

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
FERNKLOOF NATURE RESERVE (FNR) ADVISORY BOARD (FAB)  
HELD AT ELECTRICAL BOARDROOM, ONRUSRIVIER  
ON FRIDAY, 19 AUGUST 2016 at 09:00**

**1. Welcome, Attendance and Apologies**

**Present:** Duncan Heard (DH) [in the Chair], David Beattie (DB), Neville Green (NG) [Biodiversity Manager – Overstrand Municipality], Linda Griffiths (LG), Councillor Kari Brice (KB), Heloise Fortune (HF) [Environmental Secretary – Overstrand Municipality], Lee Burman (LBn), Edward Fisher (EF) [Law Enforcement – Overstrand Municipality], Andrae Marais (AM) [Cape Nature], Penelope Aplon (PA) [Environmental Officer – Overstrand Municipality]

**Apologies:** Glynis Van Rooyen (GvR), Estelle Spaarwater (ES), Liezl de Villiers (LdV) [Environmental Manager: Overstrand Municipality], Muthama Muasya (MM), Anthony van Hoogstraten (AvH)

**Welcome:** The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting. He noted that there will be a presentation today by Craig Saunders and Andre Wiehahn on a Cableway for FNR. The rest of the agenda will follow after the presentation. DH congratulated KB on her election as ward councillor. DH welcomed Giorgio Lombardi from Vogelgat Nature Reserve, Dianne Marais from Botsoc and Rob Fryer from Whale Coast Conservation to the meeting.

**2. Confirmation of Minutes for the Meeting of the FAB held on 20 May 2016.**

**H. Fortune**

**2.1 Confirmation of Minutes and Public Availability**

HF confirmed that the minutes were made available to the public.

The minutes were accepted.

Proposed: David Beattie

Seconded: Linda Griffiths

**2.2 Comments from Council on FAB Minutes dated 20 May 2016.**

**K. Brice**

KB noted that there were no comments from Council.

**3. Presentation on a Cableway for FNR by Craig Saunders (Lamloch Nature Reserve) and Andre Wiehahn (Interactive Town and Regional Planning)**

DH introduced Craig Saunders (Lamloch Nature Reserve) and Andre Wiehahn (Interactive Town and Regional Planning) to the board.

DH explained the framework of how the board operates to them. He noted that the FAB is legally constituted to advise council on the proper management of the FNR. For that purpose they need to apply their minds wisely in terms of safe guarding the ecological integrity of the reserve and in terms of the relevant environmental legislation. FAB must consider any proposals in terms of the ambit of the law. There are many laws that they need to look at but the most important ones are: The Western Cape Nature Conservation Co-ordinance was responsible for declaring the nature reserve and sets the framework for putting the advisory board in place. DH also referred to The National Environmental Management Protected Areas (NEMPA) Act and read the following sections applicable to the discussion to everyone; section 23 (2), section 40, section 50. The reserve must be managed according to the management plan.

A draft management plan for the FNR is in place.

**The mission statement says;**

***“To sustainably manage and protect the natural assets and cultural heritage resources of the Fernkloof Nature Reserve, in partnership with relevant community organisations in order to conserve and ensure the continued existence of its rich biodiversity, and its associated ecological processes and services”.***

**DH highlighted some of the management goals;**

**Biodiversity Management goals:**

*“To effectively conserve and manage the biophysical environment and the biodiversity of the FNR”.*

**Tourism Management Goals:**

*“To develop the commercial tourist potential of the FNR”.*

*“To develop and maintain high quality visitor infrastructure, facilities and recreational activities”.*

*“To ensure the safety of the tourists visiting the Reserve”.*

This draft management plan will be submitted to Council for approval and go on to the Minister of the Environment in the Western Cape for approval.

The management of the reserve is vastly under resourced financially and under capacitated in terms of staff. If it wasn't for BOTSOC over the years, the reserve would be in a far worse condition. The reserve has good staff but they are not dedicated to the reserves function, they have responsibilities elsewhere. It is very difficult to run a reserve if you have that situation. At the present moment the management of the reserve cannot meet the legislated norms and standards for the proper management set down in the NEMPA Act. It has no capacity to monitor and enforce the nature reserve regulations and control entrance to the nature reserve. Sensitive and critical eco system areas in the nature reserve are degraded through misuse up rotary drive where people have access 24 hours a day. There are paths and roads with huge impacts along the mountain top. There is no capacity to monitor the use of the reserve. There is no permit system and FNR should have a permit system according to NEMPA. The development nodes require proper planning to avoid ad hoc development. The processes that must be gone through to consider a development; The EIA results and possible impacts on the integrity of the reserve should be well established right up front to determine whether the activity be affectively monitored and controlled by management, how the activity can sustainably benefit the nature reserve, does the management plan make provision for the activity. If it is an activity that can benefit the reserve. It has to go through a public participation process to change the management plan, if that is required. If the activity requires an EIA, it needs to go through a separate public participation process. It must also be determined whether the Municipal Financial Management Act condones the activity from an administrative point of view and finally there is also the municipal Consent Use application approval which also has to go through public participation process.

On behalf of FAB DH thanked them for coming and noted that FAB and others present were looking forward to the presentation.

Craig Saunders thanked FAB for affording them the opportunity to share a possible vision/opportunity and to address some of the historical issues regarding possible funding back into the reserve. He noted that Cape Town – Table Mountain (World Heritage Site) is the most visited site tourism-wise in South Africa, secondly is the Magaliesberg, Hartebeespoort Dam area and thirdly is Hermanus. That brings the potential to harness tourism opportunities in Hermanus.

FNR is a fantastic opportunity and should have by now harnessed some of that potential, but as DH mentioned earlier it is a very sensitive area and so is Table Mountain and yet their cableway is the most visited site in SA. They generate a huge amount of revenue. Magaliesberg and Hartebeespoort dam has their own cableway that opened in 2012. Craig Saunders mentioned that he was proud to be a part of that development. The Hartebeespoort Dam Aerial Cableway has been running for 3 years now in a World Heritage Site, in a highly sensitive area and in a very special biosphere.

He brought a proposal today to FAB. There is an opportunity for Hermanus to have its own cable way in a beautiful area like Fernkloof overlooking the fantastic Walker Bay site. To create a really green cableway (not like Table Mountain's) that can get the elderly, disabled, historically disadvantaged, people and school kids up to a fantastic site as an educational base, tourism base, a hub for activity and as a point of control through the cableway into the reserve. Part of the proposal would be that a percentage of the revenue generated from the activity would go to the FNR to assist in providing the necessary operational resources, to provide for the necessary measures and staff to manage the nature reserve and to safeguard it as a reserve for now and into the future. He had personally walked up to the top of Mosselberg up along one of the paths and on his way up he saw numerous paths doing shortcuts up the side of the mountain, he saw litter up there, he saw a completely unregulated gateway which means paths entering the reserve from different angles. The cable way project should be seen as an opportunity that can facilitate the necessary control and reduces some of the impact by having an elevated cableway that can take people to the top of Mosselberg. They can get to the top and enjoy the view without thousands of people taking shortcuts and creating massive impact on the biodiversity of FNR.

He played a presentation to the FAB on the Hartebeespoort Dam Cableway. He mentioned that it is only as a point of reference of the potential and does not necessarily dictate of how it will be in FNR. It is a family based tourism development. The individual cabins take about 6-8 people. It takes about 5min to reach the top of the mountain. There are about 8 cabins on one single line. 8 cabins go up and 8 come down, it works on a rotational basis. It is called a detachable cableway. It is the same concept of the ski – lifts and the same technology is used. This system was installed by the Swiss a company called Rowena. They have also been involved in the Drakensberg cableway. Their systems are very robust and well known throughout the world. The entire infrastructure sits at the bottom of the mountain and not the top. At the top there is a rotational wheel but all the mechanical elements are driven from the bottom. At the top there are about 1000 square meters of wooden decks and walkways around the edge of the site. There is a small retail shop at the top where people can buy souvenirs. At the bottom of the station there are restaurants and venues for weddings and conferences. There are helicopters going to the top if people want to have weddings, blessings or traditional heritage ceremonies at the top. It is 815m above sea level and the total height is 325m. The total span is 1.2km up and 1.2km down. The total footprint size of the infrastructure at the bottom is 3.5 hectares. It includes the parking, ticket office, receiving building, restaurant, conference centre and offices. It is envisaged that the FNR cable way would have a significantly smaller footprint on the mountain than that of Hartebeespoort.

The possible identified bottom site for the activity is behind the Walker Bay Conservation offices across the road from the old De Mond Caravan Park on the R43. In terms of site locations, the mountain here has fantastic viewpoints. The footprint size for the top is 1.2 hectares. It has 360-degree view and is 463m above sea level. It is the only site where one can do whale watching from the top of a mountain. You will not be able to see the infrastructure from the Hermanus side but will see it from the Stanford side.

In conclusion, he stated that he does not have to build another cableway, he has built one already. He moved down to the Walker Bay area and relocated his entire family as well. He has done tourism development products for the past 20 years. He enjoys the development and the challenges it brings (the environmental and structural challenges) and also the value it brings into the community and the job creation. In Hartebeespoort Dam they employed 150 people and during the build-up phase they employed 250 people over a period of 3 years. The value injected to the area was about 40 to 50 million. The cost to establish a cable way like Table Mountain for instance is about 500 to 800 million. The Drakensberg one that has been proposed now is sitting at 600 million. He further commented that it is an opportunity and he would like to undertake if people were open to it and saw the value to FNR. Under the guidance of FAB and with the blessing of the community he feels they can do just as well as Table Mountain or even better.

He opened the floor to any questions;

DH mentioned that when one undertakes an EIA you have to consider other alternative sites - he wanted to know what other alternatives Craig had in place.

Craig Saunders commented that the most important thing that people must understand is the topography and the site has to be considered. They did sit down and looked at about 4 to 5 other possible potential sites but the wind, weather patterns, access to electrical points, access to water, access to services and people had to be considered. They need x amount of feet a day to make the project financially viable for example at least 250 people per day. So he refers back to where he started the 3 most visited sites in South Africa, Cape Town, Hartbeespoort Dam and Hermanus.

DH asked Craig Saunders to explain to FAB what he means by “touching the mountain lightly”.

Craig Saunders commented that he understands that it is a very sensitive area as it has more species potentially than Table Mountain. He further commented that they will have to come back to the board with the footprint size, what they propose as the infrastructural site, what they propose as pathways for example elevated pathways like a grid system of diamond mesh walkways elevated on stainless steel poles that lifts the infrastructure above the ground working in modular form similar to a scalextric train set as an example. He further commented that in certain places it will have to touch the ground. They cannot pretend that it will not have an impact on the environment some or other way. They will have to do an EIA first to determine the least sensitive area or exactly what area can support this type of activity. He mentioned that the top area can be moved around, but they would like the bottom site to be as identified but nothing has been cast in stone. If they are going for the most environmentally friendly option then most of the top activities must be moved to the bottom station.

He mentioned that the top receiving station does not need to have a roof. They can minimize the footprint but people will have to realise that in order to make the project viable it will have to get about 1000-2000 people up the cableway in a day. The people going up only touch the ground at the bottom and the next time they touch the ground is on a deck and then walk on the elevated pathways and then down again. So the footprint from the bottom to the top is almost zero. There will be less impact from the person going up the cableway than from the person doing a hike from the bottom to the top.

DH asked Craig Saunders for his thoughts on the visibility of the towers and the site at the bottom which he referred to as an environmental education centre. Craig Saunders mentioned that there has to be towers that hold the cable up. The footprint of each tower will be about the size of two desks next to each and there will be about six towers running up the side of the mountain. He stated that the footprints of the towers would have a minimal impact on the fynbos and that if a tower was removed the affected area could be restored. The bottom station would create a fantastic opportunity for an educational centre / conference centre / flower festival and to support activities that can generate revenue. It also becomes a gateway to the reserve.

AM wanted to know what would be the minimum footprint for the top station.

Craig Saunders commented that the cable never touches the ground so that doesn't have an impact. There will be about six to eight poles from the bottom to the top. About 40 square meters at the top would be a block of concrete 15m x 3m wide under the soil. That has to support 35 to 40 tons of force to get the cable with people in it up the mountain. Where people get off they climb onto an elevated walkway so they don't touch the ground. He thinks there should be areas where people can touch the ground be it on a rocky platform. People need to be grounded to feel part of the reserve. People are currently walking in the reserve so that aspect should not be taken out completely. There will also be a need to put in sewerage so they will need to deal with that aspect as well. Power can work off solar or a generator at the top.

DB wanted to know about ownership. Will the land be leased and by whom? Craig Saunders commented that the plan is to lease the land long-term. The infrastructure side will be owned by the people who installed it. The liability sits not with the reserve but the owners of the cableway.

DB commented that the top station would not be right on top of the mountain, it would be slightly down near to the Vogelgat boundary and wondered how Vogelgat feels about that.

Giorgio Lombardi commented that it would be a tragedy. He further commented that they can kiss Vogelgat goodbye with a thing like that on the mountain.

Giorgio Lombardi questioned how does this fit into the management plan?

DH commented that is why he went through it at the beginning of the meeting because it has to be according to the management plan. The ambit of the law puts the integrity of the reserve first. The law also provides that people should have access and there should be tourism opportunities in a nature reserve - that is also encapsulated in the management plan. What is not encapsulated in the management plan is a development node. So if Craig Saunders should develop this and do the impact assessment and there is a possibility that this could work without affecting the reserve then a process should be followed to change the management plan again. An environmental impact assessment (EIA) goes through a public participation process and the management plan change would have to follow the same process and then there is still the consent use application. So there is a lot of public participation processes that must be followed. All the studies that Craig Saunders has spoken about needs to go to specialists to obtain their opinions. If it gets to that stage where it looks like the project could work, then they will have to start with the process to change the management plan.

Giorgio Lombardi commented that Cape Town is a top destination because there is a cableway there already? More and more tourists want to visit low impacted environmental activities. If a 1000 to 2000 people go up the mountain people might say that they don't want to go up the mountain or people might not even want to come to Hermanus if there is a cableway.

Craig Saunders commented that he disagrees with Giorgio as he is coming from a completely different angle. Cape Town is what it is partially because of Table Mountain. We cannot pretend to escape tourism in Hermanus it is not going to happen. He further stated that they want to create infrastructure for the tourists that are already in Hermanus and the tourists that are going to come. There is already an influx and that is not going to change so how can we harness what is coming in already. Instead of keeping the people in Hermanus for 3 days keep them for 5 days.

LBn commented that the people that are already here make use of the paths when hiking, they do not take thousands of people up to the core of the reserve. That is reserved for the people who really enjoy the solitude. There are huts up there as well. The people enjoy the low impacts and they can cope with the sanitation. To get 1000-2000 people up the mountain in a day to that type of environment what sanitary facilities will be used. Craig Saunders commented that the same everybody else is using take the sanitation off the mountain. He noted that when they talk about the impact of the people they are not talking about everyone is going to pick a flower or run on the side of the mountain. It will be a controlled activity.

LBn commented that Cape Town has the staff and the infrastructure to control it.

Craig Saunders commented that, that is what he has been talking about to bring in the infrastructure and controls and by bringing in the finance to facilitate the controls. The rental lease of the bottom station will go to the Municipality and a percentage of the turnover will go the FNR to manage the needs.

KB commented that she will not indicate any opinions but would like to mention for all concerned that the tender for the areas (De Mond and across the road) is already out. She is not involved in the tender process but knows that the tenders that have come in has been rejected. It is an ongoing process she just thought it important to mention should that be the preferred site.

Rob Fryer commented that the alternatives that Craig is looking at is not the alternatives that should be examined. His perspective is that they need to examine other alternatives that will generate revenue. The community is interested in what is needed to manage FNR. He commented that Craig as a developer should look at other alternatives to invest in FNR maybe a cableway is not the option, he recommended that Craig look at an alternative to the cableway that facilitate the development of FNR. He further questioned that if Craig proposes to have a 1000 people a day on the mountain there will be about 300 people at a time, those people needs to be accommodated so facilities/toilets will have to be in place not just a walkway. He thinks the impact will be more than what Craig is proposing. He does not see anything less than large platforms. He referred back to his previous point from a conservation organisation's perspective. He wants to see different plans on the table for how they will provide the financial resources to manage the reserve. Before the cableway is considered other options should be looked at. He encourages Craig as a developer that wants to invest in FNR to look at other options to the cableway.

Craig Saunders commented that he has a certain set of skills and the things that Rob Fryer is asking of him may not be in his toolbox. His question of what other options they have and what options are viable should be directed to Overstrand Municipality. He referred to Rob Fryers statement on the impact of the site. He disagrees with Rob. You do not picture 200 people standing in one place, it is a flow of movement, people enter on one side and exit on the other side. It is people management and if the people are not walking on the ground then what is the impact of the people. A cableway is the lightest footprint; it is the lightest way of getting people to the top and bottom of the mountain so he will have to disagree with Rob completely. He mentioned that people have a picture of Table Mountain and Hartebeespoort Dam in their minds and that is not what they are proposing they are proposing a green cableway where people don't touch the ground and that is what he is presenting today. He is not saying that there has to be shops and people running around on the top of the mountain that is not what they are bringing. They came with the understanding that it is a sensitive environment so they are bringing the financial opportunity. Other options like a zip line can be looked at but does it have the potential to bring in revenue of 1-2million rand for FNR every year. If you can find something equally light on the environment then he will be happy to engage with it but he does not know what those things are. He can only work through the models and frameworks that he has.

LG questioned on behalf of BOTSOC what kind of destruction will happen in FNR. She referred to recent studies that shows that the smallest impact leads to huge destructive pathways. They are worried about the Bypass Rd and the Astronomy Centre because they know what will happen. She asked if he can provide BOTSOC will a detailed impact report that will show what impacts will take place, how it will be fixed, how long it will take and what the cost will be.

Giorgio Lombardi questioned how the top site will be established. Craig Saunders commented that the dropping of the pylons are done by helicopter, there are no heavy machinery moving up and down the mountain. A small temporary structure will be created to carry the equipment to the top. Craig Saunders commented that the concept is actually a cableway with chairlifts that will be able to take people in wheelchairs also up so it is not just for the healthy and fit everyone will be able to enjoy this activity and the environment.

The infrastructure will be able to withstand a fire. An evacuation plan will be in place and this will be the perfect opportunity to put a conservation officer up there to police, monitor and to educate. He asked the board to look at the opportunities in the proposal first and then raise the concerns and they will see if they can address the concerns.

Giorgio Lombardi commented that the Municipality must start to see the value of Fernkloof and the value it brings to the town it is not just a piece of mountain. Why should they now go and make infrastructure in a reserve. He agrees with what Rob said they should look at Neville's development nodes and see how they can generate funds.

DH informed the board that it is the openness of Craig that they must respect as Craig and Andre came directly to him and not like other proposals that they heard through the grapevine. He wishes that more proposals will take this route. He knows that Craig has already spoken to council, the environmental section of the municipality and DEA&DP. DH commented that he is not sure what Craig will do next but he will recommend that the relevant EIA gets done and have experts look at the proposal and give their professional opinion. If that process succeeds then the next required steps can be followed.

DH thanked them for coming and for their presentation.

#### **4. Matters Arising**

##### **4.1 Amendment of Bylaws and the Re-declaration of the Fernkloof Nature Reserve:**

**N. Green**

DH & NG will meet on 6 September 2016 to discuss the by-laws relating to FNR and FAB.

#### **4.2 Provincial By-Pass Road & Stanford Trunk Road Upgrade By-pass:**

**N. Green**

DH commented that the by-pass road is in a process and the process is driven by Province. DH commented that he will circulate John Verster's submission to the board.

DH commented that the Stanford Trunk Rd is going ahead according to Donald Grant the upgrade will start in 2020.

LBN mentioned that the Hermanus bird club have been asking about the Bird hide. As far as she knows there was no objection to the bird hide. DH commented that a proposal was made on a site for the bird hide. DH visited the site with Jamie Hart. LBN commented that they never received anything in writing that it was approved and that they can go ahead. She is concerned that they might be wasting their money since the Stanford Trunk Rd is going ahead and they have been informed that they will not make provision for access to the road where the bird hide will be. The municipality indicated that the only other alternative that they would consider is to upgrade the track to the caravan park but how will they get any guarantee that will happen. NG commented that they did a site visit and took the GPS coordinates - the next step for them was to present the site development plans so that they can see what the footprint will be. They agreed that the site was ok and that there will be minimal impact and there are areas where you can put in a parking bay. NG further mentioned that as the estuary changes the opinions also change. That was the last he heard of that, but he agrees with LBN that the provincial roads dept did mention that no access will be allowed. DH commented that the matter lies with the bird club now to look at the site situation and the estuary. DH commented that if they want to continue they must bring their development plan to the board. NG will forward the coordinates to LBN.

#### **5. Administration**

##### **5.1 FNR Integrated Management Plan (IMP) Progress**

**N. Green**

DH referred to the letter that he forwarded to Liezl de Villiers about changes to the nodes that wasn't in the draft plan that went out to the public. Her response was that she acknowledges the changes and that they will make the final changes within their department and then submit it to Council. NG commented that the zoning didn't correspond with the text, at the moment they are trying to get the document as close to what it was. If they are done with the document it will be presented to FAB and if everyone is happy it will then be submitted to Council. DH commented that for everyone that gives input a comment and a response chart needs to be drafted. DH requested that once the document has been finalised that all the members receive a hard copy. LG wanted to know where people must go to find out what the processes are that they must follow if they want to do something special in the reserve. NG commented that it depends on what the something special is if it is a development they have to go through the necessary town planning applications. Normal people not wanting to develop have open access to the reserve and there are pathways and signs to follow.

##### **5.1.1 Hermanus Astronomy Centre**

**N. Green**

DH commented that he will pass on the letter of Cape Nature's official Rhett Smart to the board. He makes it quite clear that they are not in favour of the astronomy centre and that the astronomy centre is not in the management plan.

##### **5.2 FNR 2015/16 Budget**

**N. Green**

NG reported that to date they have allocated R27000 for the trimming of hiking trails, R125000 for fire breaks and less than R300000 for alien clearing for the entire Overstrand area. They had a section trail wash away in the Fernkloof gardens adjacent to the concrete channel they are awaiting a quote from ABC Civils to see if they can stabilise it by installing gabions. They are also looking at sections of the jeep track that need repairs. The last item is the Fernkloof store, he allocated R80000 for the building and R30000 for the interior.

### **5.3FNR Management Reports**

**N. Green**

NG will distribute his report to the board.

### **5.4 World Heritage Expansion**

**D. Heard**

DH commented that he wrote to the Director of Cape Nature on 18 August 2016. He received a response from Cape Nature before the end of the day. They are happy if FAB proceeds with the nomination of the world heritage site. They do not have the capacity to do it themselves. They are happy with DH facilitating the project between FAB and Cape Nature. DH thanked Chris Martens for facilitating the meeting with Director Ernst Baard. DB thanked the Chairperson on behalf of FAB for his efforts. DH commented that the next step will be to facilitate a meeting between the representatives of each conservation area and to get a quote from Guy Palmer. DH commented that they are looking at a 3 to 5-year timeline. He will forward Ernst Baard email to the board.

## **6. Standing Items**

### **6.1 Enforcement**

**N. Green**

LG commented that she received a complaint from someone living in Hermanus Heights about noise disturbance in the reserve, people chanting, banging on drums and making fires. This is the second time it happened. EF commented that he is not aware of the situation. LG commented that she did phone law enforcement and the lady said that she will send someone out and report back but she has received no report back to date. NG commented that all he knows is what LG has told him and he also heard from Leon Steyn that he has also heard the noises above his house. NG commented that the only groups that he knows that goes up the higher trails are the church groups. NG commented that people need to phone them and tell them exactly where the disturbances are otherwise law enforcement won't know where. The other option is to contact Dean Gardiner or Michael Henn. LBn commented that she also came across a bunch of people opposite gateway where the old quarry was heading up into the bushes and last week Thursday they were up above Mount Pleasant and there were two people holding some sort of a religious ceremony. They are creating their own paths up and down. DH recommended that NG should be contacted and he can then take it up with Law Enforcement. DH asked EF to report back to the complainant, even if it is not a positive report back - just to provide the complaint with closure.

LG reported that people are still refusing to put their dogs on leads. She further mentioned that BOTSOC has come to the point where they want the non compliant dog owners to be made an example of and fined heavily and it should be in the Hermanus Times. DH asked EF to bring their statistics where they have fined or warned people on the nature reserve to the meetings. DH commented that this is one of the very few nature reserves in the country where people are allowed to walk their dogs, but it is being misused. He questioned whether the municipality is a responsible custodian if they allow this illegal practice to continue. Should the walking of dogs in the reserve not be reviewed? He wants to leave this thought with the board for consideration and for a broader discussion. AM commented that he agrees with DH as they had cases of dogs hunting small game in the reserve.

### **6.2 Hoy's Koppie**

**N. Green**

LG reported that besides the dog issue, Hoy's Koppie is very neat and tidy thanks to Dean and Michael. DB thanked Michael for removing the cross. DH asked NG to convey their thanks to Dean and Michael.

### **6.3 Ecological Issues**

**K. Brice**

#### **6.3.1 Baboon Electric Fencing / Baboon Management Strategy**

NG noted that KB will be the better person to report on the baboons. DB commented that he had heard from KB that the arrival of the equipment is imminent.

#### **6.3.2 Burning of Coastal Corridors**

**N. Green**

NG reported that he had to take the blocks in the coastal zone off his burning schedule for the year as they have to finish the mountain section first. NG commented that he did take it up with the CPMG group that they should first



speak to the residents before they start. To hear if they will be happy with the smoke, ashes, etc. DB commented that he volunteered to provide NG with some of the names of the residents. NG commented that those areas will be burned in the next financial year.

### **6.3.3 Event Applications**

**N. Green**

NG reported that the Mountain sea trail run is coming up and the wines to whale's event. He noted that those two have been approved. The BOTSOC fun run has been cancelled as it clashes with the flower show. He knows that there have been some preparations around the Cape Epic with the routes that they have looked at.

### **6.4 Research**

**N. Green**

#### **6.4.1 Research Applications**

It was confirmed that everyone is happy with the research application of Mr Oskeloski.

NG commented that he did not have a chance to look at Ms Coetzee's application on Erica research yet. NG will circulate it to the board. AM noted that it is important to ask for the reports as it is valid information for the reserve. DH commented that when the people are done with their research they must be forced to give the reports to Cape Nature and Overstrand Municipality. If they do not comply they should not be allowed to do research in the reserve again. NG reported that there was another research application from Alex Rebello to do work on the moss frog. They want to remove frogs and take them to the University. Sheraine van Wyk already did excellent work on the moss frog and did give a good report. NG commented that he personally is not in favour of this type of project by taking the frogs out of their natural habitats. It was decided not to approve this application. DH commented that the collection of species is getting more and more popular as people are paying big money for it. In the past scientists have been involved in the collection and illegal trading of species.

### **6.5 Klein River Estuary Management**

**N. Green**

HF forwarded a copy of the minutes of the last Klein River Estuary Forum meeting to the forum.

### **6.6 Report from Hermanus Botanical Society (BOTSOC)**

**L. Griffiths**

LG circulated the report to the board. She wanted to extend her thanks to Deidre Richards for the minutes.

### **6.7 Reports from Cliff Path Management Group (CPMG)**

**D. Beattie**

DB reported that he is waiting on Tiaan Marx to set up a meeting with himself and the contractors with regards to some of the paths that needs resurfacing. They have final proofs of the updated brochure, they made a few changes. They are planning to plant a few trees on Arbour Day. They are in the final stages of the co-management agreement with the municipality on alien clearing. The CPMG was re-elected at the ward elections.

## **7. General**

### **7.1 Summary Fire Report**

**N. Green**

NG and Tarron Dry are in the process of setting up a decent database.

### **7.2 Maintenance of FNR Trails (Piet van Zyl letter)**

**N. Green**

Piet van Zyl did not respond to NG's reply. This point should be removed from the agenda.

## **8. Date of Next Meeting: 18 November 2016**