

Without prejudice.
12th October 2008

To all EPA Board Members
GPO Box 1550
Hobart
Tasmania. 7001

Mr. Warren Jones
Dear Sir,

Smoke Inhalation - Forestry Industries planned burns.

On 23/9/2008 I emailed you a copy of my submission to the FPA of which you are an Advisory Council member. You are also on the EPA

On the 10th October I had not received any acknowledgement or word from you despite me writing on the correspondence that "I look forward to receiving your views on the matter." so I took the liberty to telephone you."

Well wasn't that an eye opener when you called me back. Right from the start you couldn't find my email because my email address was not "clive.stott@...", then you said you did not know I had asked for a response. When I expanded on it you made out you knew all about it, (which I proved you did not) then you said you handed it on to somebody else and they said my submission was no good.

From what you say, you are not interested in the least about the environment when it comes to smoke inhalation and I find it extraordinary as the head of environment in this state. Perhaps this is why I believe you did not perform so well in budgets estimates this year.

I feel there is a danger for you to hold positions on the FPA and the EPA, unless you can explain to me otherwise. You happen to be a common denominator in what is happening in this State with regards to forestry industries smoke and it is far from good.

No wonder people in Tas. are suffering from planned burn smoke inhalation and are being admitted to Accident and Emergency or suffering in silence at home.

I will expand on why I believe this to be true:-

You tried to tell me there were only two types of planned burns being carried out in Tasmania. You were adamant there were only two; these being, i) fuel reduction burns to stop wild fires, and ii) regeneration burns to create a necessary seedbed for eucalypts.

.../2

(2)

You know this is absolutely incorrect and I gave you the opportunity to correct your untrue propaganda which you declined to do.

When I mentioned there was a well recognized third type of burn (residue or rubbish burn) that are cited all the time by the forestry industry themselves and produce the worst volumes of smoke across Tasmania, you tried to convince me they were regeneration burns.

I feel you would have to know this is not true from FOI documents released to me.

Further, the forestry industry has I believe, acknowledged these seed bed fires are not necessary because they will not be undertaken when residue is shipped to Japan as has already been the case, or wood burning power stations are introduced to Tasmania as planned.

So, what is your game? Either you have little knowledge of getting rid of smoky forestry residue/ rubbish or you are not I believe being honest. There are smokeless methods to get rid of forestry residue and these are explained in my submission. Is this why my submission was “no good”?

Either way this is a serious matter that needs addressing and I would need to have these additional matters explained to me if you would please, as you terminated our telephone conversation quite quickly when you got really nervous at my in-depth knowledge of smoke generation and the serious health effects from it, in this state.

I gave you the opportunity to answer, but you chose to say you would respond to me, “in a week or two” even though you claim ‘someone’ had reached a conclusion that you knew about? Remember, I did write to you on the 23/9/2008. How much longer do you need please?

In addition to answering my submission, I have also asked if you could please tell me who you mentioned you have been ‘secretly’ meeting with in relation to planned burn smoke, ie, which people and which organizations? and Who said my submission was no good and why?

Thank you for your attention to this matter and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,

Clive M. Stott