



LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION OF QUEENSLAND INC.

Stock Route Management Position Paper

December 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. BACKGROUND	3
2.1. What is Local Government responsible for? - A Stock route network overview	3
2.2. Stock route usage	4
2.3. <i>Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002</i>	5
2.4. Movement and grazing of stock on State-controlled roads	5
2.5. Revenue.....	5
2.6. Stock route network costs	6
2.7. Stock route survey results	7
3. ISSUES	7
3.1. Contemporary Stock Route Requirements	7
3.2. Stock route revenue and management costs	8
3.3. Compliance and enforcement	9
3.4. Management of travelling stock	9
3.5. Agistment.....	10
3.6. Managing conflicting uses.....	11
APPENDIX 1. Local Government Stock Route Survey Results.....	12

1. INTRODUCTION

The management of the State's stock route network is undertaken by Local Government in accordance with the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002*. This Act is now the primary legislative mechanism for the control and management of travelling stock and the short-term agistment of stock on the stock route network and local government roads.

The Act charges Local Government with the responsibility of controlling and maintaining stock routes, reserves for travelling stock and all network infrastructure, such as water facilities. However, existing travel and agistment fees do not adequately cover the maintenance costs, provide for a return on investment or provide a fund for future refurbishment.

A recent survey of the 48 Local Governments that manage the State's stock routes indicates that the direct management costs to Councils has been approximately \$15M over the past 5 years or \$3M annually. According to the survey results Local Government is currently subsidising \$7.09 for every beast that utilises the State's stock routes.

This problem is further exacerbated by the fact that a large amount of resources are being wasted on managing unused routes, reserves and infrastructure. Local Government is compelled to significantly contribute to this shortfall.

Furthermore, during the recent drought many Councils experienced problems with drovers flouting stock route regulations and expressed concern that they have no practical legal powers to deal with breaches of stock route permits.

On 25 February 2003, the Minister for Natural Resources met with central western Queensland Local Government and LGAQ representatives to discuss stock route network management. Local Government have sought immediate additional legislative amendments to address issuing penalty notices, imposition of a security bond as a condition of permit, power to seize & impound stock and provide Police move on powers.

In addition, the Association initiated the formation of the Stock Route Management Working Group to consider the entire operations of stock routes, including roles, responsibilities, funding and enforcement.

The working group has drafted this paper to focus attention on the key issues and facilitate discussion within Local Government.

The LGAQ believes that the resolution of these issues will provide for an equitable partnership approach to the effective future management of the network.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. What is Local Government responsible for? - A Stock route network overview

The stock route network comprises of stock routes and reserves for travelling stock. Infrastructure that supports the needs of travelling stock is constructed within the network.

Today the network consists of -

ROUTE CLASSIFICATIONS	STOCK ROUTES		RESERVES FOR TRAVELLING STOCK		WATER FACILITIES (operational)
	LENGTH (km)	AREA (ha)	NUMBERS	AREA (ha)	
Primary	2,650	294,931	219	147,188	203
Secondary	5,000	301,591	179	109,584	173
Minor	4,000	679,288	364	139,107	193
Inactive	60,000	1,325,700	Numerous - unknown	NA	173
TOTALS	71,650	2,601,510	762+	395,879+	742

Stock Routes

The *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* provides for a road or route to be declared a stock route by regulation or use (ordinarily used for travelling stock). Roads declared stock routes are generally identified in the previously distributed map titled "Queensland Stock Routes and Water Points" (Edition 1 June 2002).¹ NR&M has recently mapped all roads that are declared stock routes under the new Act electronically and is currently distributing this data to Local Government.

¹ Note this map is not the official mechanism for stock route declaration. For the purposes of this paper this map is referred to because of its previous distribution.

Outside of the intention of the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002*, most stock routes exist as roads. Stock routes have no separate title, tenure or declaration apart from that of road. A stock route, supporting travelling stock and agistment, is just one use of the State's road network, as are the use of roads for transportation, power lines, communications infrastructure, pipelines and other community uses.

Local government (with the exception of State-controlled roads) as managers of local roads, therefore have a general duty of care to their protection irrespective of whether they are declared stock routes or not.

Reserves for Travelling Stock

The stock route network also consists of reserves for travelling stock, mainly camping and water reserves. The majority of these reserves have been placed under the control of Local Government as trustee (*Land Act 1994*). As with roads, irrespective of their use under the Land Protection Act, Local Government as trustee has a duty of care to their protection and management.

Stock Route Infrastructure

Infrastructure built on the network includes facilities such as fencing, yards, bridges and watering facilities, which include bores, windmills, troughs, tanks and piping and associated works. There are over 700 watering facilities on the stock route network. The total replacement value of stock route infrastructure is estimated to be \$31M. The book value of this infrastructure is \$9M.

In most instances the control and management of infrastructure has been vested to Local Government however remains the property of the State (NR&M).

2.2. Stock route usage

During the past five decades absolute numbers of travelling stock have declined. The long-term decline in stock numbers on the stock route network can be attributed primarily to the growth in alternative transport methods, however the rationalisation of meatworks and saleyards, and the growth in the live export trade, have also contributed to this decline.

However despite this decline, significant demand for agistment within the network was evident² during the recent unfavourable seasonal episode, highlighting the important role the network continues to play as a drought fodder reserve.

In the "*Review of the Rural Lands Protection Act and A Framework for the future management of Weeds, Pests and Stock Routes*" O'Neill (November 1996) reported-

"Industry confirmed that it regarded the maintenance of a well managed network of stock routes as integral to its future. It pointed to the critical role that stock routes had played, and continued to play, in responding to drought. It was suggested that given the

outlook for these industries there could be a move to greater walking of stock. The increasing cost of transport was identified as relevant in this regard.”

In support of this and a precursor to the future usage of the network a significant number of cattle and sheep have travelled along stock routes between 1998 and 2003². This does not include short movements exempt under legislation as well as stock movement where a permit is not required or obtained.

²Note it is anticipated that the LGAQ survey will provide actual numbers of cattle and sheep that have travelled along stock routes between 1998 and 2003

2.3. Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002

The *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* provides the legislative framework for the management of the stock route network in Queensland and came into force on 1 July 2003.

Under the Act the function of each Local Government is -

- To manage the part of the stock route network in its area in accordance with the Act and the principles of stock route network management; and
- To control the movement of travelling stock on the part of the stock route network in its area.

Local government, as day-to-day managers of the stock route network, are solely responsible for:

- Compiling a stock route network management plan for their area;
- Receiving and assessing applications and issuing stock route agistment permits;
- Receiving and assessing applications and issuing stock route travel permits;
- Monitoring rate of travel;
- Deciding whether stock routes should be fenced;
- Undertaking mustering for compliance;
- Managing and conserving pasture for travelling stock;
- Maintaining and providing travelling stock facilities;
- Managing water facility agreements;
- Managing the seizure of stray stock;
- Enforcement.

2.4. Movement and grazing of stock on State-controlled roads

As discussed previously, Local Governments are responsible for the issuing of permits for the movement and grazing of stock on the stock route network and Local Government roads. Where stock routes are also State-controlled roads, a Local Government must only grant a permit that contains those conditions recommended by the Department of Main Roads (MRD). These conditions may only relate to the protection of road transport infrastructure under the *Transport Infrastructure Act 1994* or road safety.

MRD is, however, responsible for approvals to move or graze stock on State-controlled roads in situations where the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* does not require a Local Government to issue a permit (i.e. travel that is exempt or where the State-controlled road is not declared to be a stock route).

2.5. Revenue

A maximum agistment fee of \$1.80 per beast or 32 cents per sheep is prescribed by the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Regulation 2003*.

Droving fees remain at 2 cents for each 20 head of cattle, horse and mules or part thereof for each kilometre or part thereof travelled; and 2 cents for each 100 head of sheep and goats or part thereof for each kilometre or part thereof travelled.

The State Government has deferred a decision on increased fees until seasonal conditions across Queensland improve.

The current (2002/2003) maximum stock route water fee is \$1190.00 and the minimum is \$309.00.

Travelling stock fees account for approximately 12% of all revenue received from various stock route network activities. Water fees contribute 45% and agistment fees account for 40% of all revenue. The long-term trend for revenue generated from travelling stock fees has been in a general decline. Also the real value of fees collected has declined due to inflation.

Previous State Government revenue reviews have been limited to travel fees and a more flexible approach to setting agistment fees. A broader approach to identifying other revenue generation opportunities is yet to be considered by the State Government eg. pasture harvesting fees.

In the past Local Governments were obliged to remit all fees collected for use of the stock route network to NR&M. However, the new Act now provides that revenue obtained from stock route fees and charges are to be shared on a 50/50 basis between the Local and State Governments. Local Government collect an estimated average of \$183,250 a year in fees over the last 9 years.

Fees Collected by Local Governments					
Financial Year	Seizure of Stock ³	Travelling Stock	Agistment	Water Agreement	Total by Financial Year
1994/95	\$3,678	\$44,580	\$66,572	\$40,945	\$155,775
1995/96	\$3,927	\$24,477	\$69,652	\$62,182	\$160,238
1996/97	\$1,643	\$20,928	\$55,320	\$86,304	\$164,195
1997/98	\$29,232	\$11,386	\$77,176	\$90,782	\$208,576
1998/99	\$2,430	\$8,170	\$53,169	\$73,374	\$137,143
1999/2000	\$5,876	\$8,560	\$65,977	\$98,088	\$178,501
2000/2001	\$0	\$26,432	\$23,539	\$103,345	\$153,316
2001/2002	\$978	\$21,357	\$72,299	\$68,772	\$163,406
2002/2003	\$3,461	\$38,381	\$178,782	\$107,499	\$328,123

³No seizure of stock fees under the new Act

2.6. Stock route network costs

There are costs associated with maintaining and administering the stock route network and also in replacing old infrastructure and upgrading water facilities.

Maintenance costs

Maintenance costs for the stock route network, calculated from Local Government precept claims prior to 1998/99 for stock route facility maintenance and water facility maintenance, come to approximately \$1M annually (survey data will quantify). These expenses are incurred by Local Governments while carrying out their responsibilities under the legislation. Primarily, Local Government meets its obligations through the employment of a stock route supervisor or rural lands officer. These officers will also normally undertake other roles associated with the Act, i.e. pest management; and may undertake additional duties associated with Local Government activities. Maintenance costs are derived from such things as fencing repairs, noxious weed spraying, inspections and stock route supervisor wages.

Administration costs and capital works

Additional costs are incurred in administrating the stock route network, that is the wages of Local Government staff delegated to undertake administrative actions under the legislation. These functions include receipt and issuing of permits, managing capital works projects and dispute resolution.

Upgrading Infrastructure

In addition to Local Government’s maintenance responsibilities it remains liable for the provision of new infrastructure. In the past the Rural Lands Protection Board and State government have provided funding for new infrastructure and major enhancements.

Approximately \$4.13 million has been spent since 1995 to restore 308 water facilities and construct 77 new facilities along the major stock routes. This has resulted in improved facilities for users and reduced Local Government maintenance costs. However without an improved source of revenue Local Government’s capacity to meet future demands for infrastructure remains dependant on assistance from the State.

2.7. Stock route survey results

The Association recently circulated a Local Government survey, seeking information regarding stock route travel and agistment usage, management, revenue and costs attributed to Councils. The feedback received from 24 of the 48 Councils to date has provided the LGAQ with an accurate sample of the true costs incurred by all Councils responsible for the management of stock routes.

The survey results have revealed that Councils make a significant financial contribution to the management of the stock route network and have expended approximately \$15M* over the past 5 years or \$3M annually towards stock routes management. According to the survey results Local Government is currently subsidising \$7.09 for every beast that utilises the State’s stock routes.

Stock Route Survey Summary							
No. Councils Responded	Cost Per Annum	Average No Of Stock Travelling	Cost Per Travelling Beast	Total Stock Route Revenue Per Annum	Revenue Cost Per Annum	Subsidy Per Beast	Average No. Stock Agisted
24	\$1,4M	182,227	\$7.85	\$139,956	\$1,291,347	\$7.09	31,157

Indicative cost across 48 Councils based on extrapolating survey results of the 24 Councils that responded

See Appendix 1 for the Local Government Stock Route Survey Results.

3. ISSUES

3.1. Contemporary Stock Route Requirements

Roads remain an integral part of Queensland’s cadastre and continue to meet their primary purpose of providing access and a network for the travelling public. They also preserve remnants of the State’s ecosystems, contain cultural and historical artefacts, provide a land corridor for a multitude of infrastructure (communication, power, water), provide regional open space and meet a broad range of other community needs.

However as this paper has identified demand for roads to provide a corridor to sustain walking stock has dramatically reduced since the early twentieth century at a time when all livestock producers were dependant on a well-maintained stock route network.

The network as preserved today does not accurately reflect what is used or required by bona fide travelling stock. The preservation of the network to the extent that remains contributes to the impost on Local Government resources. For example NR&M's own categorisation of routes indicates that 60000 kilometres or 83% of the network is unused. Infrastructure on these routes accounts for 25% of the State's stock route assets.

The classification of a road as a stock route brings specific legislative management obligations under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002*. The Act allows the movement and agistment of stock to be regulated on roads therefore the need to declare them as stock routes is arguable.

LGAQ recognises that planning is required to manage well-used routes however it disputes the necessity to maintain the network to the current extent. Rationalisation of the network will allow limited funds to be more strategically utilised. Similarly the occupation of stock routes and reserves by landholders can be more rationally addressed if priority routes can be identified.

Action- 1

Undertake a comprehensive review of the extent of the network, including infrastructure, with a view of maintaining a core of well maintained and well utilised stock routes and reserves.

3.2. Stock route revenue and management costs

Local Government expend a total of approximately \$3M a year on maintenance, administration and capital works. Existing travel and agistment fees however, do not adequately cover the cost of replacing and upgrading worn out facilities, provide for a return on assets or provide a fund for future refurbishment. For example, Local Government is currently subsidising \$7.09 for every beast that utilises the State's stock routes. In short, the stock route network is heavily subsidised by Local Government.

Local Governments have been obliged to remit all fees collected for use of the stock route network to NR&M. However, the new Act now provides that revenue obtained from stock route fees are to be shared on a 50/50 basis between the State and local Governments. The revenue sharing arrangements under the new Act will have little impact for Local Governments in meeting the costs of maintaining the network, gross receipts are limited under a fee regime that is 13 years old and based on pastoral support policies of past eras.

LGAQ and Local Governments supported a new travel and agistment fee structure to be introduced with the commencement of the new Act. This coupled with revenue sharing aimed to increase revenue collection to assist Local Government to offset the burden on ratepayers. However the State Government has deferred a decision until seasonal conditions improve.

Previous revenue reviews have been limited to travel fees and a more flexible approach to setting agistment fees; water charges also require review, as they do not provide sufficient returns to meet maintenance and administrative costs. Past investigations have also ignored emerging issues that may have significant impact on Local Governments obligations i.e. the cost of complying with increased Workplace Health and Safety regulations. The solutions are expensive and will only further consume the limited resources available for stock route network management.

LGAQ and Local Governments support the broadening of the review process to explore additional opportunities for revenue generation. For example, pasture harvesting, which currently does not attract a fee, has the potential to generate substantial financial benefit to the harvesting agent.

Under current revenue policies subsidisation is entrenched, that is Local Government continues to maintain infrastructure that is primarily utilised by adjoining landowners and is infrequently used by travelling stock. The capital works funding policies of NR&M prevent Local Government

receiving support for the upgrade of facilities on unused and minor routes. Whilst LGAQ recognises the need to prioritise limited funding the State ignores the fact that water facility agreements continue to exist over these facilities obligating Local Government to maintain the facility in working order. Three hundred and sixty-nine water facilities or 50% of facilities are associated with these routes. Sixty-three percent of these are utilised by adjoining landowners through water agreements that derive only \$75,000 annual revenue.

Action- 2

In the short term, seek commitment from the Minister for Natural Resources & Mines to pursue the State Government's endorsement of the proposed new fee structure.

Secondly, LGAQ, through the Working Group, explore/develop a cost-neutral model for the management of the Stock Route Network to ensure cost recovery to State and Local Government.

3.3. Compliance and enforcement

Recently, widespread drought conditions resulted in a substantial escalation in the utilisation of the stock route network. As a result, demand for pasture, both for travelling stock and local agistment, significantly increased in central and southern Queensland. These events proved that the *Rural Lands Protection Act 1985* and the associated regulations were inadequate to meet the challenges of managing the network during periods of high demand.

These inadequacies have frustrated Local Government's attempts to effectively manage travelling stock. Conflicts with, and between, drovers and landholders escalated as competition for fodder for drought-affected stock increased. Support from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines in finding suitable solutions was inadequate. The financial penalties for offences under the previous Act were not a sufficient deterrent to warrant action by Local Governments.

The *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* provides for increased penalties and enables permits to be both refused and conditioned. Breaches of permit condition now may result in the cancellation of permits. A wider range of offences has also been incorporated.

Though the new Act has not yet been tested in a rigorous environment such as existed in 2002 Local Government experiences have already lead to recommendations for change. In response, the Association through its solicitors King & Co. have drafted and forwarded amendments to the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* and *Regulations 2003* to the Minister of Natural Resources and Mines. The changes sought by LGAQ are designed to resolve existing problems however a full review is warranted based on the experiences of 2002.

Action- 3

Undertake a review of the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* and identify inadequacies that prohibit effective enforcement by Local Government officers; and develop appropriate enforcement skills and legislative knowledge in association with the Department of Natural Resources and Mines.

3.4. Management of travelling stock

The increased utilisation of the network during the recent unfavourable seasons highlighted the need for increased surveillance of drovers. Drovers recognise their obligations to the welfare of the animals under their care, however this obligation cannot be met to the detriment of other users, the pasture within the network and stock route infrastructure. The failure of travelling

stock to maintain the prescribed rate of travel during this period was in essence the major contributor to disputes.

The *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* has attempted to address this issue by requiring a minimum travel rate (10 kilometres per day) as opposed to the previous requirement to average 10 kilometres per day. This is in addition to the ability of Local Government to impose any reasonable condition.

The welfare of animals is the responsibility of the person to whose care they are entrusted. An applicant who knowingly applies to walk stock at a rate that they are incapable of achieving may have inadvertently breach their duty of care. However this should not provide a defence against compliance with the rate prescribed.

The apparent lack of bona fide destinations also lead to increased disputes. Many mobs simply meandered chasing any available pasture. Local government cannot effectively maintain a network where this is the primary objective. LGAQ supports the underlying principles of the Act that state the primary purpose is for travelling stock. LGAQ argues that greater disclosure by stockowners and drovers is required as to allow the network to be managed effectively. Legislative changes need evaluation to support this concept. Alteration of destinations should be permitted but subject to a revised assessments as if a "fresh" application.

The closure of routes and the coordination of mobs between Local Government areas were the main criticisms received by NR&M. Closure of routes is not permitted under the Act. Local Government though may refuse an application where sufficient body of feed is not available. In reality the result is the same therefore coordination between areas needs to be improved.

Action- 4

Identify preferred alternatives for the management of travelling stock, including a review of the process for granting travel permits, and identification of a bona fide destination and seek legislative changes and development of supporting policies.

3.5. Agistment

The *Rural Lands Protection Act 1985* protected the primary purpose of stock routes by allowing Local Government to grant agistment permits, without NR&M consent, in very limited circumstances.

Whilst LGAQ acknowledges that this provision has existed since 1944 the attitude towards allowing agistment by the Department seem to take a dramatic twist in recent years.

Many drought affected Local Governments viewed the Department's policy of refusing agistment on primary and secondary routes, in order to protect the network's primary purpose (travelling stock), as inflexible, discriminatory and detrimental to ratepayers.

The *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002* Act is described as providing greater management autonomy for Local Government however NR&M have effectively enshrined the old policy in legislation. The Act continues to preclude Local Governments to grant priority to the network's resources to ratepayers who fund its management.

It also limits agistment to 28 days (with one extension of 28 days) and compels Local Governments to undertake an exhaustive advertising process when pasture is abundant and requires removal for management purposes.

LGAQ considers agistment periods too restrictive and the process too complex and costly.

Action- 5

Review the agistment provisions to provide for greater Local Government autonomy and flexibility in managing access to pasture for non-travelling stock, including access by local landholders during drought conditions.

3.6. Managing conflicting uses

The management and enforcement issues discussed earlier are compounded by the fact that the stock route network in Queensland comprises roads and reserves. Roads in particular are multiple use corridors. Multi-use means a multitude of managers and legislative regimes.

The result, disparate interests impact on the effective management of the network and result in an ad hoc and non-holistic approach to management use and enforcement.

Whilst enforcement is recognised as an effective management tool, agencies have a varying commitment to the use of this tool. The competing nature prevalent amongst these agencies often leads to authorities being given by one agency, though lawful, that adversely impacts on the network's ability to accommodate stock on hoof.

Local government's obligation to stock route network management is therefore complicated and at times impeded by other agencies. These agencies are primarily the departments of Main Roads and Natural Resources and Mines.

By way of example, Local Government is often criticised for failing to "conserve the natural fodder for stock on any stock route or reserve for travelling stock". However those Local Governments who attempt in earnest to provide well grassed routes are frustrated by NR&M issuing permits to occupy or term leases over roads or reserves, often resulting in overstocking with no fodder left for travelling stock. Enforcement of lease and permit conditions is negligible.

This issue in particular requires resolution and LGAQ's proposal to rationalise the network should facilitate a review of occupation of stock routes and reserves of primary importance.

However there are many examples of multi-agency approvals that impact on the effective management of the network. LGAQ needs to prioritise resolution with both NR&M and Main Roads.

Action- 6

Identify management conflicts resulting from multiple agency management of roads and reserves, including NR&M's leasing policies and MRD's road reserve management policies.

APPENDIX 1. Local Government Stock Route Survey Results

LOCAL GOVERNMENT	COST PER ANNUM	AVERAGE NUMBER OF STOCK TRAVELLING	COST PER TRAVELLING BEAST	TOTAL STOCK ROUTE REVENUE PER ANNUM	REVENUE - COST PER ANNUM	SUBSIDY PER BEAST	AVERAGE NUMBER OF STOCK AGISTED*
TARA	\$ 93,033.20	8,266	\$ 11.25	\$ 6,152.80	-\$ 86,880.40	-\$ 10.51	2,506
BALONNE	\$ 60,200.43	6,770	\$ 8.89	\$ 3,562.23	-\$ 56,638.20	-\$ 8.37	1,525
ARAMAC	\$ 52,898.25	4,860	\$ 10.88	\$ 7,489.50	-\$ 45,408.75	-\$ 9.34	3,026
BOORINGA	\$ 87,758.33	7,354	\$ 11.93	\$ 11,227.87	-\$ 76,530.46	-\$ 10.41	760
BOULIA	\$ 54,200.00	6,800	\$ 7.97	\$ 6,400.00	-\$ 47,800.00	-\$ 7.03	0
QUILPIE	\$ 54,106.86	0		\$ 1,681.82	-\$ 52,425.04		0
BANANA	\$ -	1,700		\$ 918.00	\$ 918.00	\$ 0.54	400
EMERALD	\$ 91,453.20	6,292	\$ 14.53	\$ 313.80	-\$ 91,139.40	-\$ 14.48	448
BARCADDINE	\$ 127,145.16	19,625	\$ 6.48	\$ 1,281.21	-\$ 125,863.95	-\$ 6.41	100
LONGREACH	\$ 59,036.22	11,350	\$ 5.20	\$ 11,596.27	-\$ 47,439.95	-\$ 4.18	0
MURWEH	\$ 71,400.00	9,981	\$ 7.15	\$ 9,934.45	-\$ 61,465.55	-\$ 6.16	33
PEAK DOWNS	\$ 30,627.60	3,116	\$ 9.83	\$ 303.00	-\$ 30,324.60	-\$ 9.73	822
WAGGAMBA	\$ 172,613.09	19,461	\$ 8.87	\$ 31,420.37	-\$ 141,192.72	-\$ 7.26	10,338
BLACKALL	\$ 65,539.60	13,901	\$ 4.71	\$ 5,499.20	-\$ 60,040.40	-\$ 4.32	920
ISISFORD	\$ 42,671.60	4,549	\$ 9.38	\$ 5,279.12	-\$ 37,392.48	-\$ 8.22	0
BAUHINIA	\$ 68,035.06	8,897	\$ 7.65	\$ 3,312.25	-\$ 64,722.81	-\$ 7.27	5,816
ILFRACOMBE	\$ 32,250.20	17,874	\$ 1.80	\$ 2,212.20	-\$ 30,038.00	-\$ 1.68	0
JERICHO	\$ 103,215.06	488	\$ 211.51	\$ 1,026.60	-\$ 102,188.46	-\$ 209.40	100
CHINCHILLA	\$ 28,658.74	3,877	\$ 7.39	\$ 770.18	-\$ 27,888.56	-\$ 7.19	0
BROADSOUND	\$ 6,155.31	434	\$ 14.18	\$ 69.39	-\$ 6,085.92	-\$ 14.02	1,034
WARROO	\$ 33,672.00	11,772	\$ 2.86	\$ 3,567.00	-\$ 30,105.00	-\$ 2.56	2,288
MCKINLAY	\$ 54,349.80	11,587	\$ 4.69	\$ 10,171.20	-\$ 44,178.60	-\$ 3.81	1,041
MT ISA	\$ 4,284.60	0		\$ 3,043.60	-\$ 1,241.00		0
FLINDERS	\$ 38,000.00	3,273	\$ 11.61	\$ 12,724.60	-\$ 25,275.40	-\$ 7.72	0
TOTAL	\$1,431,304.31	182,227	\$ 7.85	\$ 139,956.66	-\$ 1,291,347.65	-\$ 7.09	31,157
SHIRE AVERAGE	\$ 59,637.68	7,593	\$ 7.85	\$ 5,831.53	-\$ 53,806.15	-\$ 7.09	1,298

* Denotes agistment restricted by Rural Lands Protection Act 1985