

**From:** Penny Bartholomew [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, 26 August 2012 7:13 PM  
**To:** EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox  
**Subject:** submission

Hi, I sent this on Friday and got it return as rejected. Hope this is now acceptable to your department. I will ring tomorrow to check if you received it or you can contact me on 02 48432263  
Cheers Penny Bartholomew

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 Sir or Madam,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Could the EPA please explain how logging operations approved for commercial scale firewood through PNF on properties adjacent to mine in the Mount Rae forest , meet the PNF stated objectives of in the introduction to the Southern Code of Practice :

**"...maintaining non-wood values at or above target levels considered necessary by society to prevent environmental harm and provide environmental services for the common good."**

I cannot see how these aims are being met in the forest where I live. In 2005 I attended a field day in this forest where NSW Government ecologists responded to past firewood clearing here by informing locals of the "non-wood" values of this forest. They told us how firewood clearing would have a negative impact on this area and it's threatened species and educated us about government concerns for the NSW endangered and Commonwealth listed Buttercup Doubletail orchid. They took actions to stop the firewood clearing which had occurred here. Under PNF all this is just ignored. Why ?

Local councillors of the Upper Lachlan Shire also listened to the DEC advice and voted unanimously against firewood logging in this forest. The granting of ministerial biodiversity certification by the NSW Environment Minister to PNF has just removed council from the process and ignored the past objections to the same operation by the governments own scientists. This does not strike me as preventing environmental harm. According to the departments own scientists it will add to it.

I had my property assessed for a conservation agreement with the Environment Minister Robyn Parker and it was found to contain vegetation matching that of Endangered Ecological Communities , the previously mentioned and Federally protected Buttercup Doubletail orchid as well as being healthy habitat for this forests ten other threatened fauna species . Could the department please explain to me how clearing and logging with heavy machinery will "maintain or improve" this forest ecosystem as required under the Native Vegetation Act when under PNF no surveys were conducted for threatened wildlife known in this forest? How can the Office of Environment and heritage even consider commercial clearing when they do not conduct surveys to identify what they claim is being "maintained and improved" or meeting of the requirements of the Threatened

Species Conservation Act to protect these same threatened fauna. Under PNF the only threatened species the developer has to account for are those listed on the NSW Wildlife Atlas. Most private lands have never been surveyed so in most cases nothing will have been recorded. This allows the PNF developer in this forest to state in the past that nothing was on his property and those for logging. All shown to be untrue according to government scientist and independent consultants reports on six surrounding properties.

The listing of prescriptions to protect threatened species on the Southern code of practice and comments from departmental heads that threatened species are protected by these prescriptions appear foolish to me when nobody identifies them in the first place. We are supposed to believe that the same habitat, across my fenceline, supposedly contains no wildlife species? Do the Powerful and Barking Owls and Gang Gang Cockatoos of this forest not fly to other properties to feed and shelter? We are to believe developer comments that across this fenceline it is suddenly an unhealthy dying forest and the Firewood Baron (his registered trade name) is only conducting this clearing and logging of firewood to make it better for the animals? Under PNF he and his forestry network claim to be improving it by logging it. The environment Minister may be naïve enough to believe this, but I'm certainly not, and neither were the departments threatened species experts when they told him to stop. They stated this forest is healthy and contains EEC's. The only management recommended was to not clear it, but allow natural regeneration, protect it from such a scale of clearing and control any feral species.

Thanks to the current PNF act not only is firewood logging happening here but forestry networks who support this operation are saying that they intend to "improve" ALL the forest and wooded areas of the Shire and the Southern Tablelands through commercial firewood logging and sell the wood in Canberra and Sydney! I thought governments at all levels were trying to stop firewood use in big cities because of pollution impacts on the wider community. What of government website which tell of the possible predicted impacts of global warming? How can felling a forest which stores carbon and then burning the animals homes as firewood help either the animals or the planet? How can this firewood logging be sanctioned when the rest of us are asked to take actions to reduce our carbon footprint and preserve biodiversity?

To help prevent future landscape scale impacts on the region I would ask that final legislation require independent environmental surveys before logging is approved. I would also ask that the loophole which allows the expansion of fulltime firewood sellers to cut down our forests for nothing better than firewood be removed. In Mount Rae forest the **only** product is firewood. It is not an offcut or a residue of saw log or millable timber but commercial firewood sold in bulk or in bags.

We were lead to believe that decisions would be going back to local communities under this government. PNF removes locals, local councils and even findings by qualified consultants and departmental ecologists from the process and streamlines clearing by a non-resident firewood business. Why aren't these decisions handed over to the local Catchment Management Authority? We were told that this is what they were set up for and that all Property Vegetation Plans are assessed by them. I would ask they become a part of the PNF process so vegetation condition can be assessed professionally.

PNF is certainly not helping this local community and removed my rights to have an opinion when they removed local councils from the process. Locals have entered agreements to protect future landowners from conducting PNF logging and local landcare has spent countless hours and government funds planting vegetation corridors linking to this forest. I cannot see how PNF

is handing decisions back to local communities? It is really only undermining all these efforts and is contrary to everything we were told by the Department of Conservation in the past.

My own property is now part of the Humane Society International's Wildlife Land Trust community network while my firewood selling neighbour's property now appears to be part of the NSW Government's PNF firewood network. This is hypocritical and shows how on ground PNF is failing to deliver on its objectives.

I ask that my comments on the Southern Code of Practice for PNF be taken into account and look forward to meaningful legislation that does not put at risk Australia's biodiversity, and both mine and future generations rights to fresh air and clean water.

Sincerely yours

Penny Bartholomew, [REDACTED] Taralga, NSW 2580



This is the view from my lounge room window, hope you like the rural bushland outlook – I don't – this is what PNF is doing to the environment. Thank you please stop this from happening elsewhere. Penny Bartholomew [REDACTED] Taralga, NSW 2580

