anymore. We definitely do not want to go and rebuild everything from scratch.

MM- You mentioned disturbance to the wetlands on site. In 2014- April 2016 we had a terrible drought. What mitigation measures are in place to address this issue?

EH- The wetland on site is as a result of the old prawn ponds, but regardless it is a sensitive system and the water table there is very high and the design of the facility must take this into consideration to avoid any issues. These measures will also be contained in the EMPr.

MM- No pollution control -(noise, waste etc.) was mentioned in the presentation. Need to include mitigation measures. There are also positives that arise from waste in terms of agriculture.

EH- There will be 3 wastewater treatment facilities on site to ensure that the treated water is up to standard. The best practice would be to pump the waste water back into the ADZ. If this is not an option,

	<p>then it will be discharged into the ocean or estuary. I do agree, we need to look at how to reuse the wastewater effectively.</p> <p>MM- Range of species of mentioned to be farmed. We need to know what species would thrive in our own climatic conditions.</p> <p>EH- analysis was done on a wide range of species so that developers would be able to pick and choose which species they would like to farm with and not be very limited. We would like to support the ornamental fish farm.</p> <p>MN- We have been trying for many years to get developers in to develop the land, since 2011. DAFF first approached us but then after sometime, they withdrew but now are back to set up the ADZ. In 2009 we refused to let the people from Dubai develop on the land because they wanted to take over all of the tribal land.</p> <p>We have reserved the area from the estuary to Mtunzini for projects that will generate jobs for the local community. So I implore you to please make the process fast and speedy. 40% unemployment rate is too high.</p> <p>The Traditional Council also does not want the Nature Reserve. It is not generating anything for the local people or benefiting anyone.</p>
5	Closure
	EH closed the meeting at 12:30



AMATIKULU AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE:

STAKEHOLDER MEETING

DRAFT SCOPING REPORT

Date: Tuesday, 24 July 2018, Time: 17:00 –19:00, Venue: Mtunzini Country Club, KZN

Chairperson: Etienne Hinrichsen

MINUTES

No.	Item
1.	Opening & Welcome
	EH opened the meeting at 17:00 and welcomed all present.
2.	Present & Apologies
	<p>Present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Etienne Hinrichsen (EH) 2. Bryony van Niekerk (BVN) 3. Michelle Pretorius (MP) 4. Guy Upfold (GU) 5. Jeremy Nottingham (JN) 6. Simon Bundy (SB) 7. Larry Bentley (LB) 8. Clive Vivier (CV) 9. Wendy Forse (WF) 10. Sibasiso Mahlangu (SM) 11. Russel Ntuli (RN) 12. Bethuel Sithole (BS) 13. Bheki Ngama (BN) 14. Neil Stellard (NS) 15. Terry Stellard (TS) 16. Shaun Minners (ShM) 17. Giles Churchill (GC) 18. Thomas Keet (TK)
3.	Draft Scoping Report Presentation
	<p>EH discussed the Draft Scoping Report as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Purpose of the meeting b. Background and history c. Proposed activity d. Feasible and reasonable alternatives e. Need and desirability f. Property description g. Biodiversity h. Heritage i. Visual

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j. Socioeconomic character k. Identified impacts l. Public participation m. Conclusions and recommendations
4.	Discussion
4.1	<p>Following the presentation, the floor was then opened for discussion:</p> <p>JN- Did the study that was done to determine the ADZs, include the current aquaculture farm (Zini Fish farms) to see if it was feasible?</p> <p>MP- The Zini Fish Farm was not identified in the initial ADZ report for land based sites, however the criteria used was very specific and was based on location, size, social impacts and land ownership etc.</p> <p>NS- The original ADZ footprint used to extend all the way to the District boundary. Why did this change?</p> <p>MP- This may have been related to negotiations the DAFF had with the tribal authority at the time.</p> <p>BS- We queried this ourselves and the answer was that the greater portion of land belongs to the Government and we cannot use it.</p> <p>CV- If possible, it would be a good idea to use that remaining portion of the land to maximize the ADZ.</p> <p>GC- Will the EA for the project be to farm x amount of tons of fish? Any developer who comes in won't have to go through another EIA process?</p> <p>EH- Correct. If the EA is granted, a developer will be able to start right away.</p> <p>CV- Have any measures been included to enhance and protect the birdlife in the immediate area? There are a lot of protected and endangered birds in the site.</p> <p>EH- There are no specific measures in place yet. The birds may be drawn to the area by the fish so precautionary measures will have to be put in place in the EMPr.</p> <p>JN- The area here at Mtunzini, we are busy losing coastal forest due to dune encroachment.</p> <p>SB- The coastline used to be prograding up until recently, now it is receding (the sea is coming closer and the dunes are receding). Tugela lost 96 m in coastline in 9 years. In general, we are losing 4 m a year of coastline.</p> <p>ShM- What tourism do you have planned for the area?</p> <p>EH- Tourism activities do not form part of the ADZ EIA, this is outside of the scope of the EIA.</p> <p>ShM- Perhaps something worth looking into is having restaurants that can serve the fish from the ADZ and perhaps have a market to sell the fish as well.</p> <p>GC and ShM re launch sites</p>

NS- If an ecosystem environmental approach is taken with the ADZ, then positive impacts on the environment will be experienced.

CV- Lean more towards a green economy- farm fish that are a threatened in the ocean (classified as orange/red).

NS- The ADZ can still be utilized as an environmental corridor. It won't be a concrete jungle. The wetlands on site can be used to attract birds and frogs.

CV- Also energy should be via solar power.

NS- Can also look into using a wave action pump if seawater is abstracted from the ocean. Can anchor it on the Glenton Reef.

CV- I support that.

ShM- Have you had any in depth discussions with the locals? It's a very volatile situation here. Have they indicated exactly what they would like to see?

EH- DAFF have been liaising with the local community and the tribal authority -for many years now and they are on board with the development.

WF- Will antibiotics be used on the fish? This poses great issues as they can be released back into the water and environment.

EH- Very low chance of using antibiotics as the cost of it is very high. However, it is a potential risk and measures should be addressed in the EMPr.

NS- DAFF also have a policy in place regarding the use of antibiotics. Flesh tests must be done on all fish and if anything is found, then it cannot be sold.

EH- The fish will also be exported and not only used locally, therefore there is a high level of accountability.

CV- Use of chemicals and other antibiotics in the fish pose threats to other animals. When they die, the vultures eat them and then they die as well.

EH- This is obviously a great concern and be covered in the EMPr.

WF- Who will manage the overall ADZ?

EH- DAFF will be responsible for the overall management of the ADZ.

MP- We also have annual permit conditions that have to be renewed and met on an annual basis which covers the concern regarding the use of antibiotics. There is also a food safety concern which is covered by the Shellfish and Finfish Monitoring programs. The ADZ will be management by the DAFF as the holder of the EA but the DAFF plans to include management committees which comprise of Government and the Public sectors.

ShM- Will the fish meet an international standard then since it will be exported?

EH- Correct.

JN- Will the ADZ be successful? What track record do we have in South Africa that shows that a facility like



	<p>this is feasible? No use spending all this money if it is going to fail.</p> <p>EH- While it's true that Aquaculture has a long history of failure in South Africa, there is defiantly merit there as well.</p> <p>MP- Mentioned various ADZ's initiatives such as Qolora in KZN and Saldanha Bay in the Western Cape which have both received EA. DAFF has also commissioned feasibility studies which can also be circulated on the DAFF website, for different aquaculture species.</p> <p>CV- Do you have interested developers?</p> <p>MP- Yes we do, quite a few already.</p> <p>NS- There is provincial resistance to using the estuary. Need to take a closer look at the technologies and methods being utilized overseas. They all promote aquaculture in sensitive areas and the impacts have bee negligible. ADZ are even in marine protected areas.</p> <p>TS- What mitigation measures re in place to prevent the seepage of seawater into the freshwater?</p> <p>EH- All ponds and other infrastructure will have to be lined effectively.</p> <p>NS- Since there are no site alternatives that have been looked at. I want to put on the table that the Amatikulu site be used for freshwater aquaculture and the Zini Fish farm be used for marine aquaculture. We already have the permits and authorizations.</p>
5	Closure
	EH closed the meeting at 19:00

APPENDIX E.4 List of Registered Interested and Affected Parties

Name	Organisation/Department	Contact Number	Email
Authorities			
Sizwe Khuzwayo	Mandeni Local Municipality-Economic Development Director	324 568 283	sizwe.khuzwayo@mandeni.gov.za
Temba Mjuza	Mandeni Local Municipality-Economic Development	324 568 283	themba.mjuza@mandeni.gov.za
Nonjabulo Ngwane	Mandeni Local Municipality	737 444 159	nonjabulo.ngwane@mandeni.gov.za
Patience Sibisi	Mandeni Local Municipality		patience.sibisi@mandeni.gov.za
Nokuthula Fakude	Mandeni Local Municipality		nokuthula.fakude@mandeni.gov.za
Mr Mzimela			mzimelah@unizulu.ac.za
Masupha Mathenjwa	iLembe District Municipality: Environmental Officer	032 946 2711/ 082 218 4737	masupha.mathenjwa@ilembe.gov.za
Nonhlanhla Gamede	iLembe District Municipality: Municipal Manager	324379501	nonhlanhla.gamede@ilembe.gov.za
Gerald Dlamini	ilembe District Municipality: Agriculture Director	0324377800 0824547321	gerald.dlamini@kzndard.gov.za
Renelle Karen Pillay	DWS	313362742	pillayr@dws.gov.za
Dr Jonas Mphepya	DEA: Oceans and Coasts-Conservation	+27 21 405 9429	jmphepya@environment.gov.za
Mr Lisolomzi Fikizolo	DEA: Oceans and Coasts-Specialist Monitoring Services	+ 27 21 819 2575	Lfikizolo@environment.gov.za
Mr Ashley Naidoo	DEA: Oceans and Coasts/Research	+27 21 819 5001	anaidoo@environment.gov.za
Musiwalo Makhuvha	Department of Economic Development, Tourism and Environmental (KZN Oceans Economy)	0332642793	MakhuvhaM@kznded.gov.za
Mustaq Hoosen	(KZN Dept of Agriculture & Rural Development) Directorate: Investment & Donor Fund Management Cedara (Livestock/Old Agrilek Building)	Mobile: 0828124745 Office: 033 3559476	Mustaq.Hoosen@kzndard.gov.za
Thutula Sinxoto	Department economics development environment and tourism	0728575690 0332642624	sinxotot@kznded.gov.za
Theo Van Rooyen	Department Agriculture and Rural Development - Director responsible for aquaculture	0825701983	Theo.vanrooyen@kzndard.gov.za

Muzi Mdamba	Department of Agriculture and Environmental Affairs	Tel: 0357806844 Fax: 035 789 8211 Cell: 082 8222 582	Muzi.Mdamba@kzndae.gov.za
Muziwandile Mdamba	KZN EDTEA		muziwandile.mdamba@kznedtea.gov.za
Omar parack	KZN EDTEA		omar.parak@kznedtea.gov.za
Malcolm Moses	KZN EDTEA		malcolm.moses@kznedtea.gov.za
Kashrina Sookraj	KZN EDTEA		kashrina.sookraj@kznedtea.gov.za
Alfred Matsheke	KZN EDTEA		alfred.matsheke@kznedtea.gov.za
Nombulelo Zingu	KZN EDTEA		nombulelo.zungu@kznedtea.gov.za
	Department of Trade and Investment, KZN		-
	Department of Trade and Industry	313 342 560	-
Hester Roodt	Amafa/ Heritage KZN	333 946 543	phoarchaeology@amafapmb.co.za
Stakeholders			
Mr Ntuli	Spokesperson Macambini Traditional Council	0820553196	mathabapmt@gmail.com
Sicelo Makhathini	official Ingonyama Trust Board	0724461304; 0338469923	MakhathiniS@ingonyamatrust.org.za
Fikisiwe Madlopha	CEO Ingonyama Trust Board		pa2ceo@ingonyamatrust.org.za MadlophaF@ingonyamatrust.org.za
Guy Upfold	Amatikulu Aquarium Plants cc – Ornamental Fishfarm	0823333996	guy@aquariumplants.co.za
Bheki Ngema	Ornamental Farmer amatikulu	0734576202	
Matthew Myburgh	Amatikulu Pet Products/ The Hatchery	0823374572	matthew@amatikulu.co.za
Louis Kruger	Amatikulu Pet Products	0350040016	
S Ndlovu	Community Leader	0786645877	
FD Sthole	Community Leader	0733468751	
MM Mthembu	Community Leader	0733355251	
J Sibiya	Community Leader	0713497569	
M Cele	Community Leader	0836193896	
M Shelembe	Community Leader	0720261629	
Nomsa Dube-Ncube	Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs	332645500 0716500000	mecpa@kzncogta.gov.za
	Enterprise iLembe		
Ms. Dinesree Thambu	Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife- Acting Coordinator for IEM - Planning Division	033 845 1999	dinesree.thambu@kznwildlife.com

Irene Hatton	Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife		ihatton@kznwildlife.com
Santosh Bachoo	Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife		santosh.bachoo@kznwildlife.com
	Dokodweni Beach Camp	071 250 9626	dokodwenibeachcamp@gmail.com
	WESSA Blueflag Beaches	082 337 1273	blueflag@wessa.co.za
Frans van der Walt	QS2000 Quanity Surveyors	035 753 4184/ 082 460 0875	frans@qs2000plus.co.za
Di Jones	CoastWatch KZN		coastwatch@telkomsa.net
Wendy Forse	Mtunzini Conservancy	035 340 2586	twiga@iafrica.com
Neil Evans	Mtunzini Conservancy	035 340 2586	evansn@unizulu.ac.za
Bethuel Sithole	Amatikulu Kob	083 267 1580	bethuelsithole@gmail.com
Neil Stallard	Zini Fish Farms	082 893 8252	neil@zinifishfarms.co.za
Lucina Sinclair	KZN Aquaculture Working Group		sinclairl@ada-kzn.co.za
Elijah Dlamini		832 259 772	elijah.dlamini@south32.net

Registered

SECTION 3: FINAL SCOPING REPORT

APPENDIX E.3.1 Final Scoping Report:

Proof of notification & invitation to comment (Stakeholders and Compliance Organizations)

1/11/2019

Webmail :: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Subject **Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078**



From Bryony van Niekerk <bryony@nuleafsa.co.za>

To <bryony@nuleafsa.co.za>

Copy <etienne@aquaeo.co.za>

Bcc <sizwe.khuzwayo@mandeni.gov.za>, 'Themba Mjuza' <Themba.Mjuza@mandeni.gov.za>, <nonjabulo.ngwane@mandeni.gov.za>, 'Patience Sibisi' <patience.sibisi@mandeni.gov.za>, <nokuthula.fakude@mandeni.gov.za>, <mzimelah@unizulu.ac.za>, 'Masupha Mathenjwa' <Masupha.Mathenjwa@ilembe.gov.za>, <nonhlanhla.gamede@ilembe.gov.za>, <gerald.dlamini@kzndard.gov.za>, <pillayr@dws.gov.za> <sizwe.khuzwayo@mandeni.gov.za>, 'Themba Mjuza' <Themba.Mjuza@mandeni.gov.za>, <nonjabulo.ngwane@mandeni.gov.za>, 'Patience Sibisi' <patience.sibisi@mandeni.gov.za>, <nokuthula.fakude@mandeni.gov.za>, <mzimelah@unizulu.ac.za>, 'Masupha Mathenjwa' <Masupha.Mathenjwa@ilembe.gov.za>, <nonhlanhla.gamede@ilembe.gov.za>, <gerald.dlamini@kzndard.gov.za>, <pillayr@dws.gov.za>, <jmphepya@environment.gov.za>, <Lfikizolo@environment.gov.za>, <anaidoo@environment.gov.za>, <MakhuvhaM@kznded.gov.za>, <Mustaq.Hoosen@kzndard.gov.za>, <sinxotot@kznded.gov.za>, <theo.vanrooyen@kzndard.gov.za>, 'Muziwandile Mdamba' <Muziwandile.Mdamba@kznedtea.gov.za>, 'Omar Parak' <Omar.Parak@kznedtea.gov.za>, 'Malcolm Moses' <Malcolm.Moses@kznedtea.gov.za>, 'Kashrina Sookraj' <Kashrina.Sookraj@kznedtea.gov.za>, 'Alfred Matsheke' <Alfred.Matsheke@kznedtea.gov.za>, 'Nombulelo Zungu' <Nombulelo.Zungu@kznedtea.gov.za>, <phoarchaeology@amafapmb.co.za>, <mathabapmt@gmail.com>, <MakhathiniS@ingonyamatrust.org.za>, <pa2ceo@ingonyamatrust.org.za>, <MadlophaF@ingonyamatrust.org.za>, 'Guy Upfold' (aquariumplants.co.za) <guy@aquariumplants.co.za>, 'Matthew Myburgh' <matthew@amatikulu.co.za>, <mecpa@kzncogta.gov.za>, <dinesree.thambu@kznwildlife.com>, 'Irene Hatton' <ihatton@kznwildlife.com>, <santosh.bachoo@kznwildlife.com>, <dokodwenibeachcamp@gmail.com>, <blueflag@wessa.co.za>, 'Frans Van Der Walt' <frans@qs2000plus.co.za>, 'Coastwatch' <coastwatch@telkomsa.net>, 'wendy forse' <twiga@iafrica.com>, 'Neil Davies Evans' <EvansN@unizulu.ac.za>, <bethuelsitholem@gmail.com>, 'Neil Zini Fish Farms' <neil@zinifishfarms.co.za>, 'Lucinda Sinclair' <SinclairL@ada-kzn.co.za>, 'Dlamini, Elijah' <Elijah.Dlamini@south32.net>, <jeremy.nottingham@gmail.com>, <larry@zob.co.za>, <cv@leopardmountain.co.za>, <sbssmahlangu@gmail.com>, <mtulirt@gmail.com>, <terrystallard@gmail.com>, <shaun@pneumaticaid.net>, <giles.churchill@acerafrica.co.za>, 'Thomas Keet' <tom@zinifishfarms.co.za>, <mpume.mhlongo@kzndard.gov.za>, <mpume.mhlonpo@kzndard.gov.za>, <godide.ntuntu@gmail.com>

Date 2018-08-16 13:14

Dear Compliance Authorities and Interested and Affected Parties,

Please follow the link below to access a copy of the Final Scoping Report for the above mentioned project on the NuLeaf website for your information:

https://webmail8.konsoleh.co.za/?_task=mail&_safe=0&_uid=9740&_mbox=INBOX.Sent&_action=print&_extwin=1#more

1/2

<http://www.nuleafsa.co.za/downloads/amatikulu-adz-final-scoping/>

If you are unable to access the document, please do let me know so that an alternative can be made.

Additionally, if you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Bryony van Niekerk (BSc Hons. EMA)



Tel: +27 12 753 5792

Fax: +27 86 571 6292

bryony@nuleafsa.co.za



Read Receipts

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Dlamini, Elijah <Elijah.Dlamini@south32.net>
Sent: 17 August 2018 05:57
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Attachments: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an... (12,7 KB)

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Gerald Dlamini <Gerald.Dlamini@kzndard.gov.za>
Sent: 19 August 2018 18:17
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Attachments: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an... (8,90 KB)

[KZNDARD]

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Giles Churchill <giles.churchill@acerafrica.co.za>
To: 'Bryony van Niekerk'
Sent: 16 August 2018 13:58
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Cc: etienne@aquaeco.co.za
Subject: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Sent: 2018/08/16 01:14 PM

was read on 2018/08/16 01:57 PM.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Patience Sibisi <patience.sibisi@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 20 August 2018 10:12
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

To: Patience Sibisi
Subject: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 1:14:41 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Monday, August 20, 2018 10:12:01 AM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Masupha Mathenjwa <Masupha.Mathenjwa@ilembe.gov.za>
Sent: 16 August 2018 16:43
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Mpume Mhlongo <Mpume.Mhlongo@kzndard.gov.za>
Sent: 17 August 2018 11:50
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Attachments: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an... (8,53 KB)

[KZNDARD]

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Neil Davies Evans <EvansN@unizulu.ac.za>
Sent: 17 August 2018 08:48
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

--Disclaimer This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and/or privileged, and remain the property of the University of Zululand. If you are not the intended recipient, please note that any review, dissemination, disclosure, alteration, printing, photocopying, circulation and transmission of this e-mail or its attachments is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us as soon as possible. We reserve the right to intercept, filter, view, block, delete, access, copy, read and /or act upon all e-mail messages originating from or destined for any of our file or e-mail servers.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Neil Stallard <neil@zinifishfarms.co.za>
To: 'Bryony van Niekerk'
Sent: 16 August 2018 13:26
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Cc: etienne@aquaeo.co.za
Subject: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Sent: 2018/08/16 13:14

was read on 2018/08/16 13:25.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Nonjabulo Ngwane <Nonjabulo.Ngwane@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 16 August 2018 14:40
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

To: Nonjabulo Ngwane
Subject: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Sent: 16 August 2018 01:14:41 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on 16 August 2018 02:39:51 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Sizwe S. Khuzwayo <Sizwe.Khuzwayo@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 17 August 2018 09:38
Subject: Not read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Themba Mjuza <Themba.Mjuza@mandeni.gov.za>
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Sent: 16 August 2018 14:52
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

To: Themba Mjuza
Subject: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 1:14:41 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria

was read on Thursday, August 16, 2018 2:51:09 PM (UTC+02:00) Harare, Pretoria.

Bryony van Niekerk

From: Theo Vanrooyen <Theo.Vanrooyen@kzndard.gov.za>
Sent: 20 August 2018 11:02
To: Bryony van Niekerk
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Attachments: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an... (7,56 KB)

[KZNDARD][KZNDARD]

Bryony van Niekerk

From: tom@zinifishfarms.co.za
To: 'Bryony van Niekerk'
Sent: 16 August 2018 15:13
Subject: Read: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Your message

To: bryony@nuleafsa.co.za
Cc: etienne@aquaeco.co.za
Subject: Notification of Final Scoping Report: Proposed Establishment of an ADZ in Amatikulu, KZN. DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078
Sent: 2018/08/16 1:14 PM

was read on 2018/08/16 3:12 PM.

APPENDIX E.3.2 Comments and Response Register

Below is a summary of the comments received during the duration of the public participation process for the final scoping report.

I&AP, DATE AND MEDIUM	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Comments on Final Scoping Report		
DEA (received on 13 September 2018 via email)	<p>There is a great concern from the interested and affected parties regarding the proposed site for the development. Please ensure that site alternatives are further identified and investigated for the proposed development.</p>	<p>Prior to undertaking this process, DAFF commissioned a report that investigated land based sites that were suitable for marine aquaculture development along the South African coast line. Two (2) sites were initially selected along the KZN coastline, one being the Amatikulu site. Ultimately, the Amatikulu site was rejected as a suitable site for aquaculture and the site near Mtunzini was selected as the better option.</p> <p>However, upon review of this report and a desktop study of the sites, it is the opinion that the Amatikulu site is a far better option owing to the fact that the site is already impacted upon, aquaculture activities are really taking place on site so the infrastructure is already there. Please refer to Section 3.1 for the full review.</p>
	<p>Please ensure that comments and concerns from Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife in their letter dated 17 August 2018 are adequately addressed and responded to in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).</p>	<p>Noted. These comments were received after the comment period had already lapsed and once the final Scoping Report had been submitted to the DEA. Subsequently, these comments have been addressed in this report. Please refer to page 51 of this document.</p>

<p>Please ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that it can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. The details such as the length of the power lines proposed must be included in the project description. The onus is on the applicant to ensure that only the applicable listed activities are included In the application. A full assessment of impacts and proposed mitigation thereto of all the triggered activities must be provided in the Draft EIAR.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the Draft EIAR, an amended application form must be submitted. Please note that the Department's application form template has been amended and can be downloaded from the following link https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the Draft EIAR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed and responded to in the Final EIAR. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the Final EIAR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments. The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41 , 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to Appendix E (this report) for all proof of notification and the comments and response report.</p>

Please ensure that the identified alternatives for the proposed activity are feasible and reasonable, including the advantages and disadvantages that the proposed activity or alternatives will have on the environment and on the community that may be affected by the activity as per Appendix 2 (1) (c) (d) and 2 (h) of GN R.982 of 2014. Alternatively, you should submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 2 (2)(x)(xi).

Alternative layouts have been addressed. Please refer to Section 3 of the EIR.



environmental affairs

Department:
Environmental Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X 447- PRETORIA · 0001 · Environment House · 473 Steve Biko Road, Arcadia, PRETORIA
Tel (+ 27 12) 399 9372

DEA Reference: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1078

Enquiries: Constance Musemburi

Telephone: (012) 399 9416 **E-mail:** cmusemburi@environment.gov.za

Etienne Hinrichsen
NuLeaf Planning and Environmental
8A Trevor Street
MURAYFIELD
0184

Tel No: 082 822 1236
Email: etienne@aquaeeco.co.za

PER E-MAIL / MAIL

Dear Sir/Madam

ACCEPTANCE OF THE FINAL SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AQUACULTURE DEVELOPMENT ZONE IN AMATIKULU, KWAZULU-NATAL PROVINCE.

The final Scoping Report (SR) dated August 2018 and received by this Department on 16 August 2018, refers.

The Department has evaluated the submitted FSR and the Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment dated August 2018 and is satisfied that the documents comply with the minimum requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014. The FSR is hereby accepted by the Department in terms of regulation 22(1)(a) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended.

You may proceed with the environmental impact assessment process in accordance with the tasks contemplated in the Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment as required in terms of the EIA Regulations, 2014.

There is a great concern from the interested and affected parties regarding the proposed site for the development. Please ensure that site alternatives are further identified and investigated for the proposed development.

Please ensure that comments and concerns from Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife in their letter dated 17 August 2018 are adequately addressed and responded to in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Further ensure that comments from all relevant stakeholders are adequately responded to and are submitted to the Department with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This includes but is not limited to comments from this Department: Oceans and Coasts Branch, Biodiversity Planning Branch and the Local Municipality. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the Draft EIR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments.

In addition, the following amendments and additional information must be included in the EIAR:

- i. Please ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that it can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. The details such as the length of the power lines proposed must be included in the project description. **The onus is on the applicant to ensure that only the applicable listed activities are included in the application.** A full assessment of impacts and proposed mitigation thereto of all the triggered activities must be provided in the Draft EIAR.
- ii. If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the Draft EIAR, an amended application form must be submitted. Please note that the Department's application form template has been amended and can be downloaded from the following link <https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms>.
- iii. Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the Draft EIAR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed and responded to in the Final EIAR. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the Final EIAR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments. The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014.
- iv. Please ensure that the identified alternatives for the proposed activity **are feasible and reasonable, including the advantages and disadvantages that the proposed activity or alternatives will have on the environment and on the community** that may be affected by the activity as per Appendix 2 (1) (c) (d) and 2 (h) of GN R.982 of 2014. Alternatively, you should submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 2 (2)(x)(xi).
- v. You are further reminded that the final EIAR to be submitted to this Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 and Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014.
- vi. Please ensure that the Final EIAR includes at least one A3 regional map of the area and the locality maps included in the final EIAR illustrate the different proposed alignments and above ground storage of fuel. The maps must be of acceptable quality and as a minimum, have the following attributes:
 - Maps are relatable to one another;
 - Cardinal points;
 - Co-ordinates;
 - Legible legends;
 - Indicate alternatives;
 - Latest land cover;
 - Vegetation types of the study area; and
 - A3 size locality map.
- vii. Further, it must be reiterated that, should an application for Environmental Authorisation be subject to the provisions of Chapter II, Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999, then this Department will require aquaculture development zone in Amatikulu letter from the pertinent heritage authority categorically stating that the application fulfils the requirements of the relevant heritage resources authority as described in Chapter II, Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999.

You are requested to submit one copy of the Draft EIAR to this Directorate and at least one electronic copy (CD/DVD) of the complete Draft EIAR with the hard copy documents.

Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been granted in terms of Regulation 3(7).

Yours sincerely



Mr Sabelo Malaza
Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations
Department of Environmental Affairs
Signed by: Mr. Lerato Mokoena
Designation: Assistant Director: Strategic Infrastructure Developments
Date: 13/09/2012

cc:	Ms Zimasa Jika	DAFF	Tel no: 021 402 3065	Email: ZimasaJ@daff.gov.za
-----	----------------	------	----------------------	----------------------------

Amatikulu ADZ

Our Ref: SAH18/12682

Enquiries: Bernadet Pawandiwa
Tel: 033 394 6543
Email: bernadetp@amafapmb.co.za
CaseID: 12682

Date: Friday November 23, 2018

Page No: 1



Final Comment

In terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act (Act 4 of 2008)

Attention: Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

Establishment of an Aquaculture development zone in Amatikulu, kZN

The application for comment in terms of heritage legislation relating to the proposal as stipulated above refers. Amafa has considered the application along with the supporting documents including the Heritage Impact Assessment Report by Froncois P Coetzee. The report indicates that there are no Stone Age, Iron Age or historical settlements, structures, features or assemblages on the surface of the development footprint .

Amafa therefore has no objection to the development.

You are also required to adhere to the below-mentioned standard conditions:

Conditions:

1. Amafa should be contacted if any heritage objects are identified during earthmoving activities and all development should cease until further notice.
2. No structures older than sixty years or parts thereof are allowed to be demolished altered or extended without a permit from Amafa.
3. Under no circumstances may any heritage material be destroyed or removed from site unless under direction of Amafa and a heritage specialist.
4. Should any remains be found on site that is potentially human remains, the South African Police Service (SAPS) should also be contacted. No SAPS official may disturb or exhume such remains, whether of recent origin or not, without the necessary permission from Amafa.
5. No activities are allowed within 50m of a site, which contains rock art.
6. Sources of all natural materials (including topsoil, sands, natural gravels, crushed stone, asphalt, etc.) must be obtained in a sustainable manner and in compliance with the heritage legislation.

Failure to comply with the requirements of the National Heritage Resources Act and the KwaZulu Natal Heritage Resources Act could lead to legal action being instituted against the applicant.

Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header.

Yours faithfully



Amafa AkwaZulu-Natali
Heritage KwaZulu-Natal
Erfenis KwaZulu-Natal

PO Box 2685, Pietermaritzburg 3200
Tel: 033 394 6543, Fax: 033 342 6097
Email: amafaddps@amafapmb.co.za
Website: www.heritagekzn.co.za

Amatikulu ADZ

Our Ref: SAH18/12682

Enquiries: Bernadet Pawandiwa
Tel: 033 394 6543
Email: bernadep@amafapmb.co.za
CaseID: 12682

Date: Friday November 23, 2018

Page No: 2



Bernadet Pawandiwa
Senior Heritage Officer
Amafa/Heritage KwaZulu Natal

James van Vuuren
Deputy Director: Support Services, Technical
Amafa/Heritage KwaZulu Natal

ADMIN:

Direct URL to case: <http://www.sahra.org.za/node/508534>
(DEA, Ref:)

Terms & Conditions:

1. This approval does not exonerate the applicant from obtaining local authority approval or any other necessary approval for proposed work.
2. If any heritage resources, including graves or human remains, are encountered they must be reported to Amafa immediately.
3. Amafa reserves the right to request additional information as required.



Amafa AkwaZulu-Natali
Heritage KwaZulu-Natal
Erfenis KwaZulu-Natal

PO Box 2685, Pietermaritzburg 3200
Tel: 033 394 6543, Fax: 033 342 6097
Email: amafaddps@amafapmb.co.za
Website: www.heritagekzn.co.za

SECTION 4: DRAFT EIR

To be included in the Final EIR

