



Review of Dawson River Riparian & Remnant Vegetation Project (2000)

FINAL REPORT



*Prepared by
Fiona Anderson
DCCA Project Officer
T: 07 4993 1004
E: dcca1@bigpond.com
December 2007*



INTRODUCTION

In 2000, the Dawson Catchment Coordinating Association Inc (DCCA) commenced the Dawson River Riparian & Remnant Vegetation Project. This project was funded by the Natural Heritage Trust and operated for approximately three years.

The project operated similar to, being a forerunner, of the incentive scheme that presently forms part of the Neighbourhood Catchment program, a component of the Fitzroy Basin Association's Regional Investment Strategy.

A number of DCCA staff, Landcare Group staff, DCCA Committee members and government agency representatives were involved in the development, assessment and monitoring of individual property based projects.

The on-ground components of the projects were completed in 2000 through to 2002 with an even spread over the three year period.

Project activities varied with particular focus on fencing and off-stream watering systems associated with riparian areas. A detailed breakdown of focus areas and project activities is provided below:

<u>Type of Project</u>	<u>Proportion %</u>
Riparian	79
Remnant vegetation	10
Wetland	4
Erosion	7

<u>Project Activities</u>	<u>Proportion %</u>
Fencing	47.5
Off stream watering	52.5

Reviewing the original project

The Fitzroy Basin Association (FBA) provided funding in 2007 to review the original project that took place seven years earlier. There were 32 individual projects completed as part of the original project and of these 24 landholders participated in this review. Six new land managers, whom were not involved directly in the original project agreed to participate in the review.

The Review Project was conducted over a six month period and included:

- Contact with all 32 properties via letter or telephone. (*Refer to Appendix for an updated Property Contact List*)
- Development of a survey. (*Refer to Appendix for the Survey Questionnaire*)
- Property visits were arranged to conduct surveys and rephotograph project sites (*refer to Appendix*) with telephone surveys conducted in some instances.
- SPOT5 satellite imagery and related mapping products were offered to landholders in acknowledgement of the time committed to participate in the review.
- Fact Sheets, Pest booklets and regional and sub-regional brochures were distributed to participants.
- The publication of a fact sheet, designed with landholders as the target audience. (*Refer to Appendix for 'Improve the condition of Creeks, Rivers and Floodplains' factsheet*).
- Final Report.

Landholders were most willing to be involved in the review project and appreciated the follow-up contact with a DCCA representative. The majority of landholders had not previously been exposed to the communication and promotional materials produced by FBA and DCCA and keenly selected copies of the information that was offered.

The review project has developed 15 recommendations for consideration by project partners and other interested parties. The recommendations are listed throughout this report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Respondent profiles and Project Management

There was a 43% change in ownership status of the properties involved in the original project. 25% of the properties no longer have owners, managers or caretakers that reside on the property. Of the 24 properties directly involved in the review, 18 (75%) are managed by the owner whilst six (25%) employ managers.

These factors are important considerations and pose certain challenges for:

- maintaining long term relationships with land managers
- developing a process and effective communication strategies to engage new landholders that are continually moving into a catchment
- developing short, medium and long term voluntary land management agreements
- developing an appropriate record keeping and project tracking system.

The original project developed a process for staff and landholders to follow to apply for funding and provide evidence that the project was completed. On occasions, staff who worked on individual projects may not have been based in the main DCCA Office. It is likely that this factor has contributed to some project records being incomplete. Unfortunately photographic records also suffered the same fate with some project photographs now confirmed as missing and one case where photos have been mistakenly filed and labelled for a project in which they do not belong.

The standard project development and implementation process seemed to be followed in most cases however as the funding cycle drew to a close the pressure mounted to see projects completed and funds expended by a particular date. Due to this pressure it appears that the usual completion process was not

followed for at least two projects with monies paid without proof of completion. It appears that the on-ground works for those two projects may not have subsequently eventuated.

RECOMMENDATION 1: *That consideration is given as to how best to provide opportunities for engaging new landholders in priority Neighbourhood Catchments.*

RECOMMENDATION 2: *For projects that are multi-staffed, that one person be allocated responsibility for ensuring documentation and supporting materials are appropriately maintained and recorded.*

RECOMMENDATION 3: *In order to achieve storage efficiency and accessibility to key information, that a single copy project documentation be maintained on file with duplicates disposed of appropriately.*

RECOMMENDATION 4: *That the filing of digital and hardcopy records focus on property name rather than landholder name.*

RECOMMENDATION 5: *That standard procedures relating to the finalisation of projects, with payment to follow after proof of completion of works or activities, should always be adhered to.*

As with many older projects including the Dawson River Riparian & Remnant Vegetation Project, the main purpose of taking photos was to show evidence that the trough or tank had been installed or the fence was erected. In many cases these images are unsuitable for showing natural resource condition changes over time. However, for a number of properties there were original images that did show some potential. Relocating the original photographed sites became a challenge however landholders were able to identify a particular tree or feature to serve as a landmark in order to relocate the original site. *Refer to the Appendix for photo comparisons of all relocated project sites.*

RECOMMENDATION 6: *That sites for resource condition monitoring be identified with a GPS waypoint, steel picket and recorded description and be easily accessible.*

Five of the properties displayed Bushcare signs on fences, gates or at the property entrance. These signs were presented to landholders at DCCA events once projects were completed. It should be noted that not every project participant was offered or presented with signs. One landholder raised this as a concern during the review process and expressed interest in obtaining a sign for display at their property.

RECOMMENDATION 7: *That all landholders participating in a project be provided with the same level of recognition and be offered promotional signage should it exist.*

SURVEY RESULTS

Land, Water and Vegetation Condition

1. Have changes been observed in the project area?

Indicator	Comments
<p>Cattle Pads</p> <p>Increase: 0 (0%) Decrease: 19 (86%) No Change: 3 (14%)</p> <p>In Summary: There has been a significant reduction in cattle pads on river and creek banks due to fencing and off-stream watering.</p>	<p>Cattle pads have increased towards troughs whilst the riverbank cattle pads have disappeared and become covered in leaf litter. Cattle are padding along fence now. Deep cattle pads are disappearing on steep banks. No stock access anymore. More concentrated in some areas and fenced off areas access trap spears otherwise spread out. Stock excluded from area. Pads down banks have decreased however have been replaced with pads along the fence. So, is a change in where the cattle pads are running. During good seasons stock used trough so pads reduced however in poor seasons stock started accessing waterhole. Pads decreased due to positioning of new fence line and water points. Pads have filled with leaves. Where banks are steep, cattle were concentrating their access in one area (about 5% of total bank area) and this is now prevented.</p>

<p>Species Composition Native grasses</p> <p>Increase: 10 (44%) Decrease: 4 (17%) No Change: 9 (39%)</p> <p>In Summary: Native grasses stands have improved in many cases despite a lengthy dry period.</p>	<p>Dense scrub doesn't allow much grass to grow. Grass growth is inhibited by high wallaby populations. Existing plants became denser but the number of individual plants did not. Due to seasonal conditions the speargrass is not so dominant. Native grasses increased around banks. No change in native grasses due to poor seasons. Spelled areas have increase in forest bluegrass, black speargrass and pitted bluegrass. No change in native grasses in areas that were unable to be spelled. Too many cattle during the drought has resulted in decrease of native grasses. Condition of native species is good considering drought declaration. River country was cane grass monoculture (tussocky and tall body of grass) and now there are more smaller, softer grasses such as bluegrass. This could also reflect that we stopped burning about 15years ago. Grasses established now at high water line of waterhole.</p>
---	--

<p>Introduced grasses</p> <p>Increase: 10 (47.5%) Decrease: 1 (5%) No Change: 10 (47.5%)</p> <p>In Summary: The condition of introduced grasses and legumes has remained steady or has improved with some landholders taking the opportunity to boost this component within their pasture system.</p>	<p>Little spread of introduced grasses from perimeter into remnant area. Effort made to increase buffel. Planting buffel grass. Heavier loam country not suited to introduced grasses. Buffel grass hasn't spread, sabi grass has possibly spread. Butterfly pea has increased. Establishing introduced pasture grasses such as Premier, Gayndah buffel, Gatton panic and Rhodes grass along watercourses.</p>
<p>Trees & Shrubs</p> <p>Increase: 11 (48%) Decrease: 3 (13%) No Change: 9 (39%)</p> <p>In Summary: In many cases, tree and shrub numbers have increased or little change is noticeable.</p>	<p>Small tea tree suckers are growing. Wilga increased Cypress pine increased on timbered country. Trees and shrubs have been chained. Few new saplings. Treating regrowth. Dealing with a robust tree system with individual stems growing. Young trees were knee high at the start of the project and have gone ahead to grow well. Last 2yrs have noticed deaths of trees of all ages which is possibly due to drought. Minimal new growth of trees and shrubs. Understorey increased. Understorey growth has reduced maybe due to less grazing pressure and grass increased therefore more competition for seedlings. Saplings (whitewood & wattle) are now surviving and are healthier. In 2005 treated vegetation under a tree clearing permit. Has been some regrowth since.</p>
<p>Weeds</p> <p>Increase: 3 (14%) Decrease: 6 (27%) No Change: 13 (59%)</p> <p>In Summary: Landholders have noticed very little change in weeds due to changed practices although overall weed problems have not increased.</p>	<p>Parthenium decreased since fencing off as used to come in from upstream. Parthenium decreased probably due to grass density. Weeds have decreased were spelling has occurred and no change where not spelled (particularly with blue heliotrope). Cats Claw and cockspur in creek. Weeds have decreased due to being controlled. Thornapple on river banks. Galvanised burr is more visible. Weeds decreased due to more grass. Neighbours up across the river are giving up on Parkinsonia. Weeds increased due to floods. Parthenium has just shown up (new weed) since creek dry and is growing in bottom of creek bed. Weeds decreased due to better groundcover. Weeds are harder to see due to more grass – sometimes Parkinsonia seedlings (coming from upstream) hidden in grass body which makes it more difficult to find and treat them. Because of seasons have been able to get on top of parthenium. Parkinsonia grows in project area but it is controlled.</p>

<p>Ground Cover</p> <p>Increase: 17 (77%) Decrease: 1 (5%) No Change: 4 (18%)</p> <p>In Summary: There was a substantial increase in ground cover due to fencing and off-stream watering systems changing the way country is managed.</p>	<p>Ground cover increased where spelled. Some areas have lower cover due to seasons. A lot more leaf litter now that stock excluded – they used to eat it. Condition and level of ground cover has been seasonal. Ground cover is still good despite drought. Ground cover has decreased over last 12mths. Was poor ground cover in cane grass but this has increased as grass species have changed.</p>
---	--

<p>Erosion</p> <p>Increase: 3 (14%) Decrease: 10 (45%) No Change: 9 (41%)</p> <p>In Summary: Overall, erosion has reduced or stabilised within project areas.</p>	<p>Project conducted in an area recognised as being erodible. Will always be some water coming down banks. Reduction in cattle pads helps. Limited rainfall and no heavy rain. One spot has eroded back under the fence. Results from big storms during dry periods. Was little erosion at the site originally. Erosion caused by stock and also pigs. More erosion generally on property due to dry weather. Still some erosion but seems to be stabilising. No water equals no erosion. Erosion has decreased – grass and tea tree establishment are an indicator.</p>
---	---

<p>Wildlife</p> <p>Increase: 13 (62%) Decrease: 0 (0%) No Change: 8 (38%)</p> <p>In Summary: Changed management practices have been favourable to wildlife.</p>	<p>Wallaby population has increased in remnant area. Swamp and scrub wallaby population increased which don't mind. Kangaroos increased: 7 (not always viewed as favourable) Whiptails have increased. Herbert's Rock Wallaby. More galahs since country developed. Plain turkey numbers have increased. Increase birds: 3 Scrub turkeys have come back onto the property near the project area. See turtles and frogs in the creek – previously didn't notice these species. Decreased due to lack of water. See possum tracks around troughs. Birdlife increased – cockatoos, mountain parrots, black cockatoos. No shooting on property. Bandicoots Dingoes increased. Platypus and brolgas. Feeding grain during the dry time has resulted in an increase in bird populations. See fish (saratoga) in waterhole which indicates that it is healthy.</p>
---	---

<p>Water Quality</p> <p>Increase: 8 (44%) Decrease: 1 (6%) No Change: 9 (50%)</p> <p>In Summary: The quality of water in creeks, rives and waterholes has either improved or remained constant in the project areas.</p>	<p>No cattle access makes a difference. Less muddying and bank not being pushed in. Cattle were watering there previously. Change of landholders next door who have different management practices to previous owner which has influenced water quality. Creek may be like a leaky dam and could be feeding into groundwater. Less sediment off farm. Difficult to say due to upstream effects. Creek was fed by springs. Hasn't run since 1990. Decrease due to effects of dam immediately upstream – no flows anymore. No water in creek. No change due to weir. Improved because stock are excluded.</p>
--	--

<p>Bank Stability</p> <p>Increase: 19 (86%) Decrease: 1 (5%) No Change: 2 (9%)</p> <p>In Summary: Bank stability has improved at project sites.</p>	<p>Still problems where bank is steep. Grass helping stabilise some areas whilst there has been other areas where large subsidence. Grass keeping more stability on banks.</p>
<p>Overall condition</p> <p>Increase: 19 (83%) Decrease: 1 (4%) No Change: 3 (13%)</p> <p>In Summary: Natural resource condition of sites has improved due to changed management practices as a result of fencing and off-stream watering systems.</p>	<p>Spelled paddocks have improved in condition. Paddocks not spelled have not improved in condition. Decreased because of the number of cattle held on the property during the drought. Change in condition to the riparian zone has been remarkable. Minimal change. Results will seen in the long term (20yrs+). Takes time for ground to recover where has been cattle access. Excellent.</p>

Additional changes to resource condition and comments relating to the project area:

Remnant area where stock are excluded is treated as a reserve therefore owners don't view it as losing country that could be grazed – it's a 'feel good' thing.

Country has improved from semi-useless to valuable country. Some natural springs in higher country.

There would be bigger changes if neighbours were on-board resulting in getting the 30kms of the creek done. 7-8kms were fenced off with this project.

Other side of river (neighbours) is not fenced and can observe the difference/change.
Plant species are re-establishing in the riparian zone.

RECOMMENDATION 8: *That fencing and off-stream watering activities associated with riparian, wetland and remnant vegetation projects continue in light of the resource condition benefits that result.*

RECOMMENDATION 9: *That strategic parkinsonia control activities be a priority weed project in the Dawson Catchment as this species may be more widespread than initially indicated.*

2. Has the condition of the project area been affected by external or uncontrollable factors?

Yes: 15 (71%) No: 6 (29%)

Comments:

Following clearing in the district, wallabies that once resided on adjoining properties have now migrated to this project area which has resulted in an increased wallaby population being supported by the remnant vegetation. Neighbours are not happy about the remnant vegetation adjoining their property being a haven for wallabies.

Clearing on neighbouring properties has noticeably increased runoff through the project area. Heavy grazing on neighbouring property has negative impact because produces high volume runoff into project area.

No control of water quality that comes down from above.

Dam restricts flows downstream thereby affecting my riparian zone.

Drought: 15 responses

Hasn't helped – condition of project area may have been different if run of good seasons.

Very little rain due to drought therefore cattle numbers have decreased but could possibly be reduced further.

Creek virtually dry for last year.

Have been drought declared for the last 5+years.

At head of watershed so dry times have had an effect.

There has been 6 dry years.

Reason why neighbours cattle keep getting in.

Poor seasons – seasons against us.

Small effect: 2

Drought declared in June 2000 and still declared.

Floods: 7 responses

There have been floods but they haven't affected project.

High flood levels four years ago (similar to early 1900s).

Floods had positive effect.

Four years ago a large flood covered ¾ of property which covered everything in mud and really changed the look of the land.

No impact from floods – they are natural and the area needs them.

They are just normal.

Flood in March 2007 deposited silt in creek.

Neighbouring properties: 9 responses

Weed problems come from upstream and neighbouring properties.

Parthenium coming from upstream.

Weeds upstream.

Stock excluded from area however neighbours cattle got in.

Odd cattle have been in the area.

Because more grass in project area the neighbours cattle keep getting in.

Cattle get in to riparian area.

Envirofund project on neighbouring property successful (\$50 000). Others conducting similar activities upstream. Resulting in 44kms of watercourse now managed better. Neighbours were doing work with a bulldozer near an anabranch which has possibly increased silt.

Fire: 4 responses

Fire burnt elsewhere and crept into project area due to increased ground cover.

Fire had positive effect.

Fires come out of the national park – sometimes they burn in the park for months.

Fire used to be used to control undergrowth but has since been cleared.

Lightning strike burnt area of 350-400 hectares. No long term damage but did remove leaf and stalk groundcover in short term.

RECOMMENDATION 10: *That opportunities in the Upper Dawson be investigated for on-ground riparian projects, should they fall within priority Neighbourhood Catchments, as landholders are already working together to better manage significant areas of riparian country.*

3. Are there any unexpected or additional benefits from the project?

With fencing there is less chance of cattle tracking/carrying parthenium from creek to further into paddocks.

Other family members would have pulled the remnant vegetation if it had not been put under the project.

Ease of mustering: 14 responses

Don't go along river anymore when mustering. Cattle do feed down there sometimes but don't hang there anymore. When mustering, cattle just go to the troughs.

Banks are steep so much easier to muster now as stock are excluded.

Installing one specific off-stream watering system allows troughs to be installed further back along the system as the pipes are already in place. This results in grazing pressure being spread which is a big benefit. Also allows for sub-division of paddocks due to water being available and assists in other property development.

Fencing has allowed us to control where cattle water which has allowed water medication to be used.

Riparian fencing has provided an extra paddock that can be controlled grazed if needed.

No bogging of cattle in river: 2 responses

Buy in cattle and with off-stream watering and fencing we are able to see them regularly as they water from the trough instead of staying down near the river.

Less cattle pads due to watering system – only damage around troughs.

Project has allowed areas to be managed differently.

Floods take the fence that crosses the creek however still have the fence at top of bank.

Fencing provides benefit to shut off river during flood-risk times thereby increasing safety for stock and less worry.

Fenced riparian area provides buffer from neighbours cattle and should their cattle get in they aren't able to mix with our stud cattle.

Fencing prevents cattle from getting lost across the river.

Spelling allows a better body of pasture to establish.

Water system set up for efficiency so much less time is spent checking waters. Pumps are on timers and can check tank levels from afar.

Cattle don't have to walk so far to water once the watering system is in place.

Troughs on hills result in better utilisation of pasture.

Saving of the area.

Off-stream storage has been beneficial.

Shut cattle out during flooding.

Now the pipeline is there it can be used for other things: 2 responses

Doing another fencing project and easier to run water to it.

Cattle health – drinking from troughs and bore instead of muddy waterhole.

Having additional paddock is beneficial.

Really improved water management and stock's access to water.

Ethically pleasing.

Good grass cover.

Neighbour developing Envirofund project next door. Another neighbour upstream also taking part in action. The DCCA project has developed trust between landholders in area. Previously the project participant was referred to as 'those sort of people' but as time has gone on the original project is being seen as an example and others are doing the same on their properties.

Can still feed the area off easily.

Easy to control stock with fencing and off-stream watering.

Hopeful that would receive the benefits that did result. Cattle access is controlled for 100 acres with a trough and a change in species has been noted.

Beneficial from a grazing point of view – healthy and diverse pasture.

Project Monitoring

4. Has monitoring been undertaken in the project area?

Monitor project area: 5 responses

Monitor other areas of property: 6 responses

Don't document/record monitoring: 13 responses

Types of monitoring:

Grasscheck: 7 responses

Basal measurements: 4

Photopoints: 9

Stocktake: 0

Collect water samples: 1

Visual observations: 18

Additional information about monitoring:

Used to do Grasscheck in April each year at six sites but haven't for a number of years now. Plant species would be identified and would send away unknown species to be identified.

Visual observations when passing by.

Originally was some monitoring (photopoints) done but not anymore.

Landcare staff have monitored project area with quadrants (composition of water species).

Photographs taken at various times of year.

Also monitor soil biology (involved with Scott Steven's group)

Three sites on property monitored twice per year. Have been monitoring for last 8-10years.

Have the GPS points for monitoring sites (also photos) from previous owner and plan to relocate. Plan to do Grasscheck twice per year (beginning and end of growing season).

Check the area more regularly during and after floods especially for weeds such as Tiger Pear.

Have noticed that the waterhole has cleared up – less suspended sediment.

Photographs were taken initially by Landcare staff.

Landcare staff have monitored the area.

Taking photographs of parkinsonia now for upcoming project with DCCA.

Conducted monitoring initially for first 2 years. With no rain I lacked motivation to continue.

Visually inspect the paddocks on a weekly basis.

Keep an eye on the area every 3-4 months.

New owner didn't realise project was in place.

Visual observations are depressing enough.

Don't do repeatable monitoring at specific sites. Assess land condition and aim for 75% or better ground cover/condition. Do have several Grasscheck sites on property but gave away as felt like it was a token effort.

Did select sacrifice paddock for hand feeding of stock.

Took basal measurements for four years but no longer do this. Were advised that this was limited value. Use an Alan Savey devised method now.

Photopoints show remarkable transitions.

Collected water samples initially but didn't get results back so didn't continue.

Keep a grazing chart with yield and beef production information which is linked to Grasscheck sites. There are seven Grasscheck sites but none are in the riparian zone. They are monitored twice per year.

Is monitoring useful?

Yes: 20 (87%)

No: 1 (4%)

Unsure: 2 (9%)

Monitoring needs to be done consistently.
It is interesting to see what is happening.
Another chore and doesn't come up high as a priority.

Would be useful if done before project started instead of just after completion.
Photographs are easy enough to take although it doesn't get done.
Need to put in steel picket to make it easier to locate sites.

Photos enable changes to be detected.
Need to have an occasional look at them.

Could monitor body of feed to retain some.

Extreme monitoring may not be useful.
Some go overboard with monitoring.

Possibly need to do more monitoring as makes sure no problems are developing and if there are problems you can try to solve them.

Monitoring is part of running a business.

Although don't formally monitor, always looking and noticing changes particularly with weeds and erosion.

Monitoring is useful if done correctly. Over time (eg. 7yrs) changes would show.

Hadn't noticed changes/improvements until looked at photos during review visit. Very impressed with photo comparison.

Not really interested in detailed monitoring – don't know enough about pasture species and not enough time to do ourselves as other activities more important.

Monitoring is not useful in the short term. Need longer time to observe. These are long range projects and are not over-nighters. Photos are useful.

Not into scientific monitoring. Visual monitoring is good.

In certain circumstances would attempt to undertake monitoring.

Monitoring is useful in good seasons but not in the dry for health reasons (depression).

It is good to see if the project is working.

Monitoring is not a priority. Is good to know gains and what changes.

Use a combination of Terry McCosker's grazing chart, SOI phase forecasting and record of rain to predict what country is likely to carry. Like to budget for feed and use production pressure as predictor. Use environmental condition as indicator of productive measure.

Grasscheck good for measuring on the spot changes in pasture condition.

Photo standards valuable as rule of thumb.

RECOMMENDATION 11: *That monitoring support needs to be provided to landholders in order for ongoing monitoring of sites to occur.*

Management

5. Issues and challenges in managing the project area:

Weeds: 10 responses

Hymenachne had been planted at a dam and has since been killed due to concerns over the plants weed status.

Carry over parthenium seed but presence is decreasing.

New emerging parthenium problem.

On-going problems with blue heliotrophe. Is controlled by allowing competition. Chemical treatment doesn't work.

Need to work to keep parthenium out. Suckers and regrowth can also be a problem.

Small amounts of parthenium.

Thornapple and parthenium.

Parkinsonia and some mother of millions. Using biocontrol for mother of millions.

Fire: 4 responses

Fuel loads haven't been a problem but are careful not to let fire into the remnant area.

Density of standing timber prohibits excessive fuel loads.

Greater body of feed although wouldn't burn it because would cause damage to vegetation. Try to graze more often to manage fire risk. Regularity of burning has reduced which has increased saplings but with the increased quantity of grass and litter should there be a fire it would be hot and damage other vegetation.

Increased fire risk due to more groundcover. Don't want fire through area nowadays – have changed our attitude towards fire.

Spelled areas has had fuel loads but have not burnt. Plan to burn in future though.

Be aware of fuel loads and fire risk.

Would be worried if fire got in area.

Erosion: 6 responses

Whoa boys/diversion constructed where cattle pad between troughs as pad erosion is a problem on undulating country. If trough was to be located closer to the river (ie. Further away from other trough) this could reduce the problem although you don't want the trough too close to the river. Consider the alignment of troughs so stock are not tracking in the direction of the yards.

Railway line and culverts direct and focus water in one point – high water flow so need to maintain good ground cover.

Fencing the riparian area didn't solve the erosion problem. Due to the project we now monitor the erosion more and may do some mechanical (dozer) works in the future to solve the problem.

Creek close to plateau so water courses coming off plateau can erode fences in these areas.

Prior to project, on sandy loam soil, cattle used to go willy nilly down long sloping creek banks which were up to ½ kilometre long. Water running down these pads would build up speed.

Contours help control.

Grazing Management: 6 responses

Challenging to keep cattle out of area as they try to get in where the grass is. Need to regularly maintain fences. There's electric fencing where fencelines cross gullies which kangaroos keep breaking wires and shorting the system out.

Need to keep eye on yourself as it can be tempting to over utilise the area you are wishing to protect (riparian zone).

Feed gap in winter – introducing verano stylo, burgundy pea and callide rhodes grass to fill gap.

Difficult to implement spelling in dry times.

Prefer to eat down 30-50% and then move cattle out.

Off-stream watering has made grazing management easier.

Stock are excluded. However the fence doesn't join onto another fence but is instead placed so it ends in an area where there are gullies and forestry (limited usage by cattle). If stock numbers were high cattle would search out the area more.

Difficult to keep neighbours cattle out.

Pests: 9 responses

Dingoes 2

Wallabies & Kangaroos 4

Allow shooters in to control kangaroos

Used to be hundreds of wild horses (coming from national park area)

Pigs:9

spread weeds.

Shooters come in to control pigs: 3

Considering allowing shooters in to control pigs.

Have feedlot next door.

To limit weed spread, wash down machinery.

Infrastructure maintenance: 14 responses

Becoming familiar with solar system and working out what maintenance is required.

Bad batch of poly pipe and now pinholes have enlarged to cause leaks which has meant that sections of pipe leading to the project area are being replaced after seven years. Pipe has improved considerably now.

Fences wash away in floods and have had to redo.

Challenging to manage fences in flood areas and where there are runners.

Poly troughs aren't as strong and can split. Would use concrete troughs next time.

Taps keep busting and corroding so can't turn off when need to. Have been trialling poly taps.

Problems with poly tanks splitting (Team Poly from Adelaide).

Fences

Very little maintenance needed except flood damage to fence.

Needing to continually check fencing. Slash under fence. Have 4 wire fence (2 electric & 2 plain).

Solar system works well however need to keep eye on battery. Can take a bit to work out the right sort of low maintenance battery.

Problems with solar panels however they were under warranty. Lengthy effort to get repaired/replaced.

Need to check single wire electric fence before cattle go into area as the roos cause damage to the fence.

Infrastructure placement: 6 responses

Dam bywash on highly erodible country is challenging and can be costly to repair.

Don't use 1 watering point anymore as they were too close together and other watering points seem to be sufficient.

On floodplains there is nothing that can be done differently with fences.

Infrastructure located away from weed areas.

Should have put tank up higher – it ended up being the same height as another tank and system would work better if it had been a little higher.

Cooperation with neighbours: 3 responses

May be concerns in future with trees along fenceline.

Neighbours have different ideas and opinions to use.

Difficult to keep neighbours cattle out.

There is parthenium next door which is new – we are maintaining competition/ground cover and maintaining pastures in good condition.

Flooding: 2 responses

To avoid stock risk we don't use the riparian area between November and May.

6. Determining when and how to graze the project area:

Quantity: 13 responses

Quality: 6

Presence of weeds: 1

Time of year: 8 (Wet season: 2 Dry: 6)

Fuel Loads: 2

Grazing excluded: 7

Continuous grazing: 2

Hadn't planned to graze but during really dry times have needed to use the area – needed all the grass that was on property. If seasons improved wouldn't graze.

Because creek area like to feed in dry to reduce stock risk with floods.

Graze before feed hays off.

Graze into the dry season.

Part of cell system – cattle in for short times. It is treated like an extra paddock.

Graze late summer or autumn. Aim for wet season spelling.

The area has helped out during drought times.

Treated as paddock that gets used for 4mths/yr in the dry season. (grazed June – Oct each year).

Try not to graze the riparian zone however if the river was high would graze because cattle can't cross. If droughted would graze the area.

Have really looked after 2 paddocks and has been tempting to graze.

Graze two smaller paddocks based on grass cover to help manage weeds. In other paddocks, allow some grass species to seed before grazing.

Drought has influenced grazing – all feed has needed to be used. Like to spell paddocks when possible – one paddock is spelling at all times.

Continuous grazing occurs – manager would prefer splitting of paddocks for more rotational system.

Total stock exclusion however it has been tempting during dry times and have only recently considered whether should graze it. Not grazed and don't want to.

Graze for 2months each year in summer as it is too cold for cattle in winter.

Fuel loads considered due to infrastructure (houses and sheds) located nearby.

Grazed all year round as paddock runs breeders – due to seasons has been difficult to spell. Has been spelled once since project started. Area was utilised due to the dry.

Area not grazed except by neighbours cattle when they get in.

Do feed budgeting and adjust stocking rate accordingly. Whole herd run as single mob across property in a rotational basis. Rest periods of 90-140 days. Project area was treated the same as the rest of property.

Graze the area quickly for 7 days of the year.

Don't graze during flood time or cyclone season.

Don't put cattle in to graze if there isn't adequate quantity of pasture. Don't take below 25-30%.

Training & building capacity

7. Other participation or activities that landholders have been involved with as a result of the project:

Developed or documented a property plan 6 responses

Property Plan done before: 11

Updated plan from doing project.

Not developed further after FutureProfit.

No official plan however went through during initial project development.

Have property map. Already had part of plan for tree clearing permit. Since 1920 has been an ongoing vision for property that has passed from grandfather to parents to son. Hasn't been documented but have considered doing so.

Had plan of where we were heading with overlays, budgeting, planning and maps.

Interested in calculating areas.

Climate course run by AgForce involved property planning. Focused on keeping climate in mind when property planning.

Owner has map but hasn't supplied to manager.

Plan from photos and in head.

Have drawing of property (not imagery): 2

No map at all: 3

Interest in computer based mapping: 5

Farm Book and Farm Map (Practical Systems). Cattle numbers are currently kept in Excel. CAD program to run photo mosaic which is used for designing and planning development. Phoenix suite of programs for mapping and accounting.

Have PMAV: 9 NOTE: Some landholders were not familiar with term.

Have Regional Ecosystem maps: 5

Tree clearing permit: 1

Land & Water management Plan: 1

Aerial Photo: 13 (some aged mid 1980s)

With overlays: 10 (Most common overlay was landtype and infrastructure, others included watering system, grasses, development, landuse).

Some maintained detailed stock movement and production records.

Some linked property planning with budgeting.

Very limited number documented goals. Some discussed with family whilst others found useful in relation to succession planning.

Property details (such as tenure, lot & plan, permits, etc) were usually filed separately.

RECOMMENDATION 12: *That FBA and sub-regions need to actively promote the availability of SPOT5 imagery to landholders.*

Extended fencing or watering points elsewhere on the property 14 responses

Fencing extended as part of normal property development though not strictly to land type. Project linked with other property development to increase groundcover across the whole property.

Project covered whole river frontage area so no need to extend this further.

Extended troughs and fencelines.

Can exclude stock from dams with fencing.

Have extended fencing – good fencing is needed because property located near road. Whole property has been re-fenced.

Have done 70kms fencing over last 9 years with sub-dividing paddocks for spelling and ease of mustering. More fencing is planned which will bring total to 100kms.

Have put in another watering scheme. Planning extra fencing.

Considering future fencing and splitting paddocks.

Has been part of overall plan for property.

Have stabilised old artesian bore (flows on ground now)

New work (fencing and water points) along river is commencing soon.

Planning to do more.

Attended workshops, courses & field days 12 responses

FutureProfit: 2

Profitprobe (Future Beef Group): 2

Have attended many field days

AgForests Days

ClimEd

Endangered reptile seminar at Roma (have rare leaf-tailed gecko on property – which is located at edge of its environment)

Baralaba Landcare Forum.

Annual attendance at AgGrow.

Peter Andrews visit.

Attend field days related to Landcare, Peter Andrews visit (and northern trip with DCCA).

AgForward – property mapping software.

Riparian field day with Andrew Baldwin (GA).

Property hosts annual field day.

Only if applies or is relevant.

Would like to attend except there are time constraints.

Involvement with DCCA, Landcare, FBA or industry groups 19 responses

Bauhinia Landcare (not active now but revival was attempted some years ago).

Theodore Landcare

Taroom Shire Landcare

Mimosa Catchment Landcare

Callide Valley Landcare: 2

Use Yeoman plough

Baralaba Landcare: 7

If interesting topic would attend/be involved: 2

To obtain bug for Tiger Pear.

Have been involved with Landcare for some time.

Information passed on from son who is involved with other groups and activities.

DCCA Committee: 4

RCS: 3

Have been involved since 1994 – they provide useful planning and recording tools.

Greening Australia: 3

Involved with for awhile however have lost contact now because the Roma office is no longer staffed.

Had follow-up visit about the wallabies that live in the rocks.

Involved with another DCCA NC project: 4

Opportunity to do the right thing for the catchment.

Have obtained maps from FBA: 2

Fish Creek Pilot Neighbourhood Catchment Group Steering Committee within southern Mimosa Catchment. Focused on continuous improvement and innovation however weren't able to get a group going in the local area. Haven't heard anything further about the group.

Attended some property planning workshops with Ken Murphy (DPIF) prior to project.

Have continued to be involved with AgForce.

Some advice isn't encouraging to try new things such as horticulture in an area that hasn't previously had horticultural crops. Trial and error yourself is often the best way. (Don't use chemical on fruit or cattle except for buffalo fly.)

Connections to FBA through their locally based Land Management Officer (Biloela): 2

Not involved yet but new to area and are interested.

Involved in the development of Stocktake.

Involved with a Beef Plan group.

Involved with Scott Stevens group: 3

He does some monitoring on property. (Grasscheck)

Younger people are involved in this group which is good.

Entered into nature conservation agreements 1

Land for Wildlife

Interested in this.

Did consider 900ha with Greening Australia project but bawked at covenant. Although area not under a nature conservation agreement we are still doing the right thing by the environment.

Conduct monitoring 3

Did monitoring prior to project

Applied for funding from other sources 6

Made application for compensation relating to vegetation but didn't take up as it wasn't worth the paperwork.

Doing this project made us more aware of funding that was available. We went on to become involved with an irrigation project.

Upgraded irrigation system with Dairy Farmers.

Vegetation management scheme (remnant vegetation).

Box Canyon project with Greening Australia.

Have tried developing Biodiversity Agreement with DCCA/FBA however seems to be problems due to country part of state forest lease.

DCCA NC project for splitting up paddocks.

Had considered fencing for timbered areas with Greening Australia.

Manager not sure if owner has received funding for new work that is about to commence.

Envirofund project (with 3 neighbours) was successful – artesian bore.

Additional comments:

Tried to change vegetation classification on RE maps.

Project helped to do what has been doing.

8. Share project learnings with other landholders by:

Property visits & field days: 17 responses

Prove how it works by seeing what it looked like before and how it changed to present day.
(Would have needed to do monitoring.)

See how others did their projects.

Visit good sites.

On-site is good but time constraints.

Go and see it. Different soils and different country.

Like to see practical things so go and see what others are doing.

See things. Once something is working well people hear about it.

See it hands on, talking in small groups and visits to better understand.

Good to see changes so need number of days over the years.

Like to see things and probably should do more.

Seeing the visual comparisons.

Seeing is the best.

Physically looking at something to make own assessment.

Information days – need to come away with useful info that is relevant to running business/property.

Invitations and workshop settings.

Greening Australia has a FarmBis approved program called 'Farmers teaching Farmers'.

50:50 read versus see

Booklet, brochures, posters, factsheets: 6

Landcare newsletter makes more people aware.

Hard when receive lots of hardcopy info.

Factsheets are good.

Photos show benefits.

Speaking with neighbours: 2

Discussions – talking about what is best.

In close knit communities people can lead by example and word of mouth gets the word around.

It can be more effective to share information outside of the local area to avoid pre-conceived ideas or thoughts.

Phone conversations. People can call and ask for advice.

Word of mouth: 3

eg. 14 active members of Landcare group – can reach a number of people quickly.

Other comments:

Need to raise awareness with other landholders that there is help and funding available.

Less into reading (or accepting what is read).

Landholders aren't good at documenting things.

Landholders have a wide apathy. It's hard to get them along and consider things differently.

Nice area to save – preserving a unique area. Site could be an indicator in future years about what could be done. An area I regarded as useless is turned into something valuable for nature.

Was only a small project although outcomes large for property management and protection of waterhole.

RECOMMENDATION 13: *That consideration be given to holding riparian management field days in different locations across the catchment.*

Reflections & Motivations

9. The most important aspects for undertaking a project:

Ranked in order of priority

Benefits to environment: 18

Improve management of property: 13

Financial support: 11

Improve productivity on farm: 8.5

Increase self confidence: 1

Access to information and advice: 0.5

Additional Information:

Re: financial support – people that don't make the effort are the ones that usually receive funding.

Financial support helped the project happen quicker – it got prioritised.

Wouldn't have been able to do the project without financial support.

By improving the management of the property, it gives more options for the future.

Improve management of property by improving drinking water for cattle.

Having financial support for project was the only reason father agreed to participate.

Project helped fund something that had been planned for a long time. Financial support is a key thing as it lets you do the work earlier than planned and do it better.

Financial support is a good incentive however environmental benefits are most important.

10. The things that landholders would do differently the second time around:

Yes, things would be done differently: 5 (22%)

No change: 18 (78%)

Make sure pumps and solar panels are installed above flood heights.

Family members agreed on the size of the remnant area that was to be protected and to this day the owner remains happy with the size.

Clarify poly pipe standards and quality and make sure it meets requirements thereby reducing maintenance issues down the track. (No Australian standards for poly pipe at time of project.)

Install extra trough in another paddock so cattle don't have as far to walk.

Cup and saucer trough system has been removed.

Concrete tanks are hard to move if not used anymore.... they remain on-site.

Concrete troughs rather than plastic to avoid splitting.

If didn't do it wouldn't have known benefits – after doing it, keen to do more.

Should have located fence further away from watercourse/river (another 10metres) so that gullies could have been more contained. It takes some time for existing erosion points to stabilise and if fence is too close then the gullies may cut out under the fence (and beyond) before stabilising.

Would put watering points further away from creek and instead place them on higher country as this would be better.

One tank should have been placed higher.

It would have been good to get the neighbours on-side so that the 14kms of the Give & Take could get done.

Things that worked well:

Planning – take the time to consider placement of infrastructure.

Planning is important – worked well to use a digitalised image with a CAD program. Will be continuing to use CAD program when developing other projects.

Designing a system where one person can muster. Consider where infrastructure located for this to happen.

Set up for spelling.

If using a crocodile (land rejuvenator) use when soil is moist as plants seed better as disturbs soil more.

Four barbs would be better than three barb fences.

Fencing and off-stream watering helps you manage cattle access to river country and means that you don't need to worry about trying to get cattle out.

Could have done whole stretch of river at once instead of a part.

Activities were planned prior to the project then the funds became available and we were ready to apply. It was beneficial having the activities all planned beforehand.

Watering:

In a paddock where stock are excluded it is good to leave dam unfenced for safety.

Second pump at different location very beneficial – safety net for hot weather and year round. Don't need to rely on one pump anymore. Very good investment.

Airlocks – tank and pipe placement important to prevent this.

Had planned large turkey nest but if one trough lets go it means that you lose everything. Best to use several smaller storages rather than one.

Two waters coming from different systems for the one paddock is a good backup system.

Beneficial having electric pumps that are on timers if possible.

Hired a dozer to lay polypipe in one pass with joiners included. If did ourselves would have been much more difficult.

Sourced labour and materials ourselves so project was able to happen in a more timely nature and suit our own situation.

Off-stream watering systems work well.

Using poly that was to standard means no problems.

Excluding cattle from waterhole where pump from prevents silting up, clearer water, no excrement which results in better quality water being used at house.

For tank placement, use water expert to take levels to find best location.

Get a professional to design rather than cut costs and design yourself.

Recommend tank capacity of 5500 gallon.

Design so there is a week's water supply in tanks. Tanks have different levels of storage with different outlet options. I) normal usage level ii) backup storage which can be opened up when there is a problem and other water has been lost in the system. System is soon to be linked.

My pumps and the design of my watering system is different from others in the district as I had different ideas and experiences as I am an ex-irrigator and came from another industry (cane and rockmelons). Considering using probes and sensors in tanks to sense when water levels drop. Poly was laid differently with dozer, trenches and tractor with yeomans ripper. Designed and developed own trough system and template based on Humes troughs as a base.

Automated system – went whole hog but glad that did it now particularly as difficult to get staff now.

Placement of tanks and troughs on hills or higher spots is good.

Centralising location of tanks/troughs/watering points and locating them on high points.

Simple but effective system that is pressure operated (not timer). If it doesn't turn on it means there is a failure and indicates there is a problem. Concept of pressure governing on pump is good. Pump is mounted on floating pontoon in waterhole.

Tanks located at high points for gravity feed.

Blue line poly standard.

Project designed for lack of off-stream watering thereby providing clean, alternative water supply for stock.

Fencing:

Four strand barb wire fence was good.

Four wire barb good rather than electric fence.

Solid standard fence good – wouldn't use electric fence.

Split post 4 strand barb fence is good – not electric.

Set up electric fence properly to start with. Electric with steel posts.

4 barb fence has been low maintenance – not electric due to maintenance that is required. Wooden posts are permanent.

Placement out of flood area/height: 4

Cleared strip for fenceline was not wide enough – trees fall on fence and access for maintenance is a problem.

Don't attach screw-in insulators (for electric fence) to trees as they rust off.

Fence was standard fence however with one plain wire for electric. Better with 4 barb. Kangaroos keep tangling the plain wire onto the barb.

Would put access gateways in different positions and spread gateways out so not concentrating cattle padding.

Fencing to keep cattle out was good.

Good to have a wider strip where fence is placed. 3metres either side (6m total). Check legislation.

Having a lane way up the centre of property is good.

Overall the electric fence was preferred over a standard barb fence - it was the only thing that kept the neighbours cattle back.

Doing fencing to land type divisions is good. Fencing was designed to break patterns and how long a mob could be on watercourse.

Placement of fence along high bank and down across the runners.

Advice for others planning similar activities:

If protecting a remnant area with fencing, don't forget to instruct the fencing contractor not to touch the vegetation in that area..... you may find that timber you were aiming to protect could end up as strainer posts!

Make sure you don't get small pipe to leave options for the future. Need at least 63mm pipe for lines of any length.

Consider trough options – plastic on cement pads to avoid cutting out but I'm more comfortable with concrete troughs.

Don't need large troughs – prefer smaller troughs (5-6ft diameter) that are cleaned out regularly.

Do not rely on one big single point of storage for your water system.

Have a property plan and plan the project activities out. Have a purpose and be clear about how it fits with other things on property.

Make sure fence is out of flood level: 2 responses

Place fence further enough back from erosion so can do further work on problem area if required.

Exclude grazing from area (set it totally aside) if need be.

Recommend doing fencing and off-stream watering work on your property. There should be more of it. Don't think of it as losing access or use of the land.

Make sure paddock sizes aren't too small particularly on poorer country.

Plan fences well. Plan with floods in mind so that flood country will benefit.

Better to do it than not do it.

Have a look at what other people have done on their properties.

Get in touch with someone and get advice. Use your local contact (such as Landcare staff) for referral to others and to access information.

Seek professional advice for designing a watering system, depending on size of property and project. Do not cut corners.

Do it properly from the start – think about the system and design it. Over design rather than under design.

If \$\$ are hard then develop and install the system in stages.

Use heavier grades of poly than what you anticipate needing. The time to repair and the inconvenience later on makes up for it so it is well worth it.

Look at heavy duty tap options.

Poly troughs will burn, prefer concrete tanks that are made on-site. To keep algae out of tanks seal the top of tanks to block out light.

Look at overall property and plan where to put infrastructure. Take time to consider best placement.

Worthwhile for environmental reasons.

Can now put troughs, etc in other places now that the system is in.

Spend time to plan and discuss to put fences in the right position.

Leave space between fence and waterhole for cattle to move around.

Seek advice from multiple avenues – expertise from a variety of fields.

Plan project and cost properly – get it right.

Talk to others that have got similar project so that you know the pitfalls.

Do it, particularly when financial support is available. ‘Help environment, help yourself’.

Do the planning until you think you will go insane so there are no regrets.

Get water (off-stream) there for a start and then do the fencing.

Planning is important.

Fence close (fringe) to cleared grazing country, 50 metres away from riparian zone.

If looking after a waterhole then believe that the whole area where stock accessed the waterhole previously is sensitive.

Grazing is part of the system – total exclusion may not be best from biodiversity and condition point of view.

11. Has follow up communication and support from DCCA been adequate?

Yes: 16 (89%)

No: 2 (11%)

If some project participants are offered materials such as signage, then all project participants should be provided with the opportunity.

Been there if wanted/needed: 6 responses

Only need to pick up the phone.

Up to individual people to contact DCCA.

Didn't hear much from them but didn't worry me.

Haven't had any contact with DCCA since but would have contacted if needed.

There if wanted to make a phone call.

This is first contact since completing project.

Hasn't been the need for contact.

Know where they are if needed.

Has been follow-up by Landcare & DCCA staff.

Has been follow-up through Landcare.

Some monitoring follow-up support or hounding necessary..... would have been only way to get decent monitoring results from project.

Get newsletters.

Staff are nice to deal with.

There hasn't been any follow-up but is not really a concern.

Manager hadn't heard of DCCA however had heard of FBA at the Biloela Show.

The project lacked follow-up - It was assumed that the landholder's project rolled along and it was trusted that what was written in the application was true and was going to happen.

This review is the first follow-up but it isn't really a problem.

It is public money and external or independent follow-up may be useful even if this is done by the organisation. It is acknowledged that funds are required to do this.

Has been no contact. Should be some follow-up.

12. Items to consider for future activities and projects:

RECOMMENDATION 14: *That all items listed at Item 12 (Final Report) be given due consideration for the allocation of staff and resources.*

Need to keep things relevant then activities offered become useful.

As new owner/manager, don't know what is out there so it is good to find out.

Ongoing administration of incentive funding is a key role for DCCA. The more local the better. There is the feeling that FBA are a bureaucracy but DCCA is not viewed in this way.

RCS enquired about 18mths ago whether we would be part of a project that was performing monitoring using satellite imagery and data from grazing charts. Not sure where this is up to and whether it links to work being done by DCCA/FBA. [Glen Lomand]

Incentive funds provides some money to do things on your property.

Potential projects: 14

May contact local Landcare/DCCA person in future to find out about incentive funding.

Land type fencing to manage smaller softwood areas within large existing paddocks. Would need to consider possible dam sites, distances for running poly pipe and whether paddock sizes would end up being too small. [Kilmory]

Land type fencing [Woodleigh]

Considering fencing fragile riparian area in Spiders Paddock (original project site) for total stock exclusion and control as cattle are still working this riparian area and causing severe erosion. [Woodleigh]

Erosion sites in riparian zone. [Coominglah]

Have considered planting trees across property – at planning stage. Very cleared block (prior to purchase) and would like to create corridors. This is an area with a lot of birdlife and would like to encourage this. [Newlands]

Interested in developing new project with neighbour regarding erosion/runoff. Water flowing quickly off neighbours country is channelling into one section of Give & Take causing gullies to form and banks to cave in. Considering diversion banks to spread runoff across a broader area of riparian zone. [Durack]

Splitting paddocks and Biodiversity stewardship. [Spring Hill]

Extending riparian fencing so whole river fenced. [Mostowie]

In future may be interested in doing other projects [Elsewhere]

Considering fencing along creek in future although this creek doesn't hold water for long. [Ramyard]

New fencing project under development/partly progressed with off-stream watering. Looking to fence off other side of waterhole and would consider other waterholes. Considering land type fencing. [Oombabeer]

May be interested in Wetland project in future – it covers about 200acres. [Hornet Bank]

Wetland project on another property was under development. [Glen Lomand]

Interested in being involved in Parkinsonia project: 5 (Refer to Contact List)

Field Day / training topics: 11

Better understanding of grasses and identifying them. Including who is the best local contact to seek advice on this topic.

Pasture & legumes – legume establishment in pasture lands.

Improved pasture species for my country.

Woody weed control (regrowth) – fire, mechanical and chemical options.

Help with identifying a climbing plant in the riparian zone that is smothering Eucalypts.

Documenting a property plan.

GRT

Tree planting

Forestry topics of interest.

Has been some on but hard to find time to get to them. It is good to get other people's ideas. Need to get out and look more.

Carbon credits/trading: 2
Using grazing as carbon sinks.

Feedlotting

Cell grazing.

General information.

New ideas and information that is semi-local such as the trip using Peter Andrews.

Water medication.

Maps: 21 (Note: This item has been actioned through the mapping component of this project)
Update / up to date map: 5

Have Spot 5 map already from FBA but imagery isn't as recent as anticipated. (2003)

Have already ordered satellite map from FBA (saw display at Agricultural Show).

Have paddock layout map (line drawing) without any supporting imagery.

Maps great for planning particularly for future development.

Have old aerial photograph.

Information 8

Mailouts through Landcare are useful.

Information on nature refuges & Land for Wildlife and other similar programs – red tailed black cockatoos are coming into the area and nesting (7-12 birds). [Oombabeer]

Good to have advice on hand and providing leaflets to read at own leisure.

Add to Baralaba Landcare and DCCA mailing list for events, training and general info. [Denby managers]

Monitoring 4

Doing monitoring activities has been disheartening due to seasons and bare ground.

Interested in Stocktake.

13. The overall rating by landholders as to how they viewed their involvement with the DCCA Project:

Neutral: 1 (4.5%)

Positive: 10 (45.5%)

Very positive: 11 (50%)

Additional comments:

The administration and distribution of the funds was handled very well and I was able to understand how the rates for payment were calculated.

A unique project with owner not aware of similar country on other properties that could be conserved as bush areas. [Kilmory]

Need more promotion of what DCCA does throughout the community and engaging more landholders. Maybe some landholders are sceptical due to organisation appearing to be semi-government due to funding situation.

A wetland regarded to be a permanent waterhole in the past dried up when the project was completed. No natural waterholes have had water for at least last four years.

Incentive funds really made difference for allowing project to happen.

Small project area but big condition changes and previously had large impact on river when cattle accessing/watering. Got pipeline and saved section of the river – river would have been in much worse condition otherwise.

Did a large project in conjunction with Greening Australia and DCCA that included 16.5kms, double-sided fencing, creek frontage.

Really think that DCCA and FBA need to work hard to fence off banks because it is a real benefit.

No problems working with organisations to do projects.

RECOMMENDATION 15: *That the FBA and sub-regions consider options for promoting riparian, wetland and remnant vegetation activities throughout the broader community with a goal to increase awareness and landholder engagement.*

Interest in promotion materials offered:

Ranked in order of popularity:

CPMG Weed booklet: 1

FBA Factsheets: 2

Subregional, DCCA & FBA foldout map and organisation brochure: 3

FBA Case Studies: 3

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Property Contact List

APPENDIX

Survey Questionnaire

APPENDIX

Photographs of
project sites

APPENDIX

Fact Sheet

*'Improve the condition of
creeks, rivers and floodplains'*