

DUPLICATE

# Lane Poole Reserve

---

## Summary of Public Submissions

---



MANAGEMENT PLAN No. 5



Department of Conservation  
and Land Management



National Parks and Nature  
Conservation Authority

# **LANE POOLE RESERVE**

## **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS**

**BY PAUL D. ALBONE**

Department of Conservation and Land Management  
State Operations Headquarters  
50 Hayman Road  
COMO WA 6152

**MANAGEMENT PLAN NO. 5**

## CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ... .. .	iii
INTRODUCTION ... .. .	iv
METHODS OF ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS ... .. .	1
ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS ... .. .	6
PUBLIC INPUT ... .. .	7
SPECIFIC ISSUES ... .. .	8
A1 LANE POOLE RESERVE (A1) <sup>1</sup> ... .. .	8
A1.1 Establishment (C18.2) ... .. .	8
C1 GENERAL PHILOSOPHY (C1) ... .. .	8
C2 LAND TENURE (C18.1) ... .. .	9
Reserve Boundaries (C18.3) ... .. .	9
Enclaves Including Lake Yourdamung (C7.2) ... .. .	10
C3 ZONING (C2) ... .. .	10
C6 FAUNA (C9) ... .. .	11
Trout (C9.3) ... .. .	12
Marron Fishing (C9.3) ... .. .	13
C7 PROTECTION (C10) ... .. .	13
C7.1 Fire (C10.1) ... .. .	13
C7.2 Dieback (C10.2) ... .. .	14
C7.3 Feral Animals (C10.3) ... .. .	15
C7.4 Declared and Exotic Plants (C10.4) ... .. .	15
C10 RECREATION AND TOURISM (C11) ... .. .	16
C10.1 Fees and Permits (C11.4) ... .. .	16
C10.3 Accommodation/Camping ... .. .	17
Generators (C11.3.2)... .. .	17
C10.4 Stream Based Activities (C11.3.3) ... .. .	17
Power Boats (C11.3.4) ... .. .	17
C10.5 Vehicle Based Activities (C11.3.4) ... .. .	18
Rally Driving ... .. .	18

1. Figures on the left of the heading refer to relevant section of final plan.  
 Figures in brackets refer to relevant section of draft plan.

	Page
Trail Bikes ... ..	19
C10.6 Domestic Animals ... ..	19
Equestrian Activities (C11.3.6) ... ..	19
Pets (C11.3.7) ... ..	19
C10.7 Other Activities ... ..	20
Orienteering/Rogaining (C11.3.10) ... ..	20
Barbecues (C11.3.1) ... ..	20
C13 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (C14) ... ..	21
C13.1 Mining (C14.1) ... ..	21
Exploration (C14.1) ... ..	21
C13.2 Timber Utilisation (C14.2) ... ..	21
C13.4 Water Supply (C14.3) ... ..	22
Public Health (C14.3) ... ..	23
C13.6 Apiary Sites (C8.5) ... ..	23
C13.7 Public Utilities ... ..	23
C14 GENERAL MANAGEMENT (C20) ... ..	24
Reserve Staff (C20.4) ... ..	24
C15 RESEARCH (C19) ... ..	24
<b>OTHER TOPICS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS</b>	
HIRE SERVICE ... ..	26
COMPETITIVE EVENTS ... ..	26
EUTROPHICATION OF THE MURRAY RIVER ... ..	26
FENCING ... ..	26
NEED FOR MANAGEMENT PLANS ... ..	26
VISITOR NUMBERS ... ..	26
COST OF IMPLEMENTATION ... ..	27
OFFERS OF HELP ... ..	27
<b>APPENDIX 1: SUBMITTERS</b> ... ..	28
<b>APPENDIX 2: MEETING TO DISCUSS INTERACTION BETWEEN TROUT, REDFIN PERCH AND NATIVE FISH IN THE S.W. OF W.A. LANE POOLE RESERVE</b> ... ..	30
<b>TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES TO THE LANE POOLE RESERVE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN</b> ... ..	2

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editor wishes to thank Barry Muir, formerly from Planning Branch, for providing much of the text. Also, thanks to Jim Williamson from Planning Branch, for editorial work, and Debbie Bowra for typing.

## INTRODUCTION

This document summarises submissions received in response to the Draft Management Plan for Lane Poole Reserve. The Draft Management Plan (DMP) was released in April 1986 and consisted of three volumes - a Management document, Resource document and Public Input. This public input was achieved through 125 person days of workshops involving various organisations, tertiary institutions, clubs, Government Departments and private persons. In addition, written submissions and responses from 159 questionnaires were received. This input contributed substantially to the positive response obtained when the DMP was published, with many initially contentious issues resolved before the plan was released.

The DMP was distributed to State and Commonwealth Government Departments, tertiary institutions, conservation groups, individuals who had expressed an interest in conservation areas and adjacent landholders to Lane Poole Reserve. Plans were available for purchase from CALM as well as inspection from various State libraries.

The release of a DMP for public comment allows the public to review proposed objectives and prescriptions before implementation and to encourage public involvement. Also, additional information may become available from sources outside the project team. New data and expertise became available from public submissions in response to this DMP and was helpful in preparing the final Management Plan.

## METHODS OF ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

Where possible comments were related to specific sections within the Draft Plan. Comments were categorised as:

1. Change in policy or legislation
2. Clarification of the plan (change in format, editorial etc)
3. Public Participation - additional information provided
4. Public Participation - amendment to existing information
5. Criticism of or agreement with specific issues
6. Comments related to, but not within the scope of the plan or project team to address.

Items (1) to (4), as shown in Table 1, were used as a basis for changes to the draft plan. Items (5) and (6) are addressed in this document. Care was taken to ensure:

- all points were considered.
- no bias was imposed on interpretation of the comments received. Thus, if a statement did not clearly give the impression that it was negative or positive, it was considered neutral and examined at length by the reviewers.

Problems encountered during review of submissions were:

- sometimes difficult to determine what section of the Plan the comments were aimed at.
- it is reasonable to assume that people happy with the Plan rarely responded and hence submissions were biased towards complaints, making it difficult to assess general acceptability.
- misunderstanding of the plan leading to inappropriate comments (all these situations have been reworded to clarify the final plan).
- actions of reviewers was sometimes a result of **their** interpretation of the **public's** interpretation of the Plan and occasionally some uncertainty existed as to reliability.
- many criticisms or suggestions were not supported with facts, reasons or logic, making them difficult to assess.

- several issues were outside the scope of the Plan; for example, criticism of current Government policy (these could not be addressed by the reviewers).

Comments in this summary have been detailed according to the section of the management plan to which they refer. The figures on the right (in brackets) of each heading refer to the relevant section of the draft plan, while the figures on the left of the heading refer to the section in the final management plan.

In the preparation of this summary direct excerpts have been taken from many of the ideas and comments submitted. These were presented as examples, to state the case without the bias of our rewriting or because they encapsulated the opinions of several other submissions. All submissions were taken into account and used where possible to improve the final plan; not quoting them directly does not suggest they were given lower priority.

A summary of the major changes to the Lane Poole Reserve Draft Management Plan can be found in Table 1 (pages 2-6).

**TABLE 1 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN CHANGES TO THE LANE POOLE RESERVE DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN**

SECTION OF FINAL PLAN	ISSUE OR HEADING	SUMMARY OF CHANGES MADE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (*)
A 1.1	Name of the Reserve	Official adoption of name by Government	1
A 1.1	Vesting of the Reserve	Vested in NPNCA Formerly vested in Lands and Forest Commission	1
A 1.1	Area of Reserve Objectives of the plan (A4 Draft)	Increased to 58,700 ha Brief Section omitted	1 2
B 6.7	Search and identification of rare plants	Omitted	1
B 7.4	Trout stocking figures and species dynamics of native and introduced fish	Added new section	3



SECTION OF FINAL PLAN	ISSUE OR HEADING	SUMMARY OF CHANGES MADE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (*)
B 8.1.2	Timber values	Added new section on pine fire protection	3
B 8.1.5	Draft fire plan	Added new section	3
B 8.2.2	Management practices to reduce dieback disease	Paragraph omitted, already accepted as standard practice	2
B 8.2.3	Data base of disease occurrence	Reworded	2
B 8.3	History of stock grazing	Added new paragraph	3
B 13.2.4	Forest utilisation constraints	Section omitted. Superseded by the Regional Management Plans (1987)	2
B 13.3	Water development in the Reserve	Added Cabinet decision	1
B 13.4 -13.6	Wildflower and seed collecting, firewood, apiary sites, grazing, and history of logging operations	Sections incorporated from B 6.8 - B 6.12 (draft)	2
C 2	Land tenure, legal status, Reserve boundaries	Section incorporated from B16 (draft)	2
C 2	Areas of State Forest recommended for inclusion	Section omitted. Recommendation superseded by the Regional Management Plan.	2
C 3	Zoning	Omitted section. "Recommended Zoning" Section C2.1 (draft)	2
	Climate (C3 draft)	Section omitted.	2
C 4.1	Geology	Added objectives 1 and 2.	2

SECTION OF FINAL PLAN	ISSUE OR HEADING	SUMMARY OF CHANGES MADE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (*)
C 4.2	Landscape	Added new section	2
C 4.3	Landforms and Soils	Added objectives 1 and 2 and background. Omitted redundant prescriptions	2
C 5	Vegetation	Added background and objectives 1 to 5	2
	Lake Yourdamung	Omitted implication for management 4 (C8.1.1 draft)	4
C 6	Fauna	Added objectives 1 to 3. Added survey and research prescriptions.	2, 3
	Trout	Added reference to Appendix 2 of these Public Submissions	2
C 7.1	Fire	Objectives expanded. Greater emphasis on protection of property and lives. Added propose overall strategies.	2, 4
C 7.2	Dieback	Added objective 1 and research prescriptions	2, 4
C 7.3	Feral Animals	Added objective 1 and prescriptions 5 and 6	2
C 7.4	Declared and Exotic Plants	Added control of water quality and spray loss to prescription 1. Added greater emphasis on control.	4
	Pine Plantation	Amended Prescription 4	
C 8.2	European Features	Added objectives 1 and 2 and prescription 5	2
C 9	Access	Added objectives 1 and 2 and prescriptions 12 and 13	2, 4
C 10.1	Site Design, Permits and Fees	Added new section and prescriptions 2, 3 and 4	4

SECTION OF FINAL PLAN	ISSUE OR HEADING	SUMMARY OF CHANGES MADE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (*)
C 10.3	Accommodation/ Camping	Added objectives 1, 2 and 3. Prescriptions 3 and 8 amended	2, 4
C 10.5	Vehicle Based Activities	Added objectives 1, 2 and 3. Park Block proposal omitted. Amended recommendations 5 and 8	2, 4
C 10.6	Domestic Animals	Prescription 3 amended to allow dogs at Tumlo campsite	4
C 10.7	Other Activities, Orienteering/Rogaining	Prescriptions 3 and 9 amended	4
C 11	Information and Interpretation	Added Background and Prescriptions 2 and 5	2
C 12	Adjacent Land Uses	Added Background	2
C 13.1	Mining	Amended Background and Prescription 3 Mineral exploration (recommendation 14.6, draft) omitted	1, 2, 4
C 13.2	Timber Utilisation	Added prescription 14. Section incorporated from C12.2.3 (draft)	2, 4
C 13.3	Firewood Collection	Added Prescription 3	4
C 13.4	Water Supply	Added objective 2, incorporated C7 (draft) and amended recommendation (7.6, draft)	2, 4
C 13.6	Apiary Sites	Amended prescriptions 3 and 4.	2, 4
C 13.7	Public Utilities	Amended Prescription 4.	4
C 14	General Management	Amended Prescription 7	2

SECTION OF FINAL PLAN	ISSUE OR HEADING	SUMMARY OF CHANGES MADE	ASSESSMENT CRITERIA (*)
C 15	Research	Amended Background and Prescription 4. Added Prescription 6.	2, 3

- \* 1. Change in policy or legislation  
2. Clarification of the plan (change in format, editorial etc)  
3. Public participation - additional information provided  
4. Public participation - amendment to existing information.

## ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

A total of 74 submissions were received from the people and organisations listed in Appendix

1. These fall into the following categories:

Private persons	26
Conservation groups	8
Industry	5
Clubs/associations	12
Government departments	10
Branches within CALM	9
Local Government	4

There was a varied response to the plan. Some were in favour of it;

- 'The most comprehensive and thorough Plan that I've seen, and Volume I is particularly well edited.'
- 'Overall the plan has a well balanced and equitable aura about it and when introduced will undoubtedly protect the Reserve whilst allowing a great diversity of recreational use.'
- 'In its organisation, the level of argument and information, its presentation and high professional standard, the Lane Poole Reserve Draft Management Plan is superior to other draft management plans for national parks or areas to be managed as national parks. We congratulate the planning team on its efforts.'

However, others felt this was not the case;

- 'The Draft Management Plan has endeavoured to satisfy the needs of all user groups within the Reserve to a degree which makes the Plan ambiguous and it ceases to provide positive direction on the long term management of the Reserve.'
- 'The area should become an "A" Class National Park. The Draft Management Plan recognises the importance of the area and suggests it should be managed as a National Park.'
- 'Statements in the text are poorly and/or irrationally referenced. The reader is left, after many important statements, not knowing, because of this, whether a statement is the opinion of one of the writers (who may or may not be qualified) or an unreferenced, indirect quote from the literature or a personal comment from some authority.'

## PUBLIC INPUT

Three submissions specifically mentioned pre-draft public input. Two submissions were critical, stating that:

- 'Public input has been limited mainly due to lack of awareness by users of the Reserve of proposals.'
- 'There has been a lack of openness on the part of the Government and CALM on proposals for logging and to a lesser extent, mining operations within the Reserve.'
- 'Suitable notices which include mention of proposed logging and mining operations and advising people of the ability to comment on the Draft Management Plan have not been erected within the Reserve.'
- 'Seventy five percent of people attending pre-Draft Workshops were from Government departments and industry, whereas only twenty five percent were from conservation groups.'
- 'The attendance at Workshops is heavily weighted towards those with financial interests and paid time and against the recreation users of the Reserve.'

The third submission to mention public input congratulated the Planning Group on its good coverage in informing the public prior to draft preparation.

## **SPECIFIC ISSUES**

### **A1 LANE POOLE RESERVE (A1)**

#### **A1.1 Establishment (C18.2)**

Opinions on the most appropriate name for the Reserve were specifically sought in the Draft Plan. Six submissions responded, some with more than one option:

Lane Poole Reserve	4
Lane Poole National Park	2
Murray National Park	1
Murray Jarrah Reserve	1
Murray Valley National Park	1

Some referred to the need for the reserve to have national park status (this is dealt with under the heading "Reserve Status") and presumably wanted the term national park as part of the name although they did not specify what that name should be.

One submission expressed strong sentiments as to why the name Lane Poole is inappropriate and confusing. It stated amongst other things that:

- there is already a Lane Poole on the Canterbury River
- the conservationist, Mr Lane Poole, is probably unknown to the majority of Park users
- the rare plant Eucalyptus Lane Poole is not present within the reserve.

It suggested 'Murray Valley National Park' as a preferential name.

However one submission strongly believed that Lane Poole was an appropriate choice: 'The land belongs to the people from the past, the present and the future. The name "Lane Poole" is a very suitable link with the past. Had it not been for the efforts of people such as Lane Poole there may well have been little jarrah forest left to reserve.'

During the time this Summary of Submissions was being prepared the Government declared the name will be Lane Poole Reserve.

### **C1 GENERAL PHILOSOPHY (C1)**

Many submissions alluded to what was perceived as inappropriate philosophies behind

establishment of the Lane Poole Reserve as a conservation area and in permitting what were considered incompatible activities.

One submission articulated this particularly well:

'The Lane Poole DMP clearly illustrates the State Government's lack of resolve and commitment to the establishment of a viable system of parks and reserves in the State which would set aside a substantial and representative cross section of Western Australia's unique ecology. Not only is the proposed reserve inadequate in size and shape, the management plan allows for activities which are **totally inappropriate** for an area with high conservation value which will also be used by the public for recreation. Such activities include:

Mining  
Logging  
Fishing  
Marroning  
and motor rallying.

The Jarrah forest, more than any other area of the State (with the exception of the Wheatbelt), has been subject to the pressures of European occupation. There is no shortage of examples of the adverse effects that mining, logging and dieback have had on our unique Jarrah forest. With this in mind, it is obvious that urgent steps must be taken to ensure that a significant area of Jarrah is set aside with both security of tenure and purpose, appropriate to its long term conservation. The Lane Poole Reserve DMP does little in this regard.'

## C2 LAND TENURE (C18.1)

Six submissions requested national park status and four more implied this status by the name of the reserve. A typical comment was:

- 'The Government should demonstrate its commitment to conservation of the environment and declare the area covered by the Lane Poole DMP and all proposed additions, a National Park under Section 5(c) of the CALM Act (1984). The Lane Poole National Park should be vested with the National Parks and Nature Conservation Authority as a Class 'A' Reserve for the purpose of conservation.'

### Reserve Boundaries (C18.3)

Eight submissions to the draft plan expressed a need to revise boundaries and some made specific recommendation as to where this should occur. Several submissions suggested

that Surface MPA should be included within the Reserve boundary because of its substantial stand of virgin Jarrah. (In fact it is included). Several other forest blocks were also suggested to be included within the boundary.

#### **Enclaves including Lake Yourdamung (C7.2)**

Five submissions made general or specific reference to enclaves and their future. Despite the wording of recommendation 7.6, which only stated that the feasibility of caveats should be investigated as an alternative to the purchase of Lake Yourdamung, three submissions objected strongly to the concept of caveats. They made the points that the owner:

- Should not have a protective caveat lodged over Lake Yourdamung.
- Should be paid adequate compensation if development or use of the land is not permitted.
- Would be prepared to exchange the land for another suitable property.

However, two submissions suggested caveats may be an alternative if purchase was not possible. They stated that:

- 'Negotiations should take place with the owners/occupiers to ensure that land uses and developments do not greatly threaten the Reserve values.'
- Legal steps should be taken to control land usage if negotiations fail.

### **C3 ZONING, ACCESS AND ROADS (C2)**

Zoning of the Reserve into broad recreation and conservation zones, and associated access issues, were raised by six submissions and road access by eight submissions (some were in common).

Several submissions supported the zoning proposed in the DMP. However, concerns were raised that access roads into areas intended primarily for conservation should be carefully controlled or closed. Additionally:

- Roads which are to be permanently closed to all traffic should be ripped and allowed to regenerate naturally.
- Staff should be provided to control road access.



- 'North Junction Form should be closed to vehicle access and developed as a walk trail'.
- Construction of high speed roads should not be allowed in the Reserve.
- There should be vehicle access to the Special Protection Conservation Zone.

Another Submission felt that:

- 'Access to private properties must be retained'.
- (Recommendation 15.1) required qualification and that the recommendation failed to mention road maintenance such as grading and widening.
- 'There is not enough outline of roads for fire fighting emergencies in the zone. This is imperative.'
- 'Access to private properties should be of priority and unlimited (i.e. no permits, etc).'

Another submission expressed concern that:

- 'There is a probability that use of Council and CALM controlled roads will be substantially increased. With that use will be additional pressure for the Local Authorities to increase maintenance of roads within its District.'

## **C6 FAUNA (C9)**

Many small points of clarification were raised by several submissions, five of which discussed fauna in some detail. Two raised specific issues:

- It is wrong that research on gazetted rare fauna is of medium priority, lower than documentation of Aboriginal sites.
- A biological survey (including selected groups of invertebrates) in Lane Poole Reserve should have been a high priority due to a lack of knowledge of which species of fauna actually occur there.

The second major issue was raised by two submissions, suggesting that:

- Construction of stream gauging weirs would have substantial effect on the movement of native fishes.
- 'A satisfactory prespawning migration is very important to native species and the weirs form major obstacles, probably preventing them from reaching the most suitable spawning grounds.'
- 'The effects of the weirs can be offset through appropriate design and/or fish ladders.'

### **Trout (C9.3)**

The issue of trout fishing gained a strong response with 18 submissions being received. Of these, 14 stated that trout restocking should continue because:

- 'Fishing is the largest participant sport/recreational activity in Australia.'
- 'The Murray River is the closest river to Perth which is capable of supporting trout , consequently it is of great importance as a recreational (and tourism related) resource.'
- 'Trout fishing represents a significant recreation and that the needs of trout fishermen should be taken into account in the management of the Lane Poole Reserve.'
- The existence of *Galaxiids* (including three endemic species) are threatened by predators (trout etc) and land clearing.
- *Galaxus occidentalis* will become extinct if trout are restocked in the Murray River.

However, some submissions raised a topic which previously available data did not highlight:

- 'Redfin perch, *Perca fluviatilis*, by virtue of very high fecundity and natural breeding have, and are continuing to do so, built up very high densities in south west waters.'
- If trout, which predate upon Redfin perch, are no longer stocked, a large increase in perch numbers will occur.
- Redfin perch do not provide a fishery comparable to that of trout.

- Redfin longer than 16 cm feed mostly upon juvenile marron and gilgies, with fish being a smaller but not insignificant part of their diet.
- Eradication of marron or perch would disturb the natural balance, however, moderate fishing of both species would be acceptable.
- Juvenile redfin less than 16 cm predate upon native fish such as nightfish and pygmy perch, the effects of which could be severe as redfin reach very high densities during summer.

In order to resolve this matter and to create improved guidelines for management an "expert group" was called together to discuss it. Notes from that meeting are presented in Appendix 2. The final submission suggested breeding and deliberate introduction of *Tandanus bostocki*, the only native angling species.

### **Marron Fishing (C9.3)**

Two submissions mentioned marron fishing specifically, one stating:

- 'If marron fishing is permitted it should be restricted and controlled. Some of the worst damage and biggest messes I have seen along rivers and river banks in the forest have been made by marron fishermen.'

The other submission supported the project team's approach to control of feral aquatic species.

## **C7 PROTECTION**

### **C7.1 Fire**

Of the 13 submissions discussing fire management, two considered the DMP should emphasise life and property protection. For example:

- 'Objectives are not clearly stated in priority order hence the plan does not emphasise the prime importance of protection of life and property.'
- 'Insufficient importance is placed on the problem of people management in relation to fire risk.'

The same two submissions were also concerned at the increased cost of implementing a more intensive and perhaps theoretical fire plan. The remaining submissions supported a more conservative approach to the fire plan but only one provided any alternative methodology.

Many suggested:

- 'The fire plan is impractical.'
- 'Too many spring burn areas.'
- 'Too many 5 year rotation areas.'
- The reserve requires a greater diversity of burn ages.
- 'The timing and frequency of the burns were all selected at random.'

One submission suggested the following fire management methodology:

- Prescription (description of land with management units based on flora, fauna, landscape and socio-economic criteria).  
Analysis (fire behaviour and impact).  
Simulation.  
Strategies.  
Evaluation.  
Public review.  
Adoption.

## **C7.2 Dieback (C10.2)**

Almost every submission mentioned dieback, but only five submissions raised specific concerns with regard to recommendations in the DMP. Two dealt with possible spread caused by mining operations, suggesting that:

- If certain uplands of the valley, which contain good bauxite deposits, were mined, dieback would spread to the lower valleys.

The remaining three submissions raised the following points:

- Bushwalkers were unlikely to spread dieback.
- 'No activities known to have the potential to spread dieback should be permitted in the Reserve.'

- 'An ongoing monitoring programme should be initiated to ensure that dieback infection is minimised.
- Management options 1 and 2 should be implemented.
- 'The consequences of spreading dieback are too serious to risk.'
- 'In an attempt to save \$70 000, the compromise alternative has the potential to devastate large areas of the Reserve.
- 70 mm colour photography and interpretive ground survey work should be carried out.
- The activities and estimates of cost in Option 2, P119 2nd paragraph, is not definite enough.
- 'The chosen option (Option 3) does not offer sufficient protection against the accidental spread of dieback due to the lack of knowledge about the distribution of the disease.'

### **C7.3 Feral Animals (C10.3)**

Four submissions specifically mentioned feral animal control. The following points were raised:

- Feral animals could cause more damage to private property than stock straying onto the Reserve.
- The Department has the responsibility to control feral animals straying from CALM land to private property.
- The use of '1080' poison baits are unlikely to be successful in feral pig control and could cause a threat to endangered native animals.
- Pig hunting should be totally banned within the Reserve.

### **C7.4 Declared and Exotic Plants (C10.4)**

Three submissions discussed weed and exotic plant management.

One submission suggested several additions and alterations to the recommendations to strengthen and clarify them. Another submission expressed concern that the DMP made no mention of the effects of weed control measures on water quality.

The third submission disagreed with the recommendation that pine plantations in the Reserve be phased out because:-

- 'Old pine areas are obviously ideal camping/picnic areas.'
- 'Returning the existing pine to eucalypt vegetation (not necessarily 'local' species?) is a little purist in ideal.'
- 'The Department needs every scrap of pine it owns to meet sawlog commitments in the future. The Plan should at least tabulate the existing pine resource on the Lane Poole Reserve, including royalty value.'

## **C10 RECREATION AND TOURISM (C11)**

### **C10.1 Fees and Permits (C11.4)**

Three submissions mentioned fees. One was against the idea of charging the public for using the Reserve. Two were in favour of fees but also noted:

- 'There should be concessions for pensioners, unemployed people and full-time students.'
- 'A special scale of fees for different types of commercial operators should be introduced.'
- 'Collection of fees and the issuing and checking of permits could be a problem.'

Four submissions mentioned permits specifically. Two felt there could be problems with its implementation and suggested that:

- The issuing of permits to control **all** access to the various zones within the Reserve is impractical.
- Acquiring a permit may prove difficult and therefore deter certain users from seeking ranger advice and use of the Reserve.

However, two other submissions agreed in principle with the recommendations but suggested minor changes such as:

- Groups greater than 20 should require a permit to camp in Conservation Zones.
- Limit the total number of people per 100 hectares to 20 in any one week.
- 'Permits for taking of wildflowers, etc. should be issued at the discretion of the scientific officer as well as or instead of the District manager, because presumably, the scientific officer knows more about the status of the plants to be collected.'

### **C10.3 Accommodation/Camping (C11.3.2)**

This topic was mentioned by five submissions. One submission was opposed to caravan/campervan sites in the Reserve because they damage the terrain and degrade the environment. Another submission agreed with the recommendation that the Tumlo Pine Plantation at the junction with the river be available for caravan camping.

However, one submission was not in agreement, adding that substantial upgrading of arterial roads leading to the Reserve would be required. In a final submission, provision for caravans was suggested for other sites as well because:

- 'At present few caravaners use sites other than Nangá.'
- 'Camper vans should be permitted at Charlie's Flat and Tony's Bend as no problems have arisen from campervans previously staying there.'
- The exclusion of campervans from these areas would unfortunately encourage them to seek non-designated camping areas.

### **Generators**

Six submissions insisted that generators for lighting and power should not be permitted in the Lane Poole Reserve.

### **C10.4 Stream Based Activities (C11.3.3)**

#### **Power Boats (C11.3.4)**

Only two submissions raised power boats as an issue and both were totally opposed to their use within the Reserve boundaries.

## **C10.5 Vehicle Based Activities (C11.3.4)**

### **Rally Driving**

Ten submissions (one containing 49 signatures) mentioned rallies within the Reserve. Three were totally opposed to rallying, considering it environmentally and recreationally unacceptable, but provided no substantial reasons.

One submission stated that rally driving in Lane Poole Reserve was more popular than the DMP suggested. However, another stated that there would probably be fewer than 3 or 4 rallies per year, all causing minimal disturbance.

Other submissions defended rallying in Lane Poole Reserve because:

- 'Rallies do not disturb the flora and fauna and therefore do not conflict with the main aim of 'conservation'.
- 'Rallies do not constitute any greater risk of disease spread than any other form of activity.'
- 'Rallies permit a large number of people to make occasional, well controlled and well organised use of the forest as a recreational facility. They would otherwise remain unaware of the facility.'
- 'Impact of rallying is minimal.'
- 'Rallying conforms to the guidelines as laid down in the Draft Management Plan as an appropriate recreational activity.'
- 'To deny access to another large area of the State Forest for rallying will increase the pressure on other areas, a situation CALM wishes to avoid both for its own benefit as well as that of other users.'
- 'The financial impact rallying has to both Government revenue and to the local communities of Dwellingup, Collie and Harvey is considerable.'
- Rallies are organised in co-operation with CALM, and other Government departments, Shire Councils and property owners and every precaution is taken to ensure that events do not interfere with the activities of others.



## **Trail Bikes**

Four submissions dealt with trail bikes and two of these believed they should be excluded from the Reserve entirely.

One submission agreed with the Park Block proposal to establish a trail bike area for recreationists to use, but another objected, stating:

- Trail bike riders prefer a large intricate area and would be dissatisfied with a circuit area after a short period.
- The block is unappealing because of dieback devastation.
- 'Proximity to the Nanga area may cause them to seek the better camping area and risk riding their bikes through the bush instead of carrying them on trailers or utes.'
- The nearest trail bike area to the Reserve is South of Mandurah, approximately 50 km away, therefore, most people visiting the Reserve from the Metro area would not be prepared to travel the extra distance.
- Areas for trail bikes are needed away from the Reserve, for example, old mine sites north of Dwellingup.

## **C10.6 Domestic Animals**

### **Equestrian Activities (C11.3.6)**

Five submissions suggested that horse riding should not be permitted in the Reserve. No submissions favoured equestrian activities in the Reserve.

### **Pets (C11.3.7)**

The issue of dogs in the Reserve attracted eight submissions. Three of the submissions agreed with dogs in certain parts of the Reserve provided they were on leashes. One submission also suggested that:

- 'Monitoring of numbers of people using the 'dog' areas versus 'no dog' areas will indicate whether we need to designate more or less 'dog' areas.'

Four submissions felt that dogs should not be permitted in the Reserve because:

- 'Dogs are a nuisance to other park users.'

- 'There are abundant other suitable areas elsewhere, and this exception is contradictory to National Park policy.'
- 'Under current rules, dog owners who bring their pets into conservation areas are visible as potential breakers of the regulations.'
- 'If access is permitted to dogs in restricted areas, a more ambiguous situation will arise, in which dog owners behaviour will be more difficult to police.'
- The recommendation spells the beginning of the end to the 'no dogs in national parks' rule.

Others felt that there should be an all or nothing policy; i.e. either dogs be allowed everywhere or else totally excluded.

## **C10.7 OTHER ACTIVITIES**

### **Orienteering/Rogaining (C11.3.10)**

Of the two submissions received mentioning orienteering, one suggested that the recommendations in the DMP:

- Were ambiguous and gave few specific management guidelines.
- Allowed the District Manager to severely limit the available area and may impose onerous conditions relating to support facilities.

The second submission stated that orienteering is one of several activities that should be monitored and their impact on the environment assessed, as it can be a very damaging activity.

### **Barbecues (C11.3.1)**

This topic was raised by four submissions, making the following suggestions:

- Recommendation 8.7 would not be supported by the majority of Reserve users because many enjoy the ability to sit by open campfires.
- Gas barbecues would be subject to vandalism and would be expensive to install and maintain.

- This recommendation, in respect of fire management, should be reviewed.

## **C13 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (C14)**

### **C13.1 Mining (C14.1)**

Eighteen submissions (25% of total number of submissions) were opposed to mining in any part of the Lane Poole Reserve. Most stated simply that no mining of any form should be permitted. However, others dealt with specific issues. For example, one questioned the value of economic bauxite resources in the Lane Poole Reserve compared with available resources on private land. Other submissions felt that management of the Lane Poole Reserve "as if it were a National Park" (section C1) was inconsistent with any form of mining. As well as not supporting mining, several submissions felt that:

- 'The Lane Poole Reserve should be excised from Alcoa's mining lease.'

### **Exploration (C14.1)**

A number of submissions mentioned exploration but few considered exploration and mining separately, and none mentioned specific minerals. Most were opposed to any form of exploration or mining anywhere in the Reserve. For example:

- 'No exploration should be permitted. Mineral exploration is destructive to the flora of the areas explored and is a major source of dieback spread. Should companies which have spent money on exploration prove the existence of an ore body, there is a strong incentive to allow mining to go ahead. It is both unnecessary and hypercritical to allow exploration in an area that is not to be mined. We do not support the view that it is necessary to have knowledge of our mineral deposits.'

### **C13.2 Timber Utilisation (C14.2)**

Twenty five submissions referred to logging. Of these, 21 were opposed to the concept of logging within an area which 'was to be managed as a national park'. Some simply stated their belief:

- 'No mining or timber felling should be permitted in any part of the Lane Poole area.'

Others found the coexistence of conservation and exploitation difficult to accept:

- 'Logging and/or bauxite mining are totally incompatible with the areas unique jarrah forest ecosystem.'
- 'How can a Reserve also be available for industry — it is surely a contradiction in terms?'

Several felt that Government was not adequately fulfilling its responsibilities:

- Further consideration to the proposed logging programme should be given and not deny the right of public access.
- The Department should care for and nurture the forests and not be interested in short term money making.
- 'Governments have been prone to sacrifice a forest to save a Government, not a Government to save a forest.'
- Regeneration of the forest will be poor because only the best trees are cut for timber leaving less substantial trees.
- Abandoned or unused farm areas should be regrown with native timbers.

Of the remaining four submissions which mentioned logging, two said that logging should not be excluded from the forest immediately surrounding the Lane Poole Reserve and felt that sections B12.2.4 and B16.3 of the Draft Management Plan excluded logging for forests immediately outside the boundary.

The remaining two submissions presented detail on "fine-tuning" timber utilisation operations when they occur, and in clarifying the draft plan.

### **C13.4 Water Supply (C14.3)**

Seven submissions raised the topic of water utilisation and damming of the Murray River. Several submissions were opposed to damming of rivers within the Reserve and suggested that:

- Maps showing the possible location of damsites should have been included in the DMP.
- The urban population reduce its 'extravagant' demand on water resources.

- CALM and other Government departments should be actively involved in positive steps towards de-eutrophication.
- Recreation activities adjacent to the water body should be prohibited.
- The management proposals are impractical and detrimental to the health of Reserve users.

### **Public Health (C14.3)**

Public health was raised in two submissions. The following points were made:

- The health of Reserve users is at risk if management proposals are accepted.
- An unprotected water supply should not be used for human consumption.
- Camping proposals are contrary to existing health legislation.
- Government departments should comply with the relevant sections of the Health Act.

### **C13.6 Apiary Sites (C8.5)**

Nine submissions raised beekeeping as an issue. Five were totally opposed to continued use of the Lane Poole Reserve by apiarists. A further two were opposed in principle to apiaries within the Reserve but recognised the effect of their removal on the livelihood of the apiarists.

One submission offered assistance in relocation of sites. One apiarist objected strongly to loss of sites within the Northern Jarrah Forest and in conservation reserves generally.

### **C13.7 Public Utilities**

Three submissions mentioned powerline access, two supporting the recommendations of the DMP. The other submission, from a local property owner expressed concern that they would be required to pay compensation for a power line to their property according to Recommendation 15.1.

## **C14 GENERAL MANAGEMENT (C20)**

### **Reserve Staff (C20.4)**

This issue was specifically raised in five submissions. The problem of adequate policing was considered important:

- 'The proposed staffing level is quite inadequate.'
- Only the most blatant breaches of the Camping Regulations are policed by the overworked Shire Ranger.
- 'Impractical for two full-time rangers and four part-time rangers to effectively control a Reserve of 54 000 hectares which, during peak periods, would attract between 5 000 and 10 000 visitors per day.'

It was recognised by some submissions that a great deal of the problems lay with the powers of ranger staff:

- CALM officers and local police should possess greater authority to deal appropriately with public disturbances and breaches of forest regulations.
- 'National Park Rangers have powers under the National Parks Act, but as Lane Poole is not a National Park, they have no authority.'

...which led to the question:

- 'Are Lane Poole Reserve Rangers to be classified as National Park Rangers?'

## **C15 RESEARCH (C19)**

Several submissions discussed research in general and raised the following points:

- 'The majority of material in each of the plans produced to date is repetitious stuff on roads, disease regulation, fire and research and monitoring.'
- 'Prepare a series of rules and regulations relating to each of these factors which pertain to all reserves or at least groups of similar reserves and parks.'
- 'Results can usually be extrapolated, often with little or no modification from one place to the next.'

- 'Ecological research and monitoring does not necessarily need to be carried out in each little reserve.'

However, another submission stated:

- 'The entire assessment of fauna within the Reserve is hypothetical. In view of this, it is surprising that such a competent plan should given credence to a definitive appraisal of the status of fauna within the Reserve derived by extrapolation from other areas and reports. Notwithstanding these minor criticisms the plan has given a high priority to research into the biota of the Reserve and has a sound section on the management implications and options for fauna.'

## **OTHER TOPICS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS**

### **HIRE SERVICE**

One submission suggested that CALM should consider renting canoes, etc, for use on the Murray River.

### **COMPETITIVE EVENTS**

One submission recommended excluding all competitive events from the Reserve, but was not specific as to what was competitive and what was not.

### **EUTROPHICATION OF THE MURRAY RIVER**

Two submissions raised the issues of increasing salinity, phosphate and nitrogen levels in the Murray River and suggested that CALM should be actively involved in reducing them.

### **FENCING**

Two submissions objected to the fencing recommendation (8.9) that adjoining land owners pay for the installation and maintenance of fences to prevent stock from straying into the Reserve. They suggested that CALM should share fencing costs.

### **NEED FOR MANAGEMENT PLANS**

One submission questioned the value of management plans if the Department is not prepared to provide adequate resources to implement the Plan. It went onto ask how much it had cost to produce this DMP and perhaps these resources would be better spent on ad hoc management.

### **VISITOR NUMBERS**

Three submissions suggested that visitor numbers should be limited to within "acceptable" levels. They raised the following issues:

- The maximum carrying capacity for the number of visitors to the 'Recreation zone' needs to be determined.



- Provision of recreation activities should focus on activities that are not available outside the Reserve.
- Development within the 'Recreation zone' should be contained within the existing degraded areas.
- Containment will be difficult to achieve if areas are expanded or upgraded as increased development tends to lead to increased use, and hence, management problems.
- Additional parks should be provided instead of large scale expansion of existing facilities at Lane Poole Reserve.

### **COST OF IMPLEMENTATION**

The cost of implementing sections of the plan was raised in 8 submissions.

Two submissions called on the Government to guarantee provision of funds to carry out the aims of the plan. Five submissions asked that details of cost analysis be included in the plan.

The final submission called for an economic analysis of the cost/benefit of pine logging from existing plantations. It expressed concern regarding loss of economic benefits if the pines were to be removed before reaching maturity.

### **OFFERS OF HELP**

Three submissions specifically offered help in implementation of the Plan. For all such offers CALM is extremely grateful and the organisations concerned can be assured their offers will be followed up.

**SUBMITTERS**

**INDIVIDUAL**

G.R. Bell  
 G.V. Blackburn  
 M. Bruce  
 D. Collis  
 J. Dines  
 East H.G. and W.  
 Etienne F.L.  
 Guerinoni S.  
 Houlding R.G.  
 Ibbs K.  
 Johnston W. and R.D.  
 Marshall J.R. and S.  
 Martin N.R.  
 McConigley J.  
 E. McCrum  
 Miles L.G.  
 Packer G.H.  
 Pen L.J.  
 Ryall P.J.  
 Roche P.  
 Seabrook J.  
 Shur B.  
 Tapper R.  
 Taylor A.  
 Velterop G.  
 Weston A.S.

**OTHER GOVERNMENT**

**DEPARTMENTS**

Agriculture Protection Board of W.A.  
 Bushfires Board  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Department of Conservation and Environment

**ORGANISATIONS**

Alcoa of Australia Ltd  
 Association of Mining and Exploration  
 Companies Inc. (AMEC)  
 Australian Conservation Foundation  
 Bushwalkers of W.A.  
 Campaign to Save Native Forests (W.A.)  
 (CSNF)  
 Confederation of Australian Motor Sport  
 Conservation Council of W.A. Inc.  
 Forest Production Council  
 Forest Products Association (W.A.)  
 Greening Australia (W.A.) Ltd  
 Kwinana Cadet Unit  
 Orienteering Association of W.A.  
 Peel Preservation Group Inc.  
 Perth Bushwalkers Club (Inc.)  
 Perth Motorsport Club (Inc.)  
 Save the Old River Murray Environs  
 (STORME)  
 South-west Forests Defence Foundation Inc.  
 (SWFDF)  
 Southwest Touring Car Club  
 The Scout Association of Australia  
 Tree Society  
 W.A. Association of Caravan Clubs Inc.  
 W.A. Car Club Inc.  
 W.A. Recreational Fishing Council  
 W.A. Trout and Freshwater Angling  
 Association Inc.

Department of Mines  
Department for Sport and Recreation  
Fisheries Department of W.A.  
Health Department of W.A.  
Shire of Collie  
Shire of Harvey  
Shire of Murray  
Shire of Waroona  
Water Authority of W.A.  
Western Australian Museum

## **CALM**

Dwellingup Ranger  
Harvey District Office  
Northern Forest Region  
Protection Branch  
Recreation and Landscape Branch  
Research Branch  
Silviculture Branch  
Wildlife Protection Branch  
Wildlife Research

**MEETING TO DISCUSS INTERACTION BETWEEN TROUT, REDFIN PERCH AND  
NATIVE FISH IN THE SOUTH-WEST OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA**

Held at Murdoch House, Department of Conservation and Land Management, on 7 October  
1986 between 0900 and 1230 hours

**PRESENT :** Mr B. Muir, CALM (Chairperson)  
Dr G. Allen, Department Ichthyology, W.A. Museum  
Mr N. Coy, Author of several books on freshwater fish  
Dr D. Edward, Zoology Department, University of W.A.  
Mr A. Fink, W.A. Trout and Freshwater Angling Association  
Mr P. Moore, W.A. Water Authority  
Dr N. Morrissy, Department of Fisheries  
Mr L. Pen, Environmental Science, Murdoch University  
Mr G. Power, W.A. Trout and Freshwater Angling Association  
Mr B. Pusey, Zoology Department, University of W.A.

**APOLOGIES:** Mr G. Blackburn, Concerned citizen  
Dr P. Christensen, Research Branch, CALM  
Dr R. Lenanton, Department of Fisheries  
Mr A. Walker, CALM Manjimup

**UNABLE TO BE CONTACTED:**

Mr E. Riley, Experienced redfin perch fisherman.

**RESULTS OF DISCUSSIONS**

- 1.1 Salinity, eutrophication and summer deoxygenation were seen as the most significant factors effecting the Murray River. These required catchment management on lands east of the Lane Poole Reserve and not directly in CALM control.
- 1.2 Trout in the Murray River were near the limit of their environmental tolerance and populations could only be sustained in the mid-to-long term by continued restocking.
- 1.3 Redfin perch were much more tolerant to environmental extremes and survived well in areas unsuitable for trout.

- 1.4 Trout and most native fish were highly specialised breeders whereas redfin had higher fecundity and were less selective in their environmental requirements.
- 1.5 Trout and redfin perch were seen as significant predators which may have serious impact on the invertebrate biota in particular. However the weight of numbers of redfin perch and their tolerance to wider extremes of habitat make them by far the greater concern. Additionally, trout are territorial while redfin are more highly mobile and their impact probably wider.
- 1.6 Nightfish (*Bostockia porosa*) are territorial, Galaxiid fish can survive in ephemeral creeks, mosquito fish (*Gambusia affinis*) interact with all species, trout are surface feeders, and cobbler (*Tandanus bostocki*) and redfin bottom/middle feeders. All these factors interact with considerable complexity making clear definition of problems extremely difficult.
- 1.7 It was concluded that no clear decision can be reached on appropriate management because available data is inadequate. Four areas of research needs were identified.
  - 1.7.1 Collate and evaluate all existing published and unpublished (including anecdotal) data.
  - 1.7.2 Analyse and interpret data from log books kept by members of the Trout and Freshwater Angling Association.
  - 1.7.3 Survey rivers and streams throughout the south-west which are **not** known to already contain trout or redfin perch and try to identify watercourses which appear relatively pristine. Implement action to protect these watercourses from introduction of undesirable fish species.
  - 1.7.4 Examine the Murray River system in the Lane Poole Reserve with an aim of determining fish dynamics and ecology in the main river and tributary streams. Use this data to determine the relative importance of various streams and the impact of gauging weirs.
  - 1.7.5 A joint Fisheries Department and W.A. Trout and Freshwater Angling Association experiment on sustainable yields of trout and interaction between this species and redfin perch to continue in Waroona Dam.
- 1.8 In the interim a policy on trout stocking is necessary for CALM to implement via management plans.

It was felt that with limited knowledge available only general guidelines were possible.

1.8.1 Water quality was having a greater impact on native fauna than were either trout or redfin perch.

1.8.2 There was some evidence that trout, redfin and native fish had reached a balance in some areas.

1.8.3 With some species near the limit of their environmental tolerance any perturbation of population dynamics could be detrimental.

1.8.4 Trout could be useful indicators of water quality in the Murray River because they are high in the food chain and approaching their tolerance limits.

1.8.5 The relatively high species diversity in areas where all fish co-existed could also be a measure of quality, both of water and of species interaction. There was reluctance to disturb this without appropriate baseline data and with no idea of the possible consequences.

1.9 While it may be biologically desirable to promote redfin perch angling to control numbers there was some concern that removal of the large predatory adults may permit increased juvenile survival. Further, promotion may cause increased pressure to distribute perch into river systems where they are currently absent. There was undisputed opposition to any move which could allow redfin perch to become more widely distributed, or entrenched in their present habitat.

1.10 The impact of water flow gauging weirs and "V-notch" barriers for hydrological research was brought into question. There is evidence that some native fish cannot negotiate the barriers and they may be either preventing migration upstream to spawning grounds or, if the species survive upstream of the barriers already, lead to genetic isolation and eventual alteration of evolutionary characteristics of the upstream populations.

On the other hand only a few streams have weirs or V-notches, early research (pre 1970) suggested there was no significant effects, and some recent data suggests the barriers may have protected some upstream native fish populations from intrusion by trout and perch. Further research is needed.

## RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were therefore made:

- 2.1 CALM aim towards acceptance **in principle** of research projects along the lines listed in 1.7 above.

These to be co-ordinated by CALM or Fisheries Department with input from the Trout and Freshwater Angling Association and both the University of Western Australia and Murdoch University.

Funding to be sought from all the above organisations plus other users of resources such as the W.A. Water Authority and logging and mining companies. The W.A. Naturalist's Club to be approached for possible involvement.

- 2.2 Trout restocking be continued **only** in the rivers and streams where it presently occurs with no new stocking to be carried out. There may be some reduction in number of areas stocked after review.
- 2.3 Restocking to be at **current** levels as far as possible in order to maintain existing population relationships. If stock availability declines restocking rates may have to be reduced. Should this occur careful observation of the effects would be made for input to the research project.
- 2.4 Redfin perch were seen as a significant threat to the environment and any action which may promote their distribution or survival opposed.
- 2.5 Concerns regarding stream gauging weirs and "V-notch" flow stations require further investigation. It was proposed this study be undertaken in conjunction with the W.A. Water Authority (who installs the weirs) as part of the research project suggested in 1.7 above.