

LITTLE RIVER

CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

STAGE 2 REPORT

Including

Best Management Options

&

Interim Management Plan

Little River Landcare Group Inc.

August 2001

Donaldson Planning & Management Services, 110 Piper Street, Tamworth 2340.
Phone (02) 6761 3391, Fax (02) 6761 3392 Email donaldsg@mpx.com.au
Agricultural & Resource Management Consultants

Table of Contents	ii
Foreword - Chairman, Little River Landcare Group	vi
The Steering Committee	vii

SECTION 1 - OVERVIEW

1. Introduction	1.1
1.1. Stage 2 Planning	1.1
1.1.1 The Process	1.1
1.1.2 Terms of Reference	1.2
1.1.3 Putting Planning into Practice	1.2
1.2. Executive Summary - Stage 1 Report for Little River Catchment Plan	1.4
1.2.1 Catchment Description	1.5
1.2.2 Condition of the Resources	1.6
2. Recent Changes in the Operating Environment	2.1
2.1 National Initiatives	2.1
2.1.1 Commonwealth Government	2.1
2.1.2 Murray Darling Basin Commission	2.3
2.2 State Initiatives	2.4
2.2.1 NSW State Salinity Strategy	2.4
2.2.2 Native Vegetation Management Plans	2.4
2.2.3 Catchment Management Boards	2.4
2.2.4 PlanFirst	2.5
2.3 Local Initiatives	
2.3.1 Central West Catchment Management Board	2.5
2.3.2 Central West "TARGET" Project	2.5
2.3.3 Mid - Macquarie Regional Plan	2.6

SECTION 2 - PLANNING FRAMEWORK

3 Prioritising the Issues	3.1
3.1 Criteria for Prioritising the Issues	3.1
3.2 Priority Issues for the Little River Catchment	3.2
3.3 Priority Land Management Units	3.3
4 Vision, Outcomes and Objectives	4.1
4.1 The Vision	4.1
4.2 Outcomes and Objectives	4.2
4.2.1 Land Management	4.3
4.2.2 Native Vegetation	4.3
4.2.3 Water - Surface water, Ground water and Riparian zones	4.4
4.2.4 Pest Animals	4.4
4.2.5 Farming Systems (Crops, Pastures and Weeds)	4.5
4.2.6 Economic Objectives	4.5
4.2.7 Social Objectives	4.6
4.2.8 Monitoring, Review and Evaluation	4.7

5	Land Management Units	5.1
5.1	Soil Groups as Land Management Units	5.1
5.2	Land Management Units	5.1
	Land Management Units Suitable for Cropping and Pastures	5.5
5.2.1	Alluvial LMU	5.5
5.2.2	Euchrozem LMU	5.6
5.2.3	Red Brown Earth LMU	5.7
5.2.4	Non Calcic Brown LMU	5.8
	Land Management Units Mostly Suited to Grazing	5.9
5.2.5	Red Podzolic LMU	5.9
5.2.6	Red Solodic LMU	5.10
5.2.7	Siliceous Sand LMU	5.11
	Land Management Units Best Suited to Timber, with some Grazing	5.12
5.2.8	Shallow LMU	5.12
5.2.9	Riparian LMU	5.13

SECTION 3 - INTERIM MANAGEMENT PLAN

6	Best Management Practices for Farm Management	6.1
6.1	Introduction	6.1
6.2	Guiding Principles	6.1
6.2.1	Planning Principles	6.2
6.2.2	Management Principles	6.2
6.3	Best Management Practices.....	6.5
	Crop Management Practices	6.6
	Grazing Management Practices	6.8
	Vegetation Management	6.9
	Remedial Management	6.10
	Aquatic Management	6.13
7	The Integrated Plan	7.1
7.1	Introduction	7.1
7.2	Best Management Options for Land Use	7.4
7.2.1	What's the Difference between Best Management Options and Best Management Practice	7.4
7.3	Best Management Options for Land Management Units	7.7
	High Priority Land Management Units	7.7
7.3.1	Red Brown Earth LMU	7.7
7.3.2	Non Calcic Brown LMU	7.7
7.3.3	Siliceous Sand LMU	7.8
7.3.4	Riparian Land	7.9
	Medium Priority Land Management Units	7.10
7.3.5	Red Podzolic LMU	7.10
7.3.6	Euchrozem LMU	7.11
7.3.7	Alluvial LMU	7.11
7.3.8	Red Solodic LMU	7.12
	Low Priority Land Management Units	7.13
7.3.8	Shallow LMU	7.13

7.4	Implementing the BMOs at Property Scale	7.13
7.4.1	Possible Locations for Land Use Changes	7.14
7.5	Regional Planning Processes	7.15
7.5.1	Planning for Biodiversity	7.15
7.5.2	Planning for Regional Dryland Salinity	7.17
8	Implementation Strategy	8.1
	Land Management Objectives.....	8.2
	Native Vegetation Objectives.....	8.6
	Water - Surface water, Ground water and Riparian zones Objectives	8.11
	Pest Animals Objectives	8.15
	Farming Systems (Crops, Pastures and Weeds) Objectives	8.16
	Economic Objectives	8.21
	Social Objectives	8.22
	Monitoring, Review and Evaluation	8.24
9	Recommendations for Stage 3	9.1
9.1	Technical, Social and Economic Analysis	9.1
9.2	Additional information Required	9.3

References

SECTION 4 - ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1.1	Terms of Reference for Stage 2 Report	Att 1.1
Attachment 3.1	Issues raised at Initial Consultation Meetings	Att 3.1
Attachment 3.2	Description of Criteria and Rankings used in Prioritisation	Att 3.2
Attachment 3.3	Multi-Criteria Analysis of Issues	Att 3.3
Attachment 5.1	GIS Analysis of Issues by Land Management Units and Issues. Att	5.1
Attachment 5.2	Capability & Limitations of Dominant Soil Type in each LMU Att	5.2
Attachment 5.3	Geology and Soil Characteristics of Land Management Units...Att	5.3
Attachment 6.1	Applying Best Management Options for Farm Management....Att	6.1
Attachment 7.1	Biodiversity Planning Principles	Att 7.1

Figures

Figure 5.1	Land Management Units	5.2
Figure 7.1	Interrelationship between Natural Resources, Agricultural production and Offsite Impacts	7.3

Tables

Table 1.1:	Issues of concern in the Little River Catchment community	1.4
Table 3.1:	Criteria used to determine the Priority Issues for the Catchment Plan	3.1
Table 3.2:	Prioritised Issues in Ranked Order using Multi-Criteria Analysis	3.2
Table 3.3:	Prioritised Land Management Units derived from GIS & other estimates ...	3.3
Table 5.1:	Cross Section of Land Management Units in the Little River Catchment ...	5.4
Table 6.1:	How the Management Principles impact on Natural Resource Management Issues	6.4
Table 6.2:	Best Management Practices	6.5
Table 6.3	Interaction of Best Management Practices with Guiding Principles	6.6
Table 7.1	How Best Management Practices address the Biophysical Objectives	7.2
Table 7.2	Priority Best Management Practices for each Land Management Unit	7.5
Table 7.3	Recommended Land Use and Farming Systems for LMUs	7.6

FOREWORD

The Little River Landcare Group (LRLG) was formed in response to a need to develop overall catchment strategies that were not being fully addressed by smaller individual landcare groups. The LRLG has a commitment to “promoting a healthy, productive and diverse biological and social environment”.

Following the formation of the LRLG, the community saw the need to develop a catchment management plan to help improve the profitability and sustainability of the community by addressing problems that could not be solved independently. The committee sought and received NHT funding to undertake a catchment plan in three stages:

- Stage 1 – Catchment description and situation statement
- Stage 2 – Best Management Options and Integrated catchment management plan
- Stage 3 – Socio-economic study

During the planning process the community, local government and agencies were encouraged to take an active role through public meetings to voice their concerns and opinions on any issue they saw as relevant.

Major issues identified by the community were:

- Dryland salinity
- Soil acidity
- Poor surface water quality
- Native vegetation
- Pasture degradation
- Soil structure decline

The development of the LRLG catchment plan has given the community and other stakeholders a far greater understanding of the problems and the processes involved in addressing these identified issues. There has been considerable effort given to keep stakeholders fully informed at every stage via newsletters and community meetings.

These issues require a coordinated approach by all involved in order to have a positive outcome, both in our own catchment and for downstream water users, who are affected by the quality of the water leaving our catchment.

The plan recommends Best Management Options (BMOs) based on workable solutions. There are a range of options, allowing farmers a choice in the way they can help meet the catchment objectives. BMOs vary according to the Land Management Unit (LMU) area to which they are to be applied. This will involve stakeholders making some fundamental changes in their management strategies, including significant changes in land use by primary producers. Consideration must be given to the capacity, both economically and socially, of primary producers to make these changes.

It is now of the utmost importance to see these BMO’s actioned. Further research and ongoing monitoring and evaluation will be an inherent aspect in producing a successful outcome. The plan will need to be constantly reviewed and modified as circumstances change and more information becomes available.

I urge all landowners to be aware of the impact of soil acidity, salinity and erosion on our long term sustainability and to take the opportunity given to us from this plan to ensure our vision for our catchment is realised. I also call on all levels of government to join with LRLG in the implementation of this COMMUNITY driven plan.

Mr Trevor Coady
Chairman Little River Landcare Group (1999-2001)

LITTLE RIVER LANDCARE GROUP STEERING COMMITTEE 2001

Name		Position	Address			Phone
Trevor	Coady	Chairman	Carinya	Yeoval	2868	6367 9244
Sharon	Porch	Secretary	Oakvale	Yeoval	2868	6846 4297
Don	Bruce	Deputy Chair	Myrangle	Cumnock	2867	6367 7287
Steve	Gough	Executive	Belmore	Yeoval	2868	6846 4067
Rodney	Williams	Treasurer	Winston Park	Cumnock	2867	6367 7330
Sub catchment representatives						
Pru	Atkinson	Cumnock	Gundabooka	Cumnock	2867	6367 7427
David	Pottie	Cumnock	Eurimbla	Cumnock	2867	6367 7361
Jo	Williamson	Yeoval	Old Yullundry	Cumnock	2867	6367 7425
Michael	Kerin	Yeoval	Roseneath	Yeoval	2868	6846 4120
Lindy	Carney	Suntop	North Eulalia	Arthurville	2820	6846 3506
John	Bennett	Suntop	Glenwood	Suntop	2820	6846 3459
Laurence	Barber	Baldry	Emrose	Baldry	2867	6367 9234
Brett	Tremain	Baldry	Kymuna	Yeoval	2868	6846 4183
Members						
Bill	Barber	Local Govt	Castle Hill	Baldry	2867	6367 9215
Sheryl	Vaughan	Publicity Officer	Redbank	Yeoval	2868	6367 9253
Mollie	Whitehorn	Landcare Co-ord (resigned Mar 2001)	Murrabar	Cumnock	2867	6367 7226
Technical Advice						
Alan	Nicholson	Salinity Specialist	DLWC	Wellington	2820	6845 2488