

PNF review submission

1 message

ShauntiSun Kiehl [REDACTED]
 Reply-To: ShauntiSun Kiehl [REDACTED]
 To: "pnf.info@ils.nsw.gov.au" <pnf.info@ils.nsw.gov.au>

Wed, Jan 30, 2019 at 12:25 PM

To: Local Land Services Department
 Re: Private Native Forestry Review

Your PNF review document has no real information:

[<https://www.ils.nsw.gov.au/sustainable-land-management/pnforestry/private-native-forestry-review-2018#For%20more%20information%20on%20the%20Private%20Native%20Forestry%20Review%20including%20how%20to%20make%20your%20submission>]

What is actually changing, factually, without all the greenwash terminology??
 Why are you taking us backwards in time, when everything else is moving towards *actual* sustainability??
 Why are you giving self-serving landholders the green light for personal economic gain at the cost of the entire catchment???

I would like to know *exactly, factually, and quantitatively*:

1. How do you plan on Enhancing landholder knowledge ?
2. What exactly does your claimed environmentally sustainable forest industry entail? How can it be sustainable with reduced protections??? In order for it to be sustainable, like any development, a proper Environmental Assessment needs to be done. And one that is holistic, not piecemeal.
3. Where are the mapped and planned takings going to be published and made publicly available? What if a neighbour has a serious issue with the proposed logging because it will drastically affect their land, cause dieback, and effectively destroy their land? You just can't continue to compartmentalise everything without serious dire overall consequences. We need strong, thick stands of core forest, AND intact corridors, not a continuous reduction of old growth habitat.
 And in alignment with that, we need strong laws to protect the small amount of native old growth forests we have left. Not to be given the green light to pillage.
4. And how is it "best management" practice if you're using large machinery and clear felling vast stands of forest that is important habitat for our incredible biodiversity?? Not to mention the increased need for clearing to make way for those humongous machines. Who are these companies, and I want full disclosure of exactly how much they are "donating" to your coffers, because all this reduction in protection of our species is all very suss. All the while your various government websites spouting completely the opposite.
5. What are your Forest "Agreements" stipulating? You're watering them down with this dubious terminology, because really, they are CONTRACTS, NOT agreements. They are purely for economic gain, and nothing else!
6. How do you plan on "ensuring" that environmental values are recognised and appropriately managed during Private Native Forestry operations? And how do you plan to monitor and enforce these "assurances"? Where are they stipulated, and how will they be applied rigorously?
7. Same goes for Aboriginal cultural heritage and natural heritage values. How will you appropriately manage these sensitive sites during Private Native Forestry operations when your primary goal is to go for the biggest saw logs you can, leaving a path of destruction in your wake?
8. How are any of the government's programs such as Save our Species propped up by these agreements? They might as well be thrown out the window, as your proposition includes the destruction of hollow-bearing trees for wildlife. 9. What protections will you employ under this regime for the wildlife needing these mature trees for their survival? Where is the balance between the needs of our wildlife and company demands?

You have got to stop throwing away our incredibly valuable ecological systems that give so much to us in return such as THE most important carbon sink we have, before it's completely broken, because every strand you break in the delicate web weakens the entire system. STOP weakening it even more, STOP caving to private industrial demands.

Southern Cross University states that: In addition to being the lungs of the Earth, forests must be effectively managed to balance the need for wood production, biodiversity conservation, water quality protection, carbon storage and many other issues. It does NOT suggest we prop up industrial-scale logging of native forests for the benefit of a few hundred jobs, and a handful of corporations!!

All other environmental services are being dismissed so that you can fulfill your one-sided, money-driven corporate contracts for wood supply.

There is already no sufficient review process or reliable information on what is actually being logged, which is dodgy and corrupt as it is. And you want to make it worse by reducing protections, saying that it makes it more 'streamlined' - Streamlined for landowners and logging companies wanting to cash in, not caring at all how the logging is carried out, what species it's going to affect, or how it's going to affect the water table and destroy millions of HOMES for all our important wildlife! How would you like your home burned to power someone else's?? It's simply imbalanced and totally unfair.

As you would know, our mature forests have taken 1000's of years to get to their maturity, and your new proposed rules, (with its, for example reduced 5 metre buffer zone for streams) intend on taking them out in almost a manner of ecocide. It is atrocious and absolutely should not be passed. Not now, when we are needing our most important carbon sink more than ever. Not ever. Looking forward to 2019, we expect forward-thinking, TRULY ecologically-sound processes that take EVERY species into account, not just humans, or a handful of corporate bottom lines. This includes "Forestry Corp" and electricity companies. We have had enough of this. The loopholes to destruction must be closed, not widened! This includes ZERO burning of native forest timber for electricity, with the fraudulent claim that it is renewable, which is totally outrageous and false.

Regards,
Shaunti Kiehl
Suffolk Park, NSW