

SENATE COMMITTEE ON VEGETATION MANAGEMENT LAWS

Subject Property:

Property Description:

Property Area: 959 Hectares

Area of Property unable to be improved because of vegetation management laws: 405 Hectares = 42% of total property.

Value of Area unable to be cleared currently at \$250.00 per hectare: \$101,000.

Value of subject area unable to be cleared if improved at minimum \$2400.00 per hectare: \$972,000.

Cost of improving 405 hectares at \$600.00 per Hectare: \$243,000.0

Potential Capital removed from property by current vegetation laws: $\$972,000 - \$101,250 - \$243,000 = \$627,750$.

Current carrying capacity of affected 405 Hectares: 0 Beef Cattle.

Potential carrying capacity of 405 Hectares improved: At 1 beast per 5 acres = 200 Beef Cattle.

Potential Annual Income of Beef Cattle on 405 Hectares of improved land: $200 \times \$300.00$ per annum = \$60,000 per annum.

Balaclava was purchased as superannuation for our retirement. The vegetation laws have thus deprived us of over \$600,000 in capital and income of \$60,000 per annum.

CARBON AND CLIMATE CHANGE

The current 405 Hectares of subject land currently contains primarily stunted ironbark and negligible grass with significant erosion between trees and negligible topsoil. With improvement the larger and taller trees would be retained and the carbon content of the pasture and its subsoil root mass would be equal to or greater than the current carbon content of the trees in the subject area. Where there is no topsoil, topsoil would develop and increase in depth every year as it has done on the already improved area of _____, reducing erosion and runoff to the waterways and reef. I see no carbon issues with the increased number of beef cattle to be run in the subject area as scientific studies have shown that free range beef cattle grazing has no impact on overall farm CO2 emissions or may even have a beneficial impact. 190ha or 20% of _____ would remain forested.

Yours sincerely

Colan McGree