

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
FERNKLOOF NATURE RESERVE (FNR) ADVISORY BOARD (FAB)  
HELD AT ONRUS ELECTRICAL BOARDROOM ON  
FRIDAY, 28 MAY 2021 at 09:00**

Sive Mzananda  
**Secretary**

Duncan Heard  
**Chairperson**

---

*\*Please refer to the last page for acronyms used in the Minutes*

**1. Welcome, Attendance and Apologies**

The chairperson welcomed everyone who attended and hope that in the next meeting all members will be available.

**Present:**

Duncan Heard (DH) [FAB Chairperson]  
Tarron Dry (TD) [Biodiversity Conservation Manager: OM]  
Siviwe Nondobo (SN) [Reserve Manager: OM]  
Kari Brice (KB) [Ward 13 Councillor: OM]  
Sive Mzananda (SM) [FAB Secretary: EMS]  
Glynis van Rooyen (GvR)  
Anthony van Hoogstraten (AvH)  
Johan Montgomery (JM)  
Johan Burger (JB)  
Sean Privett (SP)  
Muthama Muasya (MM)

**Apologies :**

Bongani Sithole (BS) [Cape Nature]  
Liezl de Villiers (LdV) [Environmental Manager : OM]  
Pat Miller (PM)  
Willemien Burger (WB) [Botsoc Exco – Observer]  
Nicolette Lloyd (NL)

**No Apologies**

Grant Gillion (GG) [Law Enforcement: OM]

**2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

**2.1 Acceptance of Minutes from the previous FAB meeting on 5 Feb 2021 and 12 March 2021.**

These Minutes have been circulated and placed on the Overstrand website.

**Amendment recommendation received**

Pat Redford, spokesperson for the Hermanus Baboon Action Group (HBAG) commented in writing as follows: *“Please refer to the point no. 9 of the FAB minutes of the February 2021 meeting. HWS have been managing baboons in Overstrand since November 2019. You indicate 3 or 4 months; however, the period is currently in its 16<sup>th</sup> month.”*

DH corrected the quote to read as follows:

“HWS has been managing the Baboons in the Overstrand Area over the past 16 months. They use many methods for keeping the baboons out of the urban areas and have employed monitors to undertake this task. Monitoring by HWS [Human Wildlife Solutions] over the past 3-4 months indicate that they have been achieving notable successes in reducing urban incursions during this period.”

## **2.2 Matters arising from Previous Meeting**

The chairperson went over the agenda and welcomed any additions to the proposed Agenda. JB, SP and KB had to be excused during the meeting since they had other commitments.

## **2.3 Oliphant path – Way Forward**

TD mentioned that this point can be taken out of the Agenda as the old path being closed and there is a new contour path.

## **2.4 Appointment of FAB Vice-Chairperson**

It was stated in the previous meeting that JB was elected as Vice-chairperson. Subsequently DH had received a letter from the Director of Cape Nature stating that he would prefer that Cape Nature employees not to fill such positions on the Fernkloof Advisory Board (FAB).

Chairperson called for nominations for Vice-chairperson. FAB decided that this item should stand over till the next FAB meeting.

## **2.5 Hermanus Botanical Society**

It was raised by AvH that there had been no representatives from the EMS attending BOTSOC meetings for a while now.

TD stated that they do still have an interest and will participate. He nominated SN to be part of those BOTSOC meetings too.

## **2.6 METT Workshop**

**DH went through the outcome of METT exercise held on 12 March 2021:**

- The meeting had workshopped the METT exercise which was aimed at indicating how effectively the FNR is being managed. The scoring is expressed as a final percentage based on the workshopped consensus scores attributed to each of the 33 applicable management sphere questions.
- The information document that explains this exercise was circulated to all FAB members previously. This 2007 document was internationally researched and verified through a project facilitated and sponsored by the World Wildlife Fund and the World Bank. *It is entitled Management Effectiveness*

*Tracking Tool (METT): Reporting Progress at Protected Areas (second edition)*. It was developed by a team consisting of Sue Stolton, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon, Tony Whitten, and Fiona Leverington.

- DH facilitated the workshop. The results can be seen on the **Fernkloof Nature Reserve 2021 METT data analysis sheet on Page 10 below**.
- The 2021 result was also compared with that achieved in 2011 when this exercise was last done with the FAB of that time. A short explanatory note has been added next to each management sphere question to provide the reader with some context of the question that was scored.
- An acceptable overall score should be from 68% upwards. In 2011 the assigned score was 56,57% as opposed to 59.6% in 2021. This reflects an improvement of just over 3% which is not a significant or satisfactory improvement over a 10-year period. The improvement can mainly be attributed to the higher scores achieved that are related to recent progress made with planning aspects.
- The management spheres as highlighted with red comment require urgent and sustained attention to improve management effectiveness going forward. They are broadly:
  - The improvement of effective measures to improve FNR security and ensure legal compliance so as to effectively protect/conservate the integrity of its biodiversity, habitats, and ecological processes as well as the safety of its recreational users.
  - The improvement of an adequate and dedicated staff component that have an adequate operational budget, work facilities and resources to achieve the stated FNR Management Plan goals and objectives.
- The draft management plan for FNR contains action projects that, if implemented, will significantly contribute to improving the weak management spheres highlighted by the METT.

TD was impressed with the METT management tool and stressed that they would also use it internally to continuously gauge progress and to motivate and focus management staff to achieve more effective management levels for the FNR.

## **2.7 FAB Members Long Service Awards**

TD stated that the Mayor was to hand them over at Council meeting, but the long serving members could not attend due to Covid19.

TD suggested that to meet with Cllr KB to see if they can manage the Mayor could hand them over at the next Council meeting. A post-humus award should also be considered for the late David Beattie.

MM asked what is the criteria to qualify for the long serving award?

TD responded that there is no criteria established for FAB members at the moment, but that *10 years* was the criteria used by the municipality for employees at present.

## **2.8 Memorandum of Cooperation - (Co-Management Agreements/Leases - Hermanus Botanical Society)**

The chairperson suggested that this be carried over since LdV was not present. LdV is requested to circulate a short one statement on the current state of affairs.

Action: LdV

## **2.9 Concept Development Plan for “Master Plan” for Gardens & Entrance Complex**

TD stated that he was unaware of any progress with this. DH mentioned that this is an important strategic matter in terms of the draft FNR Management Plan and that it has implications for medium-and long-term budgeting.

Action: TD and LdV

## **2.10 Two Draft PAMPs (2017 and 2019) on Municipal Website Causing Confusion.**

TD stated that he will take this up with Noluthando Zweni, the communications manager of the municipality.

## **2.11 Mountain Bike Track Proposal on FNR Boundary adjacent to the Municipal Sports Grounds**

On 5 March 2021, a sub-committee of FAB consisting of PM, AvH, GvR, JM and DH met with TD and SN at the site that was proposed by a mountain biking group.

The FAB Sub-committee was perturbed by the high level of impacts on the reserve boundary area that they observed (from the cemetery area and all along up to the Bosko church) consisting mostly of the following:

- A used old gravel vehicle track, with no apparent purpose, that went along the FNR boundary on the reserve side, and which is evidently still used ;
- An extensive system of well used, but unauthorised bike and other tracks in the reserve along the boundary, a bike ramp facility that had been built within a metre of the FNR boundary. When the latter is used, spectators use the FNR area as an elevated spectator area causing much trampling and littering of the reserve; and
- A leased wedding cemetery (with mature pine trees) venue within in the FNR, used by the Bosko Church.

The FAB sub-committee had determined that this boundary area of the reserve was likely an ecotone remnant (a transitional area of vegetation between two different plant communities). In this case it was the transition zone between the critically endangered Overberg Sandstone Fynbos found on the mountain and the endangered Hangklip Sand Fynbos found previously on the lowland area below the mountain. The area was therefore very sensitive from a biodiversity aspect and therefore highly sensitive to any direct and indirect impacts from the sports activities on and adjacent to the reserve as well as the potential incremental increasing nature thereof over time. For these reasons, and the fact that the FNR has

insufficient human resources to undertake compliance patrols of this area on a frequent basis, the sub-committee agreed on the following:

- The draft FNR PAMP (supported by the Overstrand Council) is in the process of being considered by CapeNature for submission to the mandated Western Cape Minister for the Environment for his approval in terms of the NEM:PAA. Thereafter, the management guidelines contained in the FNR PAMP will be a statutory mandate of the FNR management authority, the Overstrand Municipality. The draft FNR PAMP does not indicate the subject area as being zoned for a proposed mountain bike route.
- Should OM be willing to consider the proposed subject area for the proposed mountain track, the following would have to occur:
  - The proponent would have to undertake and finance an EIA process (BAR - Basic Assessment Report in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations) as the activity would trigger the need for an EIA. This would also have to include a detailed assessment of the area by an independent SACNASP registered Botanical Specialist and be subject to a full Public Participation Process in accordance with NEMA.
  - Only if the BAR obtains Environmental Authorisation would OM be able to recommend to the Minister that the FNR PAMP be amended.
  - The above processes could take up to 2 years to complete.
- Against the above background and the fact that the subject area of the reserve is being negatively and significantly impacted. It is clear that OM as the management authority cannot condone the ongoing impacts that are taking place there and it is legally obligated to stop and prevent the present ongoing degradation of the area as soon as possible. The FAB sub-committee therefore recommended measures to assist in restoring and rehabilitating the area.
- The full FAB considered the above situation and the sub-committee recommendations in depth. The option and benefits of allowing such a bike trail were also discussed at length. However, after considering the legal framework, the FAB could not make any other recommendation other than to accept the above recommendations made by the FAB sub-committee (See FAB Recommendation on next page).

**FAB MEETING MINUTES – 28 MAY 2021 Par. 2.11:  
RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL: THE PREVENTION OF IMPACTS TO AND  
THE REHABILITATION OF THE FNR BOUNDARY AREA ADJACENT TO THE  
HERMANUS SPORTS GROUNDS.**

- That the OM: EMS as a matter of urgency, consider erecting an appropriate boundary fence to prevent easy access and the further degradation of the area (The high impact zone is between the cemetery and the quarry/borrow pit north east of BOSKO).
- That appropriate informative signage be erected along this boundary to effectively indicate the reserve boundary and the activities that may or may not take place within the reserve area.
- Access to the vehicle track should urgently and physically be blocked off with bollards and/or large rocks to avoid illegal vehicle use of the reserve. Other paths should also be rehabilitated to prevent erosion and further use.
- The reasons for the above actions should be communicated in proactive media communications.
- The BOSKO church wedding venue lease should be revisited in terms of whether it is in the proclaimed the FNR or not. Such an activity that is not stipulated in the draft FNR PAMP. At the very least, the mature invasive pine trees should be removed as they are spreading seed into the reserve and are a fire claim risk for the OM.

**Action: TD and LdV**

### **3. PAMP Status Quo**

DH asked if JB if CapeNature received the draft FNR PAMP.

JB confirmed that it was received and that their relevant CapeNature committee is reviewing it, once the outcome is known, OM and FAB will be informed. The estimate is that this could take another 1-2 months

**Action: JB**

### **4. PAMP Priority Projects**

DH mentioned that the Projects identified in the draft FNR PAMP should be workshopped by FAB and the EMS to identify and recommend priority projects for implementation.

**Action: DH**

## **5. FNR Management Report**

The presentation was made by SN and TD. The management report is alive tool to track planning and daily activities.

## **6. World Heritage Site Proposal - UNESCO Motivation**

DH stated that had discussed this with WB. He had suggested that they could collaborate in producing the motivation, which was an onerous task. If she agreed, they would then look at compiling a quotation that they could present to the all the landowner stakeholders in the hope of finding the funding to undertake the work. He will take this up with WB again to find out if she was interested in undertaking the task.

**Action: DH**

## **7. Eastern Overstrand: Baboon Liaison Group (BLG)**

DH stated that HWS is have been instrumental in reducing the frequency of baboon raids into the urban areas of Hermanus and Onrus. They have documented a wealth of information on the relevant baboon troops near urban areas in the western and eastern Overstrand.

However, there are still significant problems on the border of urban areas where the residents still leave rubbish out late, do not use baboon-proof bins, have unprotected fruit trees or vegetable gardens, leave dog food outside or not securing home entrance points etc. This draws the baboons to the residential areas resulting in baboon invasions of residences.

Cllr KB mentioned that the Eastern Overstrand BLG is working very well with the HWS as reported on the monthly reports issued by HWS.

MM commented that residents must play their part by removing or securing any accessible food attractants that may be available on their properties.

Cllr KB responded that fines will be issued to residents that continue with non-adherence with the relevant by-laws.

## **8. Proposed Bypass Road**

Since the last meeting, a circular had been received from the Environmental Assessment Practitioner for SRK Consulting stating that the Western Cape Transport Department would be considering addressing the additional information required by DEA&DP in there latest refusal of Environmental Authorisation.

Cllr KB stated that the proposed Bypass Road is not supported by Council. A copy of the Council Resolution is attached.

## **9. Event Applications**

None have been received of late.

## **10. Controlled Burn of Fire Control Belt**

TD informed FAB that there would be a controlled burn between 13 to 23 June 2021, around the staff housing near the main entrance to FNR. This is not being done as an ecological burn as it will be undertaken in the winter. The objective of the controlled burn is primarily to assist in protecting the infrastructure from wildfire destruction (load reduction).

He will undertake the necessary planning and obtain the required permits. Media articles will also be placed to inform the local community of this management action.

**Action: TD**

## **11. Additional Points**

### **11.1 Fire Risk Expenditure**

TD reported that the EMS had spent over R700 000 for fire services and the new approved budget for the new financial year (2021/2022) is R1 200 000.

The fire risk priorities and article for discussion as submitted by JM in an e-mail submission prior to the meeting will be a point on the Agenda of the next meeting.

**Action: TD and JM**

### **11.2 Scout Camp and Vogelgat NR Gate**

Carried over to the next meeting.

### **11.2 Walker Bay Protected Area Complex**

Carried over to the next meeting.

### **11.3 Channel on South Eastern Boundary with the FNR village**

Carried over to the next meeting.

## **12. FAB next 2021 meeting**

Date will be confirmed (between 9 July and 16 July 2021).

## **13. Closure**

The Chairperson thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 12:30.

---



**Acronyms:**

AVM – Alien Vegetation Management

BLG – Baboon Liaison Group

BAR – Basic Assessment Report in terms of the national Environmental Management Act Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014 – as amended)

BOTSOC – Hermanus Botanical Society

CPMG – Cliff Path Management Group

DEA&DP – Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning

EA – Environmental Authorisation

EIA – Environmental Impact Assessment

ECO – Environmental Control Officer

EMS – OSM Environmental Management Section

EPWP – Expanded Public Works Programme

FAB – Fernkloof Advisory Board

FNR – Fernkloof Nature Reserve

HBAG – Hermanus Baboon Action Group

HWS – Hermanus Wildlife Solutions

HOF – Hands off Fernkloof

IMP – Integrated Management Plan

IAV – Invasive Alien Vegetation

MFMA – Municipal Financial Management Act

MTB – Mountain Biking

NEMA – National Environmental Management Act

NEMPAA – National Environmental Management Protected Areas Act

OSM – Overstrand Municipality

PAMP – Protected Area Management Plan

PPP – Public Participation Process

SCM – OSM Supply Chain Management

SOP – Standard Operating Procedure

WCC – Whale Coast Conservation

**ATTENDANCE REGISTER - FAB MEETING**

FERNKLOOF NATURE RESERVE ADVISORY BOARD MEETING ON 28 MAY 2021 ONRUS ELECTRICAL BOARDROOM ATTENDANCE REGISTER				
Name	Postal Address	Contact No:	E-mail	Signature
Glynis O'Keefe		0827258843	glynis@hermannus.co.za	
Lari Dier		0836504206	karibice@hermannus.co.za	
Suzie Nobilo		0835933959	snobilo@overland.org.za	
ANTONY VAN HODDERMAN		0832907575	Caral@hermannus.co.za	
John Hanterbury		0824942326	JOHN@FERNKLOOFNATURERESERVE.VWEST.MD5.CO.ZA	
Sean Pruff		082411008	sean@pruff.co.za	
Mukoma Musyke		0837244983	mukoma.musyke@wte.co.za	
Tshani Burger		0824555539	tburger@cpvulture.co.za	
Yvonne Day		0833669490	YD@OVERLAND.ORG.ZA	
Duncan Herrod		0824953943	duncanherrod@telkomsa.net	
Sive Narananda		0738327226	enuroodm@overland.org.za	

FAB ADV BOARD MEMBERS & OFFICIALS - 28

report, listing a number of aspects that were to be addressed in the revised EIA report. These included aspects relating to:

- Biodiversity offset and golf course wetland;
- Noise mitigation; and
- Need and desirability

DEA&DP also questioned whether the suggested bypass road will be the most appropriate solution to alleviate traffic congestion into the Hermanus CBD. This information was distributed to all registered stakeholders.

The view of the Overstrand Council remains that dealing with traffic passing through Hermanus should only be considered once the traffic congestion into and out of Hermanus has been resolved. At that time all the possibilities for dealing with traffic through Hermanus should be considered, including the possibility of introducing public transport. Should the preferred option require a biodiversity offset the maintenance of this offset will also need to be addressed.

**7. Financial Implications**

None

**8. Staff Implications**

None

**9. Comments from other Departments, Divisions and Administrations**

None

**10. Annexures**

None

**RECOMMENDATION TO THE COUNCIL:**

1. that dealing with traffic passing through Hermanus should only be considered once the traffic congestion into and out of Hermanus has been resolved;
2. that, once the external traffic congestion has been resolved, all possibilities for dealing with traffic through Hermanus should have been considered, including the possibility of introducing public transport; and
3. that, should the preferred option require a biodiversity offset, the maintenance of this offset will also need to be addressed.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL :**

**S MULLER**

**TARGET DATE FOR IMPLEMENTATION :**

**1 JUNE 2021**

**Minutes of the FAB committee's Site Meeting to the proposed bicycle track in FNR**

**02/02/2021**

**Present:**

Duncan Heard (DH) [FAB Chairperson]

Tarron Dry (TD) [Biodiversity Conservation Manager: OM]

Siviwe Nondobo (SN) [Reserve Manager: OM]

Kari Brice (KB) [Ward 13 Councillor: OM]

Pat Miller (PM)

Anthony van Hoogstraten (AvH)

Johan Montgomery (JM)

- As it stands, the blue line (proposed track) will trigger more than 300m in terms of the NEMA: EIA regs. The possibility of an EIA & employment of a botany specialist will need to be considered.
- The OM: EMS will have to, as a matter of urgency, consider erecting a boundary fence to prevent further degradation of the area. The high impact zone is between the existing BMX tracks and the quarry/borrow pit north east of BOSKO.
- OM: EMS to serve BOSKO w.r.t their encroachment onto the reserve which is illegal and BOSKO is using as a wedding area.
- Signage must be put up warning the current path users that they're in a nature reserve.
- Reserve management to put up bollards and block vehicular access to the tracks as it causes further damage to the sensitive area.
- Start a media campaign to educate the public about the impacts and the importance of encroaching into the reserve and essentially destroying the buffer zone between BMX tracks and the reserve. Potentially take journalists to the site and have a briefing.

## FNR Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) Assessments by FAB - May 2011 to March 2021

(METT assessments aligned to Stolton *et al*, 2007)

Fernkloof NR METT 13 May 2011		Fernkloof NR METT 12 March 2021		
Ques.		Ques.		
1	2	1	3	→ Legal status recognised at Provincial and National level
2	1	2	2	→ Protected Area (PA) regulations require updating & improvement
3	1	3	1	→ * Law enforcement effectiveness is not adequate
4	2	4	2	→ PA has management objectives & is managed to meet these objectives
5	2	5	1	→ * PA design (shape) makes it difficult to achieve objectives
6	1	6	1	→ * PA boundary mostly not demarcated effectively
7	1	7	2	→ Draft Management Plan exists but must still be approved
7 a,b,c	2	7 a,b,c	3	→ Critical planning process aspects are in place
8	2	8	3	→ Regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented
9	2	9	2	→ Resource inventory: Information Is sufficient for most key areas of planning and decision making
10	1	10	1	→ * Protection systems partially effective in controlling access/resource use
11	1	11	2	→ More research directed at the needs of PA management required
12	2	12	2	→ Resource management undertaken but some key issues are not being addressed
13	1	13	1	→ * Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities
14	2	14	2	→ Staff training and skills could be further improved
15	1	15	1	→ * Available budget must be further improved to fully achieve effective management
16	2	16	2	→ There is a reasonably secure core budget but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding
17	2	17	2	→ Budget management could be improved
18	2	18	1	→ * There are equipment and facilities, but but these are inadequate for management needs
19	2	19	2	→ There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities
20	2	20	1	→ * There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme
21	2	21	2	→ Adjacent land and water use planning partially takes into account long term needs of the PA
21 a,b,c	2	21 a,b,c	3	→ Planning is in place for habitat conservation, connectivity, ecosystem services, and species conservation
22	2	22	2	→ There is some co-operation with adjacent landowners
23	n/a	23	n/a	
24	2	24	2	→ Local communities directly contribute to some relevant decisions relating to PA management but their involvement could be improved
24 a,b, c	3	24 a,b,c	2	→ Impact on local communities into their trust and support for the PA as well as the PA providing opportunities to enhance community welfare
25	3	25	3	→ There is a major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities associated with the protected area e.g. mt. catchment and outdoor recreation
26	1	26	1	→ * There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results
27	2	27	2	→ Visitor facilities and services are provided for current levels of visitation but could be improved
28	0	28	1	→ * There is contact between PA managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters
29	0	29	0	→ * Limited fees are applied to PA use, but even these do not make any contribution to the protected area management
30	2	30	2	→ Some biodiversity, ecological & cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly degraded
30 a,b, c	3	30 a,b,c	2	→ Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological & cultural values are implemented but assessment of the condition of these values is limited
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>59</b>	
<b>56,57</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>59,60</b>	<b>%</b>	