

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1: REVIEW OF LEGISLATION RELEVANT TO QUEENSLAND CULTURAL HERITAGE

### State Forests and Timber Reserves

Within State forests and timber reserves, the Forestry Act 1959 (Qld) regulates dealings with items of indigenous cultural heritage. The definition of the term forest products, within a State forest or timber reserve, includes Aboriginal remains, artefacts or handicraft of Aboriginal original or traces thereof. The regulation of the sale of, and the prohibition of interference with, forest products within State forest and timber reserve has been discussed above.

The qualification of the declaration of Crown property in forest products under Forestry Act 1959 (Qld) s. 45 except where otherwise expressly provided by some other Act has some relevance to the rights conferred upon traditional owners under the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld). Section 34 of the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) specifically provides that, where the Minister is satisfied that a familial or traditional link exists between burial remains and a traditional group of indigenous people, those burial remains are the property of the traditional group regardless of who has actual possession of the remains or whether the remains are located on private land. Consequently, burial remains within State forest and timber reserve may be the property of a traditional group under the provisions of the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld). The Forestry Act 1959 (Qld) anticipates the concurrent operation of the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld).

### Protected Areas

The Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) declares that all of the cultural and natural resources of a national park (scientific), national park, conservation park or resources reserve are the property of the State. The term cultural resources is defined broadly and includes places and objects with significance under Aboriginal tradition. It is an offence to take, use, keep or interfere with cultural and natural resources in any protected area without authority. It seems likely that the unqualified declaration of ownership of cultural resources, in the absence of the existence of native title rights to burial remains, would prevail over the earlier enacted rights of traditional owners under the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld).

It is noted that the definition of the term cultural resources include sites of significance under Aboriginal tradition even where no physical evidence exists of that significance whereas the definition of the Queensland Estate is confined to evidence of human occupation except certain matters. Furthermore, while it is an offence to interfere with items of the Queensland Estate without authority, it is a defence to such an offence if a person did not suspect and could not reasonably have suspected that the thing to which an offence relates was an item of the Queensland Estate.\*

The comparable offence under the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) is an offence of strict liability. The only role given to traditional owners of cultural material under the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) is a requirement that the Act be administered, as far as practicable, in consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples amongst others.

Apart from the position of ownership of cultural resources in certain protected areas and certain offences, in which case the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) as later legislation will prevail over the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld), it appears that the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) and the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) are capable of operating concurrently.

### **Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld)**

The Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) provides for the regulation and protection of Landscapes Queensland and the Queensland Estate. Under the Act, the Governor in Council may, by regulation, declare any area of Queensland to be a designated landscape area. Before an area is declared to be a designated landscape area, the Governor in Council must be satisfied that:

- (a) it is necessary or desirable for the preservation of Landscapes Queensland or the Queensland Estate that entry to the area be prevented or regulated;\*
- (b) it is expedient to declare the area;
- (c) in the case of freehold land or land contracted to be granted in fee-simple, the consent of the occupier and, if the land is not occupied by the owner, the owner have been obtained before the declaration; and
- (d) satisfactory arrangements have been or will be made for the maintenance of the area as a designated landscape area and for preventing or regulating the entry of persons to the area.

It is noteworthy that a designated landscape area may be declared by the Governor in Council over any land but freehold land, or land contracted to be granted in fee-simple, without the consent of the owner or occupier of the land. Natural justice considerations would, however, require that notice and an opportunity to be heard be given to an owner or occupier before a declaration is made.

The Governor in Council may, by regulation, declare an area to be a temporary designated landscape area where the Governor in Council considers it necessary or desirable, and expedient, to permanently declare the area and that it is necessary to prevent or regulate entry to the area in the meantime. The consent of the owner or occupier of the land is not required. The declaration of a temporary designated landscape area ceases:

- (a) when the area it relates to is declared to be a designated landscape area;
- (b) upon its compulsory acquisition; or
- (c) upon the expiry of 3 months.

Where the declaration of an area as a temporary designated landscape area expires because of the expiry of 3 months, the area it cannot again be declared as a temporary designated landscape area.\* Presumably, the declaration of temporary designated landscape areas provides for the interim protection of Landscapes Queensland or the Queensland Estate upon freehold land or land that is contracted to be granted in fee-simple until the consent of the owner and occupier is obtained or the area is compulsorily acquired.

Designated landscape areas may be assigned to protectors. In the case, it is the function of protectors to prevent, as far as possible, unauthorised entry to the area and to protect all items of the Queensland Estate in the area.

Where a designated landscape area is declared over freehold land or land contracted to be granted in fee-simple, the owner may request, in writing, that the land cease to be a designated landscape area. If the Minister is satisfied that the loss to the Queensland Estate will not be substantial and the loss of the land as a designated landscape area will not be substantial, the Minister may authorise the removal of all or part of the Queensland Estate on or in the land within the area to the Queensland Museum. After the removal, the Governor in Council may declare that the land has ceased to be a designated landscape area.

It is an offence to interfere with notice, boundary markers or structure within a designated landscape area or a temporary designated landscape area. It is an offence to be in a designated landscape area or a temporary designated landscape area without the permission of, in the case of freehold land or land contracted to be granted in fee-simple, the Minister and the owner or occupier of the land (or an agent of the owner or occupier) or, in the case of any other land, the Minister alone. Conditions may apply to the permission.

A permit is required to perform:

- (a) a field exploration to establish the existence of the Queensland Estate; or
- (b) a survey or any excavation, examination or research of any designated landscape area, temporary landscape area, Landscapes Queensland or the Queensland Estate.

To undertake such an activity without a permit is an offence. Where a permit is granted, the grantee is authorised to enter land, perform work and remove parts of the Queensland.

Importantly, a permit has no effect in relation to an area unless, before the permit was issued:

- (a) in the case of freehold land or land contracted to be granted in fee-simple, the consent of the occupier and, if the occupier is not the owner, the owner was obtained; and
- (b) in the case of any other land, the consent of the occupier of the land was obtained.

The Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) declares, with certain exceptions, the State ownership of all parts of the Queensland Estate:

- (a) that constitute evidence of the occupation of any part of Queensland by indigenous persons; or
- (b) in respect of which there is no identifiable legal owner.

In respect to evidence of the occupation by indigenous persons, the declaration applies despite the fact that such evidence is found in, on or under land. The declaration of ownership does not apply to the ownership of burial remains by indigenous groups. Where the Minister is satisfied that a familial or traditional link exists between burial remains and a traditional group of indigenous people, those burial remains are the property of the traditional group regardless of who has actual possession of the remains or whether the remains are located on private land. The declaration of ownership also does not apply to certain events which took place before the commencement of the Aboriginal Relics Preservation Act 1967 (Qld) and other protected transactions.

No provision of the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) prejudices:

- (a) the rights of ownership of a traditional group of indigenous people of parts of the Queensland Estate held or used for traditional purposes; or
- (b) free access to, and enjoyment and use of, parts of the Queensland Estate by a person who usually lives subject to the traditional custom of a group of indigenous people and where the access, use or enjoyment is sanctioned by traditional custom.

Given that native title rights and interests find their source in the custom and traditional of a group of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people, the qualification of the operation of the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) above appears to protect native title rights and interests in parts of the Queensland Estate that amount to rights of ownership.

It is an offence to interfere with an item of the Queensland estate without authority under the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) or under the authority of the owner of the item. It is, however, a defence to a charge of such an offence that the defendant did not suspect, and could not be reasonably expected to suspect, that the thing to which the charge relates was an item of the Queensland Estate.

### **Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld)**

The Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) established the Queensland Heritage Council, the Heritage Register, created a process for entering places on the Heritage Register and instituted a regime for the regulation of development of places appearing on the register. Any person may apply to the Queensland Heritage Council for a place to be entered on the register. For a place to be entered on the register, it must be of cultural heritage value and must satisfy one of a number of criteria. Those criteria include the following:

- (a) the place is important in demonstrating the evolution or pattern of Queensland's history;
- (b) the place demonstrates rare, uncommon, or endangered aspects of Queensland's cultural heritage;
- (c) the place has a strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.

Clearly a large number of these criteria could apply to indigenous cultural heritage. However, the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) does not apply to indigenous cultural heritage. Section 61 provides:

This Act does not apply to-

- (a) a place that is of cultural heritage significance solely through its association with Aboriginal tradition or Island custom; or
- (b) a place situated on Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander land unless the place is of cultural heritage significance because of its association with Aboriginal tradition and Island custom and with European or other culture, in which case this Act applies to the place if the trustees of the land consent.

A strict approval process applies before a place entered on the register may be developed.

The validity of s. 61 of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) may be affected by the operation of s. 10(1) of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth). The equal enjoyment of rights provided by s. 10(1) relates to human rights, not necessarily to legal rights. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (the ICESCR) includes the following Articles:

#### Article 15

- (1) The State Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone:
  - (a) to take part in cultural life;
- (2) The steps to be taken by the State Parties to the present Covenant to achieve the full realization of this right shall include those necessary for the conservation, the development and the diffusion of science and culture.

The rights guaranteed under the ICESCR are to be exercised without distinction as to race, amongst others. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights also guarantees equality before the law and protection for the right of ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities to enjoy their own culture.

It appears that the equal enjoyment of rights provided by s. 10(1) of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth) may operate to provide for the enjoyment of cultural heritage on an equal footing. This suggests that s. 61 of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) may be in conflict with s. 10(1) because it purports to treat indigenous cultural heritage differently from other cultural heritage. Unless s. 61 amounts to a special measure under s. 8 of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth), it will be invalid to the extent to which it is inconsistent with s. 10(1). Section 8 of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth) relevantly provides:

This Part does not apply to, or in relation to the application of, special measures to which paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Convention applies

Paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provides:

Special measures taken for the sole purpose of securing adequate advancement of certain racial or ethnic groups of individuals requiring such protection as may be necessary in order to ensure such groups or individuals equal enjoyment or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms shall not be deemed racial discrimination, provided, however, that such measures do not, as a consequence, lead to the maintenance of separate rights for different racial groups and that they shall not be continued after the objectives for which they were taken have been achieved.

There seems to be little justification for a conclusion that s. 61 of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) amounts to a special measure. It is doubtful that the sole purpose of s. 61 is to secure the advancement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Consequently, it would appear that a real possibility exists that s. 61 of the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) is inconsistent with s. 10(1) of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth) and, by reason of s. 109 of the Commonwealth Constitution, invalid. If this is the case, places of cultural heritage significance under Aboriginal tradition or Island custom may be nominated for entry on the Heritage Register. The right to nominate places in Queensland of cultural heritage significance under Aboriginal tradition would be a significant means of protecting indigenous cultural heritage in the WTWHA.

The Queensland Heritage Act 1992 (Qld) appears to operate concurrently with the Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld). While the former regulates the development of places that are listed on the Heritage Register, the latter regulates access to designated landscape areas, provides for the State ownership of certain parts of the Queensland Estate and prohibits unlawful interference with the Queensland Estate. On the whole, there appears to be little direct inconsistency between the two.

### Conclusions

As can be seen from the summary above, Aboriginal peoples in Queensland have little involvement in the management of cultural heritage. While certain obligations exist to consult Aboriginal peoples in relation to the administration of the Nature Conservation Act 1992 (Qld) and certain burial remains are the property of traditional owners, it would appear that the most extensive rights of cultural heritage management will arise from those native title rights to cultural resources which are protected by Cultural Record (Landscapes Queensland and Queensland Estate) Act 1987 (Qld) s. 32. While the scope of such rights is unclear, they will be recognised and protected under the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) and, consequently, the future act provisions of the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) must be observed if they are to be impaired or extinguished by legislation or executive action.



## METHODS APPENDIX - APPENDIX A

The appendices included here are in the order in which they are referred to in the social assessment report. They are, for the most part, extracts from the four social assessment technical reports put together as part of the social assessment process of the SEQ RFA.

### APPENDIX.A1. METHODS FOR RESOURCE DEPENDENCY AS FOR CHAPTER 4.

**SOURCE: SE5.4 BUSINESS DEPENDENCY SURVEY, CHAPTER 1.**

#### Methodology

The methods used in the collection of data for this report include: mail surveys of timber processing industries, timber industry contractors, timber industry employees, apiarists, graziers with State Grazing Permits and other forest users with special and term leases; secondary data from the Australian Bureau of Resource Economics (ABARE, 1998) and information on timber processing industries and their allocations from the Department of Primary Industries. Employment and expenditure catchment analysis has also been undertaken to assist in determining the relationship between forest resource and towns and communities dependent upon specific resource areas within the South East Queensland RFA region.

Throughout this report the term “Forest Industry” refers to all timber processing, timber contracting, grazing and apiarist businesses. The term “Timber Processing Industry” refers to all industries who have a crown hardwood allocation and those timber salvage businesses that obtained their resource from timber mills with a crown hardwood allocation.

Two questionnaires were used in order to obtain information on forest industries. One questionnaire referred to as the “Forest Contractor and Forest User Businesses” questionnaire sought information specifically from the forest industry or business. A second questionnaire referred to as the “Forest and Timber Industries Employees” questionnaire sought information from the employees of forest industries and businesses. Forest Industry questionnaires were distributed to timber processing industries, forest industry contractors, apiarists and holders of special grazing permits, special and term leases. Forest and Timber Industry employee questionnaires were distributed to employees of timber processing industries, forest industry contractors, apiarists and holders of special grazing permits.

Questionnaires were distributed to timber processing industries through a mail out and through interview or direct contact with management at specific mills throughout the SEQ RFA region. Questionnaires were distributed to forest contractors through mail out and through the distribution of questionnaires by each mill to their contractors. Questionnaires were mailed to all holders of state grazing permits, special and term leases and to all apiarists.

When questionnaires were mailed to each industry, postal addresses were obtained from existing databases. DPI-Forestry provided databases of forest users including hardwood sawmills with a crown allocation, apiary permits and state grazing permits. The Department of Natural Resources supplied a database of holders of grazing, special and term leases. In addition, Workplace Health and Safety data on the number of registered work place employees in hardwood sawmills was accessed in an attempt to gain an indicative number of mill employees for the purpose of survey administration.

The number of surveys distributed and the response rate is given in Table 2.1. It should be noted in relation to Table 2.1 that for several forest industries and their employees, the number of surveys administered was in excess of the actual number of industries and employees. For instance, and in relation to forest contractors, no formal record or database of the number and location of forest contractors exists and as such questionnaires were distributed to contractors

through sawmills and through information provided by industry representative bodies. In an attempt to reach as many forest contractors as possible surveys were also distributed to contractors who may have worked adjacent to the SEQ region or been primarily reliant on the softwood resource.

Three core problems with the use of mailing lists are (a) that mailing lists may not necessarily include all contractors and forest industries, (b) the postal address reported on the mailing list may well be different from the actual business location of the contractor or forest industry and (c) the postal address maybe incorrect. These factors may contribute to lower response rates associated with mail surveys (standard response rate of approximately 10%). However, consultation with industry in the development of mailing lists used in this analysis is likely to have assisted in making the mailing lists as comprehensive as possible.

Information on employment levels for forest contracting, apiarist and grazing businesses was derived from survey research and was used to identify the mean employment size of each business. In addition, while existing databases identify the postal address for forest contracting, apiarist and grazing businesses, it has been assumed that these locations are the same as or in close proximity to the location of the business.

## **APPENDIX .A2. METHODS USED IN THE SOCIAL VALUES PART OF CHAPTER 5.**

**SOURCE: PROJECT SE 5.2 REGIONAL SOCIAL PROFILE, CHAPTER 3. EXTRACT FROM CONSULTANT REPORT “SOCIAL AND FOREST VALUES OF THE COMMUNITY WITHIN THE SOUTH EAST QUEENSLAND RFA REGION” PREPARED BY ENVIRONMENT AND BEHAVIOUR CONSULTANTS, TOWNSVILLE.**

### **3.2 METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.2.1 Sampling procedures**

The study was based on a sample size of 2,000. A sample of this size permits considerable statistical confidence when making inferences from a sample to a single population. The sample size allowed 10 regional samples to be drawn from the total population of the RFA region, with each regional sample having a maximum sample size of 200.

#### **3.2.2 Sample selection**

Stratified random sampling was used to identify households from within the SEQ RFA region. As a telephone interview was to be used in undertaking the research, the published white pages directory for Queensland was used to randomly select household phone numbers. Two core limitations when using the white pages as the sampling frame are that not all households will necessarily have a telephone and secondly that many silent telephone numbers will not be listed.

The technique adopted was based on the random selection of households from within 10 regional areas. The 10 regional areas were defined on the basis of the percentage of the population within 1991 census collector districts (CCD) that were employed within forestry and agricultural industries. Contiguous areas with similar percentages of the population employed within forestry and agriculture were then used to define the 10 regional sectors used in this study (table 3.1 and map 3.1). Essentially this approach stratified the population on the basis of households within CCD areas with varying levels of employment in agriculture and forestry industries, but at the same time constrained the stratification to contiguous geographic areas.

**Table 2.1. Sample Size and Response Rates for Industry Surveys**

Sample group Administered	Number of Surveys	Response Rate
<b>Forest Industries</b>		
Timber processing industries	40	32 (80.00%)
Forest contractors	150	44 (29.33%)
Graziers ( <i>SGP and special lease</i> )	562	99 (17.61%)
Apiarists	221	87 (39.37%)
<b>Total Industries</b>	<b>973</b>	<b>262 (26.93%)</b>
<b>Forest Industry Employees</b>		
Timber processing industry	878	352 (40.10%)
Forest contractors	300	207 (69.00%)
Graziers ( <i>SGP</i> )	620	15 (2.40%)
Apiarists	442	29 (6.56%)
<b>Total Employees</b>	<b>2,240</b>	<b>603 (26.92%)</b>

*Note:* Timber processing industries include all timber mills with a crown hardwood allocation and four salvage mills who are dependent on the supply of wood from mills with a crown hardwood allocation. Forest contractors include all harvesting, roading and transport contractors. The number of survey administered to forest contractors and forest contractor employees is approximate as in addition to a direct mail out questionnaires were also distributed by the timber processing industries to their contractors.

Source: EBC (1998)

As the study was to be based on 10 regional sectors defined on the basis of CCD boundaries, each town and all telephone numbers within the town, were allocated to one of the 10 geographic areas. Telephone numbers were then randomly sampled, using simple random sampling, from within each of the 10 sectors. Using this procedure, where simple random sampling occurs within each sector, the sample within each sector would be in proportion to the number of households within each town in each sector.

### 3.2.3 Questionnaire Design

The most important constraint on the design of the questionnaire was that it must be able to be completed through a telephone interview and that the maximum interview duration could be no longer than 15 minutes. As required in the study brief, the questionnaire focused on the assessment of forest values throughout the community in the SEQ RFA region. Specific questions and items included in the questionnaire were derived from similar studies in Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia and modified through stakeholder involvement to the SEQ RFA context.

### 3.2.4 Interview Procedures

Thirty-two telephone interviewers were used in the study. Each interviewer was supplied with a list of randomly selected telephone numbers in a random order and was required to systematically work through the list until the required number of interviews had been obtained. Interviewers were instructed to make up to three recalls on those telephone numbers which were not answered on the first occasion.

The list of telephone numbers supplied to each interviewer was randomly sorted and randomly selected from the total list of randomly selected telephone numbers from throughout the SEQ RFA region. This procedure minimized bias which may have occurred if interviewers used lists of telephone numbers from specific regional areas. The interviewers were instructed, as far as they were able to judge, to obtain interviews with those respondents aged 15 years and over. Interviewers were required to record responses to all open-ended questions using, as far as practical, verbatim wording and to avoid classifying or coding such responses.



### 3.3 VALUE ORIENTATIONS

Given that the survey was based on telephone interviews with respondents, the most appropriate method for identifying specific value orientations was through the use of belief statements. Fourteen belief statements were used to identify the value orientations of respondents and were based on previous survey research in Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia and through direct consultations with stakeholders in Queensland.

While the percentage of agreement with each belief statements has been analyzed, it must be recognised that many of the belief statements are related and measure a common underlying factor or value orientation. Inter-correlations across all 14 belief statements indicated four common factors, (i) forest management concern, (ii) intrinsic values or beliefs, (iii) dependency on timber and forest industries and (iv) extrinsic use values or beliefs.

Table 3.2 shows the percentage agreement with each of the 14 belief statements for the total sample, the SEQ RFA sample and the SEQ RFA Rural sample. Although the percentage agreement is reported for each belief statement, the interpretation of individual belief statements should be undertaken with some caution as the reliability of a single belief statement is clearly not as accurate as a composite scale derived through the summation of several belief statements. With this caution in mind the percentages reported in Table 3.2, show the population within the SEQ RFA region have high levels of concern about the management and use of native forests in Queensland (84%), believed that better laws were needed to regulate the use of native forests (88%), that protecting native forests would not threaten jobs (76%) and that the conservation and protection of native forests in Queensland would benefit the Queensland economy (87%). As might be expected given the high levels of extrinsic and intrinsic value associated with forests, 65% of the population also report that sometimes their beliefs about the need for employment and the need to protect native forests were in conflict.

Belief statements within each of the four factors were summed and an additive composite index derived for each of the four factors. It is recognised that factor scores could have been used in deriving the composite index, however the interpretation of findings based on factor scores is difficult, particularly for non expert readers, and as such a more interpretable additive index has been used. Table 3.3 shows the mean scores for each of the belief statements and the mean scores for the composite index for the total sample, the SEQ RFA sample and the SEQ RFA Rural sample. The composite scale for each of the factors or value orientations is used in the following analysis.

#### **APPENDIX.A3. METHODS USED IN THE SELECTION OF CASE STUDY TOWNS AS MENTIONED IN CHAPTER 5 RELATING TO SERVICE CAPACITY AND FOLLOWING IN SECTION 7 – ISSUES OF CONCERN.**

**SOURCE: PROJECT SE 5.3 SOCIAL CASE STUDY AREAS, CHAPTER 1.**

##### **1.2 METHODS**

A selection of social case study towns has been conducted throughout the SEQ RFA region to collect baseline data to assist in predicting the potential impacts and response of communities to a change in forest use and management. The selection of these case study areas for the social assessment has involved a process which considers a range of community types throughout the region

The project included both desk top data analysis and primary qualitative data collection through consultation with communities and stakeholder groups.

The project used a range of data collection methods including, community workshops and focus groups, for the collection of primary qualitative data to assist in understanding how communities predict and perceive the impacts, both positive and negative, of changes in forest use and management.

Secondary data sources such as ABS Census data have been used to construct a comprehensive socio-demographic baseline profile of selected case study communities. Local government planning documents and community service directories were used to assist in identifying local community visions and the community and services infrastructure. A more detailed description of the methodology used in the socio-demographic profile is contained in chapter three (3).

The report will first outline the process for the selection of case study towns and then provides a brief overview of the history selected case study towns, followed by a presentation of a socio-demographic description of each town including a discussion of the community services and social infrastructure and their perceived capacity.

An assessment was undertaken to determine which towns should be the focus of primary qualitative data collection. Primary qualitative data collection is resource and time intensive due to constraints in the project budget and timeline. Seven towns were chosen. These towns are:

- Gympie
- Maryborough
- Builyan Many Peaks
- Woodford
- Cooroy
- Linville
- Wondai

In these communities, social assessment workshops or focus groups were conducted with a cross section of local community interests.

The determining factors or the criteria for the refinement process in the selection of towns for workshops and focus groups are:

- the towns, or local mills, level of dependence on crown native hardwood resources;
- the level of employment in forest user industries such as saw mills, logging contractors, beekeepers and graziers with permits or leases to access state native hardwood forests; and
- the level of forest user based household and business expenditures.

The information required for the above criteria became available as some preliminary data analysis from project *SE5.4 Business Dependency Survey* became available.

A comprehensive selection process was used to identify case study areas which are representative of a range of communities in the region. The selection was a three stage process and resulted in the preliminary selection of 15 towns.

## Stage 1- Classification of Communities

The initial stage of the process involved the selection of case study areas based on a broad assessment of community characteristics.

(a) Firstly communities within the South east Queensland region with greater than 200 population were identified. This identification made use of information collected in the ABS Census 1991.

Communities with less than 200 population were not captured in this classification process. These communities generally have strong linkages to a larger service centre and their role can be considered in association with social case studies of these larger communities. However, those small communities, of less than 200 population, which have a hardwood mill were included in a separate category and the impacts on these specific communities of a change in forest use were also assessed.

(b) Secondly, communities of the region were categorised by function based on assessment and analysis of the following indicators:

- major employment sectors (economic function) within individual communities (ABS 1991);
- population size (ABS 1991);
- location of community facilities such as schools (Education Queensland) and general locational characteristics;
- proportion of residents with age greater than 55 years (>30% identified as significant proportion - ABS 1991);
- and the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population (ABS 1991).

The following classifications of communities, based on previous studies of the range of community types present throughout Australia, were used in the selection process. This was in addition to the localities <200 population with a mill processing hardwood timber.

Metropolitan Areas - areas within the Brisbane metropolitan area. These areas were broken down into statistical local areas (suburbs) for case studies and the assessment of social impacts.

Major Regional Centres - characteristics of these centres include: a diverse economic base; populations greater than 10 000; a regional service role and the provision of higher order goods and services.

Rural Service Centres - these include service centres and their satellites with characteristics including: dominant service role and employment in service and community sectors; lower level services and facilities and population less than 10,000.. Within this classification it is recognised that the centres such as Kingaroy, Beaudesert and Gatton with greater than 2500-3000 population have a greater economic diversity and regional role. This difference has been included in the selection of case study areas.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities - centres with dominant numbers of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people.

Primary Production and Processing Centre - characteristics include: dominance of primary production and processing activities; narrow employment base; and associated services and facilities.

Resort, Tourism or Retirement Community - characteristics include: prominent tourism and recreational sector; high proportions of retirees; location in coastal areas or their immediate hinterlands for lifestyle reasons and population less than 10 000.

(c) Thirdly, the possible impact on individual communities of a change in forest use was investigated. The following indicators were collapsed to assess the possible level of impact and are for the purpose of case study selection only:

- ability of communities (on LGA basis) to cope with change based on the SEIFA (ABS 1991) index of social disadvantage. The benchmark which was used for assessment of disadvantage was those local government areas identified as being below the median level for the SEQ Region;
- significance of employment in forestry or forestry associated activities taken through assessment of : proportion of employment in the agriculture and forestry (as defined by ABS) industry for individual communities relative to the State average; and
- secondly specific employment in logging, forestry and services to forestry by LGA relative to the State average. This data was gathered from the ABS INDP industry for employed persons 1991;
- proximity to hardwood timber mills.

## Stage 2 - Selection of Preliminary Case Study Areas

Using this assessment, preliminary case study areas were selected that represented the range of community type and level of linkage to the forest industry. Those communities which were identified as having limited or no linkages to the forest industry (related to use of state native forests and the location of mills) are not considered as locations for case studies due to the need to discuss the effects of a change in forestry use with individual communities. Indirect linkages to other communities in the region will be determined in other studies such as the business dependency study.

Key informants were invited to add value to review the selection of preliminary case study areas. At this stage additional information from these groups about the role of these communities in relation to the forest industry, current issues and general background about the locations were sought. Key informants included:

- DPI Forestry;
- DoE;
- CRA team;
- Social Impact Assessment Unit and regional social planners- DFYCC.

The following case study areas have been selected:

- Gympie
- Maryborough
- Beaudesert
- Cooroy
- Wondai
- Eidsvold
- Woodford
- Bundamba (Ipswich)
- Linville
- Conondale
- Builyan
- Brooweena
- Dingo
- Laidley
- Eudlo

### Stage 3 - Presentation of the Preliminary Case Study Areas to the Social and Economic Technical Committee

Presentation of the preliminary social case study areas, and an overview of the background selection process, to the stakeholder represented Social and Economic Technical Committee (SETC) for discussion.

At SETC there was discussion about the inclusion of tourism based towns. It was suggested that the social case study areas (as identified above) should include areas likely to experience the positive *economic* impacts of change in the use of native forests such as tourism/resort towns.

It was decided that an assessment of recreation and eco-tourism issues would be undertaken through a separate dedicated economic project SE4.1 Forest Recreation and Ecotourism Assessment and Economic Assessment. That project aims to identify tourism/recreation opportunities that may follow from a change in forest use.

This resulted in 15 case study towns being identified for further analysis. A review of DPI Forestry resource data and consultation with Local government authorities refined these fifteen case study towns to 12. The three towns of Laidley, Eidsvold and Ipswich were excluded from further analysis due to a low level of SEQ State forest resource use and a lack of interest expressed by the Local governments in the SEQ RFA and its possible outcomes for them.

However, Eidsvold warrants further discussion. Eidsvold is a small rural community with a history and heritage involving the timber industry. The community strongly identifies as a ‘timber community’, and has an active Forest Protection Society (FPS) branch. Eidsvold is approximately thirty (30) kilometres west of the SEQ RFA region. Eidsvold has two mills, a sawlog and sleeper mill. Of the state forest allocation zone that the sawlog mill draws resource from only 9% of the allocation zone is within the SEQ RFA region. Therefore the mill draws a small amount, of its total log through put, from state forests in the SEQ region. Based on the level of dependence on the crown resource in the SEQ region, the SEQ RFA will have comparatively minimal affect on Eidsvold. However, Eidsvold is a community which is sensitive to changes in the use and management of state forests primarily to the west of the SEQ region.

**TABLE 1.1. ASSESSMENT METHODS FOR CASE STUDY TOWNS**

Case Study Town	Focus Groups	Social Assessment Workshop	Socio-demographic Profile	Historical Overview	Community Vision Review	Service Capacity Assessment
Gympie	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maryborough		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cooroy		✓	✓		✓	✓
Wondai	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Woodford		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Linville		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Conondale			✓		✓	✓
Builyan/Many Peaks		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Brooweena			✓	✓	✓	✓
Dingo			✓		✓	✓
Eudlo			✓		✓	✓
Beaudesert			✓		✓	✓



#### APPENDIX.A4. METHOD USED IN COMPILING THE SERVICE CAPACITY DATA AT A CASE STUDY AREA LEVEL AS MENTIONED IN CHAPTER 5.

**SOURCE: PROJECT SE5.3 SOCIAL CASE STUDY AREAS, CHAPTER 3.**

This social profile is of the case study towns as listed above in the South East Queensland Region as it is defined in table 3.1.,below. The sub regions are used as the basis of some government and departmental statistics, in which case the sub regional totals are the sum of all of the Local Government Areas in the sub region. However, in the Australian Bureau of Statistics census the Local Government Areas are a major unit of analysis. There is no census boundary corresponding to the sub region, so census data have been reproduced and analysed by Local Government Area.

**TABLE 3.1. THE SOUTH EAST QUEENSLAND REGION**

<b>Sub Region</b>	<b>Local Government Areas</b>
Boonah-Warwick	Beaudesert, Boonah, Warwick
Brisbane	Gold Coast, Ipswich, Brisbane, Redland, Redcliffe, Pine Rivers, Logan
North Coast	Caboolture, Caloundra, Maroochy
Kilcoy	Kilcoy
Noosa	Noosa
Kilkivan	Kilkivan
Gympie	Cooloola
Maryborough	Tiaro, Woocoo, Maryborough, Hervey Bay, Biggenden
Kolan-Isis	Kolan, Isis
Bundaberg	Bundaberg, Burnett
Builyan-Gladstone	Calliope, Miriam Vale, Gladstone, Rockhampton
Eidsvold-Monto	Eidsvold, Monto, Perry
Mundubbera-Gayndah	Mundubbera, Gayndah
Murgon-Wondai	Murgon, Wondai
Yarraman-Toowoomba	Crows Nest, Nanango, Kingaroy, Rosalie
Gatton	Gatton, Laidley, Esk
Duaringa	Duaringa

The data for this study has been derived from secondary sources, such as Council documents, but principally from Australian Bureau of Statistics databases, especially the census. The final release of the 1996 census data is due in July 1998, therefore some of the economic and employment tables are not yet available. The study has used 1991 census data as indicators for these economic items. Use of the 1991 census presents some minor problems in that Local Government Areas have been changed, with new councils having come into being. Similarly there are minor problems in identifying all of the 12 case study towns. Six of the towns, Dingo, Builyan/Many Peaks, Brooweena, Linville, Conondale and Eudlo do not exist in the ABS data as separate and identifiable towns. They do not occupy all of a collection district, but have been located from their coordinates into the collection district that contains them. A collection district is the work load of one census collector and is supposed to contain an average 200 households (and thus about 600 persons). In reality they vary from this ideal size, although it is unlikely that any of the six smallest towns had populations in excess of 1,000, as they would then have been formally defined as urban areas or localities, and could have been accessed from the ABS Urban Centre Locality boundaries. Thus the case study towns identified are indicative rather than precise for the six smallest places. The collection districts that are identified contain those places as well as other outlying houses or communities.

In each case, maps suggest that these towns are likely to dominate the population of each of the collection districts so identified. Because the case study towns consist of between one and several collection districts it is not possible to map them thematically in the same way as the Local Government Areas. On a map of all twelve towns the collection districts in Maryborough and Gympie would be too small to show up.

This social profile is structured into three main sections: the demographic and socio-economic profile, community visions, and service capacity

The community visions section also deals with the 12 case study towns, but provides a summary of the documents as they relate to these places, as well as individual summaries for each town. The final section on service capacity etc. uses a number of additional tables of data on the regions and Local Government Areas.

The data for this study has been derived from secondary sources, such as Council documents, census. The final release of the 1996 census data is due in July 1998, therefore some of the economic and employment tables are not yet available. The study has used 1991 census data as indicators for these economic items. Use of the 1991 census presents some minor problems in that Local Government Areas have been changed, with new councils having come into being. Similarly there are minor problems in identifying all of the 12 case study towns. Six of the towns, Dingo, Builyan/Many Peaks, Brooweena, Linville, Conondale and Eudlo do not exist in the ABS data as separate and identifiable towns. They do not occupy all of a collection district, but have been located from their coordinates into the collection district that contains them. A collection district is the work load of one census collector and is supposed to contain an average 200 households (and thus about 600 persons). In reality they vary from this ideal size, although it is unlikely that any of the six smallest towns had populations in excess of 1,000, as they would then have been formally defined as urban areas or localities, and could have been accessed from the ABS Urban Centre Locality boundaries. Thus the case study towns identified are indicative rather than precise for the six smallest places. The collection districts that are identified contain those places as well as other outlying houses or communities. In each case, maps suggest that these towns are likely to dominate the population of each of the collection districts so identified. Because the case study towns consist of between one and several collection districts it is not possible to map them thematically in the same way as the Local Government Areas. On a map of all twelve towns the collection districts in Maryborough and Gympie would be too small to show up.

This social profile is structured into three main sections: the demographic and socio-economic profile, community visions, and service capacity

The community visions section also deals with the 12 case study towns, but provides a summary of the documents as they relate to these places, as well as individual summaries for each town. The final section on service capacity etc. uses a number of additional tables of data on the regions and Local Government Areas.

## **APPENDIX.A5. METHODS USED FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION ON STAKEHOLDER ISSUES AS REFERRED TO IN CHAPTER 8.**

**SOURCE: PROJECT SE 5.2 REGIONAL SOCIAL PROFILE, CHAPTER 4.**

### **4.2 METHODS**

The methods used to collect information for this chapter included surveys of:

- hardwood mills and their employees,
- hardwood logging contractors and their employees,
- forest graziers and bee keepers and their employees,
- Local Governments in the region,
- and Farm Foresters.

The surveys included ‘open ended’ questions which encouraged general comments and qualitative statements from respondents. This qualitative data has been analysed and a summary of the results is an input to this section. In addition to discussion with stakeholder peak organisations on the SEQ RFA Reference Panel, several community meetings were held and focus groups conducted involving individuals and different stakeholder groups. A forum of the SEQ regions’ member Councils of the Local Government Association of Queensland was also held as part of the issue scoping process. Additional data was also collected through interviews.

As part of the process of consultation for the CRA, a forum of the Local Government Association of Queensland was conducted. At this forum, several key issues for local governments were presented and developed. They were:

- Local Government’s use of State Forests for community infrastructure works like dams and water treatment plants
- Business and Industry compensation for RFA impacts
- The context of the rural economic downturn
- RFA impacts on Council planning, particularly on open space and recreation
- No job losses
- Conservation and eco-tourism benefits of the RFA
- RFA impacts on grazing leases and Council’s rate base
- Management of the Forest Estate
- Interim Forest Management Arrangements
- The role of Local Government in the RFA process and post-RFA
- The certainty of harvest on private land

In the local government survey, which was conducted after the forum, local governments were asked to prioritise these issues. Of the 41 surveys sent out, 23 were returned. Of those returned 13 were from shires which are inland with the remaining 10 being from shires which border the coast. Making a distinction between these two kinds of shires was found to be useful for understanding the differences in their responses. In the figure which follows, the relative importance of these issues has been graphed to show the responses of the local governments from the region as a whole, as well as responses from Eastern local governments (those which border the coast) and Western local governments (those which do not border the coast).

## **APPENDIX.A6. METHODS USED IN THE CASE STUDY TOWN COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AS MENTIONED IN CHAPTER 9.**

**SOURCE: PROJECT SE 5.3 SOCIAL CASE STUDY AREAS, CHAPTER 4.**

### **4.1. INTRODUCTION AND METHOD**

The following section presents the outcomes from a series of community workshops and focus groups, which were held in a range of case study communities.

The main aim of the overall social assessment for the South East Queensland Regional Forest Agreement (SEQ RFA) is to develop descriptive socio-economic “snapshots” of selected communities which may be affected by the planning and policy decisions as a result of the SEQ Regional Forest Agreement. As discussed in chapter 1, the main aim of this particular report is to provide baseline data on a range of communities likely to be affected by changes in forest use. In addition, this report aims to examine broad based community responses to changes in forest use including an assessment of the potential impacts of alternative hypothetical forest resource use scenarios.

Part of the process for the collection of data to meet the aim of the project involved conducting a series of Social Assessment workshops. The workshops aimed to discuss the past, present and futures of local communities, highlight community values on a particular issue, and to determine local communities’ perceptions on the nature and significance of potential social impacts from changes in forest use and management. In addition, the workshops provided an avenue for community involvement in the social assessment process.

In recognition of the varying perspectives and values within the communities concerned, a representative selection of community interests who are either involved in forest activities and/or have related interests in forest use and management in the area were invited to the workshops. The social assessment workshops, where possible, included representatives from the following interest:

- Human Services
- Retail and Trade/ Chamber of Commerce
- Logging contractors
- Saw mill workers
- Saw mill managers
- Beekeeping industry
- Graziers
- Conservationists
- Farm forestry
- Tourism industry
- National Parks and Wildlife
- Integrated Catchment Management (ICM)
- Landcare
- Local Government Representatives
- Department of Primary Industries – Forestry
- Regional and Economic Development Bureau

As the above list indicates, participants at the workshops included not only local residents and residents of the surrounding area, but also service providers, Local and State government representatives, local community groups and other organisations and individuals who have significant expertise or local knowledge of the area.

Stakeholder peak body organisations on the RFA reference panel, where appropriate, were contacted to nominate participants for the workshops. For other community interests which are not represented on the reference panel local networks were used to identify participants for the workshops.

A total of six workshops were conducted across the SEQ RFA region in townships identified as sensitive to changes in forest use and management. These areas are Woodford, Linville, Builyan/Many Peaks, Maryborough, Gympie and Cooroy.

The approach employed in the social assessment workshops is based on the focus group method. It is a discussion-based interview that produces a particular type of qualitative data, and involves the simultaneous use of multiple respondents to generate data, which is focused and relatively staged.

At the workshops, participants were asked a specific number of set questions relating to their community and their perception of the impacts of changes in forest use and management will have on their community.

The workshop was divided in two sessions. The first section sought to gather information about participants' attitudes about their town/area, including events which are perceived to be significant to the community and their visions for their community. In the second part of the workshop, participants were asked about their perception of the impact of changes in forest use and management on their community.

Responses to each question were recorded on butcher's paper and discussed briefly in a plenary session. Workshop participants wrote, on forms provided, their response to each of the questions and these were collated and included in the workshop documentation. Scribes were also present at each workshop to record issues and other additional information raised during the workshop. For detailed information on workshop outcomes, please refer to appendices.

## **APPENDIX B1. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED FROM THE FARM FORESTRY SURVEY.**

The kinds of issues raised in the survey related to the following core themes.

- Difficulties associated with farm forestry
- Advantages and incentives for farm forestry
- Suggested actions and strategies for making farm forestry a more viable industry
- Opinions related to the purpose and processes involved in the Regional Forestry Agreement

### **DIFFICULTIES ASSOCIATED WITH FARM FORESTRY**

Respondents raised many important points about the difficulties associated with farm forestry. These included:

- Government policy or legislation which was restrictive or unhelpful
- Lack of economic benefit
- Lack of information and assistance

Governments were criticised for the degree to which they inhibited the growth of the farm forestry industry with regards to the extent of red tape involved in being a forester. Government taxes on land and land classification for the payment of rates were cited as major deterrents to farm forestry. The issues which people had with governments can be summarised as follows.

With Local Government

- Lack of local government concern and co-operation.
- Mill licence disincentives through local government by-laws regarding environment protection and control of noise and pollution.



- Classification of forested land for taxation purposes.
- Regulations about thinning and pruning are inhibitive.

#### State Government

- Concern was expressed that State government royalties paid by timber mills do not reflect the true market value of the trees and hence, private farm foresters cannot compete in the present market. The royalty system is seen by some to be contrary to the principles set out in the National competition policy.
- Under the current DPI joint venture agreement, land rental payment is not paid to owner until the timber is finally harvested 30 years later. This is not encouraging for potential timber growers who may need some immediate financial return.
- DPI monopoly on timber prices does not allow farm foresters to compete in a free market.

The lack of economic benefits from farm forestry was often cited as a deterrent from investment in the industry. Because farm forestry requires a significant initial investment and receives little to no return until trees are harvested, which may be up to 30 years later, farmers are concerned that the economic viability of planting trees is limited. Some of the key economic issues raised were as follows.

- The lack of satisfactory return from sale of trees because of the DPI monopoly over the market.
- The lack of satisfactory return from sale of trees because of the DPI monopoly over the market.
- The sense that the industry of farm forestry is vulnerable to external forces including:
  - Lobbying from green activists preventing them from harvesting
  - The possibility that the crop could be destroyed by fire
  - The lack of assured right of harvest

Several issues were also raised in relation to there being a lack of information and assistance available to farm foresters. The issues identified were:

- Lack of available help or advice available to small farmers
- Lack of site specific or species specific management expertise currently in the industry
- Lack of DPI personnel available for consultation

Other problems mentioned were that in many cases practical techniques for small farmers are not necessarily the same as those used by large commercial ventures. Some farmers have also experienced high failure rates with supplied trees. It was pointed out that most farmers don't have sufficient land to be able to plant with the intention of cycling logging and planting. Such a technique may well be environmentally sound, but it is the prerogative of the government on crown land.

Another reason cited for the difficulties that farm foresters face in profiting from their trees is that commercial logging of old growth forests and natural stands allow for artificially low prices.

It was also noted that it is difficult to entice older landowners to participate in farm forestry when immediate benefits in terms of tax / rate rebates are not available.

Control of understorey weeds and the financial viability of thinning were also cited as being problematic.

## Incentives

The reasons why people choose to be involved in the farm forestry industry are both environmental and economic.

Environmental reasons include:

- Planting trees as a means to deal with erosion
- Trees for windbreaks
- Contributing to a reduction in pollution; creating clean air
- Protecting and creating habitat for native fauna
- Gaia, or a respect for ecological holism
- Planting trees for cattle and other grazing animals to provide shade and respite and shelter from frosts

Economic reasons include:

- Eco-tourism projects. Tourism objectives created as a back up to the possibility that farm forestry is not actually a financially viable option.
- Possibility for the sale of trees at advanced stages to landscapers.

Many respondents were keen to mention that they thought that farm forestry was a means of promoting sustainable economic and ecological systems. Some respondents felt that by being involved, they were providing an example and encouraging others to become involved.

## The Regional Forests Agreement

Comments related to the RFA were generally about the way in which the agreement is being carried out. Concern about the processes used to create the Agreement included:

- That the RFA did not solicit adequate input from neighbourhood groups and “grass roots” land owners
- Private sector experts should be consulted for input into the process of developing the RFA (eg Jack Mitchell, Mitchell Rainforest and agroforest consultancy, Betts Rd, Samford Q. Ph:3289 1288)
- Forestry Department input should be included to ensure good management of the trees
- A feeling of lack of inclusion in the process of developing the RFA
- A feeling that the farm forestry survey was a very surface attempt at consultation
- A feeling that the agreement is being developed in secrecy
- A feeling of frustration and disillusionment that input does not lead to action - Despite participation in surveys, meetings and research, the issues raised have not been resolved.

It was also expressed however, that the RFA was a timely undertaking and that a sense of involvement was present. Many of the respondents chose not to comment on the RFA and some noted a distinct lack of awareness of the entire process with one respondent commenting “What is RFA?”

Further comments regarding the RFA were made about the perceived intentions of the agreement. These included:

- Resistance to the idea that local industry would be sacrificed so that city dwellers’ tourist desires can be met through RFA.
- Concern that the RFA will not appease the conservation movement.
- Concern that the RFA would lead to the end of logging of state forests and private property and that this would have far reaching negative consequences for workers in forestry and dependent industries.

Some respondents expressed a general lack of confidence in the real benefits of the RFA whilst others felt more strongly that the Agreement was the notion of meretricious, interfering types.

### **Suggested actions and strategies**

The suggested actions and strategies that arose from the farm forestry survey fit into three main themes. These are:

- That the positive contribution of farm foresting to the environment and to the timber industry should be recognised and rewarded with financial incentives to participate.
- That more information and assistance should be available to farm foresters.
- That governments should legislate to make farm forestry a more viable industry.

Suggestions of how the contribution of farm foresters could be recognised and rewarded include:

- Government incentives as part of Greening Australia programs
- Government subsidy of costs of planting and management.

Suggested means for informing and assisting farm foresters included both strategies that farmers had found useful themselves and wished to pass on to others as well as ideas for ways in which assistance might be provided by government bodies. They included:

- The planting of some shorter term species such as Paulownia (10-12 years to be grown to a size able to be harvested) and Olives (10years)
- Public education about timber as a renewable resource
- Site specific or species specific management expertise being made available
- Occasional seminars on forestry would be very helpful to private forest farmers.
- More Landcare projects
- The suggestion of planting pulses as fertiliser products to be ploughed in
- Use tips from Land Line (ABC TV)
- The suggestion of making seed available to farm foresters
- Educating farmers and others about the compatibility of forest with livestock
- Farm and other forestry to be considered within a framework of catchment management
- Thinnings should be harvested with view to chipping or pulping - for the production of Ligneous Cellulose for ethanol production.

Ideas for ways in which government legislation could be changed to encourage farm foresters included:

- Better tax rebates at early stages of forest plantation.
- Land rates tax reduction in recognition of the contribution that farm foresters are making to the environment.
- Taxation reform to spread the income over a number of years when trees are harvested.
- Removing the DPI monopoly on timber prices to allow farm foresters to compete in a free market.
- Setting up of a plantation registration by some level of government – local or state
- Feeling that certain areas ought to be set aside within shires where mills can operate without fear of closure
- Creating co-operatives ought to be a priority
- Governments should establish regional employment opportunities – timber-control teams trained in ecologically sustainable timber-thinning on both freehold and leasehold land

## Conclusion

Farm forestry can be seen to be a sustainable industry with both environmental and economic benefits. There are several obstacles which need to be overcome, however, to ensure that this industry can be made viable. Farm Foresters require assurance that there will be worthwhile returns for their investment. Many of the respondents to the farm foresters survey have suggested that there be some kind of government incentives provided. These may take the form of tax rebates etcetera to ensure that, for the long period over which no actual income is derived from the trees, the farms remain economically viable.

Respondents have also emphasised that they would appreciate greater access to information and assistance from government bodies. They stressed that words of encouragement need to be backed up with actions of practical assistance.

Several respondents believe that there is an enormous amount of tired farmland that is mostly unproductive in today's climate. These respondents feel that land holders should be encouraged to return that land to production timber through farm forestry.