

September 2008

Upper Catchment Issues

TASMANIA

Dam Development in North East Tasmania *Issues and Implications for Community Involvement, Equity and Governance*



The future of *Engaeus spinicaudatus*, the Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish,
rests in our hands

Journal of Tasmanian Community Resource Auditors Incorporated

Vol. 5 No. 1

ISSN 1444-9560

Upper Catchment Issues - Tasmania

Disclaimer:

Articles from any person, group or organization are accepted for publication at the discretion of the Editorial Board, and the opinions expressed therein may not necessarily reflect the views of the Editor, or the Board of the Tasmanian Community Resource Auditors Inc.

Copyright:

Readers of this publication are reminded that all material appearing in the Journal, including any specially composed article, is covered under the copyright laws of Australia and may not be reproduced or copied in any form or part whatsoever, or used for any promotional or advertising purpose without the written consent of the Editors, author, or artist.

Submissions - Guide for intending authors

We welcome submissions on topics concerning any aspect of upper catchment issues. Consult a current issue of the Journal for style and layout of submissions. Documents will be accepted as 'MS WORD' .doc files with all text style as 'Normal'. Authors are reminded that appendices are always included as scanned images in the finished Journal articles. Therefore, material for inclusion, including photographs and appendices, must be of high quality to enable scanning and reproduction. It is the responsibility of the author to ensure that all copyright conditions have been met, and that sources are clearly attributed. Intending authors are reminded that a very diverse audience reads the Journal, and so highly technical or specialised terminology should be carefully explained. Finally, responsibility for spelling, punctuation, and referencing shall remain with the author.

(See inside back cover for referencing style used in the Journal)

Submissions should be addressed to:

**The Editor,
8 Lenborough Street
Beauty Point
Tasmania 7270
Australia**

Desktop Publishing:

Resource Publications

(ABN 66 828 584 972)

9 Lenborough Street
Beauty Point, Tasmania, 7270

Phone: (03) 6383 4594

Fax: (03) 6383 4895

E-mail: peter@resource-publications.com.au

Web: <http://www.resource-publications.com.au>

Published: September, 2008

Co-ordinating Editor: Philip J Tattersall

Grad. Dip. Sustainable Ag. (University of Sydney.)

M. Sc. (Hons), (University of Western Sydney)

Editorial Board:

Kim Eastman:

Community Advocate on water issues
Spokesperson - Dorset Waterwatch
Landmark Forum Graduate
Landmark Advanced Course Graduate
Landmark Communications Course Graduate

Philip J Tattersall:

Community Advocate

Peter Eastman:

Member - Dorset Waterwatch
Landmark Forum Graduate
Landmark Advanced Course Graduate
Landmark Communications Course Graduate

Editorial:

What do we mean by ‘community consultation’? Is it a briefing, where citizens are told of ‘the plan’? Maybe it’s all about that buzz word ‘feedback’. One thing is for sure, those meanings are seldom if ever analysed by those ‘experts’ who are supposedly acting in the public interest.

This edition of the Journal delves into the problem of community consultation. The authors inquire into the efficacy of public consultation in relation to a series of dam proposals in North East Tasmania. Their research highlights what can go wrong when governments and industries, supposedly acting in the best interests of their communities, fail to connect with citizens within the context of the broader community.

Our hope is that this research will help generate meaningful debate about better ways to involve citizens as partners in change, rather than see them as passive recipients of information and services.

The UCIT Team

Contents

Editorial:	1
Dam Development in North East Tasmania	5
Introduction.....	5
Community concerns surface	6
Legislative changes.....	8
Key issues relating to the dam proposals.....	10
Social.....	10
Biophysical.....	11
Legislative and legal aspects.....	13
Conclusion	15
References.....	18
Bibliography	19
Acknowledgements.....	21
Announcing a new community group	22
Referencing style used in the Journal	25
Tasmanian Community Resource Auditors Inc.	26

Dam Development in North East Tasmania

Issues and implications for Community Involvement, Equity and Governance

K. Eastman, Community Futures Network¹

P. Eastman, Dorset Waterwatch¹

Email: pkeastman@activ8.net.au

P. Andrewartha, Community Futures Network¹

Email: winbourne@keypoint.com.au

P. J. Tattersall², Tasmanian Community Resource Auditors Inc³

Email: soilres@optusnet.com.au

Introduction

This report represents the initial findings of an inquiry into the North East Irrigation Project (NEIP) in North East Tasmania. The inquiry was initiated by the community group, Community Futures Network Tasmania, in an effort to bring information on the NEIP into the public arena in order to facilitate scrutiny and debate. The NEIP is currently being driven at the local level by Dorset Economic Development Group (Dorset EDG).

The North East Irrigation Project is an ambitious proposal to place in-stream dam infrastructure on up to seven rivers in the municipality of Dorset. The proposal aims to supply irrigation water to support the establishment of a new dairying industry on the Waterhouse plains, an area primarily consisting of dry land cattle and sheep grazing properties. Mainland milk processing co-operative Murray Goulburn is exploring the opportunity to set up a milk processing factory in the region contingent on the delivery of enough water for pasture to support at least 50,000 cows.

Dorset EDG was established in 2003 in response to job losses from the closure of the Simplot vegetable factory in Scottsdale. Their role, initially funded by a donation from Simplot, was to promote and facilitate the establishment of local enterprises in order to build and sustain economic prosperity in the region. Dorset EDG is managed by a board of local volunteers, with an Executive Officer position initially paid for by

¹ PO Box 360, Scottsdale, Tasmania, Australia, 7260

² Phil is a PhD researcher who is researching community activism, governance and resource management in Tasmania.

³ PO Box 360, Scottsdale, Tasmania, Australia 7260

Commonwealth and State funding, now funded by the Tasmanian Government.

When the initial donation from Simplot was expended, Dorset EDG began investigating large commercial developments for Dorset. It considered its role as that of facilitator, bringing potential developers together with local stakeholders to explore economic opportunities (www.dorset.com.au). The North East Irrigation Project remains the primary focus of Dorset EDG. Feasibility studies of the project are being driven by a steering committee made up of Dorset EDG and the Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries and Water (DPIW) funded by the Tasmanian Department of Economic Development, DPIW and Murray Goulburn.

An extract from the Dorset EDG website (www.dorset.com.au) lays out the extent of the project to date as follows:

“Significant feasibility work has already taken place, and broad studies have been completed confirming;

Economics of Waterhouse land conversion to irrigated dairy pasture;

Availability of sufficient land to support large scale dairy development;

Capacity of available land to be successfully converted to dairy;

Engineering viability of dam sites suitable for supply to available land;

Economic viability of given dam sites;

Overview of known environmental values.

Current work due for completion by end July 2008 includes refinement of dam engineering and economics, and site analysis of environmental values together with offset and mitigation requirements.

It is anticipated that the Dorset EDG / Tasmanian Government steering committee formed in 2007 to assess project viability will report by September 2008. It is envisaged that the report of this committee will provide the Tasmanian Irrigation Development Board with a basis on which to assess a series of North East dams. If sufficient dams receive the statutory approvals, they are envisaged to provide a quantum of water sufficient to supply significant new dairy production in North East Tasmania, which in turn should be capable of supporting a new dairy processing facility in Dorset.” (www.dorset.com.au).

Community concerns surface

Early in 2008 the community became aware of sketchy details of the NEIP via the media.

Public concern began to mount as no definite dam site locations were revealed, no public meetings were called to gain community input into proposed developments and interested parties and potentially affected landholders felt left out of the communication loop. In March 2008, several property owners were caught by surprise when an environmental consultant, tasked indirectly by DPIW, showed up on their doorstep seeking access to their properties to assess the environmental values. It was only at that stage that the first landholders got an inkling that their properties faced inundation if the NEIP were to proceed (MacGregor 2008(a)).

Shortly after this, responding to mounting community concern, the Dorset Natural Resource Management Group (Dorset NRM) called on Dorset EDG to give details of the NEIP proposal at a Dorset NRM meeting on April 1, 2008. It was at this meeting that Dorset EDG spokesperson, Stephen Love, revealed that a steering committee of Dorset EDG and the Tasmanian Government (DPIW) had committed \$120,000 to undertake preliminary technical assessments along the lines of those referred to above in the Dorset EDG website. The steering committee had received \$20,000 from Murray Goulburn and \$50,000 each of taxpayer funds from both the Department of Economic Development and the Department of Primary Industries and Water.

Stephen Love explained that the vision was to dam up to seven rivers in the North East, including the St. Patricks River, Brid River, Sheepwash Creek, Great Forester River, Tomahawk River, Boobyalla River and Musselroe River. Mr. Love was unable to reveal the precise location of the proposed dams as the matter was still being investigated. The project was expected to provide 280 fulltime jobs in dairying, 80 jobs in milk processing, with 700 additional jobs created by a flow-on effect.

Armed with the small amount of information provided during the meeting, some potentially affected landholders and interested parties formed a coalition, later named the Community Futures Network (CFN). The initial aim of the CFN was to analyse the emerging issues coming out of the NEIP. While affected landholders held concerns for the future of their own properties, they noted a general unease within the community over the lack of community consultation on the project. People were concerned that taxpayer's dollars were being expended in pursuing a course that had experienced little, if any, public debate.

In order to facilitate such debate in the community the Community Futures Network sought information from Dorset EDG Spokesperson, Stephen Love. In answer to questions regarding the public availability of environmental and engineering reports being prepared by consultants, Mr. Love gave his opinion that it was unlikely these would be treated as public documents and that the decision to disclose them rested with DPIW. He suggested the first opportunity for public scrutiny of the NEIP proposal and opportunity for input might be through the public submission phase of the *Assessment Committee for Dam Construction (ACDC)* process (discussed below), after dam applications were filed.

The Community Futures Network, among others, found this an unacceptable approach to community consultation in that it excluded early input from the very people who were paying for the investigations in progress – the taxpayer. While it might be valuable to have input into the process during the public submission phase, it was recognized that at that stage a firm proposal would be in place. The community would be restricted to commenting on that proposal and lose an opportunity to discuss alternative sites or options. There was also a concern that the government be may be committed to progress the development whether or not the wider community saw merit in the proposal. It was felt the type of consultation alluded to in the ACDC process seemed almost an afterthought and therefore might leave communities feeling removed from decision-making and suspicious of government claims to openness and transparency.

Many people felt they had specialist knowledge of environmental and social values relating to some of the proposed dam sites which would serve to enhance public debate on the proposal. Unfortunately, it would appear that no structured process exists into which such information could be fed. In bringing these and similar concerns into the public arena this report seeks to examine the warrant of the dam steering committee, who seek to advance a project of such environmental, social and economic significance without establishing any meaningful dialogue with its community.

Legislative changes

The *Dam Works Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2007* implemented a number of changes aimed at ‘streamlining’ the dam approval process. Applications for dam permits are determined by the Assessment Committee for Dam Construction (ACDC). Third parties are able to make representations, and the ACDC *may* require further

information from the dam proponents about a range of issues, including the impact on natural values and the mitigation or offsetting of environmental harm caused by the dam (ss154 and 155 of the *Water Management Act 1999*).

Significantly, amendments to the *Water Management Act 1999* restrict the role of the independent Resource Management and Planning Appeal Tribunal (*RMPAT*) to hearing appeals on procedural issues. Appeals can no longer be made to RMPAT on the basis that information provided or a technical finding of the ACDC is incorrect. This was seen by some as an attempt to limit the scope of third parties to have their objections to dam proposals properly considered.

A further significant amendment introduced by the *Dam Works Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2007* was to exempt a person undertaking approved dam works from the requirement to obtain a permit to take listed species under the *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* (see s.51(4)).

In addition, the new *Forest Practices Regulations 2007* explicitly provide that a Forest Practices Plan is no longer required in relation to clearing of vegetation associated with approved dam works.

These amendments effectively remove the role of the Threatened Species Unit and the Forest Practices Authority from the assessment of threatened species impacts associated with proposed dam works. The assessment of such threatened species issues now rests solely under the control of the ACDC process. While the ACDC *may* require information regarding the protection of natural values, and must consider issues raised in representations, there is no explicit requirement for the ACDC to assess the impact of a dam proposal on listed threatened species.

On its website, Dorset EDG makes the following statement: “*Changing community attitudes and simplified legislative processes introduced in recent years have resulted in an opportunity to revisit potential developments that have not been successful in the past*”, (www.dorset.com.au). It will be interesting to follow the progress of re-hashed dam proposals that have failed to obtain a certified Forest Practices Plan in the past on environmental grounds, as they re-enter the field under the new ACDC process. To that end we are committed to further inquiries in the future.

The upshot of the changes to legislation and regulation has meant that any provision for robust community inquiry and appeal has been further diluted, thus exacerbating increased conflict over water management issues. In making this move, the Minister has also sent out a strong message that legislative process is a means whereby critical inquiry, instigated by communities of concern, can be shutdown. The assertions made by Greg Hall (Johnston 2008) who is a member of the Tasmanian Upper House, tend to confirm the assertion that the Tasmanian Government is moving to limit community input via appeal processes. Hall suggests that, *“Tasmania cannot afford to have developments scuttled by frivolous and spurious appeals causing damaging delays”*. He goes on to suggest in relation to an appeal not yet heard at the time of the publication of his comments that, *“I believe this appeal is based on ideological motivations rather than a matter of substance”*. The proposition that Tasmanian governance is in need of repair and indeed reinvention appear ripe for debate.

Key issues relating to the dam proposals

Social

There has been no official notice to potentially affected landholders that their properties may be affected by a proposed dam. Moreover, there has been no official opportunity for them to participate in any way in the NEIP process to date, either to gain information or to provide it. Since some potentially affected landholders found out only by accident that their land might be inundated it is quite conceivable that there are other landholders who still remain unaware of the situation and continue to make business and domestic decisions about their properties in an information vacuum. In the absence of official information, members of affected communities pass around “best guess” dam maps in an attempt to make sense of the possible effects of the proposal on their futures.

Not all landholders hold concerns about outcomes should their property be compulsorily acquired. Some trust they will be adequately compensated for the loss of their property, livelihood and amenity. However, years of reported protracted legal battles over the Duke Energy Pipeline land acquisition in North West Tasmania should put paid to any complacency over the ease of compensation negotiations.

For others, the loss of their land may cause considerable concern for a variety of reasons. Through discussions with potentially affected

community members, worrying reports have emerged. In one case, a farming family recently paid several hundred thousand dollars for a property only to discover that their newly purchased land lay in a proposed inundation zone. Others have invested time and money planning for a tourism development which they have had to place on hold while they await notification of the status of their property. Some farmers, already facing financial hardship, are now faced with escalating ethical and possible legal issues regarding the sale of land that may, or may not, fall within an inundation zone. While the NEIP proceeds with so little official information available to landholders, including precise locations of the proposed dams, farmers face significantly increased challenges for management decisions that will affect their futures.

In several instances, potentially affected properties are sites of significant environmental values, including national listed threatened species. In the case of several properties that would be subject to inundation by the Great Forester River dam, perpetually binding Conservation Covenants have been signed between the property holders and the Tasmanian Government in order to recognize and protect the identified environmental values. Legal advice indicates that while the landholder is bound to take actions to protect the identified values, the Minister may overturn the covenant for the purposes of acquiring the land for a dam. This raises significant concerns about the integrity of the covenant programs operating in the state when the Minister can, it would seem, overturn an environmental covenant and assign that land for an alternative purpose that may run contrary to community expectations. These sorts of issues are at the very core of our concerns as a community in relation to justice, quality democracy, and indeed good governance.

Biophysical

Part of the community inquiry examined the biophysical characteristics of the region in question. Waterhouse has long been identified as a saline affected area, listed and mapped as such in the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality⁴.

The region is known to have an extensive area of salinity potential. Even farmers in the area have begun to question whether the typically sandy soils of the Waterhouse region are capable of responding to land use changes from dry land grazing to intensively irrigated pasture without

⁴ <http://www.dpiw.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/Images/LVAE-53S8TC?open>

further exacerbating saline conditions. This once again highlights the importance of local knowledge in the process of environmental risk assessment.

Under climate change conditions and the downward trends in base stream flows in the North East, documented over more than 15 years,⁵ some community members question whether it was possible to predict with any accuracy the future availability of adequate stream flows to fill the dams and recoup the substantial construction costs. Farmers, while generally welcoming increased water storage, have raised concerns regarding the potential impacts on water allocations upstream of the proposed dams. It was perceived there could be a case where upstream allocations, currently costed at a comparatively nominal rate, might be reduced in order to maximize flows into the dams. There was speculation that this move might provide quicker recovery of infrastructure costs through the sale of water to irrigators in the lower catchments at a predicted starting rate of \$1,000 per megalitre (Alan Harradine, Landline, ABC TV, 06/07/2008).

Hydrologist, Dr. David Leaman, expressed his concerns about the efficacy and impacts of in-stream dams in a recent newspaper article (MacGregor 2008 (b)). Dr. Leaman spoke of the danger of an over reliance on historical rainfall figures and an overestimation of water availability in catchments, referring to poor planning decisions that have allowed some of the state's catchments to resemble "*mini-Murray Darlings*". "*As soon as you put in a major in-stream dam you start wasting water through evaporation,*" he said. He claimed that up to 70 percent of water can be lost through evaporation, depending on seasonal conditions. (This comment is particularly pertinent to the proposed North East dams, many of which would be shallow and carry a large surface area). Dr. Leaman suggested that well planned and managed off-stream dams could be used successfully but said that in-stream dams posed a risk of "*too much damage and there is a lot of wastage.*"

Numerous issues loomed large relating to the environmental impacts resulting from major in-stream dam infrastructure. Given the legislative changes surrounding dam construction that had occurred in 2007, the question of how robust the new environmental assessment process under the ACDC would be on such expansive proposals is yet to be tested.

⁵ As reported by DPIW officers March 18, 2008 to a meeting of the Consultative Committee for The Great Forester Catchment Water Management Plan.

Furthermore, in a convoluted maze of overlapping environmental legislation and regulation it would seem incumbent upon our authorities to have carefully examined their obligations under State and Federal law prior to the expenditure of taxpayer funds on any project that might be impacted by such. In our view, the legal implications of relevant legislative provisions, particularly in relation to threatened species, must be fully recognized by the authorities before they commit further resources to this process.

Legislative and legal aspects

Back in March 2008, landholders provided environmental consultants with information on State and Federal listed threatened species that exist in areas proposed for inundation. There were numerous threatened species issues that surfaced during these discussions, many of which should have set alarm bells ringing. For the purposes of illustrating this point, we will discuss one such listed endangered species, *Engaeus spinicaudatus*, the Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish.

This tiny creature occupies a highly limited area of distribution north of Scottsdale within an area of approximately 34.5 square kilometres, containing only 3.45 square kilometres of suitable habitat (Horwitz 1991, Gaffney & Horwitz 1992, Richards 1997). Some of this area lies within the inundation zone of the proposed Great Forester River dam. The species is currently listed under both the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* and the Commonwealth *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). It has also been identified as a Priority Species requiring recovery action under the *Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement 1997*.

To this end the Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish is managed under a Recovery Plan, the *Burrowing Crayfish Group Recovery Plan 2001-2005* (Doran 2000), adopted as a final plan under the *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995* on 7 November 2006. The Recovery Plan states, “Given the extremely restricted distribution of *E. spinicaudatus*, the entire natural habitat in which it occurs should be considered critical habitat for the future of the species” (Doran & Richards 1996).

While the recent amendments discussed above mean that separate approval to take (that is, harm) the Burrowing Crayfish is no longer required under the *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*, the EPBC Act continues to apply. Section 18 of the EPBC Act makes it an offence to take any action

that has, will have or is likely to have a significant impact on a listed threatened species, without approval. In deciding whether to grant approval, the Federal Minister must not act inconsistently with a recovery plan (s.139(1)(b)).

The Minister may declare that approval is not required for certain actions. However, the Minister may only declare that an action does *not* need approval, or accredit an alternative authorization process, or approve a bilateral agreement in relation to a threatened species if s/he is satisfied that the declaration / provision of the bilateral agreement is not inconsistent with a recovery plan (s.34D(1)(c), 34D(2)(c), 53(1)(c)).

The current bilateral assessment agreement between the Commonwealth and Tasmanian governments does not accredit the assessment process under the *Water Management Act 1999*.

In order to explore the legislative and legal aspects of the dam development proposal the Community Futures Network contacted the Tasmanian Environmental Defenders Office (EDO) to seek advice as to the ramifications arising from the amendments to the Tasmanian *Water Management Act 1999* and the *Forest Practices Regulations 2007*. In particular, they were interested to discover if the amendments were consistent with the Tasmanian Regional Forest Agreement (RFA) and, if not, how that might affect the management of threatened species in relation to dam works.

Forestry operations carried out in accordance with the RFA are generally exempt from the requirement to obtain approval under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. The EDO advised that land clearing for dam construction may not fall within the definition of RFA forestry operations, or may be excluded on the basis that the clearing was “*incidental to another action whose primary purpose does not relate to forestry*” (s.42(c) EPBC Act). Therefore, it is likely that any clearing associated with dam works would remain subject to the EPBC Act.

The impact of inundation of land would also be unlikely to attract the RFA exemption. Therefore, the impact of inundating critical habitat for a listed threatened species would need to be assessed under the EPBC Act.

In simple terms, if the NEIP proposal is likely to have an adverse impact on a listed threatened species, the proponent will need approval under s.18 of the EPBC Act. The Minister will not grant approval if it is inconsistent with a recovery plan. The advice above would indicate that the Great

Forester Dam proposal would, in all likelihood, fail to comply with the EPBC and consequently cannot be built at that site. Other dams in the NEIP, with similar threatened species issues, may ultimately suffer the same fate.

This assessment will leave the dam proponents and the Tasmanian Government in particular, in what appears to be a significant conundrum. The ‘streamlining’ of the dam approval process does not remove the requirement for approval under the EPBC Act. If it is likely that the proposal could fail to obtain such approval, it is questionable whether taxpayer funds should continue to be expended on technical and environmental assessments for the project.

This demonstrates the potential for legislative instruments to inadvertently shut out community input, which we assert can lead to undesirable consequences, such as those revealed in this enquiry.

Conclusion

This initial inquiry has highlighted a number of concerns surrounding the proposal to develop dams on seven rivers in the Dorset municipality of northeast Tasmania. The key concerns relate to paucity of community consultation and biophysical, social and legal aspects of the proposal.

The lack of community engagement on the part of the proponents, their agents and advisors has been a somewhat unfortunate oversight. There are important lessons to be learnt, even at this early stage. As the ultimate responsible persons, community members need to be involved at the very start of project proposals. The purpose of such engagement would be to put community firmly in the driver’s seat of decision-making by firstly seeking their permission, ongoing input and guidance, and secondly gaining important knowledge about the characteristics of their local environments (Harding 2001).

Advice from Dorset EDG would indicate that full disclosure of the NEIP proposal, including precise dam locations, may not take place prior to the public submission phase of the ACDC process. At that late stage the community would be restricted to commenting on a proposal that already had reached a high level of commitment by the government whether or not the wider community saw merit in the proposal. It could well be argued that consultation via submission does not in fact denote consultation at all, but may simply represent an opportunity to have “input” without any

corresponding influence as to the exploration of alternative sites or other options (Dakin 2003).

The biophysical concerns revealed in this inquiry relate to existing salinity degradation of significant areas of the soils in the Waterhouse region and the potential to exacerbate this problem by the introduction of intensive irrigation. As well, in attempting to come to terms with the implications of climate change, uncertainty exists over the ability of the North East rivers to supply the necessary water reserves. These concerns are based on studies that show a decline in water yield over many years. Tasmanian hydrologist, Dr. David Leaman, has acknowledged the potential for evaporation water losses of up to 70% (dependent on seasonal variations) in water storages of large surface area combined with shallow depth, such as many of the dams proposed under the NEIP. Concerns have also been expressed over the potential loss of habitat for State and Federal listed threatened species, such as the Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish, that may result from irrational planning decisions.

This inquiry has also raised a number of social issues. A lack of publicly available knowledge has forced many landholders to put their property plans on hold while they wait to be informed of the outcome from the NEIP process, and in particular dam site locations. Landowners are facing considerable uncertainty. This has resulted in an unwarranted level of confusion and concern among community members who have been forced to speculate on outcomes, rather than make decisions based in knowledge gained through meaningful consultation.

There is anger and frustration in nature and recreation based organizations and clubs at the absence of a process which would enable them to provide the NEIP proponents with their expert knowledge about the natural values of some of the proposed dam sites.

As well, several affected property holders, who in good faith have entered into supposedly binding Conservation Covenants with the government, now wait for the opportunity to provide relevant information to a process that seems unable to provide opportunities for input, let alone critical comments and analysis.

The legal implications revealed in this enquiry are quite compelling, particularly given the keenness with which the NEIP proposal is being pursued. Our research found that the management of the threatened species, the Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish, is covered by Commonwealth

legislation, the EPBC Act, which binds the State by ensuring protection of this species. Legal advice suggests that dam construction in areas providing habitat for listed threatened species, particularly those covered under a Recovery Plan, will not be allowed. The fact that a valuable tract of land supplying crucial habitat for the Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish is even being considered for dam development raises questions about the depth of inquiry that preceded the dam site selection. Indeed, as more threatened species issues continue to surface, it is a pity that existing available literature was not consulted prior to the expenditure of taxpayer funds to progress the dam project investigation to this stage. Furthermore, the engagement of local communities early in the process may have afforded the proponents the opportunity to gain detailed information as to the uniqueness of many of the sites proposed for inundation, saving costly and time-wasting investigations.

Leading scientists are highlighting the folly of continuing down the well-worn path, evident on mainland Australia, of an over-reliance on major in-stream dams and an over-allocation of limited water resources. Taxpayer dollars are being expended to buy back water rights from beleaguered farmers in an effort to secure vital town water supplies and ensure continued stream flows. As is evident, even within our own municipality, industries which do not have the capacity to rapidly respond to changing situations and markets are doomed to go the way of the dinosaur, often taking a lot of taxpayer dollars with them. From the vantage point of our present crossroads, it is imperative that our communities carefully examine how they got to this point and avoid technologies and so-called solutions that lack innovation. If we are to meet the challenges of our rapidly changing future we must avoid strategies that simply repeat history, an option, it appears, we can no longer afford.

In order to circumvent the problems so common in natural resource management decision-making here in Tasmania, new models of community consultation need to be explored based perhaps on those advocated by Gallopin et al 2001, Tattersall 2007, and Eastman and Walsh 2006. The failure of authorities and project proponents to acknowledge that citizens are equal partners in project proposals, design and management continues to lead to escalating conflict and a loss of trust in institutional processes here in Tasmania. In answer to this ongoing crisis, governments seek to modify legislation in order to prevent the ongoing involvement of citizens in critical dialogue (Johnston 2008). We assert that

the current culture of governance must undergo a reinvention if we are to have any hope of addressing the present crises of representation and community engagement.

A more detailed report will be released later in the year. In that report we intend to elaborate further on these and other matters in the context of the North East Irrigation Project.

References

Dakin, S. 2003, 'Challenging old models of knowledge and learning: new perspectives for participation in environmental management and planning', *Environments*, vol.31, no.1, pp.93-10.

Doran, N.E. 2000, 'Burrowing Crayfish Group Recovery Plan 2001-2005', Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment, Hobart.

Doran, N.E. & Richards, K. 1996, 'Management requirements for rare and threatened burrowing crayfish in Tasmania', Report to the Tasmanian RFA Environment and Heritage Technical Committee.

Eastman, K. and Walsh, T. 2006, 'Protecting the Tasmanian Giant Freshwater lobster – Saving the *Astacopsis gouldi* from the Recovery Plan process', *Upper Catchment Issues Tasmania*, vol.3, no.2.

Gaffney, R.F. and Horwitz, P. 1992, 'The Scottsdale Burrowing Crayfish Recovery Plan: Management Phase', Endangered Species Program, Project Number 240, Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service.

Gallopin, G., Funtowicz, S., O'Connor, M., and Ravetz, J. 2001, 'Science for the twenty-first century: from social contract to the scientific core', *International Journal Social Science*, 168:219-229, pp.1-16.

Harding, R. (ed.) 1998, 'Gathering and using data-beyond the scientific paradigm', in *Environmental Decision Making: the Roles of Scientists, Engineers and the Public*, The Federation Press, pp.82-107.

Horwitz, P. 1991, The conservation biology of *Engaeus spinicaudatus*, a threatened crayfish from north-eastern Tasmania, Report to the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service, Canberra.

Johnston, L. 2008, 'Planning system being abused: MLC', *The Examiner*, August 27, 2008, p. 13.

MacGregor, K 2008 (a), 'Dam dammed', *Tasmanian Country*, August 29, pp.1-2.

MacGregor, K 2008 (b), 'Dams of doom', *Tasmanian Country*, July 25, 2008, p.1.

Richards, K. 1997, 'The distribution of *Engaeus spinicaudatus* along Ruby Creek and China Creek, Scottsdale', Report to the Threatened Species Unit, Parks and Wildlife Service and the Forest Practices Unit, Hobart.

Tattersall, P.J. 2007, 'What is Community Based Auditing and how does it work?', *Upper catchment Issues*, vol. 4, no.2.

Bibliography

Alexander, J., Heffenden, S. and White, T. 1996, *Listening To The Land*, Australian Conservation Foundation, Australian Print Group.

Carson, L. 2001, 'Innovative consultation processes and the changing role of activism', *Third Sector Review*, Vol.7, No. 1, pp. 7-22.

Christoff, P. 2005, 'A wilderness in the making? Challenges for the Australian environment movement at the start of the 21st century', *Chain Reaction*, no. 94.

Dockray, M. 2003, 'Community based audit of forestry operations at Lebrina coupe RT241F and adjacent Bare Point area', *Upper Catchment Issues Tasmania*, vol. 1, no. 3.

Dockray, M., Wearne, S. and Strie, F. nd., 'A community based audit of forestry operations in the Mt Arthur upper catchment', *Upper Catchment Issues Tasmania*, vol. 1, no. 2.

DPIWE. 2003, 'Great Forester Catchment Water Management Plan', July 2003, Department of Primary Industries, Water and the Environment, Hobart, Tasmania 7000.

Eastman, K., and Nicklason, L. 2007, 'A community survey in Northeast Tasmania ; looking after our environment', *Upper Catchment Issues Tasmania*, vol.4, no.2.

Eastman, K. and Walsh, T. 2006, 'Protecting the Tasmanian Giant Freshwater lobster – Saving the *Astacopsis gouldi* from the Recovery Plan process', *Upper Catchment Issues Tasmania*, vol.3, no.2.

Fung, A. and Wright, E.O. 2003, *Deepening Democracy*, Verso, London.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. 1994, 'Competing paradigms in qualitative research', in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Sage, pp. 105-117.

- Gschwendtner, A., Eastman, K., Mills, D. & Tattersall, P.J. 2001, 'Catchment issues in the North Eastern Highlands of Tasmania – A community based case study', *Journal of The Community Based Risk Assessment Group of Tasmania*, Vol. 1, No. 1, ISSN 1444-9560.
- Harding, R. (ed.) 1998, 'Gathering and using data-beyond the scientific paradigm', in *Environmental Decision Making: the Roles of Scientists, Engineers and the Public*, The Federation Press, pp.82-107.
- Heron, J. And Reason, P. 1997, 'A participatory inquiry paradigm', *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 3, no. 3.
- Leaman, D. 2005, *Water – Facts, Issues and Problems*, Leaman Geophysics, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.
- Tattersall, P.J. 1991, 'Community Based Sampling – what is it?', *Organic Growing*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp.2-3.
- Tattersall, P.J. 2003 (a), 'Community based auditing: empowering the community to take charge – pathways to a just and sustainable society', in *Proceedings of the Community Research Network, 6th Annual Conference, powerful Collaborations: Building a Movement for Social Change, October 16-19, 2003*, ed. Rick Worthington, Sandstone Minnesota, USA, <www.loka.org/conf2003/2003_conference.htm>.
- Tattersall, P.J. 2003 (b), 'Towards a new science for resource planning and management', *Seasons, Tasmanian Journal of Organic Sustainable Agriculture*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp.13-21.
- Threatened Species Section. 2006, 'Giant Freshwater Lobster *Astacopsis gouldi* Recovery Plan', 2006-2010, Department of Primary Industries and Water, Hobart, Tasmania 7000.
- Water Management Act, 1999*, (Tasmania).
- Waterwatch 1995, Launceston Water watch, *Monitoring Handbook*, Department of Primary Industries and Fisheries, Tasmania.
- Weingart, P. 2002, 'The moment of truth for science', EMBO Reports, <www.nature.com/embor/journal/v3/n8/full/embor093.html>.
- White, S. 1993, 'Science and the environmental movement', *Chain Reaction*, no. 68, Friends of the Earth.
- Williams, M.D. 1961, *Out Of The Mist, Book iv*, O.B.M. Pty, Ltd, Hobart.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Jessica Feehely of the Tasmanian Environmental Defenders Office for her assistance with legal matters relating to this inquiry.

The enquiry team also acknowledges the information contained in e-mail communications from Mr. John Williams, Chairman of Dorset EDG.

Announcing a new community group

The group is facilitated by Dorset Waterwatch with the aim of bringing other groups and individuals together to share their ideas and innovations for a community lead future.



P.O. Box 360 Scottsdale, Tasmania, Australia 7260

CFN gratefully acknowledges the work of Lisa Eastman
who designed the logo

Referencing style used in the Journal

Why Reference? There are two main purposes for referencing during the course of your article. First, references point to the sources you have used to find information. Your references are in effect your supporting evidence. Your reader should be able to verify your evidence or follow up any aspects of special interest. Secondly, a reference list enables you and your readers to position your work within the wider literature relating to your subject and topic. The golden rule is *“if you have used someone else’s ideas then you MUST cite them”*.

Is a reference list the same as a bibliography? Strictly speaking, no. A reference list includes all the sources you have cited in the text of your article, whereas a bibliography is a list of the works you consulted, but did not cite. Examples could include general texts relating to your topic that were consulted for background information. For instance, encyclopedias are examples of such sources. Your article can therefore contain both a reference list and a bibliographic list.

What system does the Journal use? We use the system known as Harvard or the author-date system. The Journal does allow some variations within the system as long as the style used in your article is consistent.

What does a reference list look like? Consulting the latest edition of the Journal is recommended. The table below shows the preferred style and layout of the main reference categories (journals, books and the Internet). Note the use of full stops and commas. There are many more categories, but these are the main ones. In any case, the editors are always on hand to support you, so referencing should not be seen as an onerous task.

Table 1 Example citations

Entry into reference list	How cited in the text	Comments
<i>Ascherio, A., Chen, H., Weisskopf, M.G., O’Reilly, E., McCullough, M.L., Calle, E.E., Schwarzschild, M.A. and Thun, M. J. 2006, ‘Pesticide exposure and risk for Parkinson’s Disease’, Annals of Neurology, vol. 60, no.2, pp. 197-203.</i>	Ascherio et al 2006	A journal paper with more than one author. Note the title of the paper is in ‘...’ quotes, and journal name is <i>italicized</i> . Include page numbers in list.
Carson, L. 2001, ‘Innovative consultation processes and the changing role of activism’, <i>Third Sector Review</i> , vol.7, no.1, pp. 7-22.	Carson 2001	A journal paper with one author. Include page numbers in list.
<i>Pollak, J. 1993, The Toxicity of Chemical Mixtures, The Centre for Human Aspects of Science and Technology and The Public Interest Advocacy Centre, Sydney, Australia, pp. 5-40.</i>	Pollak 1993	A book, one author. Note the title is italicized, followed by publisher details and country of publication. Include page numbers in list.
Tattersall, P.J. 2003 (a) ‘Community based auditing: empowering the community to take charge – pathways to a just and sustainable society’, in <i>Proceedings of the Community Research Network, 6th Annual Conference, powerful Collaborations: Building a Movement for Social Change, October 16-19, 2003</i> , ed. Rick Worthington, Sandstone Minnesota, USA, < www.loka.org/conf2003/2003_conference.htm >.	Tattersall 2003a	Author cited more than once for the same year. Note the location of the citation is a www. Include page numbers in list.

Bibliography

Day, R.A. 1989, *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper*, 3rd edition, Cambridge University Press, New York, U.S.A.

The University of Sydney – Orange 2000, *Guide to Referencing*, 6th edition, Faculty of Rural Management, The University of Sydney.

Tasmanian Community Resource Auditors Inc.

Our job is about facilitating positive change in others, and at the same time improving our own effectiveness and professional competence as change agents. One of the major challenges facing our organization relates to finding better ways to help community members become more effective inquirers and ultimately competent facilitators of change. The collective experience of our team amounts to over 80 years of practice in self-development and community change. Careful analysis of our individual approaches has led us to believe that *personal change* sits at the very core of any effort to create a more just and sustainable world.

Why is community change important? Tasmanian Community Resource Auditors (TCRA) was formed in response to ongoing calls from the community for a greater role in decisions made on its behalf. While community groups around Tasmania displayed passion and an enthusiasm for change, our numerous interventions have shown us that many groups, despite all the best intentions, are simply not equipped to deal with the complex issues they face. Be they issues relating to water quality, forestry operation, organic food production, community health or crime we see time and time again community groups struggle in their attempts to facilitate meaningful change. In some cases, this can lead to “burn out” and a sense of frustration and disenchantment on the part of community members. At TCRA, we have established a number of innovative strategies to help community groups overcome these hurdles. The process begins by recognizing the strengths, and weaknesses, in the critical thinking abilities we all use. We work with the group members to define and express their concerns, we then delve deeper to explore root causes. We encourage the development of clear, concise arguments that lead the participants to compare problem situations with desirable or improved situations. The issues generated then become the foci of the change processes.

Over the past four years, we have successfully used an approach known as “co-operative inquiry” to help several community groups on their journey of change. The approach, strongly supported by credible research and a wealth of successful community change stories, is simply a disciplined method of sharing ideas and ways to undertake change. One important power of the inquiry process is that it enables participants to explore their approaches to making sense and problem solving. Each of us has a “learning style”, or way of dealing with problem situations. Knowledge of one’s individual learning style can be an important starting point for further personal change. TCRA is about helping others take that step.

Bibliography

- Bawden, R. 1995, ‘Systematic development: A learning approach to change’, Centre for Systemic Development, University of Western Sydney, Hawkesbury.
- Carson, L. 2001, ‘Innovative consultation processes and the changing role of activism’, *Third Sector Review*, Vol.7, No. 1, pp. 7-22.
- Dakin, S. 2003, ‘Challenging old models of knowledge and learning: new perspectives for participation in environmental management and planning’, *Environments*, Vol 31(1), pp. 93-107.
- Gschwendtner, A., Eastman, K., Mills, D. & Tattersall, P.J. 2001, ‘Catchment issues in the North Eastern Highlands of Tasmania – A community based case study’, *Journal of The Community Based Risk Assessment Group of Tasmania*, Vol. 1, No. 1, ISSN 1444-9560.
- Harding, R. (ed) 1998, ‘Gathering and using data-beyond the scientific paradigm’, in *Environmental Decision making: the Roles of Scientists, Engineers and the Public*, The Federation Press, pp.82-107.
- Reason, P. 1994, 'Three Approaches to Participative Inquiry', in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, eds. Denzin and Lincoln, Sage Publications, pp.324-329.