



**Community feedback on the 2011 Native Vegetation Regulation Review  
17 November 2011  
Cobar Bowling and Golf Club, Cobar**

Chair: Andrew Mosely, Deputy Chair, Western CMA

Facilitator: Tim Ferraro, GHD Consultant

Office of Environment and Heritage Representative: Jason Brouff

Attendance: 13 landholders, 1 apology

Western CMA Staff: Russell Grant, Operations Manager  
Karen Kneipp, Catchment Coordinator (PVPs)  
Paul Theakston, Rangelands Rehabilitation Officer  
Ben Winter, Community Support Officer

Scribes: Robyn Goonrey, Executive Support Officer  
Georgina Chaplain, Program Support Officer

Points to note but not necessarily related to native vegetation workshop:

1. Limit use of acronyms
2. Department name changes a source of community frustration – waste of tax payer \$
3. Outcomes from public meeting to go on Western CMA Internet page
4. Communication – keep in mind that there are varying generations x ,y and baby boomers – media communication needs to be targeted to all – ABC radio, 2WEB, print media lacked relevant information

1. Western Lands Commission (WLC)

- Western Lands Commission is starting to lose its impact
- Properties in the Western Catchment are on Western Lands Leases (WLL) and many management decisions are influenced by the Western Lands Act
- Landholders feel that WLC lack expertise in land rehabilitation. Western CMA has the expertise whereas WLC do not have the resources to service the area that they cover. Suggested that compliance should be with Western CMA – one government body to deal with
- Failure to recognise that low till is good for getting land back into shape

2. Farming vs mining – mining appears to have a priority over farming. There are two sets of rules – one for mining and another for farming. There is a lack of consistencies in mine vs farming. Generally landholders in the Cobar district see mining as a positive and want to work hand-in-hand with mining companies

3. INS PVPs in the Cobar district appears to be the 'way forward'. The PVP process is working well
4. Issue with length of time to get an INS PVP
5. Exemptions need to be clearer and open to flexibility and interpretation eg. ways of measuring and types of landscape – strong support to maintain dbh or underbark as a measurement in the INS EOAM chapter
6. Frustration with coolabah-black box listing as an endangered community – one landholder has 50,000 ha that he can not use. Would like coolabah – black box removed from the endangered species listing
7. PVPs – should be able to use chaining on areas previously ring barked
8. Legal advice to a CMA cannot be passed on even to other CMAs – this needs to change
9. Lack of on-ground support staff to process PVPs
10. Look at simplifying wording in PVPs
  - Landholder frustration with the delay with PVPs – lack of qualified staff
11. Every rural landholder should have the right to farm (crop) a small portion of their holding
12. Some decisions are not environmentally sound
13. Enforcing regulations should be completely divorced from CMAs
14. Communication -fear among landholders of Government Departments - CMA encouraged to carry out demonstrations / field days / pilot program so landholders know that what they are doing is compliant
15. Fifteen years for a PVP is not an acceptable timeframe – should be able to maintain improvements
  - Unclear what the regulation will be in fifteen years time (with changes in Government). Improvements under PVPs need to be able to be maintained in perpetuity
  - Attach a PVP to the property lease (in perpetuity)
  - Local input / information when PVPs are developed that are specific to the area/district being considered
  - Legal terms in PVPs difficult to understand
  - PVPs don't always give the best environmental or economical outcome
  - Habitat should be all in one section not spread out. Need local information and input specific to Western Catchment
16. More autonomy between CMAs will lead to better outcomes for landholders
17. Weed control – pepper leaf senna – this plant is not listed as a noxious weed yet it will become one if not controlled. Needs to be listed as INS. Slow process to have plants listed. Pepper leaf senna is a native plant so it is very difficult to put a case forward to have it listed as

an INS species. Landholders just want it listed as an INS so that they can remove it before it becomes a greater problem

18. Common sense and flexibility is needed. The regulation are not allowing landholders to farm their land they way they want to. Landholders are convinced it could be farmed better and bring about better results and more productive and improved land

19. Consolidate some Western Lands role into the WCMA

20. Lack of communication to let landholders know about these meetings – not enough notice