

**Submission
No 37**

**INQUIRY INTO LOCAL LAND SERVICES AMENDMENT
(MISCELLANEOUS) BILL 2020**

Name: Mr John Klason
Date Received: 22 February 2021

I am a cattle farmer near Taree and also I am trained in forestry (Bachelor of Science, forestry).

As much as 95 per cent of my property is zoned as koala habitat.

However, the 5pc of my property that was actual koala habitat was fried by the National Parks' actions a day after I had saved it from the recent bushfires.

Any koalas - and there were koalas - were incinerated.

Beyond my property, the State Forests' koalas had a far higher survival rate than National Parks, due to better fuel burn-offs.

Needless to say I do know what trees are what, but also that wild dogs from National Parks kill most of the koalas here (no mention of that in the reports).

The koala mapping used in the new Koala SEPP, meanwhile, is predominately based on work by Biolink, named in your story "Koala SEPP 'no impact' says ecologist" (The Land, September 10, p14), in collaboration with various unqualified interest groups.

However, do Biolink's results, given the unqualified nature of much of its data, carry scientific merit?

This is important because it is stated in the Office of Environment and Heritage's publication "A review of koala tree use across NSW", that Dr Steve Phillips and his Biolink colleagues' koala habitat mapping work across the NSW North and Central Coast particularly "has featured heavily in this review".

It was from the findings of this review that the koala habitat tree species were increased from the existing 10 tree species to 123 under the updated Koala Habitat Protection Guideline.

Note: I regard the report used as a foundation for the Koala SEPP is fraudulent, as is the "Koala Mapping". Prosecution of the responsible parties is demanded, as is immediate removal of all Amendments.

The basis of the fraud is parties with pecuniary interest were used, and totally unscientific data collection was used, from interest groups.