

NAME REDACTED

Submission ID: 203604

Organisation: N/A

Location: New South Wales

Supporting materials uploaded: N/A

Submission date: 10/9/2024 5:56:34 PM

Topic 1. Sustainability of current and future forestry operations in NSW

It is bordering on ridiculous to even talk about "sustainability of forestry operations" if you don't also consider that, if found to be "unsustainable*", they should be stopped.

Perhaps only in high value areas, or where it is necessary to provide blocks of forest to link areas of higher value, to enable flora and fauna and pollinators to move about with having to cross miles of open country.

Cleary, as Forestry NSW is running at a loss, it is NOT sustainable, so probably needs to be completely scrapped, to rid the face of entrenched views and vested interests, and then started again with a different - actually *sustainable* view going forward.

Topic 2. Environmental and cultural values of forests, including threatened species and Aboriginal cultural heritage values

Forests are vital to the ongoing survival of every living thing on the planet. We mis-manage them at our OWN peril, never mind imperilling all the flora and fauna that actually rely on intact and interactive forests.

It's important to note that 'regrowth coupes' are not "forest" in this sense. Essentially they are stands of human-planted silvicultural operations.

Farmed timber, if you like.

Forest implicitly means 'in a natural state'.

Hence why no "actual forests" should be being logged.

Rather, forestry operators should purchase land in the open market and set up silviculture operations thereon.

If this is "quote-unquote", uneconomical, then the problem is NOT the forests, but rather the "business model" of the foresters.

Forests cannot be treated as a resource to be extracted, in the way, say, iron or, or bauxite, can be treated.

Topic 3. Demand for timber products, particularly as relates to NSW housing, construction, mining, transport and retail

Due to better efficiencies of operation, radiata pine silviculture is MUCH more economically feasible than native hardwood forestry operations.

As a result, native hardwoods are basically uneconomic to harvest/exploit for anything other than seriously high-value value-adding - such as fine furniture, or high-grade tongue and groove flooring. And some high-end architectural veneer finishes, although these are usually restricted to finer timbers not grown in NSW, such as Tasmanian Oak.

But better-managed silviculture plantations, on ground less vertical and challenging, could enable such silviculture operations to approach similar economies of scale as radiata pine, at which point the reduced cost to the consumer of native hardwoods may once again enable them to be considered for structural timbers, cladding and flooring more generally, thereby providing both demand and actual profitability of the industry.

Topic 4. The future of softwood and hardwood plantations and the continuation of Private Native Forestry in helping meet timber supply needs

Private Native Forestry should be required to be managed, in the way European foresters manage their forests. Only a small number of selected trees to be cut from any given area annually, enabling existing smaller trees to continue growing to maturity.

Our current practice of clear felling a coupe, then replanting the entire coupe means we end up with all the trees fighting with each other to reach the sun, and so trees grow too fast and are lower quality than the older, slower growing, original 'native forests'.

The problem for our foresters today is that we needed to be planting high valued timber species a century ago, or 50 years ago, so they had time to grow. We also should not have felled every high value tree - like cedars, for example, as there are now none left that we could cut even if it were allowed.

Had those greedy ancestors of ours NOT cut every single tree, forestry operations might operate today at a heightened level of profitability.

We definitely should be planting more of the slower growing and higher value trees, and returning the 'forestry coupes' to a state much more like the original native forests pre-forestry operations.

We should also be changing our practices so that we are not 'clear felling' entire coupes. I

understand Forest NSW uses some 'creative English' to deny that this is what it does, but it is abundantly clear to anyone of the meanest intelligents, that once a coupe has been "logged" there is bugger all still standing. This practice must cease.

We need to go back to extremely selective logging, enabling us also to de-select specific trees required for habitat or food trees for endangered species like koalas.

GPS mapping technology enables us to pinpoint an actual tree and mark it 'not to be cut'.

This practice would have the added benefit of enabling the longer term growth of higher value trees that need longer growing times.

Europe has been managing their oak forests like this for 800 years.

We are yet to start. It's time we did.

Topic 5. The role of State Forests in maximising the delivery of a range of environmental, economic and social outcomes and options for diverse management, including Aboriginal forest management models

State Forests should simply get out of the way and stop its otherwise ineffectual attempts at 'managing' our forests.

They have a vested interest in a particular outcome - logging - which is unethically anathematical to the interests of the people, indigenous heritage, flora and fauna more broadly.

Their ongoing attitude to these issues (i.e. undermining and white-washing or just plain ignoring) clearly demonstrates that the heart of the forestry industry is as rotten as the heart of a hoary old eucalypt, but far less useful to the ongoing management of our tree cover and native forests.

They would LITERALLY have to reverse their thinking on all of these issues completely to have any hope whatsoever of improving the situation.

In other words, they would need to become a 'forest conservancy' organisation that, occasionally, and only when virtually unavoidable, actually felled a tree.

And as this means many people would lose their jobs and livelihoods, it is, as I said, anathema to those in the industry. Complete vested interest, and complete conflict of interest.

Topic 6. Opportunities to realise carbon and biodiversity benefits and support carbon and biodiversity markets, and mitigate and adapt to climate change risks, including the greenhouse gas emission impacts of different uses of forests and assessment of climate change risks to forests

This would require foresters to plant more trees than they 'harvest', necessitating an addition to tree cover requiring reversal of existing non-forest land-use.

In other words, resuming cleared land and converting it to managed silviculture, in a similar fashion to the radiata pine silviculture operations.

Necessarily, this would enable larger areas of 'forestry coupes' and 'native forest' to be separated out of the 'clear felling practices' of foresters - but which need not mean zero forestry exploitation in the lower value areas where, as suggested above, highly selective logging *could* take place, but requiring entirely different techniques to those currently practised. For example, helicopter haul-out of single logs, involving near-zero disturbance of the surrounding forest.

This lack of disturbance would eventually lead to forests performing better and producing higher quality timber, but perhaps less of it, necessitating some degree of winding down of State forests operations which, of course is anathema to those involved and reliant on 'status quo' being maintained.

Coal mining needs to end. Gold and silver mines inevitably end. And the workers in those extractive industries move on to other careers.

It's time we treated hardwood forestry the same way. As a terminating industry, not a failure requiring constant propping up.