

Wildlife Act Review

Submission Comment 24:

Contributor: Individual

Primary interests:

- Management and control of wildlife causing problems or damage

Comment

My comment/submission is purely from the perspective of a farmer who for many years has applied for ATCW's to control kangaroos, wombats and ducks. We farm about 1500 hectares in Vic running both beef cattle and sheep for fat lambs. We produce about 3200 prime fat lambs annually utilising 60 hectares of irrigated lucerne/plantain to enable us to grow the lambs out to maximise returns. We have more than 30km's of 2 metre high vermin proof electrified boundary fence (more is req'd) to help exclude kangaroos, wombats, deer, pigs, wild dogs/dingos and foxes. Kangaroos, wombats and ducks consume and damage pasture that our livestock could otherwise eat. Worse still kangaroos and wombats in particular damage our exclusion fences allowing the ingress of predators such as wild dogs, foxes and pigs which can take a terrible toll on sheep and lambs in particular. We know that we lose approximately 400 lambs annually between pregnancy scanning and weaning due mainly to predation. With prime lambs selling for in excess of \$200 each, losses due to wildlife damaging fences and consuming pasture are quite significant. I personally don't really have any complaints about the current DELWP system of ATCW's — if the system ain't broke don't fix it! Nevertheless I understand that there is a gaping void between what most rural Victorian's and most urban Victorians would deem acceptable in terms of common species wildlife control. I would also think there is a similar void within DELWP itself, as such I would suggest that the DPI would be a better body to administer ATCW's on private land to get outcomes more sympathetic to farmers requirements.

Provided May 05/2021