

9 Alpine Crescent  
Grindelwald  
Tasmania 7277

12<sup>th</sup> August 2014

Attn: Jan Davis  
CEO Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association.  
PO Box 193 Launceston  
Tasmania Australia 7250  
[reception@tfga.com.au](mailto:reception@tfga.com.au)

Dear Ms Davis,

Open Burning of our Landscape.

Thank you for your prompt reply dated the 11<sup>th</sup> of August.

You claim context had been removed from the Tasmanian Times article.

Have you tried to correct this with TasTimes?

Would you be able to supply me with a copy please of the whole publication, which you say was published elsewhere, or point me to perhaps where it is online?

I feel you are trying to make the cap fit your Association's burning agenda with your comment that PM2.5 is predominately produced by emissions gasses, vehicles and industrial urban smog, and that they are not generated by agricultural land use.  
PM2.5 is the predominant signature of wood smoke.

As I have asked, and you have not answered, how do you expect anyone to carry out all this burning without making smoke?

The burning you advocate is just as toxic as any other air pollution and particulate matter from woodsmoke and you are pushing to burn 60,000Ha. I think it is time you declared (from the EPA) how many deliberate tonnes of harmful fine particulates will be released into our airsheds from 60,000Ha of burning.

Your claims go against the World Health Organisation finding and I feel you are twisting these findings.

I am saying, not just suggesting, that toxic carcinogenic emission from planned and controlled burns in Tasmania do fit in with the WHO findings. You are saying they do not, and I would like you please to set out for me with what authority and experience you can claim to be voicing this?

You claim you made no mention of management of agricultural residue, and yet you say you were commenting on initiatives that will allow for increased fuel-reduction burning on private land.

In relation to the "fuel reduction first" policy where the onus of proof when it comes to environmental impacts will require it to be proven that a fuel reduction burn will have an adverse environmental impact for a permit to be issued let me say this...

If smoke is capable of being released from a deliberate burn that has the ability to negatively affect the health of an individual, fauna or flora, waterway, and so on, then that is now proven.

The fires that you mentioned happened in another state. The Inquiry and finding were from that state; not Tasmania. This is like saying the Hazelwood coal mine fire Inquiry findings in Victoria are for Tasmania, and clearly circumstances surrounding those fires are quite separate.

We cannot just go on deliberately releasing tonnes of cancer causing particulates any more in this state which you so readily subscribe to. Our distances are so small and fine particulate matter travel distances are so great (up to a 1000Km for weeks), and our health problems in all the smoke related diseases are some, if not the worst, in the country.

Further, the types of burns you subscribe to are mainly low intensity smoke producers.

Cleanairtas **IS** concerned about the overall health and wellbeing of Tasmanians and this cannot be denied. It speaks for the tens of thousands who can be affected negatively by particulates that you subscribe to producing.

This is why I have written to you to try and find out why the TFGA is so keen to propose to make life hell for so many families when there are other smokeless ways to clear land and reduce fire risk? Planned clearing does not mean planned burning.

The TFGA think they know better and refuse to accept the WHO's findings in relation to the harm caused by deliberate air pollution/particulate matter and I see this as a very serious matter.

Ms Davis I must repeat below what I wrote to you last time. I also ask if you or your organisation have overlooked any resultant class action that people will take against groups such as TFGA for actively promoting smoke that damages human health and can knowingly cause death?

**"Outdoor air pollution a leading environmental cause of cancer deaths."** - IRAC  
17/10/2013.

**The specialized cancer agency of the World Health Organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), announced today that it has classified outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1).**

**After thoroughly reviewing the latest available scientific literature, world leading experts convened by the IARC Monographs Programme concluded that there is sufficient evidence that exposure to outdoor air pollution causes lung cancer (Group 1). They also noted a positive association with an increased risk of bladder cancer. Particulate matter, a major component of outdoor air pollution, was evaluated separately and was also classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1).**

**"Tragically only half of all women diagnosed with lung cancer are alive one year after diagnosis."** - American Lung Association

**"Particulate pollution is the most important contaminant in our air...We know that when levels go up people die."**

Joel Schwartz., Harvard School of Public Health, E Magazine, Sept./Oct. 2002.

**"There has got to be an understanding that people who complain about smoke have a legitimate case, the medical science is on their side now."** - Professor David Bowman, Tasmania. ABC News Feb. 20, 2012

Thank you and I again look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Clive M. Stott