

-----Original Message-----

**From:** bim underwood [SMTP:sophie\_underwood@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, July 29, 2000 3:07 AM  
**To:** jsct@aph.gov.au  
**Subject:** Kyoto Protocol

To whom it may concern,

I saw your advertisement in The Mercury, July 15, 2000. This is a Tasmanian newspaper.

I was not exactly clear about what type of comments you were seeking regarding the Kyoto Protocol. However, I have a few concerns regarding the protocol.

I live in Tasmania where much of our amazing old forests are being converted into tree farms. I am concerned that the incentive of carbon credits will accelerate this conversion.

There are many environmental costs associated with this practice which I feel should be considered in The Kyoto Protocol:

1. The loss of an incredible natural resource, which is likely to be one of our biggest draw cards in the future in terms of tourist dollars;
2. The use of 1080 to kill wildlife;
3. The impact on biodiversity, ie. the likely decrease in biodiversity;
4. Impact on water catchments, eg the impacts on water quality, quantity,;
5. The impact on soil quality;
6. The loss of forests where tree stands vary in age and structure. For example, old trees form homes for animals;
7. The human social costs of buying up land in small communities. For example, impacts on local employment, real estate values, the loss of scenic values and recreation areas etc.
8. The potential impact on the Tasmanian community in terms of losing control of public lands;
9. The ever increasing take over of local areas by Multinational companies who rarely have any care about local social or environmental costs;
10. The increased use of fertilisers, herbicides and pesticides associated with tree farms; and
11. The conversion of a natural landscape to an industrial landscape.

Could there be some clause in the protocol that stated that trees planted to gain carbon credits could not be planted in existing forest areas.

I also had the idea that multinational companies or companies that would like to gain carbon credits could lease natural forest for preservation in perpetuity. Areas from companies like Forestry Tasmania or North Forest

Products could be leased. Thus they would be conserving a whole range of values rather than just planting trees. We should be aiming for maximum value from carbon credits. Ie Not just the value of carbon storage but all the values associated with forested areas.

Could forestry companies earn more credits for preserving pristine areas than chopping them down and turning them into plantations?

Could I please be sent a copy of the Kyoto Protocol. It is difficult for me to print off the web. That would be great. My address is:

Sophie Underwood  
155 Waterworks Road  
Dyynyrne, 7005  
Tasmania

I also want to highlight the hypocrisy of government legislation. Tasmanian has one of the highest rates of land clearance in Australia and has been stated to be as high as land clearance in the Amazon Basin. If we had a true concern about Greenhouse effects etc then we should stop companies like Forestry Tasmania and North Forest Products from clearing ANY MORE AREAS of forests. Woodchipping our forests for paper is a crime.

What will our grandchildren think?

Anyway, they are my ideas and concerns.

I hope that somebody listens to them.

Sophie Underwood

Ps Thank you for inviting comments on the protocol. I am glad that people from the community have some opportunity to voice concerns.