

Wildlife Act Review

Submission Comment 34:

Contributor: Individual

Primary interests:

- Other: Public Lands Management
- Protection and conservation of wildlife and habitat
- Management and control of wildlife causing problems or damage

Comment

I notice that, as usual, you have a lot of "experts from out of town" on your panel, with no local input from the very people that live and work in the bush. First off, you'll miss a lot of critical information and real-life observations to mesh the science done from afar, using other's research, typically done during brief visits during really nice weather, and rarely done far from roads and vehicles. That misses a lot. Second and perhaps more importantly, whatever results you end up with, even the ones that are accurate, you'll get the inevitable blowback from these very locals, farmers, retirees, bush-block owners (like ourselves), even if they are generally environmentally inclined. That inevitably means a continuation of the usual "us" vs. "them" conflict, as well as less chance of anything productive ever coming of this effort. Even if something does eventuate, it'll be at a cost of a lot of time and money on political and legal battles. Just not smart if you ask me. You need upfront participation from the people, like myself, who live out here and know the wilderness personally over many years. Not just input after the fact, added to addendums but rarely affecting outcomes, but real participation and inclusion from the get-go. This affects all users of the area, as well as the wildlife, via global warming affects on bushfire, and the lack of traditional and historic fuel reduction efforts, both Aboriginal and European, including our oft-neglected river paddling community.

Provided May 10/2021