

Doug Rawlinson

Native Vegetation Regulation Review ,
Environment Protection Authority
PO Box A290
Sydney South NSW 1232

Comments on the Draft Native Forestry Code of Practice for Southern NSW ,

Dear Environment and Protection Authority,

Thanks for this chance to make comments on the final draft of the native forestry Code for Southern NSW .

We would ask that changes be made to this act as we are aware that it presently allows people to buy native forest land and then proceed to log them for nothing better than firewood . I have followed closely for many years a case where this is happening in Mount Rae forest .

I have seen many articles and letters in local media and also seen the forestry 'spin' on how such clearing and logging under PNF will improve the remaining forests of the region as they are supposedly all dying and needing human intervention in the form of logging to save them . As a plant nursery owner and landscaper for over 30 years , I have some knowledge of the flora of our region and am not aware of any science supporting such broad statements.

The granting of biodiversity certification to these plans would seem to be the problem . As such these plans are given special streamlining and no environmental surveys are needed. It is because of this that firewood merchants can then claim that lands have no biodiversity values . Self regulation by firewood sellers cannot work !!.

We have been to Mount Rae forest and seen the areas for logging and they are known to contain the Commonwealth listed threatend orchid species the Buttercup Doubletail (*Diuris aequalis*) . This alone should see this forest protected. We are aslo aware that surrounding lands have undergone extensive ecological surveying identifying both NSW listed fauna species and vegetation communities considered under represented in the area. How can logging be considered to be maintaing and improving these values as required under the Native Vegetation Act or meet the recommended priority actions and protections for the rare orchid as required under the Threatened species act?

The end product of these operations (firewood) is also contrary to government advice on reducing carbon emissions , and taking actions to prevent global warming. How does increasing tree clearing and burning forests and wildlife homes on the huge scale that a local forestry network wishes be considered to be in the common good or warrant biodiversity certification.

We would ask that the logging approvals in Mount Rae forest be revoked and changes made to the final forestry act to ensure that native forests cannot be logged for such products as firewood and that independent surveys by qualified consultants be carried out prior to any logging approvals.

The Goulburn area was also subject to one of the worst droughts on record . As a member of the Goulburn alternative water initiatives group and as a member serving with Goulburn Mulwarree Councils water advisory group I would also ask the EPA how clearing trees on top of the great dividing range (to 30 degrees of slope) will protect the water quality of our streams and rivers? Mount Rae forest is between 920 and 1,000 metres above sea level and before the Environment Minister gave approvals to these plans Sydney Water Authority opposed this same operation because of the lack of information on the effects on water quality .

It is for these reasons that I ask the EPA and the Environment Minister to take action and make changes to the Code for private native forestry in Southern NSW to meet the stated aims of operating in the common good for both present and future generation.

Sincerely

Doug Rawlinson