

MINUTES

Conservation Advisory Committee

MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

HELD ON

MEETING DATE

WEDNESDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2007

www.joondalup.wa.gov.au



City of
Joondalup

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN CONFERENCE ROOM 2, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP ON WEDNESDAY, 26 SEPTEMBER 2007.

ATTENDANCE

Committee Members:

Cr Steve Magyar	Presiding Person
Cr Michele John	<i>from 1905 hrs</i>
Cr Brian Corr	<i>from 1905 hrs</i>
Cr Sue Hart	
Cr Marie Macdonald	
Mrs Marilyn Zakrevsky	Deputy Presiding Person
Mr Ralph Henderson	
Mr Barry Fitzsimmons	
Ms Phyllis Robertson	
Dr Marjorie Apthorpe	<i>from 1810 hrs</i>
Mr John Chester	

Officers:

Mr Murray Ralph	Manager, Infrastructure Management
Mr K Armstrong	Coordinator, Conservation Services
Mrs J Hewison	Administrative Secretary

DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Presiding Person declared the meeting open at 1805 hrs.

APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mrs Wendy Herbert
Ms Alice Stubber

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 29 AUGUST 2007

MOVED Mr Barry Fitzsimmons, **SECONDED** Mr Ralph Henderson that the minutes of the meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee held on 29 August 2007 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (8/0)

In favour of the motion: Crs Magyar, Hart & Macdonald, Mr J Chester, Mrs M Zakrevsky, Mr B Fitzsimmons, Mr R Henderson, Ms P Robertson

Dr Apthorpe entered the Room at 1810 hrs.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON WITHOUT DISCUSSION

The Presiding Person advised that this may be his last meeting as Chairperson of the Conservation Advisory Committee and he thanked all the community members and Elected Members for their enthusiastic input over the past 18 months and thanked the staff for their support to the Committee.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Nil.

IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY SIT BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Nil.

PETITIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

REPORTS

ITEM 1 CJ170-08/07 THERMAL WEED CONTROL - [02082]

WARD: All

RESPONSIBLE Mr David Djulbic
DIRECTOR: Infrastructure Services

PURPOSE/EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To present the report on Thermal Weed Control to the Conservation Advisory Committee for comment.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting on 28 August 2007, Council resolved (*CJ170-08/07 refers*), inter alia, to:

“Refers the report on Thermal Weed Control in the City of Joondalup to the Conservation Advisory Committee and the Sustainability Advisory Committee for comment”

This report seeks to address the request outlined in the abovementioned recommendation.

The consideration of thermal weed control arose from a 137-signature petition which was presented to Council in May requesting the use of hydrothermal weed control technology instead of chemical spraying wherever possible and requesting a report being presented to Council on this matter.

It should be noted that Local Governments have the responsibility to control weed growth on land they manage. In some cases this extends to the control of noxious weeds which are required to be controlled by law. These requirements form part of the operational maintenance tasks associated with road and land management. The City of Joondalup currently controls weed growth in a range of locations including pathways, road verges/medians, public gardens, grassed parkland and bushland. Weeds in the main are controlled using a range of chemical based herbicides with a lesser amount being removed by hand or mechanical methods. This work is undertaken using Council work teams, contractors, and in natural areas volunteers assist the City with this work.

DETAILS

The City commissioned a report to be written by John Banks (Arboriculturist) and Graeme Sandral (Agronomist).

The brief for the compilation of the report sought the following analyses:

- Compare the cost of herbicide based weed control and thermal based weed control;
- Examine the advantages and disadvantages of both methods;
- Identify the most suitable circumstances for the use of these technologies.

The following is a summary of the main findings contained within the report which is found at Attachment 1:

“As a generalisation, herbicides are more cost effective and its use achieves better kill rates than thermal weed control methods. The cost advantages and speed of application associated with herbicides indicate that they are suitable for large-scale operations;

Thermal weed control methods are best utilised where environmental or health issues are significant and where off site damage to non-target plants is a high risk. The costs and speed at which thermal weed control can be undertaken may limit its scale of operation. Weed control efficiency is improved if the frequency of thermal weed control is no longer than six weeks apart and, where there is an occurrence of perennial weeds which are hard to kill, hand weeding or herbicide spot spraying may be necessary on second cycle treatments.”

Issues and options considered:

The City has a number of options it may choose to take:

- 1 Undertake all weed control using chemical and mechanical methods (hand weeding).
- 2 Use a combination of chemical, thermal weed and mechanical control. Using each technology where appropriate.
- 3 Use thermal and mechanical weed control methods only.

Link to Strategic Plan:

Key Focus Area

Caring for the environment.

Outcomes

The City is environmentally responsible in its activities.

Legislation – Statutory Provisions:

Control of declared noxious weeds – Division 3, Section 42 – Agriculture and Related Resources Protection Act 1976.

Risk Management considerations:

Not Applicable.

Financial/Budget Implications:

The report outcomes indicate that the cost of thermal weed control relative to traditional herbicide methods is up to 2 times more expensive per treatment, and the kill rate on some perennial weeds will be lower. When translating this into yearly weed control the thermal treatment will require 1.5 to 2 times more applications as compared with herbicide control. Therefore, on a yearly basis the additional cost of the thermal weed control treatment may be up to 3 to 4 times more expensive than herbicide application. This is due to the higher cost per application and the higher number of applications required to achieve the same results. The City's expenditure for weed control for the last 3 contractual periods is on average \$460,000 per annum for weed control external to natural areas.

Policy implications:

Not Applicable.

Regional Significance:

Not Applicable.

Sustainability implications:

Not Applicable.

Consultation

Council is seeking input on the consultant's report from relevant advisory committees.

COMMENT

Not Applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Report on Weed Control Using Hot Water / Steam and Herbicides in the City of Joondalup

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That the Conservation Advisory Committee NOTES the report on Thermal Weed Control shown as Attachment 1 and provides comment to Council on the report.

The Coordinator, Conservation Services gave an overview of the Report. Discussion ensued.

Cr John and Cr Corr entered the Room at 1905 hrs.

MOVED Dr Apthorpe, SECONDED Cr Magyar that the Conservation Advisory Committee:

1 provides the following comments to Council on the Thermal Weed Control report:

- (a) RECOMMENDS that Council develops a Weed Control Strategy as part of its Environmental Plan, the Weed Control Strategy should be based on the principles of Integrated Weed Management, which includes the aim of reducing the reliance on herbicides;**
- (b) REQUESTS that the City of Joondalup commission a properly conducted local trial of the effectiveness of hydrothermal weed control on a variety of locations/weed types to be carried out by an independent NATA-certified or equivalent testing laboratory;**
- (c) REQUESTS cost comparisons between hydrothermal weed control and herbicide weed control to be calculated to take into account not just the cost per day of each method, but long-term costs such as increasing weed tolerance to herbicides, environmental damage and damage to human health;**
- (d) REQUESTS a target date no greater than two (2) years is set from now for final adoption of a weed control strategy;**

- 2 REQUESTS that enquiries be made of other West Australian local authorities using hydrothermal weed control for any information they may have;**
- 3 REQUESTS reports documented at points 1 (a) and (b) come back to the Conservation Advisory Committee for comment prior to presentation to Council;**
- 4 SUBMITS the following attachments to assist Council in developing its weed control strategy:**
 - **Pesticides and Human Health – March – April 2005 Canadian Journal of Public Health (Appendix 1 refers)**
 - **Institute of Science in Society – Glyphosate Toxic & Roundup Worse (Appendix 2 refers)**
 - **Amitrole CAS No. 61-82-5 (Appendix 3 refers)**
 - **Document to be provided by Cr John**
 - **Comparison of three weed control methods: chemical, flame and hot water (Appendix 4 refers)**
 - **Environment Matters (Appendix 5 refers)**
- 5 ADVISES Council that the Conservation Advisory Committee believes there are substantial benefits in bringing weed control management back inhouse.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED (11/0)

In favour of the Motion: Crs Magyar, Macdonald, John, Hart & Corr, Mr J Chester, Mrs M Zakrevsky, Mr B Fitzsimmons, Mr R Henderson, Ms P Roberson, Dr M Apthorpe

MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

REQUESTS FOR REPORTS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Nil.

CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Presiding Person declared the Meeting closed at 2004 hrs; the following committee members being present at that time:

Cr Steve Magyar
Cr Marie Macdonald
Cr Sue Hart
Cr Michele John
Cr Brian Corr
Mrs Marilyn Zakrevsky
Mr Ralph Henderson
Mr Barry Fitzsimmons
Ms Phyllis Robertson
Dr Marjorie Apthorpe
Mr John Chester

