

**From:** Paul Recher [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 2 March 2016 7:45 AM  
**To:** IPART Mailbox  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** addededum to my submission

I forgot to mention under my section on wild dogs. The biodiversity SRV council wants includes budgeting for wild dog control when, in fact, wild dogs are a positive for biodiversity by their controlling effect on the pest animals: foxes, cats, swamp wallabies. Swamp wallabies are out of control. Six months after planting 3000 koala feed trees (four Eucalyptus species) two remained. I have no doubt this sort of predation is also taking place in state forests and national parks wherever wild dogs are baited. Yet council in their ignorance wants to eliminate wild dogs. Note I am talking specifically to biodiversity and not the negative impact wild dogs have on domestic animals and people.

Treefully,  
Paul Recher

“Always be who you are unless you can be a unicorn, then be a unicorn” Unk.

**From:** Paul Recher [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 1 March 2016 1:42 PM  
**To:** IPART Mailbox  
**Subject:** submission edited update Lismore Council Biodiversity SRV

I have owned, operated, and managed Fruit Spirit Botanical Gardens & Wildlife Refuge since 1978 developing it from a dairy farm into a verdant 32 ha. jungle of biodiversity with over 2000 plant species. This private property has, by far, the greatest biodiversity of plants and animals within the Lismore council area.

I am totally opposed to the biodiversity SRV as proposed because it is a wankadoodle feel good exercise with no detail and minimum undetermined benefit.

If the proposed SRV funding was directed exclusively at delineating those road verges, unused crown road reserves, and waterways with owner permission to create a spiderweb of trees and shrub corridors interconnecting the Lismore council area biodiversity hot spots I would be very much in favour of the proposal.

Council's submission to IPART is incredibly biased. For example, council did not forward the submissions it received on the SRV, and did not tell IPART that personal submissions ran more than 2:1 against the proposal.

Council proposes to get plant species in the ground to enhance biodiversity. Who determines the plant selection? Will the election be provenance specific or merely indigenous or will it include exotics from North Queensland? What about overseas exotics? Exotics enhance biodiversity or are the decisions to be left entirely up to native plant Nazis?

The proposed budget has all the earmarks of a 9-5 chalkboard session.

Examples from the proposed budget:

a) \$20,000 for a review of the operational roadside vegetation management plan 2005. In 2005 this was done from general revenue, so why the need now to fund it from an SRV?

b) >\$462,000 Staged weed management in road reserve High Conservation Value areas  
>\$205,000 Weed management in urban bushland  
>\$319,000 Weed management in priority urban riparian areas

Council can budget these figures but when asked to provide the detailed breakdown as to what plant species, how many hours labor at what cost, how many trees, what spacing, who is doing the work there are no answers but it looks good up on the chalk board! Council already pays monies to Far North Coast Weeds. Is council proposing to stop funding FNCW and take over weed control? FNCW is funded from general revenue. FNCW only deals in declared noxious weeds. Is council going after non-declared weeds? Who is going to decide what constitutes these weeds? Seriously one man's weed is another man's friend.

c) >\$1,100,000 for Rural Land Holder Capacity Building- Project Implementation. What in the world is 'capacity building' other than wankspeak? Why isn't there Urban Land Holder Capacity Building? Considering this SRV is being proposed by horticulturally agriculturally ignorant urbanites (all the councillors in favour live in urban Lismore) the term capacity building strikes me as condescending. Again council can come up with a figure of 1.1 million but not provide any detail of said allocation.

d) >\$322,000 for Strategic conservation projects (e.g. wild dogs). I am already paying along with every other rural landholder on more than 10 ha monies annually to the Land Services Board for the control of wild dogs. Now council wants me to pay more for wild dog control? Is council condemning the Land Service Board? Who is going to be responsible for the 1080 baiting program that is currently the sole legal responsibility of the Land Service Board rangers (and maybe national parks) or is council planning on using an alternative bait? If so what bait? It is transparent council has not thought this through which is what happens in a one day chalk board session!

Wild dogs were used as an example. What else do they have in mind? I asked but could get no answer.

e) >\$972,000 Rural landholder capacity building-extension officer. I'm puking.

f) >\$270,000 Implement components of the Sport and Recreation Plan. I had to ask God what this budget item has to do with biodiversity because again council provided no answer when I asked. PS- God couldn't tell me either because like me he couldn't make any connection with biodiversity

g) >\$55,000 for Well being and tourism initiatives. Would someone please tell me what this has to do with biodiversity because council could not. Why isn't this being funded from general revenue?

After ten years, does the SRV end and said revenue (\$624,000 at year ten) get returned to the ratepayer or does it go into general revenue just as council did with their last SRV for roads (6.7% or was it 4.8%) that was diverted to general revenue after two years?

This SRV does not stand up to cost : benefit analysis. The result will be very little biodiversity enhancement and protection for a lot of money. If this biodiversity SRV is of such importance then why is council borrowing millions for a new art gallery? Obviously because an art gallery is more important than biodiversity.

The fact council cannot or refuses to provide answers to legitimate questions underscores the ridiculousness of this SRV proposal.

This proposal is supported by the feel-good troops who have never tilled the earth for a living. I will say this though, for an all-day chalk board session its pretty good.

Treefully,  
Dr. Paul Recher

“Those who are able to see beyond the lies of their culture will never be understood, let alone believed, by the masses.” Plato