As recently reported in the *Mercury* (8th March 2006), Tasmania and the Bass Strait Islands have been identified as one of twenty international hotspots for future extinctions. This claim is made by the authors of a study published in the prestigious *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* in the USA (www.pnas.org/cgi/content/abstract/103/11/4157) and is based on a study which identified parts of the world where there was a high “latent extinction risk” for non-marine mammals. Latent risk is a measure of the potential for a species to decline rapidly towards extinction.

Tasmania and the Bass Strait Islands have been identified as one of twenty international hotspots for future extinctions.

Biodiversity Conservation Must Be Core Objective For Protected Areas

The TNPA Committee would like to thank the following people who have recently volunteered their time to assist the TNPA. We are very grateful, as without this help the TNPA would not be able to undertake the range of activities it does.
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To identify, protect, conserve, present, and where appropriate, rehabilitate the area and to transmit that heritage to future generations in as good or better condition than at present.
establishing protected areas. In total, the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service currently manages 441 reserves covering 2,477,314 hectares, or about 36.38% of the area of the state. This includes 19 national parks, covering around 21% of the state, 178 Conservation Areas (8%) and a further 60 state reserves, 70 nature reserves, 12 game reserves, 23 nature recreation areas, 21 regional reserves and 29 historic sites collectively covering around 7% of the state.

Such areas are fundamental for the protection of biodiversity in Tasmania. On the negative side, however, is the fact that many other ecological communities presently remain under-represented within the present system of protected areas (notably old-growth eucalypt forests and freshwater and marine ecosystems), and that many protected areas are poorly resourced so that they do not achieve the conservation goals for which they were established.

A recent example of this neglect was the front-page articles in the *Sunday Tasmanian* newspaper late last year concerning the damage being inflicted by recreational vehicles in the Southport Lagoon Conservation Area. Most notable were dramatic photographs showing the rapidly escalating damage to the natural values of the area over the last few years, damage which cannot be rectified easily, if at all, and which not only destroys the landscape value of the area but also threatens critically endangered species. Indeed, this area is supposed to provide protection to five species listed as critically endangered nationally and another two which are endangered in Tasmania. It is also the only known site for the Swamp Eyebright (*Euphrasia gibbsiae ssp. psilanthera*) which occurs adjacent to a vehicle track in the conservation area and is presently threatened with extinction due to the continued use of this track. Whilst the TNPA commends the state government for releasing the new management plan for this area, it is important that all off-road activities in the area cease and that damaged areas are rehabilitated. After all, isn’t this what is meant by a “protected area”?

Unfortunately, it is not only in the Southport Lagoon Conservation Area that errant four-wheel drivers are trashing the values of protected areas and destroying the experience of others who would like to use these areas for their proper purposes. Furthermore, many protected areas are also facing significant threats and challenges from inadequate resourcing and inappropriate developments within and outside their boundaries.

The recent defacement of Aboriginal carvings at Arthur River and vandalism at the Coal Mines campground on the Tasman Peninsula also highlight this problem and the need for an effective policing and enforcement regime. Currently the resources and the people on the ground are clearly inadequate. More on-ground staff are required – although that is only part of the answer – better regulations and more work building community appreciation of the parks’ values will also make a difference. The commencement of works associated with a resort-style accommodation facility within the Southwest National Park near Cockle Creek and consideration of a similar tourist facility at Pump House Point within the Cradle Mountain-Lake St Clair National Park are also two instances of the threats posed by developments within our parks.

With the ascendancy of neo-conservative political and economic-rationalist views over the past decades, it appears that as governments retreat from core funding there are pressures for protected areas to generate income from nature-based tourism and accommodate revenue-earning industries through multiple-use approaches. This anthropocentric trend, which increasingly sees protected areas as human resources and is central to the demands of the growing ‘access’ lobby who overtly oppose strict protection, leads away from the idea of protected areas as refuges for the natural world.

The threats posed by this change were clearly highlighted by the *State of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area* report which was released in October 2004. Whilst the current management prescriptions in the current WHA Management Plan were found to be technically sound, the report
identified a lack of political commitment to adhere to these prescriptions as one of the key factors limiting or threatening management performance (p. 194). The amendment to the 1999 TWWHA Management Plan to allow the proposed development at Cockle Creek East is a case in point. The report also noted that “there were insufficient funds to allow for full implementation of the statutory 1992 management plan during its term, and the uncertainty surrounding future funding levels raised concerns regarding the continuity of many management programs for the TWWHA” (p. 228).

In light of these ongoing risks and threats, there is a need for a reassertion of nature conservation as the primary objective of core protected areas. Without this principle, protected areas are likely to be severely compromised by modern human demands and commercial motives. As stated in the 1999 discussion paper Australia’s National Parks and Protected Areas: Future Directions, “the fundamental direction for protected area policy must be building the conservation of biodiversity from the strictly protected core out to the vast lands outside protected areas, rather than the incremental compromise of the key lands where nature finds refuge.”

The steady decline of natural biodiversity is one of the most fundamental of all global crises, with the current global rate of extinction of plant and animal species having no historical precedent. Australia (including Tasmania) is one of the great centres of biodiversity on earth and its protected areas are the core of the national effort to protect this biodiversity. Despite the present challenges facing those involved in the establishment and management of protected areas in the 21st century, one principle must remain fundamental: protected areas should be managed first and foremost for biodiversity conservation. This is underlined by the definition of a protected area adopted by the IUCN – the World Conservation Union, as “an area of land and/or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means.”

Protected areas represent a unique and irreplaceable asset and form a magnificent legacy to pass from one generation to the next, ensuring that our descendants have access to nature and the material and spiritual wealth which this represents. Whilst protected areas are at the front line in the protection of biodiversity, if managed effectively they also guarantee supplies of clean water, stimulate economic development through nature-based tourism, and provide immeasurable spiritual value and well being for people in a world increasingly caught up in the pursuit of material gain.

Tasmania has a world class system of national parks and protected areas and it deserves world class care. Let us ensure that it remains that way by striving to achieve world’s best practice in its management and through the adequate resourcing of the Parks and Wildlife Service.

Robert Campbell (President – TNPA)
The Grand Canyon of the Tuolumne River which leads into Hetch Hetchy Valley in America’s Yosemite National Park World Heritage Area is longer and deeper than the much celebrated Yosemite Valley itself. This spectacular “twin” to Yosemite Valley stirred the soul of all who saw it, and its protection was integral to the campaign to establish Yosemite National Park (YNP). However, as early as the late 1880s San Francisco city officials were discussing damming the Tuolumne, having recognised the potential to impound snow-melt waters by constructing a dam between the granite walls on either side of Hetch Hetchy Valley, to produce a reservoir about 13 km long. The proposal was vigorously resisted, notably by the first president of the Sierra Club, John Muir. But in 1906 fires associated with the San Francisco earthquake highlighted the inadequacy of the city’s water supply and provided proponents of the dam with an opportunity to pounce. The American Congress approved construction in 1913 and the O’Shaughnessy Dam was completed a decade later. But although Hetch Hetchy has lain beneath the dam waters ever since, the issue has not gone away, with calls for its restoration mirroring similar calls for restoration of our own Lake Pedder. The Hetch Hetchy campaign has recently come closer to the eventual success it richly deserves.

New Hope for Hetch Hetchy

The Hetch Hetchy campaign is a story of dogged persistence by people who recognise that Hetch Hetchy is no less important today than in was in John Muir’s day, and the organisation that now drives the campaign is called simply Restore Hetch Hetchy. There have been many notable advocates for restoration over the years, among them David Brower, the energy behind the spectacular Sierra Club photographic book series, who was a member of the Board of Restore Hetch Hetchy – and was equally strongly supportive of restoring Lake Pedder when he visited Tasmania in the 1970s.

In 1987 an environmentalist painted a giant crack across the O’Shaughnessy Dam, symbolic of ongoing calls for its removal. That it is far from being a hopeless cause was emphasised in 1988 when the Secretary for the Interior in the Republican Ronald Reagan administration, Donald Hodel, endorsed a study by the US Bureau of Reclamation that advocated removal of the dam. On that occasion Democrat San Francisco mayor Dianne Feinstein responded by spearheading a successful pro-dam campaign that terminated the initiative. But since that time there have been further studies by University of California Davis and also Environmental Defense advocating removal of the dam, and the campaign has rumbled on. Just last year (2005) the editor of a Sacramento newspaper received a Pulitzer Prize for a series of articles on the restoration of Hetch Hetchy.

A Californian state government investigation is now considering the restoration of Hetch Hetchy. In November 2004 the
Republican administration of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, with bipartisan support, directed its agencies to undertake a comprehensive cost-benefit study into restoring Hetch Hetchy. This followed a request to Governor Schwarzenegger from two Democrat members of the state legislature. The study was to include a review of new evidence since the Reagan administration initiative, including the UC Davis and Environmental Defense reports, and other relevant matters. Its investigations are still in progress.

**Why restore Hetch Hetchy?**

For those who have seen Hetch Hetchy, its magnificence alone explains the importance of restoring it, but there are also many other reasons why this step must be taken. The O’Shaughnessy Dam was already in place by the time YNP became a World Heritage Area. But the document nominating YNP for World Heritage listing recognised that “construction of two dams in the park and development of facilities have also acted to modify the park ecosystems” (State of Conservation section, paragraph 4). One of those dams was O’Shaughnessy, the other the Cascades dam on the Merced River - which has since been removed! Hence, the US government has itself identified the Hetch Hetchy dam as a WHA management problem.

And then there are the dubious benefits to retaining an ageing dam and infrastructure in such an earthquake-prone part of the world. If a significant earthquake should occur, then depending upon which fault moves (San Andreas or Hayward) interruptions to the water supply could cost tens of millions of dollars, and those interruptions might cost many millions more if they result in there being insufficient water again to fight any fires in San Francisco triggered by earthquake damage. An upgrade variously estimated to cost US$3-4 billion has been mooted, but there are other alternatives available.

In September 2005 the Restore Hetch Hetchy campaign released a major new feasibility study. It showed that 95% of the water and 73% of the hydro-electric energy that would be foregone when the dam is removed could be retained by directing the Tuolumne River and one of its tributaries into existing pipelines and the remainder compensated for by raising the San Pedro dam on the Merced River - which has since been removed! Hence, the US government has itself identified the Hetch Hetchy dam as a WHA management problem.

Potential environmental benefits of removing the dam are not restricted to Hetch Hetchy Valley itself. For example, a restored Hetch Hetchy might provide an opportunity to divert and better manage some of the horrendous visitor pressure that presently exists in Yosemite Valley. Admittedly there is food for thought in the words of the late climber and photographer Galen Rowell, who once contrasted his view of the silent reservoir against the maelstrom of noise and development he would have witnessed instead had he been gazing down into the National Park from Yosemite’s legendary El Capitan rock face, rather than from its striking Hetch Hetchy counterpart, Wapama Rock. But Hetch Hetchy has one obvious if curious advantage over Yosemite Valley: the lessons all park managers should learn from what has happened to Yosemite could be applied to Hetch Hetchy before all the roads, hotels, campgrounds, supermarkets, tourist stores and other sprawl that infests Yosemite are allowed to become a reality in its presently silent twin. Things could actually be planned in advance with that experience in mind. Safeguarding the environment rather than grabbing the quickest and shoddiest path to private profit could be the foundation of that planning.

**An issue that deserves support**

One totally unacceptable aspect of the Hetch Hetchy debate in America is that it tends to be regarded as no more than a local issue when in reality it involves a major intrusion into a World Heritage Area. It is not good enough that the nation which took the initiative in promoting establishment of the World Heritage system, a mechanism that imposes restrictions upon how other nations should manage listed parts of their own sovereign lands, should then itself fail to live up to its own responsibility to manage one of the crown jewels of the World Heritage system. Hetch Hetchy is an issue of international significance, and the world is watching. Perhaps we all need to watch much more loudly.

These days Hetch Hetchy tends to be over-shadowed by the hype about its twin valley further south, few venture there, and its recent identification as a potential terrorist risk has hardly increased the incentive. When I arrived at the very quiet Hetch Hetchy gate to YNP I was taken aback to be asked by the ranger as to whether I knew where in YNP I actually was, as if no foreigner would have any interest in going there and I must simply be lost. I answered that I certainly did know exactly where I was and that I had travelled from the other side of the planet specifically to be there. That someone should do such a thing aroused not a flicker of interest - I was simply handed some pro-dam propaganda which sought to promote this environmental travesty as an “engineering marvel”. While my security permit was organised I was informed the introduction of a high speed ferry service, plans are to establish guided walks and interpretative tours for day visitors, restore several historic buildings to provide accommodation and open a small café. The TNPA has since met with Ian Johnstone to discuss his plans to ensure that Maria Island remains a place conserved for its natural and historic heritage. The TNPA feels that it is important that visitors have an opportunity to discover Maria Island’s outstanding natural and historical heritage in a low-cost family oriented experience. The TNPA supports plans for the island’s world heritage status to be assessed.
how long I might spend in gaol if I breached it by getting back late. In the event I did make it out on time, but once I was safely leaving I couldn’t resist innocently asking just why the National Park Service (NPS) saw fit to hand out material that promoted the dam instead of acting as advocates for protection of the area’s World Heritage values. I got the impression from the look on their faces that suddenly they would have preferred I had arrived back late.

But it is not just the American government and its agencies that are down-playing this important issue. It is equally inappropriate that this World Heritage issue gets so little traction in international conservation circles, compounding the local notion that it is just a San Francisco matter, when nothing could be further from the truth. There are many parallels between the Hetch Hetchy story and our own Lake Pedder tragedy and perhaps this situation is one of them. The mainstream conservation movement seemed to regard the Lake Pedder issue as being too radical or hopeless in the early 1970s, and this supposed “lost cause” was largely left to the Lake Pedder Action Committee (LPAC) - until the mainstream was shocked by the 1973 federal government inquiry (to which the Australian Conservation Foundation deigned to provide only a one-page letter of in-principle support!) finding in favour of halting the Pedder dam. This laid the foundation for a subsequent Commonwealth Government offer to fund an alternative scheme that would save the original lake - albeit an initiative that ultimately foundered on the rocks of political pride. When I dropped in to the San Francisco headquarters of John Muir’s old Sierra Club in 2005 in a bid to catch up on the latest on Hetch Hetchy I was astounded to be told that there was really no-one there to talk to about it, and I left with the impression that the issue is largely being left to the Restore Hetch Hetchy organisation, much as Lake Pedder was left to the LPAC. My subsequent enquiry of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) regarding its response to the Schwarzenegger government’s current inquiry, led to no more than a decision from on high in WCPA that it should not get involved.

I remain as aghast at this situation as I was in the 1970s when there was a similar lack of enthusiasm for the crown jewel of the Tasmanian wilderness. Admittedly environmental organisations are now chronically over-worked, but I suspect there is also a strong element of defeatism that drives this reluctance to become involved in issues such as the restoration of a Hetch Hetchy or a Lake Pedder. Such defeatism seems hardly warranted. Such important initiatives as the intervention by the federal Secretary of the Interior in 1988 and now the Schwarzenegger administration’s inquiry highlight this, as does the 1995 Australian Parliamentary Inquiry report that concluded restoration of Lake Pedder was technically possible.

Earlier I made deliberate reference to the political affiliation of some of the players in the Hetch Hetchy saga, not to politicise the situation but to emphasise how hazardous it can be to pigeon-hole politicians and just where potential support may come from, and from just how high an office it may emanate. The role played by the Republican administration of Ronald Reagan in promoting the restoration of Hetch Hetchy, and more recently of the Arnold Schwarzenegger administration in establishing a state-level study, run counter to some possible expectations as to who is likely to stand where on environmental issues, let alone who may take seriously an issue that more conservative environmentalists may consider a hopeless lost cause. Again there are some interesting local examples, such as the fact that it was a Liberal state government that first gave Tasmania a National Parks and Wildlife Service, even if it did take a Labor Commonwealth Government to try to stop the flooding of Pedder and succeed in saving the Franklin River. Environmental awareness and concern can span all political persuasions and it can be unwise to push politicians into a corner on any issue just because of the colour of their badge. And it can be particularly unwise to shy away from an important issue simply for fear of being labelled as an “extremist”.

How feasible is it to restore Hetch Hetchy? The grandeur of the landscape that led to people like John Muir promoting establishment of Yosemite NP is created mostly by steep time-worn walls of solid granite that are relatively immune to the lapping waters of a 13 km-long reservoir. Draw-down of the reservoir in 1977 revealed that the upper 6.4 km of the river was still contained in its original alluvial channel. A minor bath-tub ring where rock-encrusting lichen has been killed represents no real impediment to recovery of the sensational Hetch Hetchy landscape. A study by the US NPS has indicated good prospects for relatively rapid recovery of the valley biology. Again this bears comparison with our local Lake Pedder situation. The 1995 inquiry into the restoration of Lake Pedder accepted the scientific evidence that restoration of the original Lake Pedder is technically feasible. That finding is immensely valuable because it should focus the future decision on whether restoration should occur rather than wasting time on the red herring of whether or not it is possible to get Lake Pedder back.

Technical feasibility and political feasibility are two different things of course. The Pedder Inquiry outcome was perhaps optimal,
because the time was probably not ripe for public acceptance of a recommendation to actually drain ‘Fake’ Pedder. Perhaps the Hetch Hetchy investigation will result in a similar outcome. Or perhaps not – who would have foreseen circumstances that would allow the Pedder restoration inquiry to even get off the ground in 1995, or that there would currently be such a serious high-level investigation under way into restoring Hetch Hetchy? Who can foresee what might happen next? The Cascade Dam on the Merced River has already been removed since attention was drawn to the problems caused by both it and the Hetch Hetchy dam in the World Heritage nomination for Yosemite NP. Removal of the Elwha Dam from Olympic National Park is due to be completed in 2008, and this may strengthen the precedent for removal of dams from other WHAs. Worldwide, there is an increasing trend to remove dams. And while IUCN appears to have turned a blind eye to Hetch Hetchy, it is worth remembering that its 1994 General Assembly in Buenos Aires carried a resolution calling for restoration of our own Lake Pedder. Neither Hetch Hetchy nor Lake Pedder are any less important now than they have always been.

In February 2006 the TNPA lodged a submission to the Senate Inquiry into Australia’s national parks, conservation reserves and marine protected areas. Included in its submission were the following points:

1. The primary objective of the reserve system should be conservation of biodiversity and natural and cultural heritage.
2. Governments should be the primary bodies responsible for the creation and ongoing management of the reserve system.
3. It is clear in Tasmania that the government is not providing sufficient resources to meet the objectives and management requirements of its reserves.
4. Tourism, through creeping development and the attrition of natural and wilderness values, is a major threat to the integrity of Australia’s reserves and the achievement of sustainable conservation and protection of their associated values.
5. The record of governments regarding marine protected areas, particularly in Tasmania, is inadequate.

A full version of the TNPA submission can be found on its website at www.tnpa.asn.au

**Sphinx Rock**

In 2005 the Hobart City Council announced that it was to proceed with the installation of a boardwalk/viewing platform on Sphinx Rock. Following a review of comments received and the outcomes of an on-site meeting (to which the TNPA was invited and attended) the council has resolved the following:

1. In conjunction with the Wellington Park Management Trust a whole-of-park risk management strategy be prepared which will guide future consideration of risk management issues at Sphinx Rock;
2. A social values assessment and conservation plan be prepared for the site;
3. As an interim measure to manage public safety a child-proof gate be installed at the site as well as appropriate signage detailing the longer-term approach to management of safety at Sphinx Rock.

**Senate Inquiry**

In February 2006 the TNPA lodged a submission to the Senate Inquiry into Australia’s national parks, conservation reserves and marine protected areas. Included in its submission were the following points:

1. The primary objective of the reserve system should be conservation of biodiversity and natural and cultural heritage.
2. Governments should be the primary bodies responsible for the creation and ongoing management of the reserve system.
3. It is clear in Tasmania that the government is not providing sufficient resources to meet the objectives and management requirements of its reserves.
4. Tourism, through creeping development and the attrition of natural and wilderness values, is a major threat to the integrity of Australia’s reserves and the achievement of sustainable conservation and protection of their associated values.
5. The record of governments regarding marine protected areas, particularly in Tasmania, is inadequate.

A full version of the TNPA submission can be found on its website at www.tnpa.asn.au
ALCHERINGA – (sacred place) in the north-east highlands

By Helen Gee

Returning from a six day walk through the north-east highlands in late January, I felt both up-lifted and shocked. A total of 35 people joined Lesley Nicklason, of the Friends of Blue Tier group, to walk sections of the Alcheringa trail, capitalising on the unique opportunity for light-weight bushwalking. I am blown away by the diversity of the experiences to be had within this proposed 13,000 ha national park. You just have to see these forests and moorlands to believe their diversity and splendour as well as their fragility in the 21st century.

Commencing at the Mt Victoria carpark, our group climbed through forest to alpine fields of red-flowering Mountain Rocket (Bellendena montana) and white blossoming tea-tree (Leptospermum rupestre) then up through the boulder field. From the spectacular jagged peaks we gained views of all the mountains of north-eastern Tasmania. That night we camped off the mountain to the north-east where road access allowed for our trailer-load of provisions to reach us, and for walkers to join or leave as required. Absolute luxury! The second day saw our growing party approaching the Rattler Range, via the escarpment above Cash’s Gorge, to traverse the bewitching moss and lichen-encrusted forests which become progressively wetter “cloud forests”, at their best in a light mist. Reaching the site of the 1880s “Star of Peace” tin mines at the head of Cascade River, we enjoyed the luxury of a home-prepared meal, including fresh scones, jam and cream.

Day three saw us cross Rattler Hill with its sensational 360 degree views and acres of Trigger Plants (Stylium graminifolium), a blaze of pink and lilac flowers, and there was time for a swim (with platypus) in Maa Mon Chin Dam, shaded by forest. We camped by the Weld River on Emu Road, slept under the stars, then wended our way up the easy grade along the old prospecting track to Poimena on the Blue Tier. The highlights here were the crossing and re-crossing of the delightfully refreshing Frome river and historic Wynnford Weir. This was our introduction to the Blue Tier’s magical rivulets that gurgle between mossy rocks beneath a lacework of tree-fern offering frequent glimpses of the tin mining infrastructure of an earlier era (1880s – 1920s).

Poimena is central to a number of fantastic walks through the regenerating forest and our route took us out to Australia Hill and down past the Liberator and Don mine sites to Crystal Creek, where we regrouped for a walk down the upper Groom River valley. We descended from Crystal Hill and followed the (unmarked) trail downstream through magnificent tree ferns and occasional giant eucalypts which ten of us could usually, but not always, surround with hands held! Unbelievably, there are logging plans imminent for these slopes beneath Lehnrs Ridge. At Halls Falls, still on the Groom River, we swam and reflected on the tremendous local community spirit that has enabled easy access to a gem of a place. The thought that this intact catchment could be at risk is sickening. The headwaters of the George are already in plantation which is aerially sprayed with a combination of herbicides, fungicides, pesticides, wetting agents, growth promotants...
The Groom is one of only two intact tributaries of the George River and provides habitat for many native animals including eagles, quolls, devils, wallabies, possums, goshawks, the northeast forest snail and Simpsons stag beetle. The area is recognised as a glacial refuge (having survived the last ice age) and is home to plants and critters that haven’t changed in millions of years. At night you listen to mopokes calling and answering far across the valley. This is their domain.

Thousands of people have enjoyed these walks over the past few years, marvelling at the groves of sassafras, giant tree ferns, rare plants, spectacular views, old mining relics, waterfalls, the Blue Tier Giant and the unique Cradle Tree.

The Blue Tier “see it – save it” brochure was launched in 2003 and 10,000 copies were distributed – businesses from all over are still asking for more copies – but Friends of the Blue Tier, the prime group which has lobbied for the reservation of the area, has been instructed by Forestry Tasmania to desist for reasons of public liability.

OUTDOOR magazine ran a cover story on Alcheringa which generated great interest; it featured in the Sunday Examiner on 5th and 12th December 2004. The area is a bushwalking destination with potential for everything from a 15 minute wheelchair/pram access walk to the 6 - 8 day full-blown Alcheringa Walk. If you expect a marked track, be warned. Sections of the route require navigational ability, and the notes provided by the Friends of the Blue Tier will be most helpful. However there are easy daywalks on tracked sections.

Logging of the upper reaches of the Groom is unthinkable, as is the logging of the area between Weldborough and Poimena, or the roading of the Rattler Range. However encroachment is ongoing, reducing the potential size and integrity of a future national park in the area. Rapidly advancing plantations are viewed from key vantage points. The Friends of the Blue Tier have campaigned for years for reservation of a corridor. A proposed NE Highlands reserve extension (including Blue Tier, Mt Victoria, Dans Rivulet, Avenue River and Mt Maurice), was one of the combined conservation movement’s federal election asks in 2004. However, PM Howard, on 13 May 2005, made absolutely laughably small additions to the reserve system near Blue Tier (767ha, including the Waratah Creek addition). They consist of steep slopes that are highly visible from the highway near Weldborough Pass. The Break O’Day Council, while initially keen on the tourism potential that a reserve would create, has been bullied into silence by the state government. Forestry Tasmania has investigated the potential of a walking trail and come up with a less than complimentary report – it is dismissive of the scenic values and project’s high costs.

It is in all our interests to reserve a lasting reminder of the magnificence of the north-eastern highlands.
Marine Protected Areas

In February 2006 the TNPA wrote to the then Federal Minister for Fisheries, Forests and Conservation, Senator Ian MacDonald, welcoming the recent announcement by the Australian Government of plans to create a series of marine parks adjacent to Tasmania’s coastal waters. The TNPA particularly supports the Bass Basin proposal, adjacent to both the Wilsons Promontory Marine National Park and Tasmania’s own Kent Group National Park. This would be an excellent addition to the marine and terrestrial protected area system connecting not only marine protected areas but also the national parks in two states in one continuous reserved area of sea and land. In addition the TNPA argued that funds and an ongoing support program need to be committed to park management along with a strategy for enforcement, compliance and education of the community. As we well know with our Tasmanian marine and land protected areas, simply drawing lines on a map and saying an area is protected does not in itself guarantee protection. It requires government and community commitment and resources. These are integral to achieving protection.

The importance of caretakers - Maatsuyker Island

The TNPA encourages an ongoing commitment from the state government regarding the continual presence of caretakers on Maatsuyker Island in South West Tasmania.

During January the caretakers were evacuated from the island due to illness, and Maatsuyker remained unstaffed for a couple of weeks.

The situation was extremely unfortunate, however it highlighted the importance of the caretaker program to the community and to land managers.

Caretakers record weather observations for the Bureau of Meteorology. When this information is not available many fishers, aviators, bushwalkers and surfers are inconvenienced. Commercial interests and/or safety may also be affected.

Additionally, Maatsuyker caretakers may be central to emergency evacuations considering the reliable communications on the island.

Staffing Maatsuyker is critical to protecting heritage, as an unoccupied island invites souveniring and vandalism. On a daily basis, maintenance duties ensure the condition of station infrastructure. Caretakers also assist the Biodiversity Conservation Branch in monitoring fur seal numbers and unusual wildlife sightings.

The state government must ensure an ongoing commitment to the Maatsuyker Island caretaker program through adequately resourcing the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service for this purpose.
In September 2005 the TNPA lodged a submission in relation to the Draft Management Plan released for public comment. In its submission, the TNPA highlighted the following issues:

1. The TNPA commended the state government for the release of the plan as it was a positive step towards the government recognising the need for a strategic approach to managing these important areas.

2. All 4WD tracks in the area be closed and rehabilitated. The TNPA argued that existing 4WD/off-road activities have severely degraded the area, and will continue to cause severe erosion and habitat decline. The conservation values of the reserves remain at risk as long as off-road recreational vehicle activity is allowed to continue. The TNPA also argued that an alternative area where recreational vehicles could go would increase the likelihood of success of the closure of all tracks in the reserves to such activity, and in this regard the TNPA encouraged the government to implement the state-wide recreational vehicle policy.

3. The licence for the private logging road across the southern part of the Southport Lagoon Conservation Area should be revoked and the road rehabilitated. This road is a direct threat to the conservation values of the Southport Lagoon Conservation Area and, in particular, to the species Euphrasia gibbsiae ssp. psilantherea (Swamp Eyebright) which is listed as critically endangered nationally.

4. The proposed new road for access to the western end of Southport Lagoon should allow all-weather all-vehicle access. No off-road vehicle access should be permitted.

5. The Southport Lagoon Conservation Area should be immediately listed in Environment Australia’s Directory of Important Wetlands in Australia and Southport Lagoon itself listed under the RAMSAR Convention.

6. The TNPA supports the continued closure of George III Monument Site for the management of heritage values, and for the protection of the endangered species Epacris stuartii.

7. Any leasehold agreement for the Ida Bay State Reserve must consider the natural and heritage conservation values of the area. The draft Plan allows for commercial development in the reserve. However, the TNPA remains strongly opposed to the development of large-scale tourist or visitor facilities within reserves, and encourages commercial developments to be located outside reserved land. As such, any development at the Deephole Visitor Service Zone should be limited to small-scale facilities appropriate for day-use of the area and interpretative features.

Finally, the TNPA believes that the Southport Lagoon Conservation Area can be classified as one of Australia’s premier wetlands set in one of the most picturesque view fields in the world. More importantly, along with the greater Recherche Bay area, it is one of Australia’s most significant cultural historic landscapes centred on the Lyluequnny people and the 1792-93 French scientific expedition of Bruni d’Entrecasteaux. Several facts highlight the importance of these historic events:

- The ethnographic records made by the French during their encounters with the Tasmanian Aborigines represent the most important observations of tribal Aboriginal life prior to British settlement in 1803.
- The region is the type locality of a significant part of Tasmania’s flora including the state flora emblem Eucalyptus globulus.
- A world-first scientific discovery made at Recherche Bay showed that the earth’s magnetic field changed with latitude. In 1992 earth scientists from around the world made a pilgrimage to the site and laid a plaque commemorating this discovery.

Given the importance of both the natural and cultural assets of the region, the TNPA believes that the three reserves should be combined into a single reserve and the status of this single reserve be upgraded to national park status, and perhaps be included as part of the existing South West National Park. Consideration should also be given to the development of an appropriate visitor interpretation facility (perhaps within a nearby town) and the inclusion of this new park within the adjacent World Heritage Area.
Rabbits and rats are a severe threat to World Heritage values on Macquarie Island, as research reveals widespread damage to terrestrial ecosystems. This includes destruction of vegetation (habitat for threatened albatross species and other seabirds), and catastrophic erosion.

First introduced in approximately 1880, rabbits provided dietary diversity for sealing gangs. But of course they ‘bred like rabbits’, and the effect on the tussock grassland ecosystem today is extreme.

Dr Jenny Scott from the University of Tasmania is one of a large number of researchers working on Macquarie Island. ‘There is a horrific problem now with rabbit grazing,’ Dr Scott explains. ‘I have been working on Macquarie for over twenty five years examining vegetation changes through both natural processes and the presence of rabbits. Recent changes are shocking.’

With a number of unusually dry seasons and temperature increases, rabbits are now breeding year round. Introductions of the myxoma virus in the late 1970s caused a massive decrease in rabbit numbers, however the impact of this control measure has now been greatly reduced and the virus is no longer available. The successful cat eradication program has also influenced rabbit numbers and the population explosion is devastating the island’s slopes.

‘New erosion damage is evident,’ Dr Scott reports ‘and this will compromise the island’s geoconservation and aesthetic values. The damage is island-wide, but my special concern is the spectacular steep coastal slopes in the south of the island. These slopes had always managed to escape rabbit damage, but now they are being literally trashed, and albatross habitat with them. The main tourist boardwalk area in the north of the island is also being trashed, which is really upsetting.’

Situated about 1500km south south-east of Tasmania, about halfway between Tasmania and Antarctica, Macquarie Island was listed as a World Heritage site in 1997. At the time it met two of the four natural criteria – special features that represent the earth’s evolutionary history, and ‘superlative natural phenomena or areas of exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance’ (Department of Environment, Sport and Territories, 1996).

The Department of Environment and Heritage explains that it ‘is an island of unique natural diversity, a site of major geoconservation significance and one of the truly remarkable places on earth’ (2006).

Macquarie Island is the only island in the world composed entirely of oceanic crust and rocks from the mantle, deep beneath the earth’s surface. The geology of the island provides for its unique landforms, soils, vegetation and wildlife.

Sixteen species of fauna and one plant species found on Macquarie Island are listed on the Tasmanian Threatened Species List. The area has also been listed as habitat critical to the survival of two albatross species on the Register of Critical Habitat under the Commonwealth Environment Protection Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Four species of albatross breed on Macquarie Island, and all are vulnerable to extinction.

The Macquarie Island Nature Reserve and World Heritage Area Draft Management Plan 2003 recognises that the eradication of rabbits, rats and mice from the island is one of the highest conservation priorities due to their effect on biodiversity and landscape.

Environment Australia and the Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service recently compiled the Plan for the Eradication of Rabbits and Rodents on Sub-Antarctic Macquarie Island. The method for proposed eradication is based on a New Zealand model that proved successful on Campbell Island where helicopters were deployed to drop baits in targeted areas.

‘At this stage the technology exists, the plan has been written, but funding is yet to be allocated,’ Dr Scott said. ‘It is very frustrating, with destruction on the island spreading as we speak’.

But it won’t be cheap. The price tag to implement the program will run into millions of dollars.

And what is the cost if it doesn’t go ahead? The deterioration of unique habitat? Further loss of the planet’s biodiversity? The decline of geoconservation and aesthetic values? Can we afford not to address this issue?
Buttongrass Ball 2006 - Dance to Support Tasmania’s Parks.

The annual Buttongrass Ball is on again in 2006. The Apple Shed Sugar Gliders with dance caller Dave Wanless generously donate the proceeds from this ball to conservation in Tasmania. Come along and have a great night dancing and supporting Tasmania’s National Parks. No dancing experience is necessary as all dances are taught and called. A great night – bring family and friends and a plate of supper.

We hope to see you at the 2006 Buttongrass Ball –
Saturday the 24th June, 7:30-11:30pm
Wesley Hall, 58 Melville Street, Hobart

If you have any queries contact David or Cathie on 6273 2127.
The private property on the North East Peninsula of Recherche Bay may now be protected from logging and consequent damage to its cultural and natural heritage, but the highly significant heritage values of Recherche Bay associated with the 1792 and 1793 French expeditions led by Bruni D’Entrecasteaux are still far from well understood or protected from development. At high and immediate risk are the potential values inside the Southwest National Park at Cockle Creek East.

In late 2005 the North East Peninsula of Recherche Bay was added to the National Heritage List. It was a victory for the recognition of the significance of early exploration, scientific and Aboriginal contact sites in Australia. The area was found to have a range of nationally significant values, including associative cultural landscape values, associated with the French botanists and with historical activities of high scientific significance. The assessment and listing was on the basis of archaeologist and historian Professor John Mulvaney’s nomination of the North East Peninsula.

The Federal government however did not seem to see a conflict between the proposed logging and protecting the highly significant heritage values it had recognised. Without any clear justification for its decision, the government allowed the proposed logging on the Vernon’s private property block to proceed. In an urgent attempt to seek protection for the area Bob Brown initiated negotiations with the Vernon brothers for the purchase of their North East Peninsula ‘property’. In February 2006 the negotiations were successfully concluded with land being acquired by the Tasmanian Land Conservancy to be managed for the conservation of its cultural and natural values, in particular the historic heritage values related to the 18th Century French expeditions.

Entrepreneur Dick Smith played a key part in the land purchase, including putting up a significant part of the funding and providing interim funds. Dick Smith’s contribution and a donation by the Tasmanian Government, were the two key donations which facilitated the land purchase. The Government’s donation will be of major assistance in conserving the area’s heritage values, but one cannot help wonder at their motivation when they had consistently maintained that logging would not affect French expedition-related values, contrary to external advice from several sources.

A picnic and paddle was held recently at Recherche Bay to celebrate this great outcome for conservation. The picnic also saw the launch of a campaign for donations to make up the balance of the land purchase price (and yes donations are still needed). Dick Smith has generously said that if sufficient additional funds are not found, then he will cover the shortfall. The next step will be to prepare a conservation policy and management guidelines that provide for the protection of the conservation values of the land. It is understood that the Tasmanian Land Conservancy has started the process to develop management guidelines for the property. The development of appropriate management is likely to require a more intensive analysis of historic values than has occurred to date, including further research to separate the French expedition sites from later period, primarily timber getting and coal mining, sites.

Unfortunately, at Cockle Creek East, there is still cause for concern with David Marriner’s proposed resort development still on the agenda. As a consequence, the French expedition related heritage values in the Cockle Creek East area are still potentially at risk and part of the Southwest National Park is to be developed for an exclusive resort.

Cockle Creek East (Rocky Bay) was the focus of the 1793 French expedition to the area. The same range of activities was carried out in this area as on the North East Peninsula in 1792, hence the area is considered to have the same historic heritage values as the North East Peninsula. In addition, one of the expedition members was buried here, making it one of the earliest known non-Aboriginal burials in Australia. The French values of this area have not been previously assessed, but the French archaeologist, Jean-Christophe Galipaud, who has started investigating the historic French use of Recherche Bay, has expressed an interest in this part of Recherche Bay as well as the North East Peninsula.
More historical and archaeological research is also clearly needed in the Cockle Creek East area.

Because of concern for the fate of this area which is primarily within national park, the TNPA, along with the Recherche Bay Protection Group and a small number of individuals, have for some time now been lobbying the developer, the Huon Valley Council and the state government to move the development outside the national park. The TNPA has considered the issues in the broader context and developed a vision statement for the full Recherche Bay area, The Recherche Wilderness Experience, which was released in mid-2005. Sadly there seems to be little interest in a strategic approach to this issue. Despite the fact that no building had commenced by June 2005, the TNPA was also unsuccessful in arguing that Stage Designs had not satisfied the “substantial commencement” clause of its Development Permit.

In August 2005, in a move to get the historic heritage values assessed before the development progressed beyond the access road constructed earlier in the year, the TNPA requested the Minister for Heritage (and the Parks & Wildlife Service) to declare the Cockle Creek East area a Heritage Area under the Historical Cultural Heritage Act 1995. Declaration as Heritage Area provides between 2 and 5 years’ moratorium on development that may impact on potential historic heritage values of state significance until the necessary research is done. Now, 8 months later (April 2006) the Minister has still not made a decision in relation to the Heritage Area declaration and no interim protection measures have been put in place. This is in spite of the findings of Mr Galipaud, as reported in a recent article, which warns that the proposed East Cockle Creek development directly threatens French heritage in the area. The TNPA has been informed that Heritage Tasmania has undertaken an assessment of the area and that a full report is expected to be received by the Minister sometime in March, but this deadline is also now well passed. One wonders how genuine the state government’s concern to protect the 18th Century historic heritage values of Recherche Bay really is?

The TNPA is disappointed and concerned at the lack of response. In February the TNPA wrote to the Minister expressing its concern with the delay and asking the Minister to –

1. immediately put in place interim protection for the area requested to be declared a Heritage Area, including halting all development in the area until the matter is resolved; and

2. urgently make a decision on declaration of the area as a Heritage Area and make this decision known.

At the time of writing we have not had a reply.

Also concerned with the lack of consideration for the historic heritage values of the area, in late 2004, local historian Greg Hogg submitted a nomination to the Tasmanian Heritage Council for key sites to be listed on the Tasmanian Heritage Register (THR), and for the area generally to be listed on the National Heritage List. The THR nomination is being actively assessed by Heritage Tasmania and the Australian Heritage Council is still considering the nomination to the National Heritage List.

It is clear therefore that Recherche Bay and its historic heritage values are far from being saved – and are still highly at risk! What is needed to provide essential level protection is –

- urgent broader research to ascertain the range of values associated with the French expeditions;

- interim protection for areas subject to development until this research can be undertaken; and

- an assessment of the full area of Recherche Bay, also lacking to date.

Moving the proposed resort development fully outside the national park would give confidence that the places associated with the 1793 French expedition will not be protected piecemeal and that their settings will be respected.

These needs have been communicated to government for the last one and a half years by various conservation advocates and heritage practitioners, but as yet the government has taken very little direct action to address them. To date the research and protection that has been achieved has been largely through the efforts of unpaid individuals and volunteer organisations concerned to see the heritage values of Recherche Bay fully recognised and protected.

Do these same organisations and individuals need to continue to work for the protection of Tasmania’s acknowledged historic heritage values? When will the government take action, take more than a token interest, and take seriously its responsibility to protect both natural and cultural heritage values in national parks, and more broadly, significant historic heritage throughout Tasmania?

Walking Track Strategy

The potential to develop greater bushwalking experiences within Tasmania’s spectacular parks and reserves is to be explored as part of a review of the state’s bushwalks. The review, which was announced in January this year and which will be undertaken by the Parks and Wildlife Service, Forestry Tasmania and Tourism Tasmania in conjunction with stakeholders, is to focus on the 60 Great Short Walks and the proposal for the establishment of eight Great Bushwalks. While the TNPA committee has met with the PWS to discuss the scope of this review we are also keen to hear the views of members and will be organizing a speaker at a future member meeting.
Departure of TNPA Program Manager

It is with considerable regret that the TNPA has had to recently farewell Russell Warman, TNPA Program Manager for the last year. Working two days a week Russell has been the face and voice of the TNPA, representing the organisation in many areas. In his position as Program Manager, Russell managed the TNPA office, carried out valuable research into various management issues, including the cost of managing National Parks, and coordinated the various projects the TNPA has been involved in. He was also the very capable liaison between TNPA and various government agencies and NGOs.

In spite of the critical need for a paid Program Manager position within the TNPA, as demonstrated by Russell and previously by Helen Gee, the TNPA has been unsuccessful in attracting ongoing funding for the position, which was initially funded mainly through seed funding from the Mullum Trust, and to a lesser extent by generous individual donations to the TNPA. The TNPA does not wish to see this position relinquished permanently and will continue to seek new sources of funding to enable it to continue.

The TNPA Committee takes this opportunity to thank Russell for his excellent work while Program Manager with the TNPA, and to wish him well in the future.

With Russell Warman's departure and the loss of the Program Manager position, the TNPA urgently needs volunteer assistance in the following areas -

- background research on issues relating to national parks and other conservation reserves
- promoting the TNPA (including having a presence at Salamanca Market on Saturdays)
- liaison with other groups and agencies
- media liaison for TNPA
- managing the TNPA office (correspondence, telephones, filing, etc)
- other secretarial assistance (eg, minutes secretary for meetings).

If you can help in any of the above capacities (each should only require about an hour a week on average) please contact A/Secretary Anne McConnell - phone 6239 1494 or email annemc@aaa.net.au

Funds raised for Recherche Bay campaign

The Tasmanian National Parks Association extends its sincere thanks to Conny Harris and other members of the Save the Styx committee for organising the fundraiser held in Sydney in February. $5000 was raised to cover costs associated with the ongoing TNPA campaign for protecting Recherche Bay in southern Tasmania. Thanks also go to those TNPA members and friends who helped with the fundraiser by arranging or providing great prizes.
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TNPA News

TNPA News is published twice a year. Starting with this edition, TNPA News has a greater focus on campaign issues. As well as feature articles on issues related to Tasmania’s national parks and other protected areas, each issue will include updates on current campaigns, reports from working groups, and other TNPA activities. Due to difficulties with electronic distribution, the newsletter is now being sent out in hard copy (unless you advise us that you are happy to receive it by email.) We thank Kevin Kiernan, Helen Gee, Robert Campbell, Margie Jenkin, Anne McConnell, Melva Truchanas, Scott Morgan, Jenny Scott and B Kurczok for their articles or other contributions to TNPA News No. 6. Contributions for TNPA News No. 7 (deadline – mid August 2006) are welcomed. Please send contributions to: admin@tnpa.asn.au (attention – TNPA News Editor). The views expressed in TNPA News are not necessarily those of the TNPA Inc.
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