

Timothy Cathles

“ [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Phone [REDACTED]

Fax [REDACTED]

Wednesday, 25 May 2016

090516

Submission Pest Animal Management Review.

I found the document to be very thorough and mostly well worded. One of the best I have read.

Here are some points that I feel were missed or misunderstood, plus some typos and some extra notes that may be of interest.

Pg. 2/165. List of acronyms. Acronyms are listed here but all through the document they are used in their whole form with the acronym quoted after. The acronym could just be used to shorten the document.

Pg. 10/130. Recommendation 18(i) - Add. "... conservation in **some** national park **estate**." Also add. "(ii-iii), (ii) Do a study of conformation of dingos in schedule 2 lands as a priority, if it is found that only wild dogs exist then these should be treated the same as in area outside schedule 2 lands where eradication is required by law." And (iii) "For areas deemed schedule 2 land that dingo numbers are kept at a sustainable level within these areas, so as to not over populate these areas and for these dogs to move out of the schedule 2 land and become pests in other areas, and for funding to be provided to achieve this."

NOTE:- Sustainable is used in so many documents and speeches, except when they are about the top predators, people and wild dogs.

Pg. 10/130. Recommendation 22(i) – Add to end. "But only if **ALL** stakeholders agree."

Pg. 22/130. 2.2.2. Control Methods. Parra 1. Add. "...pigs and wild dogs, baiting, **trapping** and shooting continued to remain..."

Pg. 26/130. 2.3.1. Government Management Spending. The pie chart equals 100.5% should equal 100%.

Pg.29/130. 2.3.4. Parra 2. Should be stated who thinks that wild dogs have an "ecological value", and what proposed numbers / area are sustainable so as to not have an effect outside these areas.

NOTE- There are significantly more dogs and other native species in the wild than there were in 1788. Some of these animals are now considered a pest to some people.

Pg. 42/130. 3.2.2. BOX 3.2: Compliance... wild dogs are classed as a “bio-security risk” here and yet they are only controlled in a “buffer zone” on the perimeter of schedule 2 land and on private land (buy law). Surely if they are a “bio-security risk” somewhere, then they are a “bio-security risk” everywhere!

NOTE:- We have an issue with sheep measles because of the wild dog / fox problem, that comes from a schedule 2 area.

Pg. 43/130. 3.2.2. Recommendation 3 (iv-viii). – vii. Add – “... enforceable across **all tenures and land schedules** and be binding...”

Pg. 46/130. 4.1. New and Future Risks. Parra 2. Typo. “ Johné’s Disease”.

Pg. 72/130. 6.2. Management of Deer... Parra 2. Typo. “...recommend that **states and territories ...**”

Pg. 80/130. Footnote 19. Typo – “This” table, not “these” table.

Pg. 84/130. 6.4. Wild dogs – schedule 2 lands. Recommendation 18(i- iii) **Same as above.**

NOTE:- These dogs travel long distances to feed, if there is not enough food in their area they will travel over 40Km to kill in a night, every night. Why is a dog suddenly different if it goes over a line drawn on a map? As on one side, it is protected and on the other, it has to be eradicated, the dog doesn’t know the difference. Or maybe they do!

Pg. 87/130. 7.2. Environmental impacts of horses. – reword – doesn’t sound right. Eg. “...of feral horse impacts on:

Soil - loss, compaction and erosion.

Vegetation - from trampling.

Plant species - reduction of richness...

Native trees - mortality through bark chewing.”

Etc.

Pg. 92/130. Recommendation 20 (iii) change wording. “...maintain a sustainable population...”

Pg. 95/130. 7.4 Recreational Hunting as a management tool. Add extra paragraph after parra. 3. “Recreational hunting in areas of public land that have a wild dog control plan as part of their management should not be allowed as the introduction of carcasses into the plan area would reduce the effectiveness of the plan. In that foxes, dogs and pigs would be

less likely to take a bait.” And then add. “Recommendation (ii) not allow recreational hunting in areas of public land where there is a wild dog control plan in place without express permission of ALL stakeholders of the plan.”

NOTE:- This was a big issue for the Brindabella / Wee Jasper wild dog control plan, when the “minister of the day”, was going to allow recreational hunting in Brindabella NP. We had no say in the outcome, which was an insult to the stakeholders and management of the plan and to the management of the NPWS estate and also was seen as a welfare issue for park users and management teams.

Pg. 103/130. 8.2. Setting effective Research priorities. Dot point. Feral cats. Parra 1. Add “...approaches. **However if all pest predators are removed then some pest species can have an increase in numbers.**”

NOTE:- I have found that when I do a big fox / dog baiting program that the rabbit numbers increase and control work is required for them.

Pg. 110/130. 9.2. Expenditure of established species. Parra. 2. Add “... were not spending sufficient resources on managing these and other pest animals **and plants.** (delete “**inaccurate**”) Perceptions such as these...” Also a mention of schedule 2 land required here and that NPWS and state forests should be spending more on wild dog control if they cannot contain these animals in the schedule 2 land areas.

NOTE:- A dog in schedule 2 land has no control order over it but as soon as that same dog leaves that area it must be eradicated by that land manager. Why is so much onus put on private landholders to control these pests?

Pg.112/130. 9.3. Public funding drives widespread public benefits. Suggestion: Needs a recommendation for this to state. “Schedule 2 lands are under resourced and that the state government should provide additional funding to these areas to contain and control pest species, both plant and animal, within these areas.

NOTE:- If these areas are considered to be for the good of the state, then the state should be paying to manage these areas properly.

Pg. 114/130. 9.4.4. Provision of concessional or low interest loans.

NOTE:- I don't feel that this would encourage investment by land holders. We already pay to keep wild dogs out of our freehold land when they are coming out of schedule 2 land areas, with minimal effort made by these areas to contain these pests within these areas. Currently our business pays a significant amount in rates we also contribute over \$4,500.00 for “in kind” work during baiting and other works and have lost about 50 sheep so far this year, this would equate to over \$12,500.00 that wild dogs have cost us so far this year, and after paying an increase in rates, as is recommended by this document, I certainly wouldn't

be encouraged to invest further without significant additional investment by government to manage public lands better.

Prior to the Brindabella National Park been gazetted the wild dog issue was intermittent, since that time the dog issue has increased to the point that since the schedule 2 land classification was appointed the issue is now constant, which we find unacceptable.

Pg. 119/130. 9.4.3. Special purpose rate – rapid response fund. Recommendation 30 (iii). Add “This new pest animal rate should be matched \$ for \$ by the state government.

NOTE:- There is a lot of talk of loans for exclusion fencing etc. What about the government with schedule 2 lands to use inclusion fencing to stop the wild dogs from leaving these areas? There also appears to be a lot of emphasis on land holders paying more in rates etc. and the government not been burdened too much.

Quote from this document. “A loan approach would limit the overall budgetary impact on state funds.”!

NOTE:- Bad choice of words here, I find it offensive.

Yours sincerely

Timothy Cathles