

**BEFORE THE SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**DOCKET NO. EL18-003**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY DAKOTAT RANGE I, LLC AND  
DAKOTA RANGE II, LLC FOR A PERMIT OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY IN  
GRANT AND CODINGTON COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA, FOR DAKOTA  
RANGE WIND PROJECT**

Direct Testimony of Tom Kirschenmann  
On Behalf of the Staff of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
May 4, 2018

1 **Q: State your name.**

2 A: Tom Kirschenmann

3

4 **Q: State your employer.**

5 A: State of South Dakota, Department of Game, Fish, and Parks

6

7 **Q: State the program for which you work.**

8 A: Division of Wildlife, Terrestrial Resource Section

9

10 **Q: State the program roles and your specific job with the department.**

11 A: The role of the Terrestrial Resources section is to study, evaluate, and  
12 assist in the management of all wildlife and associated habitats.  
13 Management includes game and non-game wildlife populations, habitat  
14 management on public lands and technical assistance and habitat  
15 development on private lands, population and habitat inventory, and  
16 environmental review of local and landscape projects. As the Deputy  
17 Director of the Wildlife Division and Chief of the Terrestrial Resources  
18 Section, I oversee and am involved with wildlife management and  
19 research, as well as habitat management consisting of the department's  
20 public lands and private lands programs.

21

22 **Q: Explain the range of duties you perform.**

1 A: Duties include leading the Terrestrial Resources section that includes  
2 three program administrators (Wildlife, Habitat, Wildlife Damage) and 23  
3 wildlife biologists; coordinate and assist with the Division of Wildlife's  
4 Operations at four administrative regions; oversee wildlife research,  
5 management, and the establishment of hunting seasons for game  
6 species; oversee private lands habitat programs; coordinate  
7 environmental review evaluations and responses related to terrestrial  
8 issues with department staff; serve as the Department's liaison for several  
9 state and federal agencies; and represent the Department on state and  
10 national committees.

11

12 **Q: On whose behalf was this testimony prepared?**

13 A: This testimony was prepared on behalf of the Staff of the South Dakota  
14 Public Utilities Commission.

15

16 **Q: What role does the Department of Game, Fish and Parks have in the  
17 permitting process of a wind energy development project?**

18 A: Game, Fish and Parks has no regulatory authority when it comes to  
19 permitting wind energy development projects. The agency's role is to  
20 consult with developers and provide recommendations and suggestions  
21 on how to minimize or remove potential impacts to wildlife and associated  
22 habitats or provide available information to make informed decisions as  
23 related to natural resources.

1 **Q: Have you reviewed the Application and attachments? How else did**  
2 **you learn details around the proposed project?**

3 A: Yes, relevant sections of the application and attachments and also  
4 discussed project details with GFP biologists who had more direct  
5 communications with the developer.

6

7 **Q: Did the GF&P provide comments and recommendations to Dakota**  
8 **Range about the project area? Please identify who provided those**  
9 **comments and provide a brief summary of them.**

10 A: Yes, Silka Kempema, Wildlife Biologist, provided initial comments in July  
11 of 2015. During this initial consultation, information and concerns were  
12 shared with the applicant. This consultation continued with conference  
13 calls, emails, and review of reports and draft documents associated with  
14 the proposed project.

15

16 A summary of those consultations include suggestions on the types,  
17 timing and number of surveys for grassland birds (songbirds and grouse),  
18 survey recommendations for raptors, placement of turbines and  
19 associated infrastructure considering the avoidance of untilled native  
20 prairie and large contiguous blocks of grasslands and to focus on  
21 disturbed lands such as fields currently cultivated, avoidance of activities  
22 that will fragment contiguous blocks of grasslands, avoidance of wetland

1 basins or areas of high concentrations of wetlands, pre-construction  
2 surveys for bat use and habitats plus post-construction mortality surveys.

3

4 **Q: Do you agree with the comments and recommendations provided to**  
5 **Dakota Range by Ms. Kempema? If not, please explain.**

6 A: Yes. These are typical discussion topics and recommendations our  
7 Department would share with wind power companies to identify, minimize,  
8 or reduce impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitats, especially those projects  
9 that are proposed in grassland and wetland habitats.

10

11 **Q: Based on the information provided in the Application, in your opinion**  
12 **did Dakota Range utilize the proper studies and wildlife surveys**  
13 **necessary to identify potential impacts to the terrestrial**  
14 **environment?**

15 A: Consultation with wildlife agencies early in the application process  
16 included the recommendation of several types of wildlife surveys to  
17 understand the potential impacts and issues that may occur in the project  
18 area and were carried out. It is recommended to carry out post-  
19 construction mortality monitoring for at least two years.

20

21 **Q: What are the potential impacts to wildlife as a result of the**  
22 **construction of a wind project?**

1 A: Direct; birds and bats can be killed by turbines due to direct strikes.  
2 Indirect; some species may be displaced from otherwise suitable habitat  
3 around turbines and roads. A research project on the effects of wind  
4 energy on breeding grassland bird densities in North and South Dakota  
5 showed seven of nine species of grassland birds had reduced densities  
6 around wind turbines over time (Shaffer and Buhl 2016).

7

8 **Q: What potential impacts to wildlife habitat can result from a wind**  
9 **project?**

10 A: Permanent loss; habitat is permanently converted to turbine pads, roads  
11 or buildings. This is often a small percent of the total project acreage (area  
12 define by wind easements or otherwise defined project boundary).  
13 Temporary loss; habitat is disturbed for a time during construction (e.g.  
14 widened roads, crane paths) but is restored. Fragmentation; habitat  
15 fragmentation is the division of a block of habitat into smaller, and at times  
16 into isolated patches. Habitat fragmentation can decrease the overall  
17 value of the remaining habitat.

18

19 **Q: Can you suggest methods to address temporary and permanent**  
20 **changes to habitat?**

21 A: Temporary impacts to habitat resulting from construction activities likely  
22 can be reclaimed by restoring impacted areas by grading and reseeding.  
23 Disturbed areas should be restored using native seed sources to reduce

1 the introduction of new or discourage encroachment of already present  
2 exotic and/or invasive species.

3  
4 For those areas that are permanently changed, lost grassland or wetland  
5 acres could be addressed through consideration of mitigation options.  
6 Disturbed areas again should be restored using native seed sources to  
7 reduce the introduction of new or discourage encroachment of already  
8 present exotic and/or invasive species. It would also be recommended  
9 that if lost acres are replaced to carry out these replacement activities in  
10 the closest possible proximity of the project.

11

12 **Q: Are there any other impacts besides temporary and permanent**  
13 **habitat impacts that are likely to occur as a result of the project?**

14 A: Indirect habitat impacts are also a consideration. Potential indirect impacts  
15 created by wind turbines and associated infrastructure raise concerns with  
16 habitat fragmentation and potential displacement, especially with regards  
17 to breeding grassland and wetland species. Research into the effects of  
18 wind energy on habitat avoidance has shown that some species will not  
19 use grassland or wetland habitat within a certain distance of a wind turbine  
20 (Loesch et al. 2013, Shaffer and Buhl 2016).

21

22 **Q: Did GFP have any wildlife or habitat concerns regarding the**  
23 **proposed Dakota Range? If yes, what are they?**

1 A: Yes. The area of primary interest is the potential impacts to the various  
2 grassland habitats and associated wildlife.

3

4 Q: **Did GFP provide any recommendations to avoid wildlife and habitat  
5 impacts from Dakota Range? If yes, what were they?**

6 A: Yes. The primary recommendation was to site turbines and associated  
7 infrastructure in cropland or to utilize existing infrastructure and avoid  
8 siting turbines in grasslands. Other types of recommendations offered  
9 were the utilization of a 1-mile buffer around prairie grouse leks and post-  
10 construction surveys for bat and bird mortality which could be used in  
11 assisting with operational adjustments in the future.

12

13 Q: **Are there different types of grasslands?**

14 A: Yes.

15

16 Q: **Please describe the following: native prairie, hayland, pasture, CRP,  
17 and cropland.**

18 A: Grasslands are areas that contain plants species such as graminoids and  
19 are commonly used for grazing or set aside for conservation purposes.  
20 They can also be areas which are planted to a mixture of grasses and  
21 legumes for livestock grazing or feed. Native prairie is grassland upon  
22 which the soil has not undergone a mechanical disturbance associated  
23 with agriculture or any other type of development. Hayland is grassland



1 that is managed by frequent mowing and often contains non-native plant  
2 species either intentionally or by encroachment. Pasture is grassland that  
3 may contain non-native plant species either intentionally or by  
4 encroachment and is managed by through grazing. In some instances,  
5 hayland and pasture could be native prairie; in other situations, hayland  
6 and pasture in particular could be land once cultivated and restored to  
7 grassland habitat. Conservation Reserve Program acres (CRP) is  
8 grassland that occurs on land that was once tilled and used for crop  
9 production and has now been seeded to herbaceous cover to address soil  
10 loss, water quality, and provide wildlife habitat. Cropland could be  
11 described as agricultural lands cultivated and used to grow crops such as  
12 corn, soybeans, small grains, and others.

13

14 **Q: Are there any areas of native prairie in the proposed project?**

15 **A:** Yes. Spatial analysis conducted by Bauman et al. (2016) has identified  
16 potentially undisturbed lands [PUDL] within the proposed project  
17 boundary. This is one of the best available spatial data sets representing  
18 the location of untilled native grasslands. The applicant also identified  
19 within the application an estimated 2,953 acres of untilled grassland within  
20 the project area.

21

22 **Q: Do grasslands other than native prairie have conservation value?**

1 A: Yes. Given the loss of native prairie, working grasslands like pasture,  
2 hayland, and conservation grassland plantings serve as surrogates for  
3 native grasslands.

4

5 **Q: To your knowledge, are there grazed grasslands in the project area?**

6 A: Yes.

7

8 **Q: Do grazed grasslands have any conservation value and what is the**  
9 **impact to grassland wildlife?**

10 A: All grasslands have a conservation value, including those managed  
11 through grazing. Grassland birds require a diversity of grassland types  
12 and structure to complete life-cycle requirements. Studies have shown  
13 that grassland birds respond primarily not to variation in plant species  
14 composition but to the structure that these plants provide. Grassland birds  
15 have evolved with a gradation of grazing intensities. Grassland wildlife  
16 diversity can be maximized by creating a heterogeneous landscape  
17 comprised of short, medium and tall vegetation structures. Grazing  
18 (haying and burning) management can provide this variation in vegetative  
19 structure. Changes in land management and annual precipitation levels  
20 can alter plant species composition and vegetation structure of grassland  
21 within a short timeframe.

22

1 **Q: One of the GF&P's recommendations was that efforts should be**  
2 **made to avoid placement of turbines and new roads in grasslands,**  
3 **especially untilled native prairie. Based on the information in the**  
4 **Application and the proposed turbine layout, did Dakota Range**  
5 **demonstrate efforts to address this recommendation? Please**  
6 **explain.**

7 A: From reviewing the available maps, resources, and other information  
8 available there were efforts to avoid placement of turbines on untilled  
9 native prairie. It appears that multiple turbines are being planned in  
10 cultivated land (disturbed) which from a wildlife perspective is a positive  
11 siting approach. Some turbines will likely be placed on other types of  
12 grassland habitats (hay and pasture) within the project area. Avoidance of  
13 all grassland habitat will be challenging in this part of the state and in the  
14 project area as a high proportion of the total area is some type of  
15 grassland/herbaceous habitat.

16

17 **Q: One of GF&P's concerns around wind farm development is the**  
18 **fragmentation of contiguous blocks of grasslands. Why is**  
19 **fragmentation a concern?**

20 A: Fragmentation results in the direct loss of habitat and diminishes the value  
21 of remaining habitat. Habitat fragmentation is the division of large  
22 contiguous blocks of habitat into smaller, and in some instances isolated  
23 patches. Identification of contiguous blocks of habitat, especially in

1           predominantly non-habitat landscapes is an important component of  
2           grassland and wetland bird conservation.

3

4   **Q:   Are there any areas of contiguous grassland habitat in the proposed**  
5   **project?**

6   A:   Yes.  The northeastern portion of the proposed project area has the  
7   highest level of contiguous blocks of grassland habitat.

8

9   **Q:   Based on the information available does the GF&P have concerns**  
10   **over the placement of turbines and roads in contiguous blocks of**  
11   **grassland?**

12   A:   Based on reviewing available information, fragmentation of grassland  
13   habitats were avoided/minimized in some of the project area through the  
14   proposed layout of the infrastructure of the wind farm.  This is a result of  
15   primarily utilizing tilled agricultural fields for turbine locations.  There are  
16   other locations of the project area which the placement of service roads to  
17   turbines will likely create some level of fragmentation of larger grassland  
18   blocks (comprised of different grassland cover types: hay, pasture, etc.).  
19   Based on the location of the project area and the existing land-use, it will  
20   be challenging not to create some additional fragmentation of grassland  
21   habitat, and in some situations larger contiguous blocks comprised of  
22   different grassland cover types.

23

1 **Q. Does the state or GF&P have specific mitigation recommendations**  
2 **that will minimize or compensate potential impacts from wind energy**  
3 **development if they cannot be avoided?**

4 A. At the current time South Dakota does not have a state mitigation policy  
5 that can be provided to wind energy developers. However, there are  
6 resources available which can provide guidance and suggestions that can  
7 be considered as well as self-imposed actions or activities that can  
8 minimize natural resource impacts.

9

10 **Q: What are potential mitigation considerations?**

11 A: Mitigation can take multiple forms and can be accomplished in a multitude  
12 of ways. It could be an approach which implements an applied  
13 management activity/strategy on impacted lands which elevates these  
14 lands to a more productive state or higher ecological state (example –  
15 grazing management) to an approach which is more sophisticated and  
16 detailed using tools developed to calculate acres of habitat to be restored  
17 or created based on impacted acres and other relevant research data  
18 (example – decision support tool). Two examples that are available  
19 specifically for wind energy projects is a decision support tool based off  
20 the research conducted by Loesch et al. (2013) that considers breeding  
21 waterfowl and another which focuses on breeding grassland songbirds  
22 resulting from research findings of Shaffer and Buhl (2016). As stated  
23 earlier South Dakota does not have a state mitigation policy nor does the

1 state endorse either study and resulting products, however it is worthy of  
2 mentioning these tools demonstrating resources available to developers  
3 and managers.

4

5 **Q: Does the GF&P have any thoughts regarding the potential for**  
6 **cumulative impacts the Project may have?**

7 A: As projects are completed and based on location and proximity to other  
8 projects, the question of cumulative impacts will become more apparent.  
9 Knowing the importance of native prairie tracts and other forms of  
10 grassland habitat to several grassland dependent species, continued  
11 development on these types of lands could result in reduced or limited  
12 habitat value. Placement of turbines in lands currently under cultivation  
13 and avoiding where possible the different varieties of grassland and  
14 wetland habitats will help minimize potential cumulative impacts.

15

16 Our agency will continue to work with wind developers and provide  
17 recommendations that we believe will help minimize cumulative impacts.  
18 No different than offered to this project, the focus could include, but not  
19 limited to, recommendations on avoiding grassland habitats, in particular  
20 native prairie remnants, avoidance of high wetland complex areas,  
21 maximize the use of existing corridors for infrastructure, and pre and post  
22 construction surveys to assess the proposed project area that may assist  
23 in operational decisions.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**Q: Do any State threatened or endangered species have the potential to be impacted by the wind farm?**

A: There is the chance that the state and federal endangered Whooping Crane could occur in the project area. The other state listed species present is the Northern River Otter and there are not likely to be impacts to this species from the proposed wind farm.

**Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

A: Yes.

Bauman, P., J. Blastick, C. Grewing, and A. J. Smart. 2014. Quantifying undisturbed land on South Dakota's prairie coteau. SDSU Extension.

Bauman, P., B. L. Carlson, and T. Butler. 2016. Quantifying undisturbed (native) lands in eastern South Dakota:2013. South Dakota State University.

Loesch, C. R., J. A. Walker, R. E. Reynolds, J. S. Gleason, N. D. Niemuth, S. E. Stephens, and M. A. Erickson. 2013. Effect of wind energy development on breeding duck densities in the Prairie Pothole Region. The Journal of Wildlife Management 77:587-598.

Shaffer, J. A., and D. A. Buhl. 2016. Effects of wind-energy facilities on breeding grassland bird distributions. Conservation Biology 30:59-71.

**Thomas R. Kirschenmann**  
2206 Stratford Place  
Pierre, SD 57501  
(605) 773-4192 (w) (605) 494-0241 (h)  
[Tom.Kirschenmann@state.sd.us](mailto:Tom.Kirschenmann@state.sd.us) (work)  
[kirsch@pie.midco.net](mailto:kirsch@pie.midco.net) (home)

---

**Education:** Eureka High School, Eureka, SD, 1989  
BS: Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences, South Dakota State University, May 1993  
MS: Wildlife Management, South Dakota State University, May 1996

Certifications:  
Certified Wildlife Biologist, The Wildlife Society, July 2000  
Level III Career Development Training, SD GF&P, 2007

---

**Experience:**

SOUTH DAKOTA GAME, FISH, AND PARKS, Pierre, SD  
Wildlife Division Deputy Director (2016 - present) & Chief of Terrestrial Resources (11/08 - present)  
Supervisor: Tony Leif, Director, Division of Wildlife, 605-773-4518

- Serve as the Wildlife Division's Deputy Director to assist with the overall management of the Division.
- Coordinate the management and research of game and non-game species statewide.
- Coordinate the management of the Department's habitat programs, including the private lands programs, public lands management, access programs, terrestrial environmental assessments, and programs related to the federal Farm Bill.
- Oversee a staff that includes a Program Administrator for Wildlife, Habitat and Wildlife Damage programs and 23 biologists.
- Serve as the Department's liaison or representative for several state and federal agencies and associated committees.
- Coordinate with non-government organizations, constituency groups, and agricultural groups on resource management programs, projects, and issues.
- Manage an annual budget of approximately \$16M which includes research, direct payments to landowners for habitat, hunting access, and wildlife damage, and contracts to complete surveys, programs, and projects.
- Lead rules promulgation process for respective duties by presenting to the GFP Commission and assisting in writing administrative rules.

SOUTH DAKOTA GAME, FISH, AND PARKS, Pierre, SD  
Wildlife Program Administrator, Game Management (12/07 - 11/08)  
Supervisor: George Vandell, Assistant Director, Division of Wildlife, retired

- Coordinated the management and research of all game species statewide.
- Coordinated the accumulation and organization of data and regional suggestions in the development of hunting season recommendations.
- Drafted action sheets and present season recommendations to GF&P Commission.
- Assisted with the development and a team member that reviews hunting season applications and the Hunting Handbook.
- Supervised 9 biologists and 1 secretary stationed in five locations across the state.



- Served as department representative on committees (wildlife disease boards and poultry advisory board) and liaison to the SDSU Diagnostic Lab and APHIS Wildlife Services for Avian Influenza monitoring.
- “Press Release” review team member.
- Oversaw the Game Budget, including the contractual research projects with SDSU Wildlife and Fisheries Department and other academic institutions.
- Worked with the media addressing game and related issues, including live interviews, newspaper articles, and the writing of short articles.
- Team member in the development and implementation of the Mentored Hunting Program.
- Presented research and management information at regional meetings, Commission meetings, and to conservation organizations.

**SOUTH DAKOTA GAME, FISH, AND PARKS, Huron, SD**

**Sr. Wildlife Biologist (1/05 – 12/07)**

Supervisor: Tony Leif, Director, Division of Wildlife, 605-773-4518

- Oversaw management and research of upland game species statewide.
- Directed internal upland game research, analyses, and reports.
- Part of game staff committee that provided recommendations on all game seasons and license allocations.
- Served as Office Manager at the Huron GF&P District Office: directing day to day activities of Resource Biologist and Secretary within the Upland Game Section.
- Served as field co-leader with waterfowl biologist in the coordination of statewide Avian Influenza (AI) sampling.
- Worked with regional game staff on management, survey, research, and mortality projects.
- Administered the departments Wildlife Partnership Program for two years and provided guidance and direction upon request.
- Assisted with the coordination of meetings and trainings, including serving as chair person of the Prairie Grouse Technical Council (PGTC) meeting in October 2007.
- Served as department representative on several committees such as Midwest Pheasant Study Group, PGTC, Sage Grouse Council, Poultry Advisory Board (AI matters), and the National Wild Turkey Federation Technical Representative.
- Wrote management and scientific reports, as well as magazine and newspaper articles.
- Conducted presentations internally, as well as landowner and sportsmen club meetings.

**PHEASANTS FOREVER, INC., St. Paul, MN**

**Regional Wildlife Biologist**

South Dakota & Wyoming (4/00 – 1/05)

Illinois & Indiana (7/95 – 4/00)

Supervisor: Richard Young, VP Field Operations, 877-773-2070

- Established and maintained chapters comprised of grassroots volunteers and guided them in the development of habitat programs, fundraising efforts, and youth programs.
- Worked with chapters to develop wildlife habitat programs designed to fit the needs for both local and regional areas.
- Directed and assisted chapters with annual fund-raising events. Wrote grants to support local and state habitat efforts.
- Built partnerships between Pheasants Forever (both chapters and national) with local, state, and federal conservation agencies. Primary PF representative in developing SD Wildlife Habitat Extension Biologist (WHEB) program with SD GF&P and SD NRCS.
- Developed reporting system, submitted reports to GF&P, NRCS, and PF national, wrote grants, and some supervisory duties related to the WHEB program.
- Served on several state and federal habitat committees (State Technical Committee for both SD and WY, SD CRP sub-committee, WHIP sub-committee for SD and WY, SD School and

Public Lands, Northern Great Plains Joint Venture, Great Lakes and Upper Mississippi Joint Venture, IL Pheasant Fund Committee, IN DNR Gamebird Partnership Committee, IL DNR Conservation Congress).

- Organized and conducted wildlife habitat workshops for chapters, landowners, and other agency personnel.
- Established agenda, budget, and organized annual meeting for subgroup of co-Regional Wildlife Biologists, while serving as Mentor Group Leader.
- Wrote newspaper articles, interviewed for radio and TV shows, conducted presentations, and distributed newsletters.
- Educated volunteers about wildlife biology, habitat, wildlife interactions, and counsel on current, upcoming, and changes to state and federal conservation programs.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY; Brookings, SD  
Graduate Research Assistant (4/93 - 7/95; graduated 1996)  
Supervisor: Dr. Daniel Hubbard, Professor, retired  
Graduate Research Project.

- Research involved the comparison of avian and aquatic invertebrate abundances on conventional, organic, and no-till farming systems.
- Efforts included breeding waterfowl pair counts, waterfowl brood counts, wetland bird surveys, upland bird surveys, and aquatic invertebrate sampling.
- Other duties included surveying aquatic plants and collecting soil seed bank samples.
- Prepared bi-annual reports for USDA and EPA.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY; Brookings, SD  
Research Technician (3/92 - 8/92)  
Supervisor: Diane Granfors, Graduate Research Assistant  
Seasonal position.

- Assisted with wood duck study determining brood habitat and survival.
- Built, repaired, and placed wood duck nesting structures.
- Canded eggs, web tagged ducklings, banded hens, placed radio telemetry collars and acquired locations.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY; Brookings, SD  
Research Technician (10/90 - 3/91; 10/91 - 3/92)  
Supervisor: Todd Bogenschutz, Graduate Research Assistant  
Seasonal position.

- Aided on the research study that evaluated corn and sorghum as a winter food source for the ring-neck pheasant.
- Shared duties to feed pen birds on restricted diets.
- Sampled winter food plots.
- Assisted in extracting intestinal organs and taking anatomical measurements and weights.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY; Brookings, SD  
Research Technician (5/91 - 8/91)  
Supervisor: John Lott, Graduate Research Assistant  
Seasonal position.

- Worked on yellow perch food habit study.

- Used various equipment to sample fish and zooplankton. Aged fish and processed stomach contents. Sorted and tabulated zooplankton samples.

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, Ordway Prairie, Leola, SD

Intern/Preserve Worker (5/90 - 8/90)

Supervisor: Andy Schollett, Preserve Manager

Seasonal position.

- Monitored grazing leases and rotations, conducted brome and prairie plant surveys, spraying of noxious weeds, fencing and general maintenance.