

Grindelwald
Tasmania. 7277

14th September, 2008

Sue Napier MP
Shadow Minister for the Environment, Parks and Wildlife

Dear Sue,

Forestry Industries Smoke Inhalation

Thank you for your email dated 8/9/2008.

Actually, in my submission to the FPA I am not sure that I, “...recognize(d) that fire still has a role in regeneration of Tasmania’s eucalypts, and reduction of fuel in our forests and parks as part of avoidance of out of control hot bush fires.” at all, quite to the contrary.

No planned burns:

What I did say was, “...Forestry does not have to do planned burns. There are other methods they can use that virtually make no smoke at all...” and I put up alternatives to burning so there would be no smoke pollution.

Reduction of fuels:

As I said, if masticators were used there would be a reduction of fuel in our forests and parks that would prevent out of control hot bush fires. The same would apply if Air Curtain Destructors and Pyrolysis techniques were employed.

Regeneration of Tasmanian Eucalypts:

There has been much talk by forestry that eucalypts need to be regenerated by fire. Bob Knox from Forestry Tasmania, Mersey Division, says eucalypts will grow quite well without fire.

It was reported in the Mercury newspaper (3/9/2008) by Forestry Tasmania’s assistant general manager Michael Wood that the fuel wood being transported to Japan would have just been burnt. He claims there could be up to a million tonnes a year of this fuel wood spread across Tasmania.

Bob Gordon states in the same article, “... instead of wood in forests being burnt to create a seedbed for eucalypts...” he would like to see it feeding wood fired power stations.

What does this tell us? That these so called forestry regeneration burns are not regeneration burns at all. They are forestry operations residue burns or rubbish burns and if they can send the wood to Japan or use it in power stations then they are now stating there is no need for eucalypt forests to be regenerated by fire.

.../2

(2)

For these reasons I do not recognize that forestry needs to conduct smoky 'regeneration' burns. Imagine how much cleaner our air would be without this million + tonnes of smoky wood being burnt each year. Imagine the savings to our Health Department.

Planned burns do not have to take place in our forests or parks to prevent fuel build up. Planned regeneration burns do not have to take place to create a seed bed.

Would you kindly forward a copy of this correspondence to Jeremy Rockliff and Brad Nowland please.

I look forward to hearing back on this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Clive M. Stott

<http://www.cleanairtas.com>