

Subject: FW: Comment on draft Kangaroo Management Plan
Date: Tuesday, 28 March 2017 8:40:05 AM
Attachments: [Comments on K mgt plan.docx](#)
[image001.jpg](#)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 24 March 2017 3:24 PM
To: Environment
Subject: Comment on draft Kangaroo Management Plan

Controlled native species management
Environment Division
PO Box 521
Canberra ACT 2601

Please find attached comments on the draft Kangaroo Plan



Comment on Draft Plan for controlled native species management

Submission March 2017

Congratulations on a comprehensive well-researched and referenced, logical document.

I would like to make some comments applicable to:

1. Kangaroos within enclosed areas
2. Prescribing minimum populations
3. Commercial harvesting.

1. The draft plan refers to vasectomy as a fertility control activity but it does not advocate it. In my experience, vasectomy is quick, relatively easy, and there is no doubt about its efficacy. Sterilising dominant males slows the rate of increase of semi-enclosed population. It would be a useful tool in sensitive areas such as Weston Park or golf courses. It could also be beneficial in areas without defined boundaries.

Further monitoring as part of a planned research study is needed to determine the minimum number of large males that need to be treated to deliver a measurable lowering of rate of increase.

2. Prescribing a preferred population would be an alternative approach to current processes. Landholders / leasees and CNP managers would be given a 'permit-to-hold' a prescribed number. They would be delegated responsibility to manage excess.

Most golf courses want to have kangaroos and are prepared to have up to, say 100. Beyond that kangaroos begin to interfere with the state of the course and occasionally public safety. Similarly, most rural leaseholders want some but not too many kangaroos. The CNP also needs a balance competing objectives, as the draft plan eloquently demonstrates. If a figure was set for CNP reserves that reduced the chances of vehicle collisions, there would be no need for the extremely expensive and unsightly fences that are appearing on roads such as Tuggeranong Parkway. Fencing resources could be allocated to real conservation projects such as Mulligan's Flat.

What is missing in all cases is a target population that provides managers with an achievable and measurable objective.

3. There is no doubt that the costs of complying with the requirements of the National Kangaroo Management Program are proportionally large for small jurisdictions and for those with smaller harvestable populations. Tasmania, Victoria and to a lesser extent, Western Australia are in the same situation. (It is a common problem that applies to many other activities, for example animal disease management to name just one that I know well.)

A solution would be for the Commonwealth to accept greater responsibility. Under a truly national management plan, professional shooters in Queanbeyan and Murrumbateman would be able to operate in ACT. They could quietly and with little fanfare, cull on say the Majura Firing Range, avoiding for the ACT expensive processes which accompany current culling. Indeed, their work would not only be cost neutral to the ACT budget but could even generate income.

It would also put an end to the morally dubious practice of burying thousands of potentially valuable animals and wasting the resource.

A change such as this would be similar to those taking place in many other fields where there are benefits and efficiencies from a National approach. Corporate registration of business names, of professionals, and of veterinary medicines and pesticides are examples.

Thank you for the opportunity of commenting.



Fenner School of Environment & Society