Ilise Bourke

From: NE Bioregional Network <telopea_tas@yahoo.com.au>

Sent: Sunday, 13 January 2013 2:13 PM

To: tfacommittee

Subject: Legislative Council Tasmanian Forest agreement Committee

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Flagged

To Ilise Bourke Executive Assistant,
Our submission to the above process consists of three submissions,

Attachment A: The East Coast Conservation Corridor Report emailed 24th December. This Report builds on information generated through the IGA independent verification process to highlight the high conservation values of the North East and East Coast of Tasmania. The protection of the areas proposed under the Agreement (for this region) will considerably enhance and formalise a connected landscape of National Heritage value on the East Coast of Tasmania.

Attachment B: Newspaper article and Linking Landscapes brochure sent by post. The newspaper article is a summary of our groups view in relation to forestry and the Intergovernmental Agreement in Tasmania. The key themes in this article are that native forest harvesting can be environmentally sustainable if carried out at the appropriate scale and with best practice management and that native forest restoration offers a win/win outcome for forest workers, wood production and nature conservation.

The Linking Landscapes brochure is a summary of the comprehensive conservation planning project carried out by the North East Bioregional Network and associated scientific experts in 2006/2007. The purpose of including this is to demonstrate that the reserve proposals included in the IGA (for the North East and East Coast) are based on accepted scientific conservation planning principles. The validity of Linking Landscapes was endorsed through IVG 5A Report (Verification of the heritage value of ENGO proposed reserves).

Attachment C: This email which includes the above explanations of previous submissions and below brief comments on elements of the Agreement.

Clauses 17 to 21 Our view is that funding should be allocated for restoration of unsuitable plantations back to native forest. As stated previously landscape scale restoration would have significant nature conservation benefits as well as providing employment for displaced rural forest workers and increasing the area of native forest available for sustainable harvesting.

Clauses 22-27 We support a smaller scale native forest industry based primarily on supplying local and regional needs via locally based sawmillers. We do not suppport industrial scale plantations grown primarily for pulp. The agreement legitimises the extensive conversion of native forest to plantation which has occurred over the past 20 years; a process which has resulted in massive environmental destruction. It also important to note high quality agricultural land has been lost in the rush to sign up for the flawed MIS . We support utilising high quality agricultural land for farming. We are in favour of restoration of many plantations back to native forest using criteria such as steep slopes, water supply catchments, visual impact, wildlife corridors, economic viability and first rotation (more viable for restoration) to identify suitable sites.

Clause 28-32 We are concerned about the notion of using "residue" for unspecified uses. The woodchip

industry started this way with the intention being to use residue from forest operations to produce pulp. The reality was that in the end it was not unusual for up to 90% plus of timber harvested in coupes being woodchipped and exported to Japan.

Clause 33 We support the proposed new conservation reserves for the North East and East Coast of Tasmania.

Clause 36 It is vital that all of the reserves proposed for the North East and East Coast are allocated a tenure which precludes Mining (State Reserve, Nature Reserve or National Park). The prospectivity report produced as part of the IGA overstated the mining potential in the region. If there was high value deposits in the region there would be much more activity than there is.

Clause 38 The proposed Landscape Conservation Program should be cross tenure (that is all public and private land) rather than confined to Parks and Wildlife land this would ensure holistic land use principles could be properly considered.

Clause 46-47 We do not support unconditional certification of forestry operations. At a minimum there needs to be detailed information on the scale and proposed management prescriptions for future forestry operations.

Clause 51 We do not support changing the status of any land currently managed by Parks and Wildlife. In addition section 55 of the agreement specifies that the management of new reserves will be the responsibility of a properly funded Parks agency answerable to the Minister. Opportunities to benefit the Aboriginal community (and rural communities) lie in extending employment opportunities in Parks and perhaps providing funding to purchase private land to be managed by the Aboriginal community for conservation purposes.

Clause 53 Forestry operations on private and public land should not be exempt from the Land Use and Planning Act.

There should be a substantial amount of funding allocated for conservation on private land given that most threatened forest communities occur on private land, land clearing legislation in Tasmania is weak and there will be additional pressure on private land as a result of the increased amount of land protected on public land. In addition there should also be money allocated for a FOREST RESTORATION FUND for the purpose of employing displaced forest workers (so their valuable skills may be utilised) and to increase the area available for sustainable native forest harvesting and for nature conservation where appropriate.

We would appreciate the opportunity to give a verbal presentation in order to clarify any questions the Legislative Council may have in relation to our submission.

Yours sincerely

Todd Dudley President North East Bioregional Network Inc.

Phone (03) 6376 1049

Postal address: 24751 Tasman Hwy, RSD St. Marys 7215