



REFERENCE: 19/2/5/3/C2/3/WL0037/19

The Owner/s
EnviroAfrica CC
PO Box 5367
HELDERBERG
7135

Tel: (021 851 1616
Fax: (086) 512 0154
Email: inge@enviroafrica.co.za

For attention: Ms I Erasmus

COMMENTS ON THE PRE-APPLICATION DRAFT BASIC ASSESSEMENT REPORT (BAR) FOR THE PROPOSED UPGRADE OF THE KLAARSTROOM OXIDATION POND WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM ON THE REMAINDER OF PORTION 32 OF FARM KLAARSTROOM 178, PRINCE ALBERT

Dear Ms Erasmus,

1. The above-mentioned document (the 'Report'), dated March 2019, as received by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, Directorate: Waste Management (the 'Department') on 19 March 2019, refers.
2. The Department has reviewed the documentation and has the following comments:
3. According to page 12 of the BAR, the existing system has a design capacity of 50m³/day. It is proposed that the current capacity of the Klaarstroom Waste Water Treatment System (WWTS) be upgraded to a new capacity of 61m³/day (11m³/ day expansion) for dry weather and the peak wet weather flow was calculated to be 127m³/day or 1.47 l/s. The report however also states, on the same page, "records indicate a measured peak daily flow of 80 m³/day which is approximately 60% higher than the current design capacity". Based on the above, will the upgrade to 61m³/day be sufficient to handle the measured peak daily (80m³/day) and calculated peak wet weather flow (127m³/day)?
4. The report states, "The depth of the current single anaerobic pond is unknown, and the volume thereof probably completely filled with sludge. These existing ponds need to be de-sludged. This sludge is considered difficult to handle, with a black jelly-like consistency and difficult to pump. It is therefore suggested that the existing sludge be buried on site and contained within the fenced off area." Kindly indicate the estimated volume of sludge contained in the pond and kindly provide comment on the nature of the sludge based on any tests that was performed on the sludge.

5. According to the report, tests will be performed on sludge during the operational phase to determine the best method of disposal, which may include land farming or composting. Has any of these possibilities been considered for the sludge currently in the oxidation pond present on site?
6. What is the expected volume of sludge, which will be produced by the proposed upgrade, to be removed from the ponds every 5 to 7 years?
7. Kindly elaborate on how the dedicated areas identified for sludge and screening disposal on site was selected with specific reference as to how the associated risk or impacts had been considered.
8. The report states that the final effluent will be sent to a lined galvanised dam with a roof, located close to the sport field, which will be irrigated with the effluent. Kindly confirm if this dam will be lined and also what the quantity of the dam will be as the Report states conflicting volumes.
9. How will the chlorine dosing be managed? Will it be an automated or manual system?
10. What will happen to effluent that does not meet irrigation standards?
11. Kindly include this Department's Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management as an interested and affected party in order for them to provide comment on the application, once the application is lodged.
12. Should there be any major spills of hazardous substances at the Facility which could lead to environmental degradation, the management of such spills should adhere to section 30 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998), as amended, which includes reporting responsibilities.
13. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on the information received.

Yours faithfully,



EUGENE PIENAAR

ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR: WASTE MANAGEMENT LICENSING

DATE:

15/4/19