



Volume 15-16, February/ May 2006

ISSN 1449-6720

Inside this Issue

President's Message	1-2
Website upgrade etc	2
ECA Office bearers	2-3
Threatened species survey & assessment guidelines-final update	3-6
Recovery of money	6-7
2006 Conference & AGM	7-8
Professional Indemnity Insce – new deal	8
Update on vegetation sampling	9
Unusual/casual observations	9-10
Membership report	10-11
Accreditation scheme for consultants	11

Newsletter of the Ecological Consultants Association of NSW Inc.

President's Message

Despite concerns that external economic pressures and changes in legislation may have had a negative impact on our industry, I cannot find a consultant who is not busy. The impact may yet be felt, but I see healthy and optimistic signs ahead.

However, the biggest threat to our industry is probably not external, but internal, by the production of poor quality work and demonstration of unethical behaviour.

I am alarmed at the amount of poor work that has been brought to my attention in recent times. I am sorry to say that some of this work has been generated by our members, and such work could easily threaten their entry to the DEC accreditation scheme. Such work may also expose the consultant to action by clients who have had to outlay further money to get a competent assessment report.

Unethical behaviour by consultants includes misdemeanours such as untruthfully claiming to be an ECA member (perhaps we should be flattered!) to serious breaches of trust such as claiming to hold qualifications that have in fact been purchased over the internet.

Although such behaviours have been exhibited by non-members, they can give us all a bad name.

Your Association's responses so far has included institution of the Code of Conduct, support and aid in the development of the DEC's accreditation scheme, participation in the development of survey guidelines and provision of opportunities for professional development through our conferences.

In addition to these past actions, your Council has decided to provide some guidance in regards to the professional standards we should demonstrate in our assessment and management reports: remind local authorities of the dangers of using unqualified consultants; and the provision of more opportunities for professional development.

Judie Rawling and I are drafting a document regarding report standards and we welcome any contributions you may have on this topic. Your Council has written to local councils to remind them of the presence of a large pool of qualified and professional consultants in our Association's membership. We are also considering offering

workshops to our members in some of the more esoteric areas of expertise such as bat call analysis and flora identification. Any other ideas are most welcome.

In this issue of your Newsletter we are addressing a number of matters of import – rules that determine how we work, the much-anticipated accreditation scheme, professional indemnity insurance and recovering money from clients. Thank you to all contributors.

We would like to provide a review section in the Newsletter and ask for volunteer reviewers. Contributors will receive a free copy of the review material in return for their review. But this must be within reason – don't bother offering to review the latest HANZAB volume or the Flora of Australia! Please make all such suggestions to the Editor and I look forward to at least one review in the next volume.

Stay well and safe.

Kindest regards,

Liz Ashby
President



Website upgrade & new ECA email addresses.

The ECA has recently changed hosting and management of its website to a new provider. As part of the transfer, the website is in the process of undergoing an upgrade to improve the content and make it easier to find the information you require. In the near future you should notice progressive improvements to the site.

The address of the website remains the same at:

<http://www.ecansw.org.au/>

so no need to change your bookmarks!

Included with the transfer to the new provider is the provision of a number of dedicated email addresses for use by key members holding particular positions within the Association. In future, emails to the following personnel regarding ECA matters should be sent to the following addresses:

President (Elizabeth Ashby)
president@ecansw.org.au

Secretary (Judith Rawling)
secretary@ecansw.org.au

Treasurer (Paul Burcher)
treasurer@ecansw.org.au

Membership Officer (Paul Burcher)
membership@ecansw.org.au

Newsletter Editor (Gerry Swan)
newsletter@ecansw.org.au

Webmaster (Stefan Rose)
webmaster@ecansw.org.au

These email addresses will remain the same regardless of who holds the above positions at any particular time.

Stefan Rose
Webmaster

ECA Office Bearers 2005-2006

President: Elizabeth Ashby
e.ashby@keystone-ecological.com.au

1st Vice-President: Stephen Ambrose
Stephen@ambecol.com.au

2nd Vice-President: Jason Berrigan
wolfen@kooe.com.au

Secretary: Judie Rawling
jrawling@urbanbushland.com.au

Treasurer: Paul Burcher
pburcher@ozemail.com.au

Membership Officer: Paul Burcher
pburcher@ozemail.com.au

Public Officer: Paul Burcher
pburcher@ozemail.com.au

Councillors:

Phil Burrell
burrnico@optusnet.com.au

Martin Denny
mtking@ozemail.com.au

Deryk Engel
DerykE@Lesryk.com.au

Keith Kendall
kendall@midcoast.com.au

Toby Lambert
tobysid@acay.com.au

Liz Norris
Liz.Norris@bigpond.com

Stefan Rose
Stefan@ecotoneconsultants.com.au

Nick Skelton
ecology@ecology.net.au

Ray Williams
ray@ecotoneconsultants.com.au

Brian Wilson
brian@ecotoneconsultants.com.au



NSW Threatened Species Survey and Assessment Guidelines - Final Update

Late last month I was invited to contribute to a meeting of an 'expert review panel' to hammer out any last changes to the survey guidelines. These guidelines have been

floating around for many years (the original set of guidelines were developed by NPWS and SMEC in 2001) and are now acquiring some importance for those working as ecological consultants. They will take on greater importance once released and adopted as 'standards'.

It is worthwhile looking at the two Acts that control much of our business i.e. the *NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995* and the *NSW Threatened Species Legislation Amendment Act 2004*. Section 113 of the first Act states "(3A) Without limiting subsection (3), an accreditation is to include conditions that require a species impact statement to be prepared in accordance with survey standards approved from time to time by the Director-General by order published in the Gazette."

The Amendment Act is more general. Subsection 126O of Schedule 1 states "(4) Without limiting subsection (3), an accreditation is to include conditions that require surveys and assessments to be undertaken and prepared in accordance with standards approved from time to time by the Director-General by order published in the Gazette."

This means that any consultant accredited under the DEC scheme will have to follow those standards set up by the DEC.

The expert panel consisted of three - myself, Anne Conway (Countrywide Ecological Service and EIANZ rep) and Gary Leonard (currently with Coffs Harbour City Council),

and there were three from DEC (Graham Wilson, Catherine Price and Suzanne O'Neil).

The first item raised was whether the 'guidelines' would become 'standards'. There was a lot of foot shuffling, but I persisted and, yes, inevitably, they would be the standards. So, be warned and look at the 'guidelines' carefully.

The history of the guidelines is important, as they are based upon two sets of major surveys undertaken by NPWS (CRA surveys) and State Forests (impact assessment surveys). These sets of surveys used large numbers of people including agency staff, consultants and volunteers. Consequently, much of the methodology used in the guidelines could require more surveyors than usual. The basic methodology has been refined and further developed using research studies (from scientific papers) and from the survey methodologies developed for the Commonwealth EPBC guidelines. These methodologies have been developed by various organisations (e.g. Birds Australia, Australian Museum) and are again reliant upon the use of staff, consultants and volunteers. All this is reflected in the voluminous document that could ultimately become our reference text.

The document is over 200 pages and contains a range of information other than survey

guidelines. There are sections of the relevant legislation, how to approach an assessment study (an 8-step process including identifying key attributes of a proposal, selecting an investigator, preliminary assessment etc), accumulation of existing information, collation of data and interpretation of results. There are also a series of appendices providing sources of information, Section 5A guidelines, key stakeholders, pro-formas, IBRA Regions, identification resources as well as a large spreadsheet giving recommended survey methods for each fauna species. The overall impression of the document is that it is a very useful guide to undertaking the impact assessment process. The document will become the reference text for impact assessments and will be of great use to those just entering the consulting game.

There are several changes in the new guidelines that have come in response to numerous issues raised in submissions. I don't know how many submission there were, but we were given nine pages of issues and the actions taken by DEC. Most of the actions showed that the guidelines were amended as a result of some issue. Two major changes in the guidelines came from the greater use of habitat assessment to determine what threatened species could occur in an area, and the application of the precautionary principle. This means that an assessor would

cover all threatened species likely to occur, based upon their known distribution and presence of appropriate habitats. I think most ecological consultants do this anyway, but it is now part of an established process.

There is now a greater emphasis on the use of the Assessment of Significance (i.e. the new 7-part test), and a considerable amount of detail is now required. The list of requirements are summarized in a table that covers two and half pages. Some of the requirements are quite detailed, including a certification of the report by the investigator, maps and species and abundance data. Initially raw field data (copies of original data sheets) were to be added in an appendix. However, we strongly fought against this, so that it will now state that these data can be made available on request. It was also pointed out that some of the requirements were considered as 'desirable', not 'essential' in the published Section 5A guidelines. This is to be investigated by DEC. I had a trial-run of a 7-part test using the new guidelines and found that out of a 90 page document, only five pages were devoted to the actual assessment of significance, the remainder were covering all the other requirements now needed.

There is considerable discussion about survey design, stratification, data collection, survey effort (with appropriate graphs), habitat

assessment and survey limitations. Mentioned several times through the document is the statement that the surveyor may change the survey technique, but any change must be accompanied by a scientific reference. We pointed out that any modification of a technique (or minimum survey effort) would probably not be based on any scientific evidence, but rather on our professional evaluation of the site, and other extraneous factors (amount of disturbance, most important parts of the site, demands by the client etc). It was accepted by DEC that any change of technique or effort would be described in detail and any site be accurately located and any technique be reproducible by an independent assessor (i.e. no need for a scientific reference).

In the plants section, both transects (to be called belt transects) and quadrats are still to be used. "Random meander" has disappeared, with the new term "diversity searches" replacing them. This involves undertaking several transects searching for threatened plant species, with a separate pass for each species. Not much difference, but more focused. There is a need to ensure that the nomenclature of vegetation communities is constant throughout the State (or region) and this will be developed in the final draft. Minimum survey efforts are given. I won't go into plant survey efforts (not my

expertise), but Gary accepted them as workable.

The number of survey techniques and the amount of survey effort required to satisfy the assessment of fauna is immense and should create many problems for consultants. Despite many protests DEC are determined to recommend a methodology that should provide all of us with a long and fun-filled working life (if any client will agree). There is insufficient space to detail all the requirements so I will concentrate on some aspects.

1. The number of trap nights (Elliotts, hair tubes, cages, pits) is no longer set out. Rather, there is a survey effort calculator that gives you the number of trap-nights for a 95% and 99% likelihood of capture at different trapping rates – you have to look up any studies to get trapping rates for each species. However, if you are to try and find a threatened species, it will be rare and probably have a trapping rate of 1% or less. The calculator gives the number of trap nights for 0.1% (95% likelihood) as 2994. If you are surveying a small area for a rare species, it would be covered by traps! Higher trapping rates give a much more workable number (e.g. 5% is 58 trap nights).

2. The survey unit is still vague and is left up to the surveyor, it may be per stratification unit (as in the old guidelines) or it may be that set out in the EPBC guidelines

i.e. area. This is still to be resolved.

3. There has been an increase in the survey efforts for several of the fauna groups, in response to the EPBC guidelines (these were to be on the DEH website, but not yet and don't know when). So, bird surveys (area search) are no longer 20 minutes per 2ha block in a unit, but are now 60 minutes (and done three times). Searching for nocturnal birds has become even more bizarre, with two pages devoted to them. Yes, there is still the information that 8 to 10 repetitions of call playbacks are required for 90% probability for most owls and surveys should be spread over two seasons. I thought that the Barking Owl was a bit easier, only four repetitions, but each repetition should be a week apart. It states that 'Surveys for habitat features should be conducted to compliment surveys, particularly if it is not possible to undertake appropriate level of survey effort in appropriate time of year'. Discussion at the meeting inferred that habitat surveys could be used as a substitute for call playback etc, but the precautionary principle should still be used i.e. do the work, then assume they are there. We insisted that some owl surveys should be undertaken and that most surveys of a shorter time than stated above usually yielded some results – better to do something than just write about them.

4. Pit trapping in arid areas should go for 10 nights (I wonder what ACEC think) and be repeated three times over the year.

I won't go through all the details, as the new guidelines will be available soon (the old are on the DEC web site), but here is a summary of the survey efforts required:

Per Sample Unit

FROGS	
Habitat Search	4 nights
Listening	4 nights
Call response	4 nights
Driving transects	4 nights
REPTILES	
Pit traps	4 nights (8 nights in arid)
Searching	2 days + 2 nights
BIRDS	
Search	3-4 days
Wetlands	3 days
Call response diurnal	3 alternate days i.e. 5 days
Nocturnal	8 to 10 nights
Barking Owl	At least 4 nights week apart
Spotlighting - foot	2 nights
Spotlighting - vehicle	2 nights
Stag watching	~ nights
MAMMALS	
Spotlighting - foot	4 non-consecutive nights i.e. 7 days
Spotlighting - vehicle	4 non-consecutive nights i.e. 7 days
Call response	4 nights
Stag watching	~nights
Elliotts - ground	Minimum 4 nights
Elliotts - tree	3 to 4 nights

Pit traps	Arid 10 nights repeated 3 times over year
Search	Minimum 2 hrs
BATS	
Harp/ mist	5 nights
Ultrasonic	4 nights

This will need at least two teams, or two survey periods i.e. one at night, one in the day, basically doubling the resources for surveys. I am not too sure how clients, particularly small developers, will take to this. As they say, the release of the guidelines (= standards) should lead to 'interesting times'!

Martin Denny



Recovery of money or How to make the dead beats pay.

Most of our member consultants have small businesses, so you know how important cash flow is to your economic survival. Recently, I have had a number of colleagues ask my advice on how to chase money, so I thought it best to share my experiences with you all. The

following advice is provided on a without prejudice basis with all of the usual disclaimers and clauses to protect me from your subsequent misadventures....

1. **HARDEN YOUR NOSE.**

The most important lesson to learn and apply is that you have a business relationship with your client. Don't be too nice - you will only make yourself vulnerable to the sharks out there.

2. **GET IT IN WRITING.**

A signed contract is best, describing the scope of work, the fees, the deliverables and terms. Include a clause declaring that you will charge reasonable costs of recovery and/or interest on late payments. If you don't have a full contract, at least get a letter confirming you have been hired for the job, detailing rates and conditions. If they won't write one, you write one to them, confirming your appointment.

3. **BE CONSISTENT.**

If you are lax in chasing payment on one contract, then the client can reasonably expect the same leeway the next time.

4. **BE REASONABLE.**

Don't send in the sheriff for a bill that is a few days overdue or demand that the client

sell their home if they are in genuine financial difficulty. In such circumstances, discuss a mutually-acceptable payment schedule and *GET IT IN WRITING*. If the client subsequently declares themselves bankrupt, you will at least be in the line with the other creditors. Otherwise, you may miss out entirely.

5. **APPLY APPROPRIATE TERMS.**

If your client provides an ABN, they are entitled to pay on terms (say 14 days). If it is an individual, payment is due upon completion of the work.

6. **MAKE IT EASY FOR THEM TO PAY YOU ON TIME.**

Make sure your invoices clearly reflect your terms (e.g. show the date that it falls due). Include your BSB and account details on the invoice, maybe offer a discount for prompt payment.

7. **HAVE A RECOVERY PROCESS.**

Issue a polite reminder when it is overdue. Then have a follow up process - it is up to you how long you are prepared to wait, and the number of reminders you send, but if you need to enforce this in court you have to have at least tried to get the

money. Phone calls are no good – create a paper trail. If they ring you with promises, make a note and send them confirmation of the conversation.

8. **BE PROFESSIONAL.** Make sure your work is worth paying for and delivered promptly. It is hard to make them pay on time if you were 6 months late giving them the report.
9. **GO TO COURT.** Once you have an enforceable agreement and have made all reasonable attempts to recover the debt, don't hesitate to go to court. You fill out an Application for Recovery of Money that you get from and lodge with your Local Court. There is a cost to do this, but this can be added to the client's bill (if your contract says so) and the size of the fee depends on whether or not you are a company and whether you or the Sheriff delivers the documents. You do not need a lawyer to represent you; in fact you may not even need to appear. If the client admits that they owe you the money, the Magistrate will issue orders in chambers.
10. **ASK FOR ADVICE.** Don't be ashamed to ask for help. The clerical staff at the Local Court process

these applications every day. They are very helpful.

Good luck and good business.

Liz Ashby.



2006 Conference & Annual General Meeting:

First notice

Conference Theme: Wildlife Corridors.

Venue: Hallstrom Lecture Theatre, Australian Museum, William Street, East Sydney.

Date: Friday, 8 September 2006

Time: 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. (registration from 8 a.m.).

Registration Costs: \$65 for members and \$110 for non-members (includes cost of lunch & tea breaks).

Following the success of previous annual conferences, the ECA invites its members and guests to attend this year's conference on Wildlife Corridors.

Wildlife corridors allow movement of flora and fauna between patches of wildlife

habitat, as well as providing important habitat themselves. The preservation and establishment of corridors to link habitats is a practical conservation measure to ameliorate loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat, particularly in rural and urban landscapes.

Ecological consultants are becoming increasingly involved in identifying important wildlife corridors, assessing their condition as wildlife habitat, and advising landowners, councils, government departments, courts and community groups on how to protect, enhance and manage these corridors.

However, there is still some confusion among the scientific and wider community about what are effective wildlife corridors, how they should be protected and managed over the long-term, and how and where new corridors should be established. The conference addresses these issues and, in particular, investigates the interaction between the science, politics and community involvement in wildlife corridor management.

Specific topics that will be covered in the conference include:

Morning Session: What is an Effective Wildlife Corridor?

- The aims and types of wildlife corridors.

- ❑ Statewide and regional corridor networks.
- ❑ Essential habitat features of wildlife corridors for mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, invertebrates and flora.

Afternoon Session: Wildlife Corridor Management

- ❑ Creation, enhancement and ongoing habitat management of wildlife corridors.
- ❑ Wildlife corridors in the NSW rural landscape: a practical example.
- ❑ Urban wildlife corridors – a local government perspective.
- ❑ Riparian corridors – a state government perspective.

The Annual General Meeting of the Ecological Consultants Association of NSW Inc. will be held immediately after the conference, at 5 p.m. in the Hallstrom Lecture Theatre.

All participants are invited to attend a conference dinner at Beppis Restaurant (Cnr of Yurong and Stanley Streets, East Sydney) at the conclusion of the AGM. The cost of this dinner is not included in the conference fee.

Further information about the conference can be obtained from Dr Stephen Ambrose (Chair, Conference Organising Committee), Elizabeth Ashby, Paul Burcher, Liz Norris or Judith Rawling.



New Deal on Professional Indemnity Insce.

Necessary evil. That's what I call it in polite company. But we must have Professional Indemnity insurance to trade – governments and some of the bigger clients insist on it, and you would be a fool to advise on multi-million dollar developments without it. Don't think that you don't need such insurance or that you don't need much insurance because you always do the right thing. Insurance claims are not about the insurance company paying for the insured – it is about chasing along the chain until they find someone who isn't and making them pay.

I am concerned that the price of adequate insurance makes it unaffordable for members. The going rate for a tender with government at the moment is \$10 million cover and I know that some members carry much less, despite doing such work.

So your Council has responded by having talks with a new player in the local

insurance market – EnviroSure. They are interested in achieving lower premiums (10% less to start and probably much less in the longer term) and breaking the seeming monopoly that the big three have in our market place.

The crux of the plan is to offer members in the scheme an "umbrella" cover of \$10 million, the premiums determined by the numbers of entities covered. For example, if 10 individual companies with 3 employees each were insured for \$10 million dollars each for \$10,000 per annum, this represents \$100,000 premiums with a combined cover of \$100 million. If we were to act as a collective in the umbrella program, then the 10 entities would be covered as if they were a single "corporate" client with 30 employees. The premium would be shared amongst the 10 entities – much cheaper – and we would all have adequate cover – a better situation for many.

The whole scheme is to be underwritten by Lloyds of London and we are still negotiating. Your Council and I think this is worth a try and Keystone Ecological and Urban Bushland Management Consultants are the first two entities on board. The more the merrier and the more the cheaper.

Feedback would be appreciated and don't forget our new email addresses – you

can write to me at
president@ecansw.org.au.

Safe working,

Liz Ashby

Update on Vegetation Sampling

In the last ECA Newsletter I proposed that DEC should establish a database whereby an accredited practitioner could submit plot data that is consistent with that used in regional surveys. The data could then be subjected to PATN analysis (or similar) to compute which community/communities and be available to those who require it in a similar way that the wildlife atlas data is.

I have since found out that in Victoria, all plot data is collected using the same method and is checked, verified and ordered onto one database system by Victorian Department of Natural Resources and Sustainability via several database managers in Melbourne. Apparently, all botanists and ecological consultants use this system. Consultants submit data to the database so it builds up over time and information is not lost. You can buy some of the Victorian flora data for \$100 on a CD.

It has been estimated that there is probably over \$10 million worth of flora site data sitting around in NSW hardly

be able to be used. It would be extremely useful if all this data could be managed and available for use.

Paul Burcher



Unusual/casual observations.

HOW BIG A THREAT ARE ROADS TO POWERFUL OWLS IN SYDNEY?

I am aware of three Powerful Owl road kills in the northern Sydney suburbs over the last 18 months, one in Cammeray (August 2004), one in Lane Cove West (September 2005), and one in Wahroonga (February 2006). All three road kills were on busy arterial roads that are close or adjacent to bushland areas where Powerful Owls were known to roost by day and presumably forage by night. This leads me to ask the following questions:

- ❑ were these birds disturbed from their day-time roosts;
- ❑ were they immature birds who were

inexperienced at dodging heavy traffic;

- ❑ were they pursuing prey at the time of being hit by a vehicle;
- ❑ has it become more difficult for Powerful Owls to dodge vehicles because of increased traffic on our roads and urban encroachment on their natural habitat; or
- ❑ have road kills been a function of increased numbers of Powerful Owls in Sydney (particularly in the Lane Cove River Catchment Area)?

I would be interested to hear of any other records of Powerful Owl road kills in the Sydney region. In Britain, road kills are considered a significant threat to the status of Barn Owls because this species flies low over roads and is susceptible to being hit by vehicles at night. If there are additional records of Powerful Owl deaths on our roads, then we may have to consider this as another potential threat to the status of this species, and particularly Sydney populations.

Stephen Ambrose

BIRD VICTIM OF SPIDER.

Whilst recently undertaking a fauna survey adjacent to New Illawarra Road, Bangor, NSW (out near the ANSTO facility Lucas Heights) I came across

the following, a New Holland Honeyeater (*Phylindonyris novaehollandiae*) caught in the web of what appears to be a Garden Orb-weaving Spider (*Eriophora biapicata*). What astounded me about this was the size of the bird, the speed at which it was likely to be flying when caught, the likelihood that, when caught, it would have flapped around for a while, and the fact that it was actually entangled. The bird was obviously dead, and given the smell, had been for a while.



The photograph shows the Orb-weaving Spider actually sitting on the honeyeater, but whether it was feeding on this or not I didn't ascertain at the time of the field survey. I can appreciate/understand that smaller birds could be caught in the webs of these and other spiders, having stumbled into them on occasion myself whilst in the field and noting how sticky they are, but a bird of this size (which is

approximately 17-18.5 cm long and weighs around 20 grams [S. Ambrose, pers. comm.]) I found startling.

Just thought some of you out there may be similarly interested in this observation and have seen similar instances of birds (or other fauna??) being caught in spider webs.

Deryk Engel

FERAL ANIMAL ALERT - FIVE-LINED PALM SQUIRREL ON CENTRAL COAST

The local pub is a source of much unreliable information – gossip, innuendo, uninformed opinion – but sometimes there is a gem just waiting to be picked up and polished. While sharing a cleansing ale recently, a mate of mine told me that, while he was eating his lunch at a construction job on the Central Coast, his father saw a strange squirrel-like mammal.

And indeed he did. Mr Laurie Paterson saw a Five-lined or Northern Palm Squirrel (*Funambulus pennanti*) feasting on fallen Silky Oak (*Grevillea robusta*) blossom in suburban Wyoming last October. This species is native to India and Pakistan, completely diurnal and generally arboreal (J. Seebeck, Fauna of Australia, 1989).

Mr Paterson watched this animal for about half an hour, until it darted up into and disappeared among the foliage

of the Silky Oak tree. It was very alert and wary, taking refuge under a nearby parked car when there was any other activity, such as a Magpie flying low along the road.

He recently reported this sighting to the local National Parks and Wildlife Service office at Gosford. He identified it from one of their reference books and subsequently spoke to NPWS Officer Neil Martin who, coincidentally, had been responsible for shooting out a feral colony of this species around Taronga Zoo many years ago.

There have been a number of feral populations of this species in Australia, all connected with zoos (there is still a population around Perth Zoo) and this Central Coast population is no different, as Eric Worrell's original Wildlife Park used to be in Wyoming. Although long gone, its legacy lives on with some odd turtles in the local creeks and now the Five-lined Palm Squirrel.

I am further investigating the occurrence of this species on the Central Coast and hopefully will be able to report to you later regarding its impact and fate.

Liz Ashby

Membership Report

At the time of writing the number of members of the ECA was 64, comprised of 57 practising members, three

associate members and four non-practising members.

New members (since volume 14 of the newsletter) are as follows:

Practising members

Nicholas Bauer (Total Earth Care) - Sydney

Robert Blackall (Total Earth Care) - Sydney

Elizabeth Broese Van Groenou (Cumberland Ecology) - Sydney

Tony Gilson (Greening Australia) - Sydney

Andrew Huggett (InSight Ecology) - Moonee

Anna Lloyd (A&R Environmental) - Emerald Beach

Brett Morrissey (Total Earth Care) - Sydney

Greg Richards (Greg Richards & Associates) - ACT

David Robinson (Cumberland Ecology) - Sydney

Peter Stricker (Actinotus Environmental Consultants) - Sydney

Associate Members

Claudia Catterall (Abel Ecology) - Lismore

Allen Watterson (Ecosphere Consulting) - Mullimbimby

Non-practising

Radika Michniewicz - Ryde

Paul Burcher

Accreditation Scheme for Consultants.

We all know about this, so I won't go on about the detail of it, but be reminded that the deadline for submissions on the draft scheme is looming rapidly - FRIDAY 9TH JUNE.

Go to the DEC website at

http://www3.environment.nsw.gov.au/npws.nsf/Content/dec_public_consultation

and download the draft document and the FAQ paper.

I **know** it is a bureaucratic process, but how else could it be done? I **know** it is expensive, but the government will not subsidise it further.

Get your submissions in to the DEC.

Liz Ashby
President

Workshops.

ECA Council are working towards running a number of workshops over the next couple of years.

The first two are being planned for late October 2006 at Coffs Harbour, and will hopefully involve a one-day bat workshop, and a one-day grass identification workshop. Updates will be forwarded to all members as plans progress.

Liz Norris