

11 June 2008

Mrs Claire Reeves
Biosecurity and Product Integrity Division
Department of Primary Industry and Water
GPO Box 44
HOBART TAS 7000

SUBMISSION IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATORY CONTROLS FOR AERIAL SPRAYING AND GROUND SPRAYING AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL PRODUCTS.

The submission is made of behalf of the Tasmanian Fishing Industry Council and the Tasmanian Aquaculture Council the peak industry bodies representing the interests of wild catch fishers, seafood processors and marine farmers in Tasmania.

We welcome the move by the State Government to place greater restrictions over the control and use of agricultural chemical products applied by aerial and ground spraying. We do however have some concerns with a number of the specific measures proposed in the consultation paper. Our concerns are outlined below with reference to the draft Regulations as requested.

Amendment 2: Enforceable water quality standards have been set to protect aquatic environments

Sub-regulations 41 (1) (2) (c)

If the intent of the regulation is to proscribe enforceable water quality standards for *all* prescribed water bodies i.e. aquaculture tanks / ponds the TFIC / TAC supports this initiative provided provision is made to regularly review the prescribed limits in light of any new information.

Amendment 3: Exclusion zones have been established around protected places to exclude contamination through the direct discharge or spray drift of chemicals

Sub-regulations 41 (2) (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k) and (l)

In regard to the proposed exclusion zone around waterways including a “prescribed water body” and aquaculture enterprises 41 (2) (j) the buffer proposed buffer zone, 10 meters, is inadequate and we recommend that the buffer zone be increased to 50 meters. We believe that there is an informal agreement between Saltas and Forestry Tasmania that specifies a buffer zone of 50 meters. We also recommend that it be compulsory for test strips to be placed within the buffer zone during spraying events, such that spray drift may be readily observed.

Amendment 4: Neighbour notification requirements have been clearly defined and are mandatory for both aerial spraying and ground spraying

Regulations 23 and 24

Generally supported. However, we do have concerns regarding the ability for neighbours to negotiate a more flexible system of notification. The proposal as currently worded does not provide sufficient protection for individuals (not the land/facility owner) who may be on the property adjacent to where the spraying is to be conducted but unaware that spraying operations are about to commence.

Amendment 5: Permission from property owners must be obtained prior to aerial spraying within 100 meters of residential premises.

Regulation 18

We have concerns that there is no provision that relates to ground spraying. This may also lead to elevated levels of pesticides in “prescribed water bodies” if weather conditions are unfavourable. Our particular concern for example would relate to roadside spraying near uncovered aquaculture ponds or marine farm leases adjacent to the shore where spraying operations maybe conducted.

Yours sincerely

Neil Stump
CHIEF EXECUTIVE