

**Submission
No 430**

**INQUIRY INTO MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LAND IN
NEW SOUTH WALES**

Name: Mrs Faye O'Brien

Date received: 30/08/2012

RECEIVED

30 AUG 2012

GPSC's

27th August 2012

Dear Robert and Committee Members

We appreciate the opportunity to make a submission and participate in the formal hearing process of the GPSC No.5.

While we will reflect, momentarily, on the past to explain how our industries and communities come to be at this point, our attention in this submission is focused on going forward and achieving the best outcomes for our forest, our communities and our industry for today and into the future.

Our intention is to be brief and to the point.

We have also attached one of the submissions we made to the Natural Resources Commission which clearly outlines who we are, what our philosophies are for your information, rather than repeat all that information here again. As our redgum resource has changed since 2010, our product range has changed.

The NSW Labor Government creation of 107,000 hectares of Riverina Redgum National/Regional parks in March 2010, was certainly the beginning of the "boutique" redgum timber industry that the NRC had envisioned in their Final Recommendations Report.(Dec.2009)

Our redgum timber industry and our small communities were part of the collateral damage the Labor Government were willing to pay, in order to cling to power.

Frank Sartor's "lesson in politics" to redgum timber industry people, in Deniliquin, in January 2010, emphasizing the need for inner city Green preferences to remain in Government was followed by Ian Cohen, Leader of the Greens, being quoted in "The Australian" Feb 2010 with "...if they (Labor) don't deliver on these forests in a sustainable way, they can go to hell."

Once the Pilliga was safely ensconced into reserve, the Greens then turned their attention the redgum forests of the south west.

This is not a paranoid conspiracy theory, but the reality of the last dying months of this desperate Labor Government grasping at straws, playing politics, with no real concern for the environment nor the people, who lived in the Riverina, ten hours from Sydney.

Just deal-making, coldhearted politics at work!

And yes, it does guarantee a very cynical response these days, when we hear "trust me, I'm from the government"

But the traincrash has happened and now we are getting on with it.

The redgum timber industry is a much smaller entity, but still vitally important to the well being of the redgum forests and their communities- environmentally, economically and socially.

There is still the resilience, commitment and investment in the industry- seeking to thrive, not just survive. Businesses, employees, communities and customers need to maintain confidence with sound government policy making and direction.

The redgum timber industries should be seen as part of the solution, not as a problem by the committee and the government.

The NRC based their report recommendations on a water scarce future, and ironically since the release of the report, the redgum forests have been constantly flooded since.

To replace the economic value of the timber industry with the tourism, is a fanciful idea at best.

Since 2010, as the redgum forests of the Riverina remain under fluctuating flood conditions, access has been extremely limited. Many forests were actually closed to visitors. So if you has a business relying on the tourists coming to the redgum forests, you would definitely require a second income to survive

As well as the larger redgum forests, we now have isolated fragments of forest with no obvious management- fire management/ weeds/pests

control/silviculture- with some of the newly nominated redgum national parks still not even signed

However, one of the shining lights in the NRC document was about the absolute recognition of the need for interventionist/intensive active management of the redgum forests, regardless of land tenure. The Final Report's Recommendation 3 and 4 outline the principles of sound redgum forest management and argues the need for trial large scale thinnings across the redgum forests, with thinning becoming an essential tool to enhance both conservation and production outcomes

We urge this committee and the Government to actively pursue these recommendations for the best outcomes for forests and their communities. Committed, serious engagement with community and industry will make a difference to achieving the best outcomes.

Attached is a flow chart that we have constructed to illustrate the prohibitive costs of National Parks managing large scale thinnings operations as compared to utilizing the experienced timber industry to do the same job so much more cost effectively.

This is such an opportunity to take National Parks off welfare, while still achieving great environmental outcomes.

The cumulative effects of government policy and decision making are taking its toll on the resiliency and the viability of NSW rural communities. - Water, private native veg regulations, redgum national parks and on and on!

Here is a positive way of making a difference.
Lets get on with it!

Looking forward to your response

Kind Regards

Faye and Ken O'Brien

THINKING

OUTSIDE THE BOX

A WAY OF TAKING NP OFF WELFARE, WHILE SIMULTANEOUSLY IMPROVING THE ENVIRONMENT AND KEEPING LOCAL REDGUM COMMUNITIES VIABLE, PRODUCTIVE CONSERVATION AT WORK

Local Timber Industry

Newly Declared Redgum National Park Estate NSW

= 107,000ha

Assume that half the NP estate is thinned

Approx. 50,000ha

@40 tonne per hectare

50,000ha x 40t = 2 million t

OVER 10-20 Year Time Frame

Government Agencies

2million tonnes of thinnings
x \$20 per tonne = \$40 million Royalty
\$\$\$ PAYMENT BENEFIT TO THE GOVERNMENT
And \$600 million Economic Stimulus to the Economy
(2 million tonne X \$300 per tonne Retail FW)
Timber Industry is the solution, not the problem

Machinery/Labour Hire Costs = \$600 per hr x 30hrs per week

= \$18,000 per week

Assume that harvest team harvests 500 t per week

= \$18000/500 = \$36.00 per tonne

One team will harvest approx 12.5 ha per week

At 40 tonne per hectare X \$36 = \$1440 per ha.

50,000ha X \$1440 = \$72 million

50,000ha will take 4,000 weeks

(excluding any wet weather/flooding conditions delays)

One team = 76.92 years

Two Teams = 38.46 years

Four Teams = 19.23 years

Eight teams = 9.61 years

ALL AT HUGE \$\$\$ COST TO THE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

As Patrick Moore Co Founder of Greenpeace said in 2006:

"One of the best ways to address climate change is to use more wood, not less. Wood is simply the most abundant, biodegradable and reusable material on the planet."