

From: P & M Nielsen <tinlizard33@westnet.com.au>
Sent: Saturday, 6 July 2019 3:33 PM
To: NRC
Subject: Feedback: NSW Natural Resources Commission's draft Program Strategy for the Forest Monitoring and Improvement Program.

Importance: High

Dear NRC people,

Thank you for your request for feedback/comment on the NSW Natural Resources Commission's draft Program Strategy for the Forest Monitoring and Improvement Program.

I have many concerns including:

That for the Program to be improved, we need to go right back to the drawing board; totally reviewing the effects of logging on our natural resources, especially public native forests and particularly taking climate change into consideration.

Firstly, it is important to assess whether there is any longer a 'social license' to log our native forests, considering the escalation of timber quantities and logging methods from genuine 'selective logging' as was once practiced, to only retaining a small number of trees per ha, and 'intensive logging' which is essentially clearfelling of 40-60ha area blocks. Or whether growing existing forests intact, 'Proforestation' serves the greater public good by maximizing the double benefits of nature-based biological carbon sequestration and unparalleled ecosystem services such as biodiversity enhancement, water and air quality, flood and erosion control, public health benefits, low impact recreation and scenic beauty.

We cannot ignore scientific evidence. In order to avert further damage to our climate, the urgent need is to reduce carbon emissions to net zero. The process of reducing our emissions together with reducing wildlife extinctions can begin tomorrow by adopting scientifically advised reforms to a Program Strategy which sensibly controls and regulates land clearing and logging of public native forests. The evidence is clear, such a strategy would reduce emissions, store carbon and enable the recovering forests to take up and store ever increasing volumes of carbon as they age, and in the process provide secure habitat, generate rainfall, cool climate, assist streamflow and river health.

By contrast we observe the obvious signs of degradation as seen in the North East native forests, in particular severe dieback and weed infestation (Lantana or logging induced BMAD, Bell Miner Associated Dieback) which appears to be caused by poor harvesting practice, lack of effective maintenance and restoration, all stemming from refusal to consult with local conservationists and ecologists. What are your findings on the effects of logging on promoting lantana infestation and/or BMAD? What is the current extent and severity of BMAD and how is this changing? Accurate mapping must inform the harvest planning process so they can be monitored over time.

I would be interested to know:

Given the damage inflicted on hollow bearing trees and recruitment trees in the logging operation process, what assessment is being carried out to measure the long term effects?

Where the external damage appears relatively minor, how is the internal damage assessed and the likelihood of survival measured?

What results have been recorded for the survival of hollow bearing and recruitment trees retained over logging cycles?

How are you assessing the numbers of recruitment trees and age groups, required to be retained in order to maintain the necessary hollow bearing trees in perpetuity?

How many hollow bearing trees do you assess need to be retained in order to have a healthy fauna population?

In my opinion critical habitat is currently given insufficient consideration in the 'program strategy', resulting in the RFAs and IFOAs providing drastically inadequate protection for the high number of endangered & threatened species. How effective are prescriptions for threatened fauna, their needs pre and post logging assessments?

Are the regulation buffers for various threatened plants proving effective and are follow up inspections carried out?

I am concerned about riparian buffers being totally inadequate for critical habitat for the many reliant species, aquatic life, erosion, streamflow, stream pollution, river health or water quality downstream. Clearly 5m buffers are a recipe for disaster on all these issues. What are the most effective widths for riparian buffers?

I am an artist, a farmer, a conservationist/environmentalist who is committed to respecting the natural world, our natural resources and a sustainable future.

I present a community radio program 'Celebrating Earth & Art' for which I research and report on matters of interest to environmentalists and artists. Many of the above concerns have been raised by my listeners.

I would very much appreciate being kept informed and would like to be part of the consultation process in order to keep myself and my community informed.

Yours Sincerely

Meg K Nielsen
'Celebrating Earth & Art'
River fm 92.9 Tuesdays 4-6pm
6663 5239
0413 417 543
Email: tinlizard33@westnet.com.au

"You cannot get through a single day without having an impact on the world around you. What you do makes a difference, and you have to decide what kind of difference you want to make." Jane Goodall