

From
Bob Loone
Deputy Mayor
Meander Valley Council
63 Sorell street
Chudleigh
Tasmania 7304
Phone 03 63636190

To

Committee Secretary
House of Representatives Standing Committee on
Agriculture, Resources, Fisheries and Forestry
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

Phone: (02) 6277 4500
Fax: (02) 6277 4516
email: arff.reps@aph.gov.au

Inquiry into the Australian forestry industry

Dear members of **Inquiry into the Australian forestry industry**

I value very highly integrity and honesty.
Therefore I am being very honest and forthright with you with information based on my long and very detailed data and experience with the Australian forestry industry.

Oh how I would love there to be a truly independent investigation into forestry by non forestry compromised people who have a proven track record of taking seriously facts, credible information and all submissions.

As I look at the names of the people presiding over this investigation I am concerned that party members are bound to party policy and therefore are in no way free to be able to (even if they wanted to) properly consider and act on submissions that may be contrary to party policy. Therefore it appears this investigation may just another exercise to divert even more public money into unsustainable and economy destructive forestry activities.

Having stated that I would welcome evidence that would show me to be incorrect and I hope you can.

Those who know me would know I am a positive person. I am not daunted by long odds because it is to GOD that I am accountable. I feel called and indeed it is my responsibility as a representative of our communities to try and make you aware of the truth. Then as I see it what you do with it is your responsibility because only you have the power to do that. I have not that power but of course I will support you if you act responsibly to the information provided.

My submission will be a series of brief comments based on your terms of reference. My immediate thought is that they are akin to putting a band-aid on advanced cancer in that they do not address the core cultural and political problems that the forestry industry has brought upon itself. I also have attached a few files that I think would comply with the terms of reference taken from the extensive library of information I have compiled over the years covering all aspects of forestry. If you could like further information on any aspect of my submission please let me know. I also look forward to being able to expand and further explain aspects of my submission at hearings that I can attend.

Many well informed and sensible people have tried to help forestry but forestry's response for their care and costs in time and money seems to be that they have they been ignored or written of as of no value. It is amazing that people like Frank Strie, David Leaman, Tim Thorn (Now we the people) and many others are still trying to help after for so long being slighted and dismissed as having nothing to offer that is worth considering. Their excellent track work and record should be publicly acknowledged with apologies, congratulations and most of all have their work taken seriously and properly acted on. Will you listen to what these people are saying and encourage them and give them your full support, or will you repeat the mistakes of the past and write them off as of no value because they are not members of your political party or because what they are saying is different to our proven blind and failed forestry political policies? Will you yet again succumb to the wishes of the arrogant, overpaid, politically powerful forestry industry spin with its proven record of being expert at manipulating governments, destroying our farms, delivering them to foreign ownership, and disregarding the health and rights of communities. Will you yet again succumb to the wishes of failed forestry executives pretending all is well while presiding over constant and ongoing economic, social and environmental forestry disasters?

A check on the flow of public money to forestry shows that forestry feasts out of the public purse. It is unsustainable in almost every sense of the word while damaging and restricting development of viable and sustainable industries. Forestry is devoid of public accountability, constantly inflicting offensive impacts on communities and individuals and making senseless decisions yet acting like only they know everything. Forestry appears to be continually writing off the

very people who can help them as of no value or whose knowledge is not required as all required knowledge has been supplied and will continue to be supplied from within forestry.

For many years forestry has refused to listen to those who have the answers to their problems. They appear not to be aware that almost all their present problems are the direct result of their own foolishness and refusal to listen to or communicate with those who have been trying to warn them for at least the past 15 years that their policies, direction and management methods were seriously lacking in integrity.

Some brief Comments in response to the 'terms of reference' list:

- **Opportunities for and constraints upon production;** Obviously the wrong type of trees has been planted. Trees not suitable for timber and too expensive to grow to be viable for pulp. From now on any government assistance like MIS incentives should only apply if trees suitable for milling timber are planted on say at least a 40 year rotation. No incentives or benefits should be available for growing unsustainable and unviable pulp wood trees. We should be establishing a hemp industry for fiber production which is far more productive per ha than trees, is more versatile and can be sustainable.
- **Opportunities for diversification, value adding and product innovation;** Talk about closing the door after the horse has gone and that's after thousands have warned forestry that the gate is open and it is made very clear that forestry is a self regulating law unto itself (what a sick joke) closed shop and offers of help (apart from money) is not welcome. It is going to be very hard to get the horse back now. For example for more than 15 years I and many others have been informing forestry and you of the stupidity of diverting tax money to destroy our farms to plant unviable and unsustainable e Nitens. The end result has been to deliver our valuable, highly productive farms (that our farmers and economy are in desperate need of) into foreign ownership at around 20% of its value. See attachment 2011 02 16.
- **Environmental impacts of forestry, including:**
 - **impacts of plantations upon land and water availability for agriculture;** See attachments 2010 06 10 and 2001 02 09 **and,**
 - **the development of win-win outcomes in balancing environmental costs with economic opportunities;** While forestry exerts its privileged status and exemptions from laws the rest of the community must obey it seems that the only win forestry is interested in is its own. History demonstrates very clearly that

forestry will always win in the end and the communities must lose. Before there can be any win win discussions forestry must demonstrate that they can be trusted. What has to happen is a genuine culture change, not weasel words or slick advertising but real change that can build trust. Unless forestry is willing to do that there is little use discussing win win outcomes. Forestry has destroyed the trust of many in our communities and if you are interested I can supply a huge amount of evidence that clearly demonstrates that forestry cannot be trusted. Forestry's actions show that they cannot be trusted and it will be difficult to gain community trust again without major restructure. For example far too many millions of tonnes of millable timber (that could be used for downstream processing) has been sent to the chipper. Talk of downstream processing loses all credibility while forestry's culture of self regulation, spin, secrecy and cover prevails.

- **Creating a better business environment for forest industries, including:**
 - **investment models for saw log production;** Obviously MIS incentives should only be available (if at all) only when native forests are replaced with timber plantations which are not suitable for pulp and only to be used for saw logs. That was the original intention for MIS incentives which has been grossly abused and distorted by mismanaged, irresponsible and now mostly failed MIS corporations misusing diverted taxable income to quickly amass large landownership portfolios.
 - **new business and investment models for plantation production;** Only farms owned by farming families (if any at all) should be eligible for any government help to be destroyed and converted to unsustainable forestry plantations. We need all of our farm land (that is not already destroyed by forestry) for food and economic purposes. No more farms should be fettered away and destroyed by forestry or be allowed to be given or sold over to foreign ownership.
 - **superannuation investment in plantations;** The question could well be asked why didn't Australian superannuation funds purchase the bargain priced fire sale of the GSF farms? Is it that there is a lack of integrity and trust based on past losses and lies that makes Australian superannuation funds reluctant to invest in forestry? Again the chooks are coming home to roost and forestry's arrogance, mismanagement and lies has given it a reputation that scares off investors unless they see a quick bargain.

- **Social and economic benefits of forestry production;** The very obvious gross overstatement of any claimed social or economic benefits (if on balance there are any) of forestry production has made many people very angry. Added to that the huge amount of public money wasted on forestry it would be very difficult to show there are any social and economic benefits of forestry production especially when the devastation of so much of our social and economic capital is considered. Of course political party policy constraints will prevent any proper inquiry from being conducted to assess if there are any so-called social and economic benefits of forestry production claimed by forestry. Alternatively there is ample documentation to suggest that when the negative effects of forestry on our communities, jobs, economy, health and future potential are considered it would seem that there are no net social and economic benefits resulting from forestry production. The sad fact is that there could be good social and economic benefits in forestry production if there was integrity, care, proper management and community input in forestry matters.
- **Potential energy production from the forestry sector, including:** I will leave this topic to others who are more involved with it than I am.
 - **biofuels;**
 - **biomass;**
 - **biochar;**
 - **cogeneration; and,**
 - **carbon sequestration;**
- **Land use competition between the forestry and agriculture sectors:** Public money given to forestry has caused unfair competition favouring forestry over agriculture causing billions of dollars in loss to our economy, besides thousands of jobs, health, agricultural production and ultimately the loss to Australians of owning what was their land. Some of my previous comments relate to this topic also.
 - **implications of competing land uses for the cost and availability of timber, food and fibre;** What's the use of government favouring of forestry giving them unfair financial advantages resulting in costly interference in market forces only to lose the farms, land and all its future generation of wealth to foreign ownership? The implications of causing unfair competition may well increase the cost and reduce the availability of timber, food and fibre. Native forests (managed differently to what they are now) can produce our timber. All the hype used by forestry about the cost and imbalance of importing more timber than we export is like saying that we should not import cars or any other goods if we do not export to the same value as we import. This much touted and falsely

founded argument, designed by forestry and extensively used to elevate forestry above all other land uses is ridiculous and makes no sense. Fibre is much more economically viable and sustainable if produced via hemp or similar crops and also from and is now available made from waste products such as wheat straw, coconut or banana waste etc.

- **harmonising competing interests;** Again the rhetorical question of how willing is forestry to harmonise with any competing interests? History tells us that forestry always overrides, overrules and sometimes destroys competing interests. There will have to be a major and demonstrated culture change (from ignoring or crippling competing interests) if there is to be any real harmonizing with them. For example recent trials are showing that there is no long term value or advantage to be gained by conducting forestry residue burns. At present forestry burns are still being conducted regardless to the damage the smoke and toxic gasses does to our health (and not just those with respiratory illness), our environment, our tourism image, and loss of energy production from our solar panels. Many see it as unjust cronyism that forestry is exclusively exempted from EPA authority or requirements. It should go without saying that this seriously detracts from any integrity or authority the EPA may be trying to establish. Harmonizing and working together is far preferable to neither side listening to each other and I would love to be able work with forestry and not be forced to have to be like a whistle blower.
- **and,**
- **opportunities for farm forestry.** Let farm forestry on farms owned by local people be driven by market forces. Maybe some slight tax postponement benefits for plantings that exceed 40 years but the opportunities must be essentially market driven.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present my submission and I look forward hoping to have the opportunity to be able to expand on the above brief submission at a hearing.

Yours truly,
Bob Loone
Deputy Mayor
Meander Valley Council
63 Sorell Street
Chudleigh

Tasmania 7304
Phone 03 63636190
24 March 2011

List of Attachments:

2011 02 16 RGL letter Re GSF Land Loss
2011 02 14 Clive Scott Smoke4All7Comments
2011 02 23 Frank Nickalson FT Obsolete Practices
2011 03 01 MeanderValleyMunicipalityForeignOwned NF PropertyDetails
2011 03 15 MIS Forestry's Lack of Logic
2011 03 21 FiguresWhyMillAndPlantationsUnviable
2011 03 22 Pulp Mill, Forestry Burns, And Air Contamination
2008 11 15 David Leaman Injustices
2009 12 06 Forestry Scandalises Planning
2009 12 09 BadForestrySiltedUp Tamar
2010 06 08 Bound&BiggsProblemsWithPlantations
2010 06 10 WaterIssues&PlantationsLeaman9Comments
2011 01 29 CanadiansGrabGreatGreatSouthernLand
2011 01 31 LBeaudin WoodSmokeKillingUs

2011 02 16 RGL Letter Re GSF Land Loss

MIS Forestry a self inflicted disaster where all who desperately tried to prevent it were ignored or denigrated by being publicly dismissed by both forestry and politicians as being uninformed troublemakers.

Agricultural food production is Tasmania's best potential for generating sustainable economic growth and fulfilling jobs. During the past 15 years governments have financially assisted unsustainable MIS forestry to destroy farms, jobs, soils and agricultural production.

On 28 January 2011, 252,000 ha (630,000 acres) of Great Southern Forests' MIS high productivity farmland was transferred over to foreign ownership. That's equivalent to about 2500 highly productive farms (about 30% of all of the farming area in Tasmania) gone to foreign ownership, denied to future generations. Farms that were purchased at \$10,000 per ha (and destroyed by heavily taxpayer subsidised MIS forestry) is now given over to foreign ownership for around \$2,000 per ha. The wealth that land produces into the future will now go overseas while our economy is left to struggle. Those 252,000 ha from now on will be managed to serve the purposes and benefits of their overseas owners.

Untruthful forestry claims and Federal Government (especially Senator Eric Abetz) promoted (taxpayer financed) MIS has resulted in all that land being lost from local ownership into perpetuity. All the sustainable wealth, jobs and economic viability those farms generate is now permanently lost from this and future generations.

Now Gunns are considering transferring part of their unsustainable and unviable plantation estate which is equivalent of over 500 highly productive farms, over to foreign ownership in a desperate effort to prop up their unprofitable operations, reduce their self generated excessive debt level, and build an unviable pulp mill.

Like compulsive gamblers our politicians pour public money into the treacherous forestry pokey machine. So far we have lost: (a) ownership of about 2,500 farms (entrusted to our stewardship for

future generations), (b) over 10,000 jobs, and (c) \$Billions in wealth generation and ongoing economic activity.

What a strangling indictment irresponsible MIS forestry is imposing on us resulting from federal government foregoing unlimited tax revenue by diverting it to benefit get rich quick MIS corporations who prevented farmers from purchasing farms by paying distorted land prices only to then deliver those farms to foreign ownership. Now Gunns are considering doing that also.

I cannot understand why both major parties are still supporting the 100% tax free incentives to encourage more MIS forestry.

Bob Loone
Deputy Mayor
Meander Valley Council
63 Sorell Street
Chudleigh
Ph 63636190

2011 02 14 Clive Scott Smoke4All7Comments

Well done Forestry Tas

Clive Stott cleanair@cleanairtas.com Picture: John Hawkins of smoke over Chudleigh
14.02.11 2:05 am



Forestry Tasmania admits they got it wrong last year and are now using their own failings to extend the length of their selfish planned burn smoke season this year.

FT apologises for smoke – ABC 24/4/2010: [HERE](#)

Obviously Forestry Tas. knows nothing about the harmful effects of the smoke they pump into our airsheds across Tasmania or into the lungs of Tasmanian people. Either that or it seems they just don't care about the environment, the animals, or fellow mankind.

Smoke management means stopping the smoke at the source.

Lower levels of smoke for a longer period of time, are just as harmful as higher levels of smoke for a shorter period of time. We have had both now after suffering about 50 years of deliberate and unnecessary FT burning.

“We almost got it completely right last year” means Forestry Tas. got it completely wrong ... again!

Instead of Bob Gordon attempting to give FT an underserved pat on the back for past deliberate air exceedances, I am inviting him to have a look at

<http://cleanairtas.com/issmoke.htm>.

Here he can read about some of the harmful effects associated with THEIR pernicious wood smoke.

No amount of spin will reduce the harmful effects of this smoke.

Forestry Tasmight as well be saying, "Here are a 100 cigarettes – don't smoke them all at once.

And while councils are bringing in no smoking laws at bus shelters and in malls because of the known harmful effects of smoke, we find out that in 2008 it is estimated FT released into our airsheds (from their heavy-fuel burns alone) the equivalent amount of particles that would be released from 6.45 trillion to 9.15 trillion cigarettes.

Well done Forestry Tas. I feel you are making a laughing stock out of our primary Environmental Management and Pollution Control Act (supposedly administered by the EPA). I believe you are not exempt from this Act and nor should you be.

<http://www.forestrytas.com.au/news/2011/02/changes-to-our-regeneration-burning-program>

ShareThis

Hide Comments

Comments (7)

1. Was thinking bout taking up the fags so I could enjoy some breaks through the day while co workers slaved on, but FT have squashed that idea.

Boss says you will enjoy enough smoke whenever you are outside, so fag breaks are banned....the windows will be left open so we can all inhale....

Kids aren't forgotten either.....no more smoking behind the shed at school....now we can all enjoy a good puff in the classrooms....encouraged by the teachers.....

If FT was clever, they could hook up some motor racing or football sponsorship....."Anyhow, have a nitens", or "Come to the flavour of Celery Top country"....or "Tasmania, your passport to smoking pleasure"....

Posted by Dave Groves on 14/02/11 at 07:20 AM

2. Clive,
How did your water testing go?

Posted by Bemused on 14/02/11 at 08:49 AM

3. #2 Bemused you are a bit off topic but since it is a really nice day out there without any forestry smoke about I will tell you.
It failed, E.coli 56/100mL and coliforms 59.1/100mL Both are meant to be below 1.0 remember.

The Tamar valley is so nice today, clear as a bell. The before and after photos will be interesting.

I really feel forestry would like a few wood heaters going though so they can commence their burning.

Posted by Clive Stott on 14/02/11 at 12:07 PM

4. Forestry Tasmania is a loose cannon that is destroying a once vibrant forestry industry by an obsession with wood chipping. This obsession has seen sawmills close, the requirement of huge subsidies to prop up Forestry Tasmania and the on going pollution of our once pristine air and water.

The smoke emitted from prescribed burns and managed wildfires is unfiltered wood smoke that is extremely dangerous to unborn foetuses, infant children and elderly people. It even affects normal healthy people without warning. Wood smoke pollution is 12 times more carcinogenic than cigarette smoke, attacks the body cells up to 40 times longer, and kills untold numbers of adults and children every year. It contains a toxic soup of more than 4,000 chemical compounds of harmful gases and particle matter that go deep in the lungs and kill people, 69 of which are known human carcinogens, including arsenic, particulate matter, ozone, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, dioxin and various irritant gas such as nitrogen oxides that scar the lungs. There is no escape from the effects of smoke. The tiny particles and gases seep into houses through closed doors and windows reaching up to 70 percent of the outside pollution level.

And all this for what?

Posted by max on 15/02/11 at 05:13 PM

5. Now you know this is not a serious matter. All this wood smoke is non-accountable because it is carbon neutral and therefore doesn't really exist. Which interpreted means, it will all have grown back again by next year so we can repeat it ad nauseum.

In Forestspeak I think it's called 'value adding'.

Posted by Barnaby Drake on 15/02/11 at 06:31 PM

6. expect will be delaying most burns until after the grape vineyards sold by gunns are harvested- that is unless the winemakers want some smoke compound essences to go with the oak essences in the wines.

Posted by mike seabrook on 15/02/11 at 06:58 PM

7. Thanks for the update on your water Clive.

Posted by Bemused on 16/02/11 at 07:52 PM