

UMGUNGUNDLOVU WASTE MANAGEMENT FORUM

WASTE MINIMISATION WORKSHOP

**09:30, Thursday 4 September 2008 at Africa Enterprise Conference Centre,
Pietermaritzburg**

Present

Mr Ricky James (RJa)
Mr Riaz Jogiati (RJo)
Mr Neil Khuzwayo (NK)
Mr Ntombi Mnguni (NM)
Mr Pius Moseya (PM)
Mr Don Mtshali (DM)
Mr Cyril Naidoo (CN)
Mrs Joyce Pope (JP)
Mr Brendan Rajoo (BR)
Mrs Heather Sheard (HS)
Mr Andrew Weymouth (AW)
Mr Vincent Ngubane (VNg)

Organisation

Department of Agriculture & Environmental Affairs
Umgungundlovu District Municipality
Mkhambathini Municipality
Mkhambathini Local Municipality
Msunduzi Municipality
uMngeni Municipality
Msunduzi Local Municipality
uMngeni Municipality
Richmond Municipality
Department of Agriculture & Environmental Affairs
uMshwathi Municipality
Richmond Municipality

Phelamanga JV

Mr Rod Bulman (RB) Phelamanga Projects
Ms Sthoko Duma (SD) Phelamanga Projects
Mr Nhlanhla Gcwabaza (MG) Lemba Soni IT
Mrs June Lombard (JL) Icando
Mr Ray Lombard (RL) Lombard and Associates
Ms Mbaweni Manqele (MM) Phelamanga Joint Venture
Ms Verusha Nadar (VNa) Lombard and Associates

Apologies

Ms Manisha Maharaj
Mr Fhedzi Matunda
Mr Bheki Memela
Mr Blessing Mhlongo
Mr John Mumford
Mr Richard Rajah
Mr Bheki Sosibo
Mr Mandla Zuma

Organisation

Department of Water and Forestry
Lemba Soni IT
uMngeni Municipality
Lemba Soni IT
Impendle Municipality
Msunduzi Municipality
Mpofana Municipality
Msunduzi Municipality

	Action
<p>1. OPENING AND WELCOME RB opened the meeting by introducing himself and welcoming everyone present. All the participants introduced themselves and stated their expectations of the workshop.</p>	
<p>2. APOLOGIES RJo gave apologies of the municipalities not present at the meeting such as Mpofana and Impendle, which did not have representatives available to attend.</p>	
<p>3. PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP RJo gave an outline of the workshop and stated its importance. He highlighted the point that the district generates approximately 250 000 tonnes per annum but only about 1 % is currently recycled. A recovery rate of 20 to 30 % should be achievable. This workshop was to look at how to remove practical obstacles, which requires all Local Municipalities in the district to work together.</p>	

	Action
<p>4. OUTLINE OF WASTE MINIMIZATION AVAILABLE STRATEGIES</p> <p>RL presented the hierarchy of waste management, which consists of: Avoid; Minimise; Re-use; Recycle; Process; Treat. RL drew attention to the Mariannhill Landfill site is an example of a landfill that is properly run.</p> <p>It was suggested that ways and means of materials recovery could be devised, even from rural areas, by separating waste at source e.g. using, by different coloured bins, lids or plastic bags for different types of waste.</p> <p>It was agreed upon that producers should aim at two things when pricing a product: to charge for the manufacture of the product as well as for the recovery cost of that product, for instance, tin cans are the first largely recycled waste products in South Africa because the cost of recovery/ recycling is charged in its selling price. The next most recycled product is paper.</p> <p>The plan to have zero waste by 2022 can create good work opportunities. RL noted that we should work towards this goal before the start of 2010 Soccer World Cup, and it would be possible through assistance from companies that produce and recycle goods such as Nampak, Sappi and Mondi. He also stated that it would be worthwhile for people to visit the landfill or drop off areas so that they can have a better understanding of what we are talking about.</p>	
<p>5. BRAINSTORM "BURNING ISSUES" IN DISTRICT</p> <p>MM conducted a brainstorming session by clustering the officials present according to their municipalities to discuss:</p> <p><i>What waste category needs attention in your municipality?</i></p> <p>They were to write their responses on a card provided and paste it on the wall. The responses were as follows:</p> <p>5.1. UMngeni Unsorted Domestic Waste (General waste)</p> <p>5.2. uMshwathi/ Mkhambathini</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Need a garden refuse disposal area(b) Sugar cane on National roads falling from trucks – cane litter is a big problem.(c) Building waste (Contractors put their waste in a big drum, and once that drum is full, they put waste into the street bins or on the ground next to the bin)(d) Behavioural issue (People pollute the streets in the commercial areas with rubbish on pension pay dates) <p>5.3. Msunduzi</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Electronic Waste - Appliances such as stove and fridge carcasses, toasters etc and old computer carcasses are accumulating all over the place.(b) The tyre industry's negotiations with the cement industry to supply chopped up tyres as a source of fuel had reached an impasse because the cement industry wanted to take the tyres but also charge disposal fee for them. The practice of burning tyres contributes to veld fires. <p>5.4. Richmond</p> <p>Cardboard from retailers has trebled in quantity especially since the advent of the new Boxer shop.</p> <p>Garden refuse: branches and garden waste problematic on landfill. They have the chipper but it has never been used because of the cost involved in using it, as it needs staff, fuel and maintenance.</p>	

Action

5.5. UMDM

- (a) Growing quantities of paper, which is just stored and dumped. This is a significant component of the waste stream and should be recycled.
- (b) Garden refuse: dumped indiscriminately. Garden refuse sites - waste brought to landfill.
- (c) Glass – no incentive to bring back glass. No local glass processing plants in KZN so
- (d) Logistics kills glass recycling.
- (e) Asbestos

5.6. DAEA

- (a) Electronic waste (Cell phones, computers are stored since they are on the asset register)
- (b) Sawdust is a problem – hoping to encourage briquette-making from sawdust in Howick area.

6. IDENTIFICATION OF POSSIBLE INTERVENTIONS

6.1. Discussion question

Participants were asked to consider the following questions:

- As a municipality, what waste minimizations are being taken, are you succeeding, in addressing this waste issue?
- Look at pros and cons for both responses by considering why is it failing or why is it successful (e.g. if you have a sponsor who facilitates a specific project that leads to its success?)

6.2. Reports back

6.2.1. uMshwathi and Mkhambathini

- NO waste minimization takes place these areas.
- We will separate waste
- Make use of recycling at the Metro store site.
- Have containers available in the household shopping centres etc, but the negative impact is that some people do not have enough time to sort waste.
- We have other plans of dealing with waste which is an off site facility where we engage informal settlements such as Siyazenzela informal settlement and Jika Joe.
- We engage members of the community to adopt a stream and keep it clean because if they use different streams to travel it would be difficult to keep the area clean, but if they only use one it would be much more convenient to keep that particular area clean. We also give money to uplift households that do not have food on the table.
- The communities did not know there was money in recycling. E.g. a bag of cans equals to R30,00 and as soon as they get that they will start to go to other areas to collect more cans for cash and that would be another solution to waste reduction. We have run a tender for a contractor that will deal with all the waste such as papers cardboard etc.

6.2.2. Richmond

- Scrap metal: There is a newly established buy-back centre for scrap metal - good control of the type of metal coming in. We have about 20 groups of people selling scrap metal.
- There was one buy-back centre and 20 hand trolleys that had operated with DAEA funding 3 years ago which worked for 3 to 4 months while the contractor was subsidised but did not last. We received funding for a plan for recycling, but when the money ran out, we couldn't sustain the project and it collapsed because the quantities of waste were too small.

6.2.3. uMngeni

- We saw the potential of processing compost for a community garden.
- We had funding for recycling centre as a collection point and our municipal staff were running it. We had staff members who were very dedicated and had support from the DAEA. The big problem was transport caused by fluctuations in petrol

	Action
<p>prices. The location of the recycling centre was close to the CBD. We were shut down when one individual came into the area and opposed the operation. We were told we shouldn't have built our centre next to a public road, that it didn't smell good and wasn't properly taken care of. The objector had it shut down by applying for, and getting, a court order. But there has been an ongoing appeal for 2yrs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff salaries were an ongoing cost, and the municipality wanted to save more money for the landfill. The landfill receives 18 000 tonne per month including glass. ▪ There was public support, with a good mind set among the residents of Howick. ▪ We had educational centre where teachers brought children for educational purposes. <p><i>6.2.4. Msunduzi</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have noticed that contractors work better than municipal employees at industrial premises. ▪ Food for garbage sponsored pilot project is underway. ▪ Tender has been awarded to a private sector operator to establish a Materials Recovery Facility at the landfill – this will conserve airspace. The contractor has been severely delayed by EIA process. ▪ In the interim they were working on a small scale with Mondi to recover household and office paper. Mondi will also collect other materials as well as cardboard and paper, – this is according to a written undertaking by Mondi to DEAT. The uMsunduzi recycling initiative with Mondi could expand into the other local municipalities. A similar system was working in eThekweni. • It was noted that all municipalities had been provided with chippers but they were never utilised. The supplier trained staff to operate the chippers but locals were unable to maintain them. 	
<p>7. PRIORITISATION OF INTERVENTIONS</p> <p>After discussion of the needs and current initiatives it was agreed that a district-wide waste minimisation programme could be started with paper/ cardboard and green/ garden waste. There was already an initiative for e-waste which would also be supported.</p> <p>It was noted that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cape Town uses clear plastic bags, which are more easily recycled than black plastic bags. 2. Negotiations could begin with Mondi for assistance, for instance in providing orange bags for paper recycling. 3. The separation of paper would work better in smaller centres if it were baled and then sent to a bigger centre periodically. K4 kraft cardboard is very valuable clean. 4. Another option is to liaise with supermarket chains to use their trucks returning from stock deliveries in outlying areas to transport clean, baled waste to a central facility. It was noted that there might be health and hygiene issues. 5. There are other collectors who are presently collecting, the process should not interfere with what is going on at the moment but run parallel with it. 	
<p>8. ALLOCATION OF TASKS</p> <p>8.1. Information gathering</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Green garden waste / (green Waste) ▪ Paper cardboard 	<p>RL HS JP RR CN</p>

	Action
<p>8.2. Proposal writing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Market Research ▪ Technology, infrastructure ▪ Social buy-in ▪ Money ▪ Institutional and other factors ▪ Monitoring ▪ Issues related to labour/ skills development 	<p>To be allocated later</p> <p>DM RJo</p>
<p>8.3. Political processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involving private sector ▪ Obtain cooperation from the council ▪ Public involvement and support 	<p>To be allocated later</p>
<p>8.4. Donor identification DBSA, MIG, IDT etc etc</p>	<p>RJo</p>
<p>9. TIME FRAMES It was agreed that information gathered should be circulated by 17 October 2008.</p>	
<p>10. FUTURE MEETINGS After discussion it was agreed that a follow-up workshop will be held on 17 October 2008, facilitated by the Phelamanga JV where the proposal writing and political processes would be tackled once all the information has been gathered. After this meeting the Waste Forum would take over the process.</p>	
<p>11. CLOSURE There being no further business, the meeting was closed at 15:21</p>	