| 02 64533043                   | Attent, 043                             | <b>r</b>   | Ρ.   |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                               |   | 0 101  |  |
| 1 1 1                         | ementary SUBIVIISSION N                 | vv.  |  |
| s<br>joulture, Fisheries & Fo | restry                                  |  |  |
|                               |   | 4<br>4   |  |
|                               | Suppl<br>S<br>riculture, Fisheries & Fo | Supplementary<br>Supplementary<br>Sticulture, Fisheries & Forestry | 02 64533043<br>Attent) 02 64533043<br>Supplementary SUBMISSION NO. 101<br>Sticulture, Fisheries & Forestry |

To be held in Cooma – Council Chambers – 9 September 2005 Time Slot -Ernie Constance & Coral Talbot - 1.30 pm Coral Talbot - additional comment to original submission:

Due to economic pressures and increased work load on rural ratepayer funded bodies such as Local Government and Rural Land Protection Boards in New South Wales, (in the Cooma District and I think it would likely be the same elsewhere too) on ground property inspections for all pests including weeds do not happen on a regular basis as they once did.

As a consequence the lack of more regular personal contact between the regulatory body and the landowner there has been a breakdown in communication, education and understanding of roles/ responsibilities and what changes are happening on the ground for both the regularity body and the landholder. Pest species can and often do thrive under these conditions.

Many new landholders to a district have an urban background with no knowledge of pest species of any kind, let alone the responsibilities that comes with being a landholder. Often people buy their piece of country paradise to escape the stress of urban living, not knowing and without the knowledge to identify/evaluate an existing pest problem, knowledge of their legal obligations comes later and the cost of control/eradication has not been included their budget nor calendar, for some they have bought their worst nightmare. Surely it should be compulsory for all properties that are being sold or inherited to carry an official inspection certificate stating any existing pest problem/s and required remedial action that needs to be undertaken.

I believe Pest Controllers (animals/weeds) Trappers or Doggers, call them what you will, require natural ability in addition to acquired skills, people with these combined skills are not found easily and often are not available. To encourage and keep young people employed in this field we must recognize they require security of employment and this can only be achieved by on-going secure funding.

State and Catchment Management Authority's may have different project targets/funds available, I believe there is a danger of cross boundary hotspots not being dealt with adequately if there is insufficient co-ordination/consultation and planning between neighbouring Catchments or State bodies.

Due to privacy laws, Landcare groups can no longer access Local Government/RLPB Data-base address lists (we no longer necessarily know our neighbours) this makes it very difficult to inform/contact people for Group Programmes that are more effective when everyone joins in.

Finally, the cost of all pest control work is a legitimate tax deduction for farm businesses, I believe it would be more equitable and cost effective and give a strong incentive to be pro-active if the deduction was extended to all landholders.

Fed.H of R Review PA Impact

5/09/05