



Port Owen Marina Authority (NPC)

Reg # 1999/010199/08

Post Net Suite 2 Private Bag X1 Vredenburg 7380 · Tel 022 783 0943 ·
Fax 0865462112

E-mail: poma@poma.co.za

January 2025 Updated POMA Newsletter

As discussed at our recent public meetings, the Port Owen Marina Authority remains committed to serving all stakeholders in the marina. We recognise that our shared goal is to ensure you enjoy access to the water as often as possible, and we are working diligently to achieve this, despite limited resources and regulatory constraints.

We kindly ask all stakeholders to be mindful of the impact their comments can have on staff morale. Constructive feedback is always welcome, but remarks that undermine our team's efforts can hinder productivity and the positive atmosphere we strive to maintain.

Our staff numbers are limited, and this affects our ability to address every request immediately. For example, the removal of Ulva and other essential tasks—such as dredging, maintenance, and the upkeep of open spaces, walkways, and jetties—must be prioritised according to available resources.

We appreciate that many residents have valuable ideas about productivity and time management. Please be assured that our team is equally committed to these principles. While occasional challenges are inevitable, we are actively managing them and remain focused on continuous improvement.

Following the two public meetings held in December 2025, we have addressed key questions raised by attendees. Our next step is to establish a strategic team comprising Board members, municipal representatives, and external consultants with extensive dredging experience. Together, we aim to develop a long-term solution for the marina's challenges. Realistically, this process may take five to ten years, or longer, and will depend on securing both financial resources and environmental permissions. Without these, even maintaining a basic navigable channel may prove difficult.

We thank you for your understanding and ongoing support as we work towards sustainable improvements for the marina community.

Dredging

We moved into area 3A of the loop this week, we are certain you can see the dredger is making progress. We successfully dredged 98.73 meters in 36 hours and 27 minutes.

The remaining distance to Pelican Bay is 1,469.56 meters. Based on current progress rates, completing this distance is estimated to require approximately 542 hours and 30 minutes.

For context, in 2025 we dredged a total of 277 hours and 28 minutes. At that annual pace, the remaining distance to Pelican Bay will take about two years to complete.

This is dredging an approximate 10m channel.

Dredging report up till 26 January 2026

Port Owen Marina Authority: Dredging / Discharge Records (January 2026)														
Date	Location (as per Dredging Plan, WSP report, van der Grinten et al. 2021)	Dredging				River Velocity (m/sec) Average				Volume (m³)		Discharge CWDP Daily Limit	Remarks	
		Dredging Time		Engine Hours	Dredging Hours	Discharge Hours	Discharge Rate	Flowmetrix						
		Start	Stop	Run Hours	Run Hours	Run Hours		Before	During	After	Lower Limit			Dredge lifted to River
01/01/26														
02/01/26														
03/01/26														
04/01/26														
05/01/26														
06/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	7:28	11:33	4:05	3:21	0:28	0:16	0.43	0.73	0.77	0.43	438.4	923	5 x blockages of the suction head
07/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	8:24	12:18	3:54	2:48	0:50	0:16	0.47	0.73	0.7	0.43	299.7	923	8 x blockages of the suction head
08/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	9:22	12:58	3:36	3:06	0:14	0:16	0.43	0.67	0.6	0.43	372	923	2 x blockages of the suction head
09/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	11:00	13:39	2:39	2:23	0:00	0:16	0.47	0.7	0.67	0.43	260.7	923	No Blockages
10/01/26														
11/01/26														
12/01/26														
13/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	15:40	17:49	2:09	1:53	0:00	0:16	0.43	0.6	0.57	0.43	214.2	923	No Blockages
14/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	16:48	18:55	2:07	1:51	0:00	0:16	0.5	0.67	0.57	0.43	217.1	923	No Blockages
15/01/2026(A)	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	6:25	7:45	1:20	1:04	0:00	0:16	0.43	0.57	0.6	0.43	161.7	923	No Blockages
15/01/2026(B)		17:38	19:48	2:08	1:52	0:00	0:16	0.47	0.6	0.53	0.43	214.3	923	No Blockages
16/01/2026(A)	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	6:23	8:27	2:04	1:48	0:00	0:16	0.43	0.53	0.57	0.43	210.6	923	No Blockages
16/01/2026(B)		17:47	19:48	1:59	1:43	0:00	0:16	0.43	0.57	0.63	0.43	206.1	923	No Blockages
17/01/26														
18/01/26														
19/01/2026(A)	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	6:24	10:05	3:41	3:08	0:17	0:16	0.43	0.63	0.73	0.43	282.7	923	2 x blockages of the suction head
19/01/2026(B)		16:38	18:58	2:20	1:06	0:20	0:16	0.43	0.57	0.67	0.43	150.9	923	No Blockages
20/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	6:42	10:37	3:55	3:32	0:07	0:16	0.43	0.6	0.67	0.43	438.6	923	1 x blockage of the suction head
21/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	7:20	11:09	3:49	3:33	0:00	0:16	0.43	0.63	0.7	0.43	437.9	923	No Blockages
22/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	8:07	11:42	3:35	3:19	0:00	0:16	0.46	0.7	0.7	0.43	370	923	No Blockages
23/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	8:24	12:19	3:55	3:39	0:00	0:16	0.46	0.7	0.67	0.43	435.5	923	No Blockages
24/01/26														
25/01/26														
26/01/26	Dredge Area 38 (Eastern Loop)	11:45	14:40	2:55	2:39	0:00	0:16	0.43	0.67	0.63	0.43	333.6	923	No Blockages
27/01/26														
28/01/26														
29/01/26														
30/01/26														
31/01/26														
Total Hours		49:13:00	42:45:00	1:56:00							5057	0	m³	

Answers to questions that were posed at the two public meetings held on the 29th of November 2025 and the 5th of December 2025. Please note questions are in black and answers in green. Please note many of the questions are verbatim, we did not change them due to not wishing to misrepresent anyone.

29th November 2025

- It was asked if there is a short-term solution for an E-Watch as a non-voting member to be on the board so that there can be a voice.
 - Currently E Watch is not an association that fits the requirements of the POMA MOI. They have representation through POPOA who do have representation on the board and as such can raise issues there which will be raised by the POPOA representative on the board. They will therefore have the same voice as anyone aligned to any of the associations that are on the Board.
 - If we were to see this differently then, any body that considers itself an association would have the right to ask the same question.
- In the introduction of the Chairmans report it reads “I appeal to all stakeholders, many of whom have great ideas and energy, to get more actively involved in POMA.”
 - Any member can become more actively involved by working through the channels that were set up to ensure all residents have a voice. We encourage this. Also, one can raise issues/suggestions directly with the Marina manager on manager@poma.co.za which will then be brought to management’s attention. Furthermore, I we have an open-door policy, and several people have reached out directly, and we have to a large degree dealt with their questions.

- Feedback was provided on behalf of a person that stays in Marina Point, and they were chatting about POMA. The assertion was that the individual went with a request to POMA and his comment was, every time when he goes there, he only gets shit, which was the client's exact word.
 - This is indeed a worrying situation. Particularly as we have no formal complaint regarding such behaviour. If this indeed is happening members should raise it at the time it happens. If the office is not responding there are several directors that that person can address their complaint to.
- It was stated that with regard the POMA office, the public and clients do not get much assistance, this issue was experienced when a person approached POMA regarding the Candock and Afridock issue. The question is, why are stakeholders not allowed to look at the minutes of meetings.
 - Upon request we are happy to make portions of minutes available to members with regard specific questions.
 - With regard the Candock vs Afridock situation we did purchase Candock at a premium as we as a board believed the quality was superior. It is widely regarded that the Candock is slightly thicker and more robust we felt this would reduce our future maintenance costs thus justifying the premium. The premium we paid extra was approx. R345k and the board unanimously voted for this.
- The question of fairness was raised with regard jetty usage, it was stated some of can use their jetties 100% of the time, some of them can use the jetties 75%, some 50% and some only 20% of the time. It was asked are if we being fair in the way we are charging people? Because they cannot use their jetties, especially the people at Marina Point. He can use his jetty probability 75% at the time, but there are people at Marina Point who can only use it like 20% of the time. It was suggested we must be fair to certain people because fairness is particularly important.
 - Fairness is an interesting term as its outcome invariable could become unfair to others. With regard this request who is to determine the % someone can or cannot use their jetty. We all live in a tidal zone sadly many of us were not made aware of this when we purchased our property. I can appreciate more than most the difficulty this poses. There have however been suggestions made to members to move material sideways to allow them access. We cannot dredge next to properties at this time as we are a) behind schedule with our channel dredge and b) concerned about the material from the land slide sliding into the marina edges. This may be something we can look at addressing in the future meaning several years.
- It was stated that there is a comment in the report that says the "method regarding the application to extend the jetty into the main channel at the west entrance, which was rejected by POMA. The applicant subsequently referred this matter to his lawyer, which leaves POMA no choice than to get legal assistance." Frank said that the statement is not correct.
 - To clarify it is correct that POMA was not going to respond to a lawyer's letter without first consulting their own lawyers.

- Furthermore, regarding the actual decision a meeting had taken place with POMA and the jetty owner. At this meeting the POMA decision had been discussed and reiterated in person.
- There was a request for clarification regarding the main channel is. Or is the main channel the portion that has been dredged, which is a deeper section of the main channel? But the application that was put in, was to extend the jetty to the edge of the dredged channel, not into it.
 - There are rules regarding the distance that jetties may protrude from the land side. It was clear to the Board at the time that this application did not comply with the current rules. We can always revisit this application; this however does not mean there will be a different outcome.
- There was a concern raised re the way jetties were charged for. It was stated that on Foxtrot jetty and Hotel jetty, they had to pay for the entire jetty, the centre spine, the walkway, and everything, he asked why has POMA changed that?
 - This is a historical challenge as over time different Boards have done things differently. One can clearly understand that this Board is unable to rectify any deals that were made by previous boards and their directors.
 - Moving forward there will be a standardisation as to how these berths are charged for. Currently no member in the main basin owns any jetty, what they in fact own, lease or rent is the berthing right which is how it is worded in the contract. This means they are paying for the right to have their vessel in the water between the jetties.
 - To clarify POMA is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of jetties in the main basin only, from Delta to Juliet.

5th December 2025

- It was queried how can we improved the dredging in terms of how much has been dredged? What was the goal and what did we achieve? Is the current dredger adequate to do the job?
 - Essentially No it is not and we need to commission another dredger. Once we have received the permit renewal, we will do that, as we do not wish to jeopardise the current permit.
- Are we reaching the target that we've made? And how can we prove we do?
 - We did not reach the target we were set and there were a few reasons for that. Mainly the flow of the river, the tides, maintenance of the dredger, etc.
 - Furthermore, as stated previously we are going to apply for a permit for a second dredger.
 - There was a report in 2023 that a 30 m channel with slopes of 1.5 and 1.8 respectively in the main basin and loop would be completed by 2025. I surmise this is where a few jetty owners are incredibly unhappy which is completely understandable.
 - This statement was made when the board at that time believed they could use the commercial dredger Santa Isabella and had that been allowed, we would probably have achieved that commitment. Sadly, all dredging

operations were stopped by the authorities, and we had to revert to where we currently are.

- There was a query as to whether it is an actual design issue, or is it a maintenance issue?
 - It is a combination of both this dredger was not designed to do the workload that has been asked of it and there have been a few challenges re what we are allowed to do with the intake for e.g. we have applied a few times to be allowed to have a cutting head, and this has been declined.
- The question was asked who decides where they dredge? Because he lives in Marina Point for 6 years and hasn't seen the dredger.
 - There is dredging plan which is in the office for anyone to see we will also put this on the website so residents can see the plan and the progress
- It was requested that effective dissemination of information about the dredging be provided. Because a lot of these questions might be answered if the information was shared.
 - This was agreed to
- The question was raised if it possible to view POMA's liability insurance.
 - We can assure everyone that we are adequately insured for the purpose of carrying out our mandated responsibility.
 - Should anyone need to see this they can visit the office.
- It was asked if POMA going to relinquish other expenses and focus purely on dredging?
 - The short answer is no. we have a contract with the municipality that requires a few things that are to be maintained, and we cannot default on that contract's responsibility
- Question online; the expectation is defining the dredging problem per area and identify what needs to be addressed for each area to ensure long-term solutions.
 - Our plan is to engage with the relevant departments to see if we can get further permits to allow us to do more. This entire situation is not a quick fix but a 5-to-10-year plan.
- The question was raised if this is the same dredger that was used 16 years ago?
 - The answer is yes, but it has been adapted over time. The hydraulic boom is the latest version, before that we had a much smaller hydraulic boom, even before that we had a cutter head that belonged to Alan Klaasen – Southern Ocean Engineering, we were informed we were not allowed to use it.
- The question was posed if POMA have looked at any other form other than dredging? Bearing in mind that the silt that's coming down the river, it goes into the loop, and it flows into the marina.
 - There is no plan at this stage to prevent silt from coming into the marina from the river, as the cost of an EIA would be prohibitive.
- The question was asked what are we allowed to do with the Bergrivier municipality grant?
 - We are allowed to fulfil the responsibilities of our contract.

- It was suggested that POMA must dredge more than the desired channel.
 - At this time this is not possible we are already struggling to keep up with a main channel due to the restrictions on when we can dredge
- It was asked what the requirements to dump out at sea are?
 - Jen answered: If we were to dump out at sea, we would need to identify a dump site. Then usually that would require an environmental impact assessment, which will include a variety of specialist studies to determine if that is a suitable dump site, or if an alternative dump site should be required.
- It was asked what's the result of the machine that measure the amount of silt.
 - Jen answered we monitor turbidity which is the easiest way to explain it sort the cloudiness of the waters. So, turbidity, as well as chemical oxygen demands, how much is being taken out of the environment
- The question was raised; can't we apply to the authorities to out more silt into the river if it is disappearing so quickly?
 - We need to achieve our current quota before we can apply for this, but the plan is to make these applications
- Is the restriction for only dredging in daylight hours based on the noise, the dredger or can we consider another source of energy or silencing the engine?
 - Daylight hours are due to safety concerns, monitoring, noise pollution and affected parties.
- Does POMA have a measurement tool or something that measures the flow in the river, and what is the minimum flow when it should be? Do we utilize that flow?
 - Jen said yes, we had Anchor do a study to determine what the flow would be. There is a minimum out going flow rate in all our authorizations. This we monitor in 3 positions across the river with a flow meter. Once Shadley is happy we have the correct flow rate and that the level of the river is not above the marsh, he gives the instruction to start dredging.

I hope these answers clarify concerns and answer them appropriately if not please feel free to communicate with me via the e mail manager@poma.co.za and the manager will relay it to me. The reason for this is so we have a central point through which all queries go.

Jeff Hampton
POMA Chairman