National Landcare Program – Environment Small Grants final project report

| Project number | NLESG687 |
|----------------|---|
| Grantee name | Mount Roland Rivercare Catchment Inc |
| Project title | Reducing weed threats to Mount Roland and the Tasmanian WHA |
| Project period | 07/09/2018 to 07/09/2019 |

Submit your completed report to your customer service manager.

1. Project achievement

a. Briefly outline the activities completed by the project end date. If applicable, comment on why all activities were not completed by the project end date.

All weed sites in the Mt Roland catchment that had previously been mapped and/or controlled by MRRCI in previous years were re-visited and mapped, noting new weeds and the status of previously controlled sites.

Revised mapping records were collated and further control work was undertaken and targeted towards sites of strategic importance and where there was the potential for eradication. As a result of control work by contractors and voluntary efforts at working bees, Spanish Heath and Montpelier Broom especially has been considerably reduced around Mt Roland.

In addition, and as a result of this project, a significant new infestation of foxgloves has also been mapped and steps taken to contain its spread as well as educate landowners/stakeholders about its impact and on methods of control.

New weed mapping work and weed control in the Minnow catchment was also undertaken as part of this project, which contributes to identified objectives in the *Minnow Catchment Action Plan (P Stronach 2016)* and the *Weed Management Plan for the Minnow Catchment (G Taylor 2018)*.

Community education and participation through three working bees has both assisted in the control of weeds in the catchment, as well as engaging community members in taking greater action on weed control. Information is also shared through MRRCI web site www.rivercare.org.au and social media https://www.facebook.com/mountrolandrivercareinc/

b. Provide the relevant measurements of yourcompleted activities. Refer to the metrics that you provided in your application form. You must include every metric for the activities you undertook.

| Activity | Unit | Unit of measure |
|--|-------|-----------------|
| Weed treatment, total new area treated | 8,000 | ha |
| Weed mapping of significant weed threats in the Minnow Catchment | 85 | sq km |
| Community weed working bees | 3 | |
| Liaison with major stakeholders | 7 | |

c. Attach agreed evidence to demonstrate successful completion of your project. List the attached documents below against the relevant activities.

• Appendix 1 - Mapping report (Mount Roland environs) - updated site history and mapping records of previously identified weed sites.

• Appendix 2 - Mapping report (Minnow catchment) - new mapping records for the Minnow catchment.

•Appendix 3 -Stakeholder report - records of liaison with and involvements of major stakeholders in coordinated weed control programs.

• Appendix 4 - Working Bee report - records of participation and outputs from community working bees.

d. What groups or organisations participated in the project? If applicable, briefly describe how each group or organisation contributed to the project.

Kentish Council – funding, in-kind support and weed control work, OH&S support.

Dept of State Growth – weed control work.

Parks and Wildlife Service – weed control work.

Sustainable Timbers Tasmania – weed control work, access to forestry areas.

Forico – weed control work, access to forestry areas.

Timberlands Pacific –access to forestry areas, technical support.

2. Project outcomes

a. Outline the project outcomes achieved by the project end date.

Revised weed mapping records for 124 sites around the Mt Roland area, including Gowrie Park Hydro Village, and walking tracks to Mt Roland and Mt Claude.

Additional weed mapping recordswere produced for the Minnow catchment.

Whole of catchment weed maps were produced bringing together the weed mapping data in an easily interpreted format. (Appendix 1& 2)

During the process of mapping weeds, various dump sites in bushland were also identified and the data for this has been collated and shown on the mapping documents to allow dissemination to relevant stakeholders i.e. Kentish Council, Parks and Wildlife Service. (Appendix 1& 2)

On-ground weed control, including updated site histories and control records for controlled sites. All previously mapped sites around Mt Roland revisited and controlled as appropriate, including two annual controls of all Kunzeaericoides sites. New weed control work was focused on the treatment of isolated or relatively contained occurrences of high priority weed species to prevent spread.

Relationships with stakeholders have been strengthened through activities of this project with greater contribution as a result from plantation landowners and government agencies to tackle weeds on land under their responsibility. (Appendix 3)

Three working bees were held for weed control and education (Appendix 4).

b. Do the achieved project outcomes align with those specified in the \square yes \square no grant agreement?

If no, explain why.

3. Project benefits

a. What ongoing environmental and social benefits has the project achieved?

One of the major project benefits is the reduction of the threat of weeds to nearby World Heritage Areas as well as protecting the natural values of the Mount Roland Reserve and Minnow Catchment through the control of high priority invasive weeds in the project area.

At the same time, the project has added to the data bank of weed mapping knowledge, identifying where environmental weeds are (or were) as well as establishing where they are not. Walking tracks to the top of Mount Roland and the headwaters of the Minnow were mapped and surveyed for weeds.

The achievements of this project have come through a combined strategy of weed mapping; onground direct action; liaison with stakeholders; a co-operative approach to weed management; knowledge sharing and education regarding weeds; plus community engagement to encourage greater local participation in eradicating environmental weeds.

In addition, the project has also benefitted primary production areas (forestry and pastoral properties) by controlling small infestations before they had chance to spread to these properties.

Some examples of positive benefits from the project are:

- **Horehound** one location covering a large area. Left untreated horehound would have spread to neighbouring properties that graze sheep. Horehound often results in sheep death when they get caught on the seed heads.
- **Hemlock** one location. This highly poisonous weed had the potential to spread throughout waterways and on to grazing land if not treated.
- **Gopher spurge** three locations. Very toxic weed with potential to spread throughout a broad area or plantation, private land, and native forests.
- **Foxgloves-** Weed working bees and volunteer removal of foxgloves from 'gateway' locations. This will prevent the spread of foxgloves outside the 'infected areas' and protect native bushland.
- Willows Willow removal from the Minnow channel to prevent spread downstream. Landholders informed of willow treatment – removal to be undertaken on two properties in late spring/summer to reduce infestation in the middle catchment.
- **Spanish heath –** Containment of satellite populations to reduce spread from plantations and private land into native forest areas
- **KunzeaEricoides** volunteers removed Kunzea from roadsides and tracks to prevent spread into the Mount Roland reserve
- Elisha's tears removal from a steep gulley to prevent spread into a waterway leading to natural forest

A further unexpected benefit that resulted from weed mapping work was the identification of a large number of 'dump sites' in bushland, where a variety of rubbish has been dumped – ranging from glass and plastic bottles, furniture and general household rubbish to garden waste (a notable source of environmental weeds). These sites have been mapped in order that the information can be passed on to relevant authorities to action.

Some of the social benefits of the project have occurred through the weed working bees and has resulted in increased membership of MRRCI and a greater awareness of weed problems in the catchment. This is an important part of capacity building to ensure people have the skills and knowledge to deal with environmental weeds.

Local contractors were engaged and trained to complete weed mapping and weed control works associated with this project, significantly building the local capacity for these works.

MRRCI Committee members participated in a 'priority setting workshop' to discuss and determine priorities for strategic on ground control of weeds.

The voluntary weed control activities were also a social event - following a few hours of hard work with a hearty lunch has fostered social inclusion and community involvement.

b. Were there any key lessons learnt in delivering the project? If applicable, describe any changes made in response to these lessons.

The key lesson learnt from delivering this project has been the knowledge that the weed control strategies employed by MRRCI over several years have paid off, in that areas with significant weed infestations previously have now been controlled to a point that they are deemed clear of weeds or have reduced down to a level that ongoing weed working bees and local landowner efforts will be able to keep them in check.

Another key lesson is a realisation that on ground works are accompanied by a huge amount of administrative and procedural tasks, especially when liaising with multiple stakeholders.

| | Question | Number |
|----|--|--------|
| a. | How many participants (employees and volunteers) were involved in the project? | 88 |
| b. | How many community participation and engagement eventswere held? | 4 |
| С. | How many people attended project events or activities? | 52 |
| d. | Where applicable, how many community groups participated in delivering the project | n/a |

4. Total eligible expenditure incurred for your project

a. Complete the following tablesrecording your actual expenditure incurred on your project. All expenditure should be GST inclusive, less GST credits you can claim.

| Eligible expenditure items | Total (GST inclusive less any GST credits you can claim) |
|----------------------------|--|
| Labour/ contractors | \$22,915.07 |
| Materials | \$936.65 |
| Equipment | n/a |
| Consultancy | \$3,536.00 |

| Venue hire | n/a |
|---|-------------|
| Administration support related to the project | \$1,762.25 |
| Total eligible expenditure | \$29,149.97 |

b. Was the expenditure incurred in accordance with the grant \Box yes \boxtimes no agreement?

If no, explain the reason for any underspend or overspend, or any other significant changes to the budget.

<u>Note</u>: The initial estimation of consultancy work and administration support was a little more than the actual amounts incurred (partly due to some work being done on a voluntary basis) and therefore it was possible to undertake more weed control work instead.

c. How much cash and in-kind contributions were invested in your project? Include all investment except this grant. This includes any private sector, your own contributions or partner contributions. Complete the following table and add rows as required.

| Contributor | Cash or in-kind | Contribution (GST excl) |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|
| MRRCI contributions – admin, organisational, management, catering | In-kind | \$4,110 |
| MRRCI consultants | In-kind | \$32,781 |
| Community & members – weed working bees and other control/mapping work | In kind | \$4,390 |
| Forico | In kind | >\$5,000 |
| Kentish Council | Cash + in-kind | \$12,522 |
| Sustainable Timbers Tasmania | In kind | Not yet quantified |
| Dept of State Growth | In kind | \$7,320 |
| Parks and Wildlife Service | In kind | \$1,600 |

5. Certification

I being a person duly authorised by the grantee hereby certify that:

- the information in this report is accurate, complete and not misleading and that I understand that giving of false or misleading information is a serious offence under the *Criminal Code 1995* (Cth).
- the grant was spent in accordance with the grant agreement
- I am aware of the grantee's obligations under their grant agreement, including survival clauses.

 I am aware that the grant agreement empowers the Commonwealth to terminate the grant agreement and to request repayment of funds paid to the grantee where the grantee is in breach of the grant agreement.

SignedDate

Appendix 1 - Mapping report (Mount Roland environs)- updated site history and mapping records of previously identified weed sites.

The detailed weed mapping data that has resulted from this project has been collated into one map (*Figure 1*) to illustrate:

- the areas that were mapped and their extents;
- the location of weeds found, categorised as Weeds Of National Significance (WONS), Declared, Significant (in a local context), or Other;
- dump sites (sites where household, garden or other rubbish has been dumped in bushland areas); plus
- walking tracks that were mapped and determined to be weed free.

A subset of the detailed mapping data upon which the overview map is based is shown in *Figure 2* for illustration purposes. Mapping data has been collected over a number of years and a historical record of control work done is kept. Information for each site that has been mapped and/or controlled includes:

- location relative to road junctions, as well as GPS coordinates;
- the extent of the weed and its density;
- the species of weed found;
- control status both current and historical; plus
- additional notes.

Figure 3 is a map of Gowrie Park (a previous Hydro village) showing the layout of streets that existed previously. Tourist accommodation and a small number of residences are all that remain in the area, however the legacy of past gardens is the seedbank for major infestations of Spanish Heath, Montpellier and English Broom, Gorse, KunzeaEricoides and more recently Foxgloves.

This site was chosen as one of the locations for weed working bees as there was a realistic opportunity to control the Foxgloves.

Figure 1: Overview weed map of the catchment



Figure 2 : Subset of mapping data - McCoys Road

| Dist from junction with Claude Road | Site No. and control status | Area | Density | Coords (acc 3m) | Weeds present/status | Notes |
|---|--|----------|---------|--|---|--|
| 20m | 1 Controlled 2012 2014 June 2016 April 2018 | 25 x 30m | 40% | 440434 5413054 | Spanish heath | Heath mowed and not seeding |
| 10 - 60m | 2 Controlled 2012 2013 2014 2016 2018 | 50 x 20m | 20% | 440312 5412460 | Mont broom No plants found in 2016 or 2018 | W side roadside, extending into mown area adjacent to burial ground |
| 800m | 6 Controlled 2012 2013 2014 2016 2018 | 10 x 2m | Occ | 440285 5412343 | None found 2018 | E side Juvenile plants |
| 950m | 7 Controlled 2012 2013 2014 2016 WB 2017 WB 2018 WB | 350 x 5 | 50% | 0440279 5412302 | Mont broom | Both sides. From junction with Foleys Rd uphill for approx 200m In 2018 still many seedlings |
| 1000m | Uncontrolled | 80 x10 | 40% | Nth boundary 440247 5412229 Sth 440239 5412124 | Mont broom | Private property adjoins roadside uncontrolled |

Figure 3: Map of Gowrie Park with associated weed data



| Road | Site No. | Area | Density | Weeds present | Notes |
|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--|
| Wellington Road | W-1 | 300m | 10% | Foxgloves | Along most of the roadside verges. Very thick in drain lines especially. Doesn't appear to have spread into bush other than near to dwelling at top end. Mainly clear near the backpackers |
| L1 (Field St) | L1-1 | | | Foxgloves | None found |
| L2 (Picton St) | L2-1 | 100m x 1m | 10% | Foxgloves | On both sides of road up to a third of the way along. |
| L3 (Eldon St - thru rd to O'Neill's rd) | L3-1 | 50 x 1m | 20% | Foxgloves | Along roadside for approx 50m both sides. |
| L3 (Eldon St - thru rd to O'Neill's rd) | L3-2 | | 2 plants | Foxgloves | North side, 2m in from road, approx 50m from junction with O'Neill's Rd |
| L4 (Pelion St) | L4-1 | | 2 plants | Foxgloves | south side of road, approx half way along |
| L5 (Ossa St) | L5-1 | 100 x 1m | | Foxgloves | both sides (and middle) of road up to about half way along |
| L6 (Top end of Wellington St) | | | | Foxgloves | None found |
| L7 (Manfred St) | L7-1 | 5 x 3m | 50% | Foxgloves | Along both sides of road, large patch just prior to private property. |
| L7 (Manfred St) | L7-2 | 20 x 10 | 10% | Foxgloves | Also follows boundary fence going south and into the bush area |
| R1 Hugel St | R1-1 | 10 x 5m | 10% | Foxgloves | on property with new dwelling (south side), both sides of road along verge |
| R1 (track to dam from end of Hugel St) | | 0 | 0 | Foxgloves | None found on either side of track from the end of Hugel St up to the dam |
| R2 (Legges St) | R2-1 | 140 x 2m | 50% | Foxgloves | Dense on both sides along roadside |
| R2 (Legges St) | R2-2 | 100 x 50m | 10% | Foxgloves | Spread throughout disturbed areas on building sites of new dwellings |
| R3 (Ben Lomond St) | R3-1 | 100 x 30m | 10% | Foxgloves | Along road sides and spreading into private properties on south side of road |
| R3 (Ben Lomond St) | R3-2 | 150 x 50m | 20% | Foxgloves | Widespread across property to north side of road |
| R3 (Ben Lomond St) | R3-3 | 5 x 5m | 50% | Foxgloves | Behind cottage next to restaurant |
| R4 (Barrow St) | R4-1 | | occ | Foxgloves | Left side of road |
| R4 (Barrow St) | R4-2 | 100 x 50m | 10% | Foxgloves | Spread over property on right side of road |
| R5 (Roland/Rufus - behind cabins) | R5-1 | | 1 plant | Foxgloves | Behind cabins, left side of road |
| 1467 Claude Rd | | 5 x 5m | 30% | Foxgloves | Patch behind house, gone to seed |
| Road at side of Hydro workshops | | 0 | 0 | Foxgloves | None found |

Appendix 2 - Mapping report (Minnow catchment)–some new mapping records for the Minnow catchment.

A2.1Weed species present – Lower Beulah Rd No. 1

Landowners - Sustainable Timbers Tasmania (STT), Forico and Kentish Council (KC) roadsides



Figure 4: Section between Union Bridge Rd and Dynan's Bridge Rd

| Table : | 1: Weed | species | found | in | this | area |
|---------|---------|---------|-------|----|------|------|
|---------|---------|---------|-------|----|------|------|

| Species | Common name | Comment |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Acer pseudoplatanus | Sycamore | Static |
| Anagallis arvensis | Scarlet pimpernel | Abundant |
| Antirrhiinum sp. | Snapdragons | Two populations south side |
| Aquiligia sp. | Columbine | Slow increase- fairly localised |
| Brassica rapa | Rape, Wild Turnip | Abundant along most of roadsides |
| Carduuspycnocephalus | Slender thistle | Increasing |
| Centauriumerythraea | Common centaury | Abundant |
| Coprosma robusta | Karamu | One location – SE forestry road |
| Cotoneaster sp. | Cotoneaster | Increasing |
| Crataegusmomgyna | Hawthorn | Fairly static |
| Crocosmia x crocosmiflora | Montbretia | One location spreading |

| Cytisusmultiflorus | White Spanish broom | One population |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cytisusscoparius | English broom | A few populations - spreading |
| Digitalis purpurea | Foxglove | Increasing quickly |
| Echium vulgare | Viper's bugloss | One site |
| Epilobiumciliatum | Fringed willow herb | Occasional plant |
| Erica lusitanica | Spanish heath | Spreading |
| Euphorbia peplus | Cancer weed | Occasional plant |
| Fuschiamagellanica | Fuschia | One location |
| Galium aparine | Cleavers | Spreading quickly |
| Genista monspessulana | Montpellier broom | Spreading through pine plantation |
| Hypochoeris glabra | Smooth cat's ear | Occasional |
| Leontodon taraxacoides | Hawkbit | Common |
| Leycesteriaformosa | Elisha's tears | Spreading |
| Lotus corniculatus | Slender bird's foot trefoil | Occasional |
| Lotus pedunculatus | Greater bird's foot trefoil | Occasional |
| Onopordumacanthium | Scotch thistle | Common |
| Orobanche minor | Broomrape | Occasional |
| Parentuccelliaviscosa | Yellow bartsia | Increasing occurrence |
| Plantago minor | Broad-leaf plantain | Common |
| Prunella vulgaris | Self heal | Common |
| Rosa rubiginosa | Sweet briar | Spreading |
| Rumexobtusifolius | Broad-leaved dock | Increasing populations |
| Salix fragilis | Crack willow | Tributaries off the Gog near road |
| Solanum nigrum | Black nightshade | Occasional |
| Sonchusoleraceus | Sow thistle | Occasional |
| Spergula arvensis | Corn spurrey | One location |
| Stachys arvensis | Stagger weed | Occasional |
| Trifolium repens | White clover | Common |
| Typha latifolia | Cumbungi | Increasing in damp courses |
| Verbascum virgatum | Twiggy mullein | Occasional and spreading |
| Vicia sativa | Cressy vetch | Occasional |
| Vinca minor | Blue periwinkle | Localised populations - large |

A2.2 Weeds species present – Beulah Back Road

Weeds were identified along the Beulah Back Road between Beulah Rd and Lower Beulah Road (route marked in red on map below). The weeds present are on roadsides managed by Kentish Council, and land managed by Sustainable Timbers Tasmania, and private landholders.



Figure 5: Beulah Back Road between Beulah Rd and Lower Beulah Road

Table 2: Weed species found in this area

| Species | Common name | Comment |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| Acer pseudoplatanus | Sycamore | Static |
| Anagallis arvensis | Scarlet pimpernel | Abundant |
| Aphanes arvensis | Parsley piert | New population |
| Brassica rapa | Rape, Wild Turnip | Abundant along most of roadsides |
| Centauriumerythraea | Common centaury | Abundant |
| Cotoneaster sp. | Cotoneaster | Increasing |
| Crataegusmomgyna | Hawthorn | Fairly static population |
| Digitalis purpurea | Foxglove | Increasing rapidly |
| Digitariaviolascens | Violet crabgrass | Spreading quickly |
| Dipsacusfullonum | Teasel | Populations increasing rapidly |
| Echium vulgare | Viper's bugloss | New population -starting to spread |
| Epilobiumciliatum | Fringed willowherb | Occasional occurrence - increasing |
| Erica lusitanica | Spanish heath | Population increasing |

| Erodium moschatum | Musk storks-bill | Common |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Eryngium ovinum | Blue devil | New population - small |
| Fumaria muralis | Ramping-fumitory | Occasional occurrence |
| Galium aparine | Cleavers | Population increasing quickly |
| Geranium molle | Dove's foot geranium | Quite common - increasing |
| Hypericum humifusum | Trailing St. John's wort | Occasional |
| Hypochaerisradicata | Cat's ear | Common |
| Juncus acutus ssp. acutus | Spiny rush | Only two plants seen |
| Lepidium didymum | Lesser swinecress | Occasional occurrence |
| Leontodon taraxacoides | Hawkbit | Very common |
| Leycesteriaformosa | Elisha's tears | Spreading – many juveniles |
| Linumbienne | Pale flax | Occasional occurrence |
| Lotus corniculatus | Bird's-foot trefoil | Common |
| Lotus pedunculatus | Greater bird's-foot trefoil | Common |
| Luecanthemum vulgare | Oxeye daisy | Very large populations spreading |
| Malva parviflora | Small flower mallow | Occasional occurrence |
| Navarretiasquarrosa | California stinkweed | A few plants – road to Olsen's - south |
| Nigella damascena | Love-in-a-mist | Only three plants seen |
| Onopordumacanthium | Scotch thistle | Common |
| Orobanche minor | Broomrape | Random plants - spreading |
| Parentucelliaviscosa | Yellow bartsia | Common |
| Plantago major | Broad-leaf plantain | Common |
| Prunella vulgaris | Self-heal | Abundant |
| Ranunculus trilobus | Buttercup | Occasional occurrence |
| Raphanusraphanistrum | Wild radish | Abundant along most of roadsides |
| Rosa rubiginosa | Sweet briar | Increasing spread |
| Rubusfruticosus | Blackberry | Very abundant |
| Rumexobtusifolius | Broad-leaved dock | Populations increasing |
| Salix fragilis | Crack willow | In stream channel – multiple locations |
| Senecio jacobaea | Ragwort | A few isolated plants – north side |
| Silybummarianum | Variegated thistle | Increasing populations |

| Sonchus asper | Spiny sow thistle | Increasing slowly |
|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Sonchusoleraceus | Common sow thistle | Increasing slowly |
| Spergularia media | Greater sea-spurrey | On road to Olsen's |
| Typha latifolia | Cumbungi | Increasing in dams and waterways |
| Verbascum virgatum | Twiggy mullein | Populations increasing annually |
| Vicia sativa | Common vetch | Increasing |

Appendix 3 - Stakeholder report - records of liaison with and involvements of major stakeholders in coordinated weed control programs.

A3.1 Mount Roland Rivercare Catchment Inc (MRRCI)

MRRCI and its members have invested a large amount of time and resources into weed control in the Mount Roland catchment. This has occurred over many years and has been funded through a number of different programs, supported with many volunteer hours of work by its members.

This has included the strategic weed management plan¹ that informs this project as well as significant background research about he natural values² of the area and the threats from invasive species.

This work occurred prior to the commencement of this NLP funded project, and although not directly attributable to NLP funded project, it is highlighted here for context as it underpins the positive outcomes that have resulted from this project.

Further, MRRCI and its members contributed to this project with in-kind resources for the weed working bees, including catering, advertising and promotion as well as weed control work and information sharing, plus project oversight, financial management and background research.

It is estimated that the value of in-kind contribution to this project from MRRCI and members is \$8,500.

In addition to the funded consultancy work through this project, much more has also been contributed by each of the consultants on a voluntary basis.

It is estimated that the value of in-kind contribution to this project from consultants is \$32,781.

A3.2 Kentish Council

Mt Roland Rivercare Catchment Inc has a partnership agreement with Kentish Council which facilitates collaboration on environmental projects as well as knowledge sharing in relation to environmental weeds and their management. Some of the funding provided through this agreement has contributed to this project, for example some of the costs associated with the working bees. The partnership agreement funding also contributed to the previously mentioned Minnow Action Plan².

Further to the assistance provided through the partnership agreement, Kentish Council allocated \$12,000 in their budget to control weeds in the Minnow Catchment. So far,Council has implemented Spanish Heath control on Lower Beulah Road, and other works are ongoing.

Liaison with their Green Spaces Coordinator and Infrastructure and Assets Manager has provided support in relation to OH&S requirements for working on Council controlled land, as well as attendance at planning meetings.

¹Taylor,G (2018), 'A Weed Management Plan for the Minnow Catchment', <u>http://www.rivercare.org.au/site/images/Weed Management Plan for the Minnow Catchment Feb 2018.pdf</u>

² Stronach, P (2016), Minnow Catchment Action Plan,

http://www.rivercare.org.au/site/images/20160828%20Minnow%20Catchment%20Action%20Plan%20Low%20Res%20Final.pdf

A3.3 Department of State Growth

MRRCI has an ongoing and collaborative relationship with the Department of State Growth in relation to roadside vegetation management. As a result, the roadside corridors in the vicinity of Gowrie Park have previously had weed control measures implemented in addition to the normal roadside slashing program. Weed spray programmes were specifically targeting Spanish Heath and KunzeaEricoides.

Further work was undertaken in support of this project to control weeds along roadsides on Claude Road and also on Oliver's Road. In addition, these two roads have now been designated as 'Priority Weed Control Sites' - meaning that these two roads will get annual control.

It is estimated that the value of their contribution is \$7,320 for control work done in 2018.

A3.4 Parks and Wildlife Service

MRRCI has had an ongoing and collaborative relationship with the Parks and Wildlife Service, particularly in relation to environmental weeds in the Mount Roland Reserve and a site under their control at Gowrie Park known as "Top Town".

Liaison with PWS staff has assisted the project in a number of ways – facilitating access and OH&S requirements relating to work on Crown Land, biosecurity information relevant to the project and attendance at planning meetings.

PWS has also directly contributed to weed control work by employing a weed contractor to spray KunzeaEricoidesat Gowrie Park. They have also funded further annual control on their patch of Kunzea at Toptown.

It is estimated that the value of this weed control work is \$1,600.

A3.5 Sustainable Timbers Tasmania

Sustainable Timbers Tasmania is a Tasmanian Government Business Enterprise and manages plantations within the Minnow catchment that were within the area of interest to this project. Their co-operation and assistance with weed mapping and subsequent control activities in a number offorestry areas and along access roads was necessary to achieving successful outcomes.

Throughout the project, STT staff have played a supportive role in facilitating access to plantations for weed mapping and attendance at meetings.STT has also undertaken weed control work of pine wildings near the Minnow River.

A3.6 Forico

Forico is Tasmania's largest private forestry management companywith plantations in the Minnow catchment. Their co-operation and assistance with weed mapping and subsequent control activities in a number of forestry areas and along access roads was necessary to achieving successful outcomes.

Throughout the project, Forico staff have played a supportive role in facilitating access to plantations for weed mapping and subsequent control work. Forico has also undertaken weed control work in support of the project, specifically weed control of Spanish Heath in the Minnow catchment generally, plus control of Gopher Spurge along Bridle Track Road.

It is estimated that the value of their contribution is >\$5,000.

A3.7 Others

Several other landowners in the Mt Roland and Minnow catchments have contributed to this project by controlling weeds on their properties. Interactions between MRRCI members and property owners have helped to extend knowledge about environmental weeds and how to control them.

Examples are:

Timberlands Pacific is a forest management company with plantations in the Minnow Catchment and has provided technical support to the project as well as facilitating access to plantations where required.

Minnow Cabins (Tourism business) is in the process of controlling various weeds on their property and MRRCI members have met with them on site to discuss ways to do this.

Landowners and tourism businesses at Gowrie Park have contributed to this project – assisting with the organisation of the working bees and implementing weed control work on their properties.

MRRCI is also working with Mount Roland Folk Festival organisers regarding protocols to minimize weed spread from the event to be held at Gowrie Park in October 2019, and also through provision of an onsite weed education workshop as part of the Festival activities.

It is expected that the involvement of landowners will continue, particularly where significant infestations have been reduced to a more manageable task as a result of collaborative weed control work by multiple organisations and individuals.

Appendix 4 - Working Bee report - records of participation and outputs from community working bees.

A4.1Mt Roland Reserve, O'Neills Rd and Claude Rd (20 October 2018)

Volunteers from the community along with MRRCI members hand pulled weeds from roadside verges and the Mt Roland Reserve. 10 people participated and contributed 20hrs weed control work. The focus was mainly to target Montpelier Broom seedlings, and in revisiting sites that had been previously controlled over a number of years. Funding for costs associated with this working bee was provided by Kentish Council and MRRCI.

Figure 6: Example of promotional material for the working bee



Figure 7: Part of the Mount Roland Reserve along Claude Road, where Montpelier Broom seedlings were starting to invade native bushland. This area was cleared as part of the working bee.



A4.2Weed Action Day at Beulah in the Minnow catchment (23 February 2019)

The main focus for weeding activity at this event was Foxgloves, which had been spreading in the catchment from plantations since 2012 and were extensive along roadsides. 19 community volunteers and MRRCI members contributed 38 hrs work to clear foxgloves from roadside verges as well as some strategic locations within the plantation areas, including an informal picnic area and tracks. The method of weed control was firstly the removal and bagging of seeds heads, then chipping out the rosettes with hoes and hand tools, or hand pulling small seedlings.

Cooperation from landowners Sustainable Timbers Tasmania and Foricofacilitated access.

Funding for costs associated with this working bee was provided by MRRCI and its members.

See also the attached report "Weed Action Day - mini report STT".

Figure 8: Example of promotional material for the Beulah Weed Action Day



A4.3 Weed Action Day at Gowrie Park (13 April 2019)

Weed mapping work undertaken through this projecthad identified a number of sites around the Gowrie Park village where weeds were located. The focus of the weed working bee was mainly in targeting Foxgloves growing along the verges of the roadways of the previous Hydro village. There are also significant large infestations of Spanish Heath, KunzeaEricoides and Montpelier Broom in

this area and the strategy for these has been containment and controlling outliers around the edges of the main infestations. Foxgloves have more recently started appearing and are at a stage that could be controlled and managed, which is why this was the focus for the weed working bee.

11 volunteers and MRRCI members contributed 22 hrs work hand pulling and chipping foxgloves using hand tools. Funding for costs associated with this working bee was provided by and MRRCI and its members.

Figure 9: Example of promotional material for the Gowrie Park Weed Action Day





Figure 10: Roadside weed control in Gowrie Park also illustrating some of the Spanish Heath extent



Figure 11: Foxglove rosette prior to removal