

Circular Ponds

Postal
Address

(ABN)33 467 459 020

G & C Anderson

Circular Ponds
Tasmania

Phone / Fax

Tas

02/07/2003

Dear Sir or Madam:

We are Glen & Christine Anderson of "Circular Ponds" Tasmania. (See Att. 1 & 2)

We wish to draw you attention to the difficulties that we are experiencing with our property "Circular Ponds".

"Circular Ponds" lies within the Mole Creek Karst Area & has extensive karst features over all of its 283 Ha. This has not posed a problem in the past; the property was a VDL stopover since the early 1850s at least & has been settled, logged & farmed since then.

However in recent years there are ever-greater restrictions being placed on our management of the property from external sources, these restrictions are far-reaching & ever increasing to the extent of encroaching on our farm business. These restrictions are placed over our property and others in the area with little or no consultation or publicity, (e.g.: when we are only informed after the fact, as was the case with the listing of this area on the "Register of the National Estate" around 1983 (Att. 3). We did not know until 1985 when a small article appeared in the "Examiner" newspaper. We have received notification that we are listed only in answer to our direct questions and in recent correspondence from state ministers.

The property was originally purchased in 1978 to expand the 50 odd milking herd from our previous farm and it had the added bonus of a local saw miller being able to come in and log during the winter. Which was an invaluable asset in keeping us out of overdraft and our mortgage paid especially during the dairy downturns. When the sawmiller went back to get a permit after a break of a year or so he was laughed at, he tried again two years later with the same response, no point in even putting any

paper work in. Another local was actually stopped from logging while it was in progress and is still trying to get compensation. So due to no fault of our own our backup income and superannuation are no longer available to us. The stress and hardship this has caused is significant.

To add insult to injury a council officer has told us there is no guarantee we can rebuild our house even if it burns down. This causes restrictions on our farming business, new dairy, sheds etc.

We cannot, no matter how hard we try comply with regulations in regards to dairy discharge effluent. Mayberry is an active drainage area and Circular Ponds is the plughole. We cannot even site the sump for our dairy in accordance with regulations. Mayberry is almost a Polje (Note 1) (Att 4) it is only that some water exits Mayberry through Sensation Gorge at peak flows that disqualifies Mayberry from being a "Polje". In most years the water would flow through the gorge on only a handful of days. This means that all water exiting Mayberry flows through the karst system on all but that handful of days.

"Fence all streams up to class 4, to keep stock out." Has been on the "green" agenda for many years. Along with *"no fertiliser"* as the acid will react with the limestone according to the greens. A recent proposal to the Forest Practises Act suggested a 20-metre clearance for class 4 streams (sinkholes that fill with water are class 4 streams). *"no ploughing"* of paddocks was submitted, at the recent Mole Creek Karst Management Hearing in Deloraine.

Even during a visit by Mr Brian Green, Minister for Primary Industry, Water & Environment (Tasmania) on the 11 December 2002 and before, we have been consistently told, that these restrictions are for forest areas, inside national parks, administered by another branch of government or just on someone's political agenda.

However The Department of Primary Industry, Water & Environment (Tasmania) posted on the 24 September 2002 on it's web site guide lines for "Protecting and Managing Karst" The list of things that the DPIWE suggest should be done - <http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/RPIO-4YQ8DW?open> (Att.5) include fencing of sinkholes, replant native vegetation, **DO NOT apply any fertiliser with in at least 35 metres of a sinkhole.** These are but 3 of a long list of DPIWE recommendations contained on the above page & on <http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/RPIO-4YQ925?open>, (Att 6)

We have been told by the DPIWE that these are "only recommendations" (Att. 7) we have been told similar things in the past.

When we first became aware of the National Estate listing we were told it would make no difference to us. But we have not been able to sell timber since then. We were told “But you can cut it all down if you like, as long as you don’t sell it. We are not telling you what to do with your land.” Now we are not allowed to clear the trees and are restricted to 5 tonne in any year in the “Priory 1 Karst” area. The recent “Tasmanian Nature Conservation Strategy 2002 - 2006”

<http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/JCOK-5KZTT4?open> has 64 recommendations many of which affect this property. Of particular note is “Statutes & Planning – Recommendation 6 – the 4th dot point ■ *enable legislative endorsement for codes of practice, including duty of care component, to make compliance mandatory and external to compensatory mechanisms.*

The sustainable management practices included on the DPIWE web site would then become law if this were made legislation.

The Commonwealth’s Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 also affect this property. We are told that this is “unlikely to be relevant to your continuing dairying activities.” But are told in the next paragraph “an enlargement, expansion or intensification of use is not a continuation of use.” With the number of dairy farms in Tasmania falling from 1522 in 1980 to 612 in 2002 & the number of cows increasing from 103000 in 1980 to 170000 in 2002 (TFGA 2002 annual report) it is well established that “enlargement, expansion or intensification” are just part of dairy farming & that these restrictions would have an affect on our enterprise.

We have written to the Hon. Dr David Kemp asking is the recent proposal by the DPIWE to purchase 80Ha of our property & the proposed placement of a covenant on another 60Ha would be an intensification.

The DPIWE are very quick to point out wherever possible when a particular area is not directly under the control of their department. As with building codes – we have been told that we cannot rebuild our house if it burns down. However the council is only following legislation brought in by the state & commonwealth governments. The DPIWE’s “Protecting and Managing Karst” web page <http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/RPIO-4YQ8DW?open> (Att. 5) states

“Do not Locate built structures (eg. Roads, sheds, houses, etc.) on known karst features.”

Leaves little room for doubt. Our farm is a karst feature. We are the only property named in the “Meander Valley Council Natural Resource Management Strategy” & all of our property is included in that report.

One of the main problems with this situation is that no one from the Premier down & up to the Commonwealth level wants or has the durastriktion to fix the problem. In the mean time we are left in limbo, while various departments run for cover behind each other.

The government is only too happy to continue with this as it has & will introduce codes of practice which are given credence by the length of time they have been in place, these codes of practice are then made law.

With the ever-increasing restrictions being placed on our property it is quite obvious that no private sector person would buy it. If someone did they cannot build a house, shed or dairy. They cannot make a road or track or have a septic system. They will also struggle to find grass to feed stock as once the sinkholes are fenced there will not be any pasture. They can't apply fertilizer within 35m of sinkholes. Mr. Schaap (ministerial adviser) during his visit with Minister Green on the 11 Dec.2002 said that he would not buy it ("Circular Ponds") & could not see how anyone else could. The regrowth of trees was to be our superannuation that is down the drain. The fact that our mortgage is with Department of Economic Development (Tasmania) means that the only buyer, the government is also the mortgagee.

The restrictions placed and proposed to be placed on our property severely affect our farming enterprise. These effects range from the time and expense of attending meetings, writing letters, compiling submissions, researching government papers, showing people over our property & time spent on the phone. The legislative restrictions restrict the ongoing viability & productive of our farm as any value in further development may be short lived or even illegal. As farming is about continued development of a property, this is a major restriction on our enterprise.

We would be welcome the opportunity to show you over our property. We are told many times " Well you did tell me and I saw the photos, but I had no idea it was like this."

Mayberry and all Mole Creek farming areas can be very productive, but not if those farming it do not have a secure tenure over their land.

Yours sincerely

Glen and Christine Anderson

Notes

1. Mole Creek – A Geological and Geomorphological Field Guide Clive Burrett & Albert Goede.
University of Tasmania.

Our property can be veiwed at

Legislation & Guidelines

That directly effect G & C Anderson, “Circular Ponds”,19 Mayberry Rd., Mayberry, Tasmania, 7304.

Dairy Farm

Property 283 Ha (700 Acres). 300 pasture, 400 Bush

Commonwealth

- Register of the National Estate
- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

State (Tasmanian)

- Forest Practices Act 1985 and amendments
- Forest Practices Code 2000
- Forest Practices Regulations
- Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993
- Private Forests Act 1994
- Regional Forests Agreement (Land Classification) Act 1998
- Water Management Act 1999
- Tasmanian Nature Conservation Strategy 2002 – 2006
 - **Indirectly** - Mole Creek Karst National Park and Conservation Area Management Plan
 - Integrated Karst Management Plan (Being develop at this time)
 - State and Commonwealth Wetlands Policy – (The Integrated Karst Management Plan discussion paper states that the “Mole Creek karst may qualify as a wetland of conservation significance under State and Commonwealth wetlands initiatives.”

Local Government (Meander Valley Council)

- Natural Resource Management Strategy
 - (Att. 8) We have included the Recommendations and our objections to this Strategy
- Meander Valley Scenic Management Strategy
- Meander Valley Council Vegetation Management Strategy

Negative Impacts on Landholders

- These impacts are far reaching to the extent that it is doubtful that we know the full extent of their impact.
- The property is unsaleable due to the ever-increasing restrictions. Such as-
 - *The Commonwealth’s. Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, Subsection 43.B(1) of that Act states:*

*”A person may take an action described in. a provision of Part 3 without an approval under Part 9 for the purposes of the provision if the action is a lawful continuation of a use of land, sea or seabed that was occurring immediately before the commencement of this Act. For this purpose, **an enlargement, expansion or intensification of use is not a continuation of a use.**”*

Given that in 1980 there were 1522 Tasmanian dairy farms and 103000 dairy cow, compared to 612 dairy farms and 170000 dairy cows in 2002. (TFGA 2002 annual report) **enlargement, expansion and intensification are the norm.**

- DPIWE Protecting and Managing Karst – (Att.4)
<http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/RPIO-4YQ8DW?open>
- Guidelines for Cave and Karst Protection, IUCN – (Att. 5)
<http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/RPIO-4YQ925?open>
The DPIWE is quick to point out that the above documents are not regulations. How ever the
- “Tasmanian’s Nature Conservation Strategy 2002 - 2006”
<http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/JCOK-5KZTT4?open>
has 64 recommendations many of which affect this property. Of particular note is “Statutes & Planning – Recommendation 6 – the 4th dot point ■ **enable legislative endorsement for codes of practice, including duty of care component, to make compliance mandatory and external to compensatory mechanisms.**”
The sustainable management practices included on the DPIWE web site would then become law if this were brought in.

these include

- **Do not** apply any fertiliser, pesticides or other chemicals within at least 35 metres of a sinkhole or cave.
- **Do not** locate built structures (e.g. roads, sheds, houses, etc.) on known karst features
- Sinkholes and caves can be protected by:
 - If natural vegetation has been cleared, consider replanting with local provenance native species, especially around streams, caves and sinkholes;
 - Fencing streams, caves and sinkholes to exclude stock;

Anyone does not have to look at a map of our property (Att 1) to long to realise that there is very little left if a 35-metre radius buffer zone is placed around sinkholes. We have invited visitors to the property to step out this distance between sinkhole to find what land would be left. In most cases they have not started to step out the distance as the next sinkhole was clearly within 35 metres. 70 metres is the distance between sinkholes before a metre of ground is not affected by these guidelines.

Add to this that we have been told, “Mayberry is an active drainage area and that “Circular Ponds” is the plug hole” In other words all the water that flows through Mayberry is discharged from Mayberry through our property.

Mayberry is almost a Polje (Note 1) (Att. 3) it is only that some water exits Mayberry through Sensation Gorge at peek flows that disqualifies Mayberry. In most years the water would flow through Sensation Gorge on only a handful of days. This means that all water exiting Mayberry flows through the karst system on all but that handful of days. The Environment & Planing (Tasmania) guidelines suggest not to discharge dairy waste within 20 metres of an active drainage zone. This cannot be done within the Mayberry polje or “Circular Ponds”

- Council has told us that it is unlikely that we would be allowed to rebuild our house if it burnt down. This is now reinforced by the DPIWE, Protecting and Managing Karst guidelines - *Do not locate built structures (e.g. roads, sheds, houses, etc.) on known karst features*

As well as these and other tangible matters such as time and expense incurred in staying up to date and abreast of these matters there are other areas not easy assessed, such as the time used that could have been productively spent elsewhere on the farm. The stress that is placed on our family by these matters is considerable.

Positive Impacts on Landholders

- We have learnt to deal with politicians & bureaucrats

Impact on Property Values

- Our property is unsaleable to a private person. The DPIWE (TAS) Karst guidelines (if made regulations), along with National Estate & Environment Protection and Biodiversity Act's make it illegal to farm here.
- If the Priority 1 Karst area was excluded from the property this would cut the property in half.
- The DPIWE (TAS) is keen to point out that there have been cases where the value of the property has increased when a covenant has been placed on a property. However with no building permitted on our property, even to replace the existing house if it burnt down this would not be so. Also with the type of forest that is on this property and the restriction placed on this type of forest we feel this would not be the case here.

Administrative costs for Landholders

We estimate that we conservatively spend an average of 16 hours a week working on the karst issues that affect our property.

The total cost is hard to define but include a portion of such things as

Computer Equipment

Phone and Fax charges – 2 phone lines

Internet connection – We have a one-way satellite broadband connection without this our research time would more than double and our ability to download large reports etc. would be doubtful given the poor line speed by landline alone.

Consumables – such as paper, ink, files and other office supplies.

Transport costs – To meetings etc.

Impacts on non-landholders and regional communities

- In the long-term there will be fewer permanent residents of this area. It is the farming and timber industries that have opened up this and many other areas. It is the activities of these industries that sustain the infrastructure that tourism is based on. It is the people living and working in these remoter areas that provide help to those that are lost or breakdown in these areas. In this area for instance mobile phone reception is very poor.

Efficiency and effectiveness of environmental regimes

- There is no efficiency or effectiveness in any of the proposed conservation schemes for this property. While many of regulations and guidelines would require us to stop farming and living in Mayberry, we are told that the Tasmanian Government is not interested in purchasing our property.

The proposed purchase of an 80Ha “Priority 1 Karst”(Att. 9 & 10) area, which would split our property in half would protect very little of the karst area. While this is a mainly forested area it contains far fewer karst features than other areas of our property. The area also contains some pasture that is used to hold our stock on when other parts of our property floods. This flood prone area is our main grazing area. It is in our interest to defer grazing of this area to reduce pugging in these wet conditions. Given the nature of the karst ground it is only necessary to remove stock for a short period (as little as 24 hr’s) of time before the ground will again accept stock without pugging. This removal of stock has the other effect of moving stock out of running water that they would silt up and soil, which would then run directly into the karst. *(Animal welfare is a further consideration)* It is the “Priority 1 Karst” area along with the purposed “Private Timber Reserve” area that represents the high dry ground on our property. These areas allow us to remove the stock from the wetter areas when necessary. With supplementary feeding we can hold stock off these wet areas for some time.

In the proposed revised “Priority 1 Karst ”(Att 10) area an access corridor was placed at one end of the property. The largest known rift on our property dissects this corridor. This rift is a karst feature that the guidelines say should have a 35-metre buffer zone. Access to this corridor is only available through the wettest paddock on our property. Again conflicting with karst management guidelines. Once we have gained access to the back of our property through this corridor, after filling in the rift, we are in a paddock that the established access is included is the “Priority 1 Karst” area. An alternate access would necessitate the establishment of access through a forested area containing many limestone out crops, “karst features”.

We feel that the proposed conservation measures have far more to do with political expediency than any steps towards protecting the karst values. It has been normal farming practices over the past 150 years that have maintained this area in it’s current healthy state, to the extent that it now attracts the interest of the DPIWE (TAS)

Transparency and community consultation

In our case there is very little if any transparency and community consultation. This can be highlighted when our property was placed on the “Register of the National Estate” in 1983. It was not until a neighbour read a small article in the local paper in 1985 that we became aware that our property had been included on the “Register of the National Estate”.

We have been told many times in regard to legislation & guidelines “no that doesn’t effect you” or “these are only guidelines” only to be told some time later “ that was brought in back then, it’s too late now to object” or “those guidelines are now included in these regulations”

We have tried in the past to meet with the responsible minister to discuss the matter. After the first meeting an election was called a week later and the minister retired from parliament and there was a change of government. The second meeting was during the next election campaign, some 4 years later, with the minister taking up a different portfolio in the re-elected government. The current minister Hon. Brian Green DPIWE has met with us as part of “Mole

Creek Karst Private Land Owners Group” and is unwilling or incapable of finding a resolution to the problem. His advisers show no interest in finding a resolution to the matter at all.

A committee was formed in 2001 we believe to formulate the “Integrated Karst Management – Mole Creek” yet no one with “Priority 1” karst or with major karst features on there property was even aware that such a committee had been convened. It was not until the last meeting of this committee that any members of the “Mole Creek Karst Private Land Owners Group” were invited to attend. Work was even carried out for this committee on our property by Mr Rolan Eberhard, Karst Officer, DPIWE (TAS) during this time without mention of the committee.

Attachment 1

Circular Ponds

Attachment 2

Attachment 3

Attachment 4

Polje

Karst Window


First a **Definition** from the  Glossary of Speleological and Caving Terms: A large closed depression draining underground, with a flat floor across which there may be an intermittent or perennial stream. The polje may be liable to flood and become a lake, and its floor makes a sharp break with parts of surrounding slopes.

Image: The end of the **Rakov Polje** in Rakov National Park near Postojna in Slovenia.

Polje is the Slovenian word for **field**, which means the flat and very fertile ground of the valleys in Slovenia. In the area around Postojna many valleys show the same characteristics:

- The valleys are rather small, a few hundred meters wide and up to one or two kilometers long.
- The sides of the valleys are rather steep.
- Most valleys have a stream flowing from one end to the other.
- The stream enters the valley in a karst spring, often the entrance to a cave.
- The stream leaves the valley in a ponor or the entrance to a cave.
- And last but not least: the valley has a flat and very fertile ground.

This typical form of a Polje is easy to explain, after the way they were formed is understood. The whole karst area is drained underground by caves. If the caves are rather close to the surface and rather big too, sometimes the roof collapses and forms a doline. The stream that flows through the cave now flows through the Doline and the doline looks like a valley with steep walls and a river arising from a cave and disappearing into another cave.

As erosion continues, several parts of the cave may collapse and it looks like dolines or poljes connected by short caves and natural bridges. After some time the remaining natural bridges collapse too and the dolines get connected, to form bigger poljes.

Poljes are also called karst windows, as they look like windows of not karstified areas in a karst area. The ground of the poljes is not karstified as it is below the karst ground water surface. The cave river of the cave system is the ground water surface, as soon as the drainage moves down, the karst ground water will follow and the polje will fall dry. It will become a dry valley.

Attachment 5 (3 pages)

Water

Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment

Protecting and Managing Karst

[Protecting karst areas](#)

[Sinkhole management](#)

[Sound management practices](#)

[Guidelines for Cave and Karst Protection, IUCN](#)

At times, karst environments seem out-of-sight, out-of-mind. However, failure to consider these environments could result in groundwater contamination and the effects will flow-on.

What is karst?

Karst landscapes feature sinkholes, springs and streams that sink into subsurface caverns. Karst terrain is hollow by nature and the potential for groundwater pollution is high. Streams and surface runoff enter sinkholes and caves, and bypass natural filtration. Groundwater then travels through underground networks, and can move rapidly from one part of a catchment to another. If polluted, the groundwater carries contaminants into wells and springs in the area.

Protecting karst areas

Groundwater pollution often originates within the district or property dependent on the groundwater supply for drinking water and household use. Given this is so, property owners should identify the total catchment area of any karst lands, and be aware of the potential impact of activities within the catchment.

Within karst catchments, activities that could impact on groundwater flows and quality should be planned with particular care. In some instances, it may be appropriate to obtain specialist advice to clarify catchment boundaries and to ensure that appropriate planning steps are followed. This can help to ensure that an activity will not cause unacceptable impacts to groundwater.

Karst wells and springs used for domestic and other purposes can be contaminated from a number of poor practices, including:

- Uncontrolled stock damaging streambanks and vegetation, results in excess soil entering groundwater via streamsinks and caves;
- Animal wastes entering and contaminating waterways and harming cave animals;
- Failure to maintain or restore native vegetation, particularly in the vicinity of streams, caves and sinkholes;
- Inappropriate use of herbicides, pesticides or fertilisers. To minimise water pollution, use herbicides and pesticides that breakdown rapidly in

the soil. Wick wiping techniques are recommended in the vicinity of water courses; and

- Filling sinkholes or caves, or using them to dispose of animal carcasses or rubbish can damage the karst environment and cause impacts to groundwater.

Sinkhole Management

Sinkholes are natural drainage points for the groundwater system and should never be filled or used as rubbish dumps.

When contaminants enter groundwater through sinkholes, it does not mean "out of sight, out of mind". The problems associated with contaminated water will emerge posing a health concern and threat to the environment. In karst areas, groundwater may resurface at springs and spread the contamination into streams and rivers – our water supplies.

Plugging a sinkhole may cause:

- Poor drainage
- Flooding
- Subsidence
- Erosion
- Pollution

If you purchase a property where a sinkhole was previously used as a dump, strongly consider cleaning it out and restoring the vegetation to improve water quality.

Sound Management Practices

Sinkholes and caves can be protected by:

- Preventing excessive runoff from entering groundwater by retaining natural vegetation to act as a buffer and barrier and by fencing around the sinkhole or cave;
- If natural vegetation has been cleared, consider replanting with local provenance native species, especially around streams, caves and sinkholes;
- Fencing streams, caves and sinkholes to exclude stock;
- If diversion of water from natural sinking points (e.g. caves, sinkholes) is necessary, this should be planned to ensure that unacceptable impacts on the karst system are avoided;
- Pumping of groundwater from wells should not exceed the rate of recharge to the aquifer, resulting in a lowering of the water table;
- Manage caves to protect their natural values by ensuring that persons entering the cave behave responsibly. Members of caving clubs affiliated with the Australian Speleological Federation are required to abide by a minimal impact caving code;
- Avoiding structures that divert water that naturally flows into sinkholes.

- **Do not** locate a septic system, feed lot, animal waste lagoon or stormwater basin near known or suspected sinkholes or caves.
- **Do not** apply any fertiliser, pesticides or other chemicals within at least 35 metres of a sinkhole or cave.
- **Do not** locate built structures (e.g. roads, sheds, houses, etc.) on known karst features.

Tasmania Online | Service Tasmania

This page - <http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/RPIO-4YQ8DW?open> - was last published on 24 September 2002 by the Department of Primary Industries, Water & Environment. Questions concerning its content can be sent by mail to GPO Box 44, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia 7001, email to [http://www.dpiwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/FeedbackForm?OpenForm&Email=WildlifeEnquiries@dpiwe.tas.gov.au](mailto:WildlifeEnquiries@dpiwe.tas.gov.au) or by telephone to 03 6233 6556.

Please read our [disclaimer and copyright](#) statements governing the information we provide on this site.

A [text version of this page](#) is also available.

Attachment 6 (3 pages)

Guidelines for Cave and Karst Protection, IUCN

Copyright 1997, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Prepared by the WCPA Working Group on Cave and Karst Protection

1. Effective planning for karst regions demands a full appreciation of all their economic, scientific and human values, within the local cultural and political context.
2. The integrity of any karst system depends upon an interactive relationship between land, water and air. Any interference with this relationship is likely to have undesirable impacts, and should be subjected to thorough environmental assessment.
3. Land managers should identify the total catchment area of any karst lands, and be sensitive to the potential impact of any activities within the catchment, even if not located on the karst itself.
4. Destructive actions in karst, such as quarrying or dam construction, should be located so as to minimise conflict with other resource or intrinsic values.
5. Pollution of groundwater poses special problems in karst and should always be minimised and monitored. This monitoring should be event-based rather than at merely regular intervals, as it is during storms and floods that most pollutants are transported through the karst system.
6. All other human uses of karst areas should be planned to minimise undesirable impacts, and monitored in order to provide information for future decision making.
7. While recognising the non-renewable nature of many karst features, particularly within caves, good management demands features be restored as far as is practicable.
8. The development of caves for tourism purposes demands careful planning, including consideration of sustainability. Where appropriate, restoration of damaged caves should be undertaken, rather than opening new caves for tourism.
9. Governments should ensure that a representative selection of karst sites is declared as protected areas under legislation which provides secure tenure and active management.
10. Priority in protection should be given to areas or sites having high natural, social or cultural value; possessing a wide range of values within the one site; which have suffered minimal environmental degradation; and / or of a type not already represented in the protected areas system of their country.
11. Where possible, a protected area should include the total catchment area of

the karst.

12. Where such coverage is not possible, environmental controls or total catchment management agreements under planning, water management or other legislation should be used to safeguard the quantity and quality of water inputs to the karst system.

13. Public authorities should identify karst areas not included within protected areas and give consideration to safeguarding the values of these area by such means as planning controls, programs of public education, heritage agreements or covenants.

14. Management agencies should seek to develop their expertise and capacity for karst management.

15. Managers of karst areas and specific cave sites should recognise that these landscapes are complex three-dimensional integrated natural systems comprised of rock, water, soil, vegetation and atmosphere elements.

16. Management in karst and caves should aim to maintain natural flows and cycles of air and water through the landscape in balance with prevailing climatic and biotic regimes.

17. Managers should recognise that in karst, surface actions may be sooner or later translated into impacts directly underground or further downstream.

18. Pre-eminent amongst karst processes is the cascade of carbon dioxide from low levels in the external atmosphere through greatly enhanced levels in the soil atmosphere to reduced levels in cave passages. Elevated soil carbon dioxide levels depend on plant root respiration, microbial activity and a healthy soil invertebrate fauna. This cascade must be maintained for the effective operation of karst solution processes.

19. The mechanism by which this is achieved is the interchange of air and water between surface and underground environments. Hence the management of quality and quantity of both air and water is the keystone of effective management at regional, local and site specific scales. Development on the surface must take into account the infiltration pathways of water.

20. Catchment boundaries commonly extend beyond the limits of the rock units in which the karst has formed. The whole karst drainage network should be defined using planned water tracing experiments and cave mapping. It should be recognised that the boundary of these extended catchments can fluctuate dramatically according to weather conditions, and that relict cave passages can be reactivated following heavy rain.

21. More than in any other landscape, a total catchment management regime must be adopted in karst areas. Activities undertaken at specific sites may have wider ramifications in the catchment due to the ease of transfer of materials in karst.

22. Soil management must aim to minimise erosive loss and alteration of soil properties such as aeration, aggregate stability, organic matter content and a healthy soil biota.

23. A stable natural vegetation cover should be maintained as this is pivotal to the prevention of erosion and maintenance of critical soil properties.

24. Establishment and maintenance of karst protected areas can contribute to

the protection of both the quality and quantity of groundwater resources for human use. Catchment protection is necessary both on the karst and on contributing non-karst areas. Activities within caves may have detrimental effects on regional groundwater quality.

25. Management should aim to maintain the natural transfer rates and quality of fluids, including gases, through the integrated network of cracks, fissures and caves in the karst. The nature of materials introduced must be carefully considered to avoid adverse impacts on air and water quality.

26. The extraction of rocks, soil, vegetation and water will clearly interrupt the processes that produce and maintain karst, and therefore such uses must be carefully planned and executed to minimise environmental impact. Even the apparently minor activity of removing limestone pavement or other karren for ornamental decoration of gardens or buildings has a drastic impact and should be subject to the same controls as any major extractive industry.

27. Imposed fire regimes on karst should, as far is practicable, mimic those occurring naturally.

28. While it is desirable that people should be able to visit and appreciate karst features such as caves, the significant and vulnerability of many such features means that great care must be taken to minimise damage, particularly when cumulative over time. Management planning should recognise this fact and management controls should seek to match the visitor population to the nature of the resource.

29. International, regional and national organisations concerned with aspects of karst protection and management should recognise the importance of international co-operation and do what they can to disseminate and share expertise.

30. The documentation of cave and karst protection/management policies should be encouraged, and such policies made widely available to other management authorities.

31. Data bases should be prepared listing cave and karst areas included within protected areas, but also identifying major unprotected areas which deserve recognition. Karst values of existing and potential World Heritage sites should be similarly recorded.

Protecting and Managing Karst

Attachment 7

Attachment 8 (6 pages)

MEANDER VALLEY COUNCIL NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Recommendations: **Objections**

1. Adopt a three-tier planning and management framework for the municipality (i.e. the regional management committee, the major sub-catchment committees and the catchment units).
In the interim, continue to work with existing groups, establish new groups where there are critical gaps (e.g. the Caveside area) and reactivate groups which have gone into remission (e.g. Upper Rubicon and Upper Quamby Group).

2. Prepare 'whole of sub-catchment' management plans for each sub-catchment in consultation with State and local government, the community and landowners.

Interim Actions

Prepare local area Management plans for critical locations.

There needs to be far more consultation with landowners or the whole process will grind to a halt. We need to know how it affects our day to day farming operations and our long term viability. Locking up land will put farmers viability into question.

3. Facilitate and coordinate preparation of a native vegetation management strategy for the Council area.

In the interim, explore funding options in partnership with other land management agencies and organisations.

4. Continue to support implementation of the Meander Valley Weed Strategy and in particular the distribution of the *Weed Management Plan*.

5. Facilitate, coordinate and assist the preparation of a Rivercare plan for the whole of the municipality covering all major catchments down to the sub-catchment level (plans should be prepared for each of the major catchments down to the sub-catchment level). In the interim, continue to support local area management plans.

Who is funding fencing program for streams, sinkholes etc? On this property this would mean we would lose the vast majority of our pasture. Is there compensation available for loss of production and property values? With all water sources fenced native faunas access would also be restricted. The resulting non-productive area would soon become infested with weeds.

6. Facilitate, coordinate and assist with the preparation of a roadsides and utilities easements strategy for the municipality with a view to minimising the impacts of development and maintenance works on natural resource values. In the interim, facilitate the establishment of a communication process to coordinate the management efforts of the different agencies.

Roadside spraying seeps onto private land and is leached into creeks and streams etc. and into the Karst system. This has caused noticeable vegetation loss on our property, if this pollution is detected by water monitoring it could be attributed to landowner.

7. Contact the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (Transport) with a view to generating pressure for the conduct of a National Road System project along State and National highways in the municipality.
As for 6
8. Facilitate, coordinate and assist with the preparation of a fire management strategy plan for the Council area with the assistance of the Tasmanian Fire Service, the Parks and Wildlife Service and the Deloraine Aboriginal Community Association.
Controlled burns need to take place or the entire Western Tiers will be lost.
9. Facilitate, coordinate and assist access to incentive scheme funding for the protection of native vegetation of conservation significance.

3.2.4 Programs & Activities - RFI Private Land Reserve program - "Circular Ponds" has been surveyed for inclusion in this scheme. Given that Mole Creek area was on the main access route to Circular Head area the trees have been harvested for over 150 years, the forest does not meet the criteria. There is no provision to take into account the karst values.

10. Council should develop a practical and appropriate trigger process for investigating development applications for areas of vegetation of priority conservation significance (i.e. important, urgent, critical).
Does this mean that all farm developments are halted (barn, dairies etc). Already the Council has given us no guarantee that we can rebuild our house if it burns down.
11. Facilitate, coordinate and assist with the preparation of a strategy and guidelines to conserve and manage remaining wetlands in the Meander Municipality (with the assistance of relevant agencies).
Interim Actions
Liaise with landowners in priority locations (Circular Ponds, Mole Creek karst and middle Rubicon) to encourage protection of priority wetlands.
Compliance with this would necessitate the removal of all stock from Circular Ponds and surrounding areas. What compensation for loss of livelihood and property value is available?
12. Council and other relevant bodies should continue to consult with landowners to seek their co-operation for the retention of priority forest types on their land.
We have 400 acres of timber we are currently paying principle and interest on and we are prevented from harvesting it and receive no compensation for it.
13. Council and other relevant bodies should consult with existing landowners to seek their co-operation for the retention of lowland grassland communities on their land.

14. Support preparation and implementation of conservation plans for priority forest epacrid species.
15. Facilitate, coordinate and assist in the preparation of detailed mapping of threatened flora species within the municipality which can be included in Council's GIS system and the planning process so that they can be protected from disturbance. In the interim support the implementation of a system to identify roadsides and other Council lands with rare and threatened species within the municipality.
16. Facilitate, coordinate and assist in the preparation in the preparation of detailed mapping of threatened fauna species within the municipality which can be included in Council's GIS system and the planning process so that they can be protected from disturbance.
17. Promote awareness of the importance of riparian vegetation.
18. Facilitate willow mapping for those areas of the municipality, which are not already mapped.
19. Continue to support river environment restoration programs toward the eventual eradication of crack willow.
20. Report sightings of feral goats to the Parks and Wildlife Service.
21. Support proposed cat control legislation as a means of managing the domestic cat population.
22. Support feral cat control wherever possible and in particular where animal species of high conservation significance are at threat.
23. Support rabbit control wherever possible and in particular where plant species or communities of high conservation significance are at threat or where associated erosion problems are deemed to be significant.
24. Encourage landowners to contact the Game Management Unit and to prepare Property-based Game Management Plans for their properties.
25. Raise public awareness of best farm practice in relation to the protection of soil values.
26. Encourage completion of land capability mapping for the whole Municipality.
27. Work with Parks and Wildlife and the World Heritage Consultative Committee to prioritise rehabilitation of degraded sites on the Central Plateau within the municipal area, particularly in the headwaters of streams and rivulets leading to the Western Tiers.
28. Support installation of off stream watering points and fencing to control stock at priority locations. Who bears the cost? As for objection 5 - Who is funding fencing program for streams, sinkholes etc? On this property this would mean we would lose the vast majority of our pasture. Is there compensation available for loss of production and property values? With all water sources fenced native faunas access would also be restricted. The resulting non productive area would soon become infested with weeds.

29. Facilitate, coordinate and assist with the preparation of a salinity strategy for the municipality (possibly in conjunction with the Northern Midlands Council). **In the Interim**
 Promote retention of native vegetation areas prone to dry salting particularly in ground water recharge areas;
 Promote remediation of affected areas, particularly in groundwater recharge area; Council to acquire hazard mapping to assist with decisions. Encourage best farm practice in areas of salinity hazard.
30. Encourage the continuing assessment of all roads in natural and plantation forests as potential sources of land instability correction of problems and implementation of a monitoring and maintenance schedule.
31. Promote the identification of Protected Environmental Values for all sub-catchments in the municipality. PEV planning should include the establishment of water quality target indicators for each PEV in each sub-catchment.(PEV- 'Protected Environmental Values')
32. Continue to source Federal and State funding to upgrade sewage treatment within the municipality in line with relevant State Government policies and standards.
33. Facilitate promotion and adoption of the dairy effluent disposal code of practice in the municipality.
34. Support continued water management planning throughout the municipality.
35. Support determination of environmental flows for all sub-catchments within the municipality.
36. Liaise with the State Library of Tasmania regarding the establishment of a dedicated Meander Valley natural resource reference section at one of its branch libraries.
37. Compile existing species lists into a Council-held database.
38. Encourage Service Tasmania to maintain a computer terminal work station to the public for accessing Parks and Wildlife Internet site.
39. Encourage the Parks and Wildlife Service to conduct a public information night(s) to demonstrate how GIS system works and how it can be access and used from the home computer.
40. Council should acquire the GIS information for use on its in house computer network.
41. Council should utilise NHT funding to subsidise the distribution of vegetation type modules in the Study Area, whilst also investigating other options for reducing the cost of this information to the community.
42. Include a list of natural resource management contacts in the Council's Community Register.
43. Revise and update the Tasmanian Landcare Association contact list to be Study Area specific and widely distribute within the community, possibly by Councils using their rates notices (see Section 5.4.5).

44. Utilise Council notices over the next 2-3 years to raise awareness of the outcomes of the current study and of the need for and mechanisms to assist with natural resource management in general.
45. Facilitate appropriate Council Staff participation in urban bushland management courses run by TAFE.
46. Support training programs for rural and volunteer fire brigades on fire ecology and native vegetation management.
47. Support the community involvement in natural resource management training.
48. Coordinate and hold natural resource management field trip(s) on a regular basis to encourage the exchange of practical information between landowners and to foster stronger contacts with government and non-government agencies.
49. Local schools be encouraged/supported to become actively involved in natural resource management programs within the region.
Needs to be a balanced program not just pro conservation.
50. The Committee should support efforts to retain Landcare Education as a curriculum component by the Department of Education.
51. Identify new residents in the community and the priority natural resources management issues their area and distribute appropriate background information to them.
52. Encourage landowners to participate in Whole Farm Planning as a guide to the management of natural resource management on their properties.
53. Encourage continued State government support for Whole Farm Planning and the Farmwi\$e Program in particular.
54. Encourage and support future scientific research in the municipality, particularly that which is of direct relevance to the protection of natural resource values.
55. Promote landowner participation in Birds Australia's atlas program.
56. Liaise with the State Library and support their development of a resource section dedicated to the storage of information about the municipality.
57. Encourage inclusion of monitoring in all funding applications.
58. Liaise with Statewide sampling project coordinator to encourage use of the Council area as a case study location during future consultancy.
59. The Committee should require the inclusion of maintenance agreements as part of all funding applications for fencing and weed control.
60. Council to continue its support for the Natural Resources Management Committee.
61. Undertake an annual review of the current action plan annually, of the overall plan every three years with a major reworking within 10 years.

62. Appoint a Natural Resources Manager to undertake the above tasks.
63. Encourage local nurseries and seed suppliers to propagate locally indigenous vegetation for use in revegetation projects.
64. Institute a program of regular and formal meetings with adjoining Councils with a specific focus on natural resource management matters.
65. The Committee and Council should continue to explore avenues for project sharing and support for land management activities in the municipal area.
66. Committee members read and become familiar with Binning and Young's report on Management Agreements (1997).
67. Review the vegetation database and mapping to identify areas of the priority vegetation types and seek out participation of private landowners in the Fencing Incentive Scheme in these areas. Why should private landowners contribute to the fragmentation of their own land if this would cause loss of income and devaluation of their property.
68. Review the vegetation database and mapping and existing management plans and whole farm plans to identify key areas for revegetation.
69. Investigate options for establishment of a rates incentive scheme to support natural resource management objectives.

Most of the residents of Mayberry are supporting Natural Resource (by default as we can't log) but don't receive any rate reduction or compensation.

70. Prepare a brief for a consultancy to undertake Scenic Protection Special Areas mapping using the Ministerial Committee's techniques (or similar) in conjunction with one or several techniques of community consultation to determine key viewpoints and to identify community concerns generally.
71. Advocate the development of *Tasmanian Private Forests Strategy* to guide the process of maintaining important conservation values on private forests in the State. What compensation is available for removing these forests from production?
72. Once identified, Council should investigate an amendment to the Meander Valley Planning Scheme 1995 to include rare and threatened species and communities information on the Scheme Plans and to add controls through appropriate clauses. In the interim, all development applications in areas of threatened species or communities should be referred to the RFA Private Land Unit, DPIWE for advice.
73. Cooperate/support Land Capability mapping over the remaining Council area as a matter of priority.

- If capability is calculated at less than current stocking rate would Council seek to reduce it and if so what compensation would the landowner receive for loss of income?
74. Seek access rights to mapping information for incorporation in the Council's GIS data systems.
 75. Council should investigate the capacity for attracting additional funding for natural resource management programs by making alternative use of cash in lieu payments resulting from subdivision and / or rationalising their land asset inventories.
 76. Facilitate the establishment of at least one Waterwatch group or testing program per sub-catchment.
 77. Facilitate Waterwatch testing in each sub-catchment area to agreed standards, at consistent location(s) and across an agreed range of indicators.
 78. Council consider establishing and maintaining a central database for the storage of water quality / water quantity information collected in the municipality.
 79. Identify priority areas and foster establishment of new Landcare, Bushcare and Rivercare groups in those areas.
 80. Encourage the establishment of Wildcare Groups in the municipal area to assist with the management in Parks and Wildlife Service areas.
 81. Promote involvement of the Land for Wildlife scheme to local landowners.
 82. Cooperate in a demonstration project in the Christmas Hills And Birralee Road area to evaluate the processes and benefits in undertaking cooperative planning for the establishment of coordinated nature conservation effort between public and private landowners.

Attachment 9

Attachment 10