Detailed risk assessment for 1080 and PAPP bait use in Victoria

*Please indicate your response to these statements by circling Yes or No and completing the underlined sections.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Bait user’s name:** |  |
| **Bait user’s address:** |  |
| **Baiting location (if different to above):** |  |
| The objective of the pest control strategy is: |  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The number of foxes / wild dogs / feral pigs / rabbits (circle relevant species) impacting on the property is approximately

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|       | per hectare or |       | per spotlight kilometre and are at levels that have the potential to impact on production and/or biodiversity. |

I have identified where the foxes / wild dogs / feral pigs / rabbits (circle relevant species) are living and foraging on the property. **Yes / No**

|  |
| --- |
| I have identified the following non-target domestic animals / marsupials / reptiles / birds (circle relevant animals) on the property (please specify species): |
|       |

Based on the susceptibility, ecology, location and population size of the target and non-target species on the property I have selected the following bait/s.

[ ]  Shelf stable 1080 bait

[ ]  Shelf stable PAPP bait

[ ]  Perishable (‘fresh’) 1080 bait

[ ]  Liquid Capsules (for use in Canid Pest Ejector)

I have determined the most appropriate bait placement (attach map) and deployment method. **Yes / No**

Based on the information above and the product label, I have calculated the appropriate amount of bait required during the baiting program to be:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|       | (number / kg) of |       | (bait type) over |       | (hectares / km transect) |
|       | (number / kg) of |       | (bait type) over |       | (hectares / km transect) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The total amount of bait to be used is: |       | over |       | (weeks) |

I have taken steps to increase the effectiveness via coordinating the program with neighbours. **Yes / No**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I have determined that the use of |       | (bait type) is an integral and appropriate part of my |

pest control strategy and that all identified risks and impacts (see over) can be managed **Yes / No**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The start and completion dates of the baiting program will be: |       | to |       |

During the baiting program I will monitor to check that risks are being effectively managed. **Yes / No**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Further detail on monitoring: |       |

**Risk identification and Mitigation**

The table outlines some of the more common risks associated with the use of 1080 or PAPP vertebrate pest baits and the minimum risk mitigation measures required (under the DFU, product label and SDS) to effectively manage them.

Using the table, identify the potential risks that may occur during your proposed program.

| **Risk** | **Minimum Mitigation Measures****(DFU, product label, SDS)** | **Likelihood rating (record below)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Exposure to domestic animals | Notification to neighbours, Signage, Restraint, Muzzling, Enclosed bait stations, Timing, Restrict access, Remove/destroy untaken baits, Carcass disposal |       |
| Exposure to wildlife | Bait selection, Bait placement, Bait amount, Timing, Free feeding, Restrict access, Remove/destroy untaken baits, Carcass disposal |       |
| Exposure to livestock | Notification to neighbours, Bait placement, Signage, Restrict access |       |
| Juvenile pest animals orphaned | Bait timing |       |
| User exposure to 1080 or PAPP during handling and use | Correct use of equipment, PPE |       |
| Exposure to unauthorised persons from laid 1080 or PAPP baits | Signage, Restrict access, Remove/destroy untaken baits |       |
| Exposure to unauthorised persons from 1080 or PAPP baits in storage | Secure and safe storage, Restrict access, Signage, Correct packaging, Disposal after program is complete |       |
| Exposure to unauthorised persons from 1080 or PAPP baits in transit or disposal | Restrict access, Signage, Correct packaging, Timing |       |
| Contamination of waterways/potable water | Distance restrictions, Disposal |       |
| Contamination of feedstuffs | Distance restrictions, Disposal |       |

**Risk Management**

Using the definitions below, determine the likelihood of these risks occurring following implementation of the mitigation measures.

* Unlikely – does not exist or will not happen, unexpected
* Possible – may exist or happen but not certain
* Likely – plausible that it exists or will happen, probable at least one time
* Almost Certain – Exists or will happen more than once

If the likelihood of a risk occurring following compliance with the DFU, product label and SDS is **unlikely** then the risk is deemed to be **managed** to an acceptable level.

If the likelihood of a risk after mitigation is still **possible**, **likely** or **almost certain** (residual risk) then the risk is **not managed** to an acceptable level and a more detailed risk assessment that considers **additional risk management** strategies is required.

**Additional risk management**

To assess the Risk Rating of the residual risks associated with potential baiting activities, fill in the likelihood and impact columns in the table below. Refer to the Risk Matrix for definitions and further information.

Any risk that has a Risk Rating of Significant-High despite using additional mitigation strategies should preclude the use of 1080 or PAPP baits and users should consider alternative control options.

| **Risk** | **Likelihood****(minimum mitigation)** | **Additional Mitigation** | **Likelihood****(revised)** | **Impact** | **Risk Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exposure of domestic animals |       | Removal of domestic animals during baiting, additional signage, additional notification to people who may visit the land where the baits are laid |       |       |       |
| Exposure of wildlife |       | Integrate alternate control methods, ensure only the minimum effective amount of bait is used, increase the frequency of checking baits and recovering carcasses of poisoned animals |       |       |       |
| Exposure of livestock |       | Removal of livestock during baiting |       |       |       |
| Juvenile pest animals orphaned |       | Increased monitoring |       |       |       |
| User exposure to 1080 or PAPP  |       | Using additional appropriate protective equipment  |       |       |       |
| Exposure to unauthorised persons from laid 1080 or PAPP baits |       | Increase the frequency of checking baits, additional signage, relocate bait stations, additional notification to people who may visit the land where the baits are laid |       |       |       |
| Exposure to unauthorised persons from 1080 or PAPP baits in storage |       | Lay baits immediately after purchase. Additional security |       |       |       |
| Exposure to unauthorised persons from 1080 or PAPP baits in transit or disposal |       | Additional security |       |       |       |
| Contamination of waterways/potable water |       | Increase distance restrictions, restrict access, increase the frequency of checking baits and recovering carcasses of poisoned animals |       |       |       |
| Other risks / further detail: |       |  |       |       |       |

| **Risk Rating** | **Risk Tolerance** | **Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Low – negligible potential for adverse impacts due to baiting activities | **Acceptable** | HumansMinor - mild exposure requiring washingCritical - fatality |
| Medium – small potential for adverse impacts due to baiting activities |  | Non-target animals Minor – mild poisoning |
| Significant –some potential for adverse impacts due to baiting activities. Monitor carefully and discontinue program if adverse impacts become likely to occur |  | Moderate – poisoning requiring veterinary treatmentMajor – fatalityCritical – multiple fatalitiesEnvironmentMinor – direct contamination of water course or potable waterModerate – NA |
| High –high potential for adverse impacts due to baiting activities. Risk cannot be reduced to an acceptable level. Consider alternative control options | **Unacceptable** | Moderate – NAMajor – NACritical – NA |
|  |  | **Minor** | **Moderate** | **Major** | **Critical** |
| **Likelihood**How likely is the event to occur at some time during (or after) the program | **Almost Certain** | Medium | Significant | High | High |
| Unlikely – does not exist or will not happen, unexpected  | **Likely** | Medium | Medium | Significant | High |
| Possible – may exist or happen but not certain | **Possible** | Low | Medium | Medium | Significant |
| Likely – plausible that it exists or will happen, probable at least one time Almost Certain – Exists or will happen more than once | **Unlikely** | Low | Low | Medium | Medium |