



**Make a submission – Contact Details**

First Name\*: GRAEME & DEBBIE

Last Name\*: LEE

Phone:

Mobile\*:

Email\*:

Postcode\*:

Country\*: Australia

Stakeholder type (circle)\*:

Community group	Local Government	Aboriginal group
Industry group	Other government	Forest user group
Environment group	Individual	Staff

Other, please specify:

Organisation name: G & D. Lee

What is your preferred contact method (circle): Mobile, Email or phone?

Would you like to receive further information and updates on IFOA and forestry matters?

Yes

Can the EPA make your submission public\* (circle)?

Yes

No

Yes, but anonymous

Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?

No

We wish to make a submission to the IFOA remake

My Credentials.

I have previously been a primary school teacher for 36 years and during that time I taught Environmental Education specifically for four years to a range of classes from Kindergarten to Yr 6. I had established intricate ties to specific groups to form the basis of my education program. I liaised with Koala Foundation advocate Deborah Tabbot and many lessons were given on the koala.

WIRES was intricately involved in the whole school program

Alex Floyd previously with NSW Forestry Commission and National Parks also helped to guide the programs on endangered flora (threats to and proposed actions to help educate both students and staff).

Our school Tyalla Public School at Coffs Harbour was involved in a production and planting of species through Landcare to help establish wildlife corridors from Urunga to Woolli in supply of over 15,000 seedlings grown for locally selected seeds and grown in the school greenhouse under direction and direct instruction from NSW State Forestry Commission nursery before it closed. Seedlings of local plants were also sold cheaply to local farmers for shelter belts and wildlife corridors etc.

Local Aboriginal elders were approached to help develop a real understanding of cultural factors both by excursions, overnight camps and direct activities in school times.

All the above helped me gain a great insight into endangered species and large amounts of advice about minimising threats to these species. Our Environmental program won North Coast Schools Program 1993 and 1994 due to our community involvement.

OUR PNF PVP 490

Our property of approx. 1200 acres has 600 acres of native forest on which a PVP exists we have considered seriously our responsibilities to the future both for species and children of the future.

Page20 point7.1

We constantly are on the lookout for threatened species by observation, tracking and scat observation as well as night spotlighting and sound surveys.

Tree selection for timber products are selected in areas where no evidence of koalas have been observed (either live koalas or scats or prints along existing snig trails) over periods of time.

Page25 Stand -Level protection Measures Giant Trees

Large habitat trees are deliberately left as refuges for animals and seed trees.

Fauna page20 7.1

Quolls have been sighted in open paddocks that years ago were poisoned axed leaving many hollow logs and blady grass thickets near these logs.

We have 1080 baited to within a 1km of these areas as part of the Smiths Ck Wild Dog Association of which I am the co-ordinator, more along cleared fire trails (Wares Fire Trail) because according to LLS rangers baiting with dog sized baits is relatively safe as the baits are injected into the middle of the baits which are too large for a quoll to eat completely as their stomach is too small to eat the whole bait.

This is also the result of studies from NPWS

Our logging activities resulting in easy access to all parts of our forest areas through snig trails helps us monitor these above invasions of weeds

7.2: We note that a proposal to a move for protection for threatened species to implement large ecological reserves.

OUTCOME based proposal already exists as in BONGIL BONGIL N P

Bongil Bongil NP was once Pine Creek State Forest – now considered a jewel for koalas.

I was raised from 1960 at Bundagen and went to school at Bellingen

I had to walk then ride through Pine Creek State Forest every school day. I met the foresters regularly and got to know them and learned their histories. Fore example where and when lantana started to invade this forest and how it was removed by teams of men decades ago. Teams of WW1 prisoners would chip out lantana.

I learned about the 30-year cycle of logging and how productive this forest was on that cycle.

I learned they knew their forests so well that they knew when to get trees for specific orders ,such as piles for export through Coffs Harbour to New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Boganville for wharfs and sea jetties. These were Turpentine trees used as piles that had to be rung and the bark left to dry and left in place to repel sea borers

I witnessed the felling of portions of forest near the old Pacific Hwy near Sid Burke rest area. Then the TSI program (Timber Stand Improvement)program was implemented by felling timber that was of little value for timber. I also saw that large (habitat) trees were left as seed trees.

I then watched as the whole area was burned and then watched as the forestry workers hand seeded in the burnt area. This I remember was in the late 1960's

Looking at the area now it is a very impressive stand of forest.

These practises managed that forest well for all.

Page 39 point 11.2

Fast forward to 2018 when we want to reinvent the wheel with more legislation, more red tape, more big stick penalties to the start of the chain of command as in more training, more penalties ; yet people who live in and work in forests know what is needed already.

Now if this new proposal gets the green light I will have to collect and record and maintain more data for probably the LLS (Local Land Services) to assess. I note that little more funding has been given to them for this. I also know that we as livestock owners have to pay rates each year as user pays for LLS services.

Will we as timber harvesters be asked to pay for the data collected to be assessed by LLS in the future under user pays (and side stepping by state government offloading services and getting in revenue for what is a public service?)

Our property at Bundagen had a mining lease for mineral sands (Rutile, Zircon, Monazite) as well as other rare minerals in the sands

This was to follow on when the mining plant that was working south of Bonville Creek towards Bundagen finished (the old Pine Creek State Forest). The replanting of this area was mainly made using Flooded Gum.

All of the above management and subsequent lack of; (controlling noxious weeds and feral animals) still has meant a jewel held up for green groups to herald a prime koala area.

Who is going to take responsibility for the real management of this prime forest area?

Do we need to take more productive timber areas such as Pine Ck State Forest alias Bongil Bongil NP to lock up for feral dogs, cats, deer, lantana and invasive grasses. Cutting many families incomes and business services to a few ranger jobs who cant manage the reserves and National Parks because of funding and I allege no real understanding over time of a forest from the roots up, so as to gain the green political tick of approval that then directly flows to a seat in parliament through the votes of people fed mis-information to support a stilted view on forests

Under 7.2 I note the second point states "outcomes- based, informed scientific evidence or information"

Doesn't decades of NSW Forestry Management of Pine Ck State Forest give outcomes based evidence?

4<sup>th</sup> point "appropriate in scale to allow for the conduct ..... As a commercial enterprise\

Pine Ck State Forest was an extremely valuable commercial and natural resource that protected timber fauna and flora but now has only picnic tables for visitors that previously catered for timber products, commercial businesses, permanency in employment, protected lands and protected species.

Our PNF forest area is valuable commercially to us

We have carefully followed husbandry on our PVP for cyclical production

On page 23 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph starts "The proposed changes to the TSL....." last sentence " The licence will be more effective and efficient to implement.

How? This again is so vague

General licence conditions

1<sup>st</sup> point – When applying for a PNF PVP 490 we initially were told a significant area approx. 20% was old growth forest. This was made by satellite studies.

When challenged due to ground truthing by us – (old logging trails, 40 year old stumps, thick regrowth regeneration) the officer Michael Body from CH Environmental State agreed and didn't ground truth until 2 years later when inspecting the block next door for a PNF agreement. He drove through our block and saw this to be correct.

How could landowners have confidence in decisions made on scientific basis with the latest technologies. Yet more of the same is planned to be forced onto Private Native Forestry agreement holders .

page 25 – Tree retention (hollow bearing trees)

Why would you bother to fall a tree when it has large hollows full of sand that bluntens your chainsaw immediately so that it requires sharpening before any more timber could be harvested. Most if not all timber workers would avoid this as it is restricting their income earning potential.

We need these trees as recruitment trees for generations of seedlings as well as homes and feeding sources for fauna.

I notice bottom of page 25

Burning

We tried slow burning a small portion of harvested area and noted the potential for erosion due to no ground litter and have discontinued the practice. This has meant regrowth is protected from grazing cattle in logged areas (we run approx. 100 head of dry cattle in this 600 acres) But we have to be on heightened alert for invasion by red lantana as the bordering blocks are owned in some cases by non- resident owners who have let the country explode with noxious weed ,the seeds of which are carried to our forest areas. Red lantana is highly poisonous to cattle. Again our access trails for timber harvesting have helped us maintain a high degree of control over these invasions.

We have taken on added responsibility for our forest above the terms of PNF.

Page 27 – Bell minder associated dieback.

On our southern side is a block owned by people who do not want to harvest timber and do not want to graze cattle. The evidence is stark. Our property has a shorter understorey while

their land has a shrubby understory. Bell miners seem to stop at our boundary and no observable effects are evident in our forest.

Also previous wildfires have had a large impact on their forest areas than our country.

If I had a choice to be in one of the forests (ours or theirs) during a fire I would take my chances in our forest that has been selectively logged, managed and is accessible because the fire is less intense.

I notice that little consideration is given to fire (page 25 4 lines) I come back to discuss this .

Since we have been on this land (1998 on) we have experienced 2 major bush fires from both North and South of our property

The first was considered State Emergency and was approx. 12 years ago where State Forests paid for helicopters and water bombers councils etc to fight to control the fire before it approached the village of Copmanhurst.

We knew the country. We had trails that enabled quick actions along these fire trails so they could be swept with graders to gain rapid control of this fire.

The second was known as Hills Rd Fire (2011) and was burning through inaccessible country loaded with large areas of deep scrubby country. Rural Fire couldn't access that country. Other fires had broken out in other areas around Grafton so they requested other RFB to help.

A dozer was brought in but they decided to let the fire come out of the overgrown country and fight it on our country because of ease of access and clearer forest. (no noxious lantana, scrub, deep thickets and much old fallen timber with no management over 40 years).

In summary – In our Private Native Forests

The existing PNF agreement has all the legislation and conditions needed to manage private native forestry and does not need re-evaluation.

We have followed the PNF agreement and married it to good Landcare practise.

Commercially we have supplied thousands of dollars of timber products in the form of flooring, power poles, power pole cross arms, fencing materials, thousands of blueberry netting poles for bird netting, hundreds of small poles for hot house horticulture (cucumbers, berries, tomatoes etc).

In so doing have been able to reinvest that income into our property Wanda Downs to develop it to be in better condition than when we bought it to the benefit of timber production, fire control and water management and lastly but not leastly fauna and flora.

We look to the future to start re-logging area previously logged from 2009 where regrowth is again harvestable in the form of power poles to specification of 12.5/4 and 12.5/6 poles consistently used in towns for power poles.

In the future we intend to fence our forest lands into compartments so we can control grazing on it to allow for closer management which will benefit flora diversity.

Graeme and Debbie Lee