



MEETING MINUTES

DATE	12 April 2013		
VENUE	Great Brak Museum		
TIME OF MEETING	10h00-14h00		
MINUTES BY	Barry Clark		
ATTENDEES			
NAME	ASSOCIATION	EMAIL	Tel
Barry Clark (BC)	Anchor Environmental Consultants	Barry@anchorenvironmental.co.za	2017013420
René de Kock (RDK)	Great Brak Museum	Corriemoor@mweb.co.za	083 448 1966
Jacques Kriel (JK)	Department of Water Affairs	Krielj@dwa.gov.za	082 808 9836
Wilna Kloppers (WK)	Department of Water Affairs	KloppersW@dwa.gov.za	0828076191 0219416196
Isa Thompson (IT)	Department of Water Affairs	thompsoni@dwa.gov.za	0828052158 0123368647
Jan Volschenk (JV)	IRA	Janv\$telkomsa.net	0825553229 0128070727
Linda Widlake (LW)	Oteniqualand Trust	Widlake@isat.co.za	0446203549 0828212178
Aussie Eybers (AA)	BEWAREA	Aussie@eybers.co.za	044 620 2714
Chris Botes (CB)	Resident	mwcbotes@telkomsa.net	0446203494
Nolusindo Jafta (NJ)	DWA: RQS	jaftan@dwa.gov.za	
Dewald Coetzee (DC)	DWA: NWRI	Coetzee@dwa.gov.za	0415089702
Nico Le Roux (NLR)	Outeniqualand Trust (GBR)	Primplan@telkomsa.net	044 620 2399
Ron Dugmore (RD)	Island Residence Association	rond@mweb.co.za	044 620 2972
Denise De Wet (DDW)	Island Residence Association	Denisedewet@gmail.com	044 620 2765
Tony Mills (TM)	IRA	liztony@polka.co.za	0833050566
Richard Robinson (RR)	Outeniqualand Trust (GBR)	rievrog2@vodamail.co.za	0448746794
Warren Manuel (WM)	Mossel Bay Municipality	Wmanuel@mosselbay.gov.za	078 594 0891
Wouter Jacobs (WJ)	Eden District Municipality Disaster Management	Wouter@edendm.co.za	083 530 4307
P. Myburgh	MBM	pmyburgh@mosselbay.gov.za	0446065257
Pierre Villain	Conservancy, GB Heights	aecpierre@gmail.com	0828335063

PROCEEDINGS																
Item	Comments	Actions														
1. Welcome & Introductions	Dr Barry Clark introduced himself and thanked everyone for attending the meeting. Dr Clark also requested that all present at the meeting please also introduce themselves which they duly did.															
2. Apologies	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Barabara Weston</td> <td>DWA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mr Naidoo</td> <td>MBM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bertrand van Zyl</td> <td>DWA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vernon Gibss</td> <td>EDM</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Frans Mouske</td> <td>DWA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>John Kavetsen</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Werner Pienaar</td> <td>Bewaaria</td> </tr> </table>	Barabara Weston	DWA	Mr Naidoo	MBM	Bertrand van Zyl	DWA	Vernon Gibss	EDM	Frans Mouske	DWA	John Kavetsen		Werner Pienaar	Bewaaria	
Barabara Weston	DWA															
Mr Naidoo	MBM															
Bertrand van Zyl	DWA															
Vernon Gibss	EDM															
Frans Mouske	DWA															
John Kavetsen																
Werner Pienaar	Bewaaria															
3. Agenda	<p>BC went through the draft agenda (Annex 1) and let the stakeholders know that he would be going through the Draft Management Plan for the Great Brak Estuary. He apologised for the fact that the copy of the plan that had been sent out earlier in the week was corrupt and explained that he had spent most of the week rebuilding the document.</p> <p>The following items were added to the Agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trimming of Reeds in Amy Searle Channel (Warren Manuel, MBM) 															
4. Estuary Management Plan	<p>BC handed out 10 printed copies of the Draft EMP and put a copy up on the screen for all to read. BC proposed that they run through the plan and that they discuss the various components of the EMP as they moved through it. This proposal was accepted.</p> <p>1 Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Purpose & Scope <p>2 Situation Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive summary from Situation Assessment report <p>3 Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As developed at the previous two stakeholder meetings <p>4 Management objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As identified at the previous two stakeholder meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conservation of estuarine biodiversity ○ Restoration of estuary health 															

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Effective and efficient mouth management ○ Water quality management ○ Visitor management ○ Development planning ○ Harmonious and effective governance ○ Enhanced public awareness and appreciation for the Great Brak Estuary ○ Research and monitoring <p>5 Zonation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Geographical extent of the estuary – this was based on the definition in the National Biodiversity Assessment: Estuary Component (van Niekerk & Turpie 2012) – i.e. the 5 m contour: <i>“‘estuary’ means the estuarine functional zone as defined in the National Estuaries Layer, available from the South African National Biodiversity Institute’s BGIS website (http://bgis.sanbi.org)”.</i> ● Coastal Protection Zone and Development Setback Lines – EIA required for development within these boundaries ● 1:100 y floodlines – Water Use Licence (or General Authorisation) required for any development within this boundary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NLR indicated that 1:50 and 1:100 y floodlines have been defined for the Great Brak estuary by the MBM ○ WM undertook to provide these to BC ○ RDK made indicated that these floodlines are being disputed by the Eden DM through the establishment of the coastal setback lines ● Establishment of a Special Management Area on the eastern channel (bait sanctuary) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NLR made the point that a bait sanctuary had been established in this area previously (from the mouth up to the bridge) by Cape Nature and queried why it was necessary for the estuary forum to have to go through the process of reinstating this. Was the existing sanctuary not still valid? Seems unfair to have to go to great lengths to establish something that already exists. NLR undertook to send a copy of the documentation (WCNCB ordinance) to BC ○ BC explained that in the past that the Nature Conservation ordinances had been used to control exploitation of living resources in estuaries but that estuaries were now governed under the Marine Living Resources Act and that bait reserves declared under the old legislation would have to be re-proclaimed either under the MLRA or ICMA. This had been done for many similar areas elsewhere. BC suggested that PDV confirm this with Cape Nature legal services ○ WK indicated that the RDM study for the estuary recommended prohibiting bait collection when the estuary mouth was closed 	<p>BC to request 1:50 and 1:100 y floodlines from MBM and to add these to the EMP</p> <p>NLR to send a copy WCNCB ordinance for GB estuary bait sanctuary to BC</p> <p>PDV to confirm if WCNCB ordinance pertaining to the bait sanctuary on the GB estuary is still valid</p>
--	---	--

	<p>6 Key Result Areas and Management Action Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation of estuarine biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establish a Special Management Area (Bait Sanctuary) that incorporates the channel on the east side of the island <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussed above ○ Eradication of alien invasive species from the estuary and catchment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PDV explained that Ernita van Wijk from SANBI had been mandated to clear aliens (<i>Spartina altiflora</i>) from the GB estuary. He had asked her to come to the meeting but had not received a response ○ Integrate Great Brak Estuary management plan into development planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RDK explained that the MBM IDP was currently being updated and should be ready by the end of the month. Stakeholders must therefore take responsibility for ensuring that key issues affecting the estuary are picked up in the IDP. If they are not this must be brought to the attention of the MBM by the stakeholders themselves. ▪ Representative from the MBM had not arrived at this point and were thus not able to respond. ○ Removal of unnecessary or derelict structures that impede water movement in the estuary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It was queried whether this referred to the N2 bridge or what. BC explained that this was a proposal included in the RDM study report for the estuary and that he assumed this did not refer to existing structure that are in use but rather derelict structure from the previous bridge. ▪ RDK explained that the existing bridge was too narrow to allow floodwaters through and that debris frequently became trapped on the upstream side of the bridge further reducing the width of the channel. ▪ RDK also explained that there was also a good deal of construction material stored next to the bridge that should be removed by the MBM. ▪ WJ explained that this was not the responsibility of the MBM but rather the Dept of Roads • Restoration of estuary health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Restoration of freshwater flows to the Great Brak estuary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BC explained that the sign-off of the recommended ecological flows for the estuary contained in the recent RDM study report was contingent on this being achievable within the context of operating rules for the Wolwedans dam. This had recently been confirmed by Dr Stephen Mallory who had been commissioned to prepared the draft operating rule. These will require the use of the recently constructed desalination plant. The MBM had since submitted a letter to DAW expressing concern over the report and questioning whether this was indeed feasible given the costs of desalination. ▪ DC indicated he had met with the MBM and that they had resolved most of the issues relating to this. He also explained that regular artificial breaching of the mouth should not be required once the operating rules were brought into effect. The dam would be retained as full as possible to allow maximum natural spillages. ▪ WK indicated that the operating rules for the dam only kicked in when water levels in the dam were <70%, 	<p>PDV to follow-up with Ernita</p>
--	---	-------------------------------------

	<p>above this level a release of 3-4 Mm³/m was required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AA commented that CWAC counts had shown that water bird numbers in the estuary had improved significantly in recent years. Pencil bait and bloodworm previously used to occur in the estuary – we should seek to restore populations of these species. Crabs seem to be coming back now. ▪ NLR commented that the Great Brak estuary is a huge asset to the MBM and that they need to take responsibility for managing the system properly. By protecting the health of the system they would ensure that property values remain high and rates also remain high. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective and efficient mouth management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Finalise and implement the Draft Mouth Management Protocol for the Great Brak Estuary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ BC explained that he had drafted a mouth management protocol for the estuary which was included as an appendix to the EMP. This provided for both seasonal breaches and emergency breached and outlined protocols and responsibilities for each. This had been prepared in accordance with the format as required by the DEADP and would need to be submitted to them for final approval. ▪ NLR raised the point that it was important to understand that flooding in Great Brak affected economic activities – not just recreational activities ▪ DC commented that the mouth management plan needed to be discussed with the MBM as they would be the lead agent for implementing this. The issue regarding use of the PetroSA bulldozer also needs to be resolved. Need to have a formal agreement that this will be available whenever it is needed else MNM would have to get their own bulldozer. ▪ NLR commented that PetroSA derives enormous benefit from the Wolwedans dam and must thus share responsibility for ensuring safety of town residents and for protecting the health of the estuary ▪ DC explained that the Wolwedans dam was build and owned by DWA. PetroSA contributed to the construction costs. • Water quality management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BC indicated there were two action items here: (1) Water quality monitoring in the Great Brak estuary and (2) Reduce inputs of nutrients and waste water to the Great Brak estuary ○ NLR expressed concern that a shortcoming with many estuary management plans is that they did not adequately address river health. Testing of bacterial levels was not done frequently enough as this was expensive for salt water systems. It is not clear if this is the responsibility of the District Municipality of the Local Municipality. The reporting requirements for the Wolwedans Dam as outlined in the GEC documents included requirements for monitoring of bacterial levels ○ BC explained that legal requirements for maintaining good water quality was enshrined in the constitution which requires that everyone has access to an environment that is not harmful to their health. ○ WK confirmed that responsibility for public health lies with the district municipalities (recently moved from local to district) ○ NLR commented that the conversion from bucket system to water borne sewage in the informal settlements 	<p>BC will confirm what monitoring is going on with Vernon Gibbs from EDM and if it is possible to collected additional samples for DWA: RQS</p>
--	--	--

	<p>be referred to the MCC and from there to the PCC. All of these committees meet on a quarterly basis. The system is functional and works. In the Eden District the GRI is acting as the PCC but this is not ideal. The GRI needs to be formerly established as a PCC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NL commented that this system seems very similar to the set of committees that were established for the CMAs that subsequently collapsed. ○ AA commented that it would be necessary to involve the upstream riparian landowners and many of the people who were involved in the GEC ○ NL suggested that the local chamber of commerce or business chamber and rate payers associations should be represented on the EMF as well. RDK agreed to try and contact these people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhanced public awareness and appreciation for the estuary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action items: (1) Create effective mechanisms for on-going communication with stakeholders, (2) Develop an effective education and awareness programme for the Great Brak estuary that enhances visitor experiences ● Research and monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Action items: (1) Promote scientific research, (2) Monitor biophysical indicators of estuary health , (3) Monitor human use of the estuary 	<p>BC to circulate draft constitution for the EMP Forum</p> <p>RDK to contact Wolwedans community and business chamber/ratepayers assoc.</p>
5. Trimming of Reeds in Amy Searle Channel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● WM explained that reeds in the Amy Searle channel need to be cut as they were blocking the channel and poses a flood risk. ● There were no objections to doing this. 	
6. Date for next meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● It was suggested that the next meeting be set for 3 months hence on 18 July 2013 starting at 10h00. 	BC to send out reminder of the next meeting
7. Closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The meeting closed at 14h00 	