

ENVIRONMENT — DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND WILDLIFE —
WELLINGTON DISCOVERY FOREST — LOGGING INVOLVEMENT

5798. Mr M.P. Murray to the Minister for Environment:

- (1) I refer to the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPAW) managed logging operation that took place in the Wellington Discovery Forest in February and March 2015, and I ask:
- (a) why was it necessary for DPAW to be in charge of that logging operation when it is the Forest Products Commission which is in charge of all logging operations in the native forest;
 - (b) why was DPAW involved in logging this native forest, despite its stated role to ‘protect and conserve the State’s natural environment on behalf of the people of Western Australia’, and does this activity not represent a conflict of interest for the department;
 - (c) how many hectares of forest were logged during the operation;
 - (d) how many tonnes of jarrah logs were sourced during the operation;
 - (e) how many tonnes of marri logs were sourced during the operation;
 - (f) were the logs sold commercially, who were the buyers, and for what purpose were they bought – i.e. char logs for Simcoa, structural timber, woodchips etc.; and
 - (g) was DPAW a recipient of any monies derived from the sale of the logs sold, and:
 - (i) if yes, is it appropriate under the Wellington Discovery Forest Plan 2008 that DPAW be the recipient of such monies;
 - (ii) what was the total amount of money DPAW received from the sale of the logs; and
 - (iii) if no, such logs were sold as part of the logging operation, where are those logs now?
- (2) I refer to the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPAW) managed logging operation that took place in the Wellington Discovery Forest in February and March 2016, and I ask:
- (a) why was it necessary for DPAW to be in charge of that logging operation when it is the Forest Products Commission which is in charge of all logging operations in the native forest;
 - (b) why was DPAW involved in logging this native forest, despite its stated role to ‘protect and conserve the State’s natural environment on behalf of the people of Western Australia’, and does this activity not represent a conflict of interest for the department;
 - (c) how many hectares of forest were logged during the operation;
 - (d) how many tonnes of jarrah logs were sourced during the operation;
 - (e) how many tonnes of marri logs were sourced during the operation;
 - (f) were the logs sold commercially, who were the buyers, and for what purpose were they bought – i.e. char logs for Simcoa, structural timber, woodchips etc.; and
 - (g) was DPAW a recipient of any monies derived from the sale of the logs sold, and:
 - (i) if yes, is it appropriate under the Wellington Discovery Forest Plan 2008 that DPAW be the recipient of such monies;
 - (ii) what was the total amount of money DPAW received from the sale of the logs; and
 - (iii) if no such logs were sold as part of the logging operation, where are those logs now?

Mr A.P. Jacob replied:

- (1) (a) Although the Forest Products Commission is entitled to harvest and sell timber products from State forest and some other reserves, the Commission is not entitled to harvest timber for commercial purposes from *Conservation and Land Management Act 1984* section 5(1)(h) reserves such as the Wellington Discovery Forest.
- (b) Parks and Wildlife managed the timber harvesting in the Wellington Discovery Forest as part of the management of the area as a demonstration forest. This is consistent with page 127 of the *Wellington National Park, Westralia Conservation Park and Wellington Discovery Forest Management Plan 2008* which states that “*Silvicultural treatments that involve the removal/harvesting of some trees for the purpose of demonstrating the response of the forest to disturbance is consistent with the purpose of the reserve, and therefore will be permitted*”, and as such does not represent a conflict of interest.

- (c) 34 hectares.
 - (d)–(e) Approximately 1900 tonnes of wood were produced for sale during the operation. Jarrah and marri material was mixed and the volume of each species removed was not required to be individually determined under the harvesting arrangements.
 - (f) All wood products obtained from the operation were sold to the harvesting contractor.
 - (g) Yes.
 - (i) After seeking legal advice, Parks and Wildlife considered it appropriate that the forest produce could be sold to the contractor or to a third party.
 - (ii) Parks and Wildlife has received royalties of approximately \$38,000 by the contractor. These funds have been placed in a trust account and will be used to improve the visitor facilities at the Wellington Discovery Forest.
 - (iii) Not applicable.
- (2)
- (a) See answer to question (1)(a).
 - (b) See answer to question (1)(b).
 - (c) See answer to question (1)(c).
 - (d)–(e) See answer to question (1)(d) and (1)(e).
 - (f) See answer to question (1)(f).
 - (g) See answer to question (1)(g).
 - (i) See answer to question (1)(g)(i).
 - (ii) See answer to question (1)(g)(ii).
 - (iii) See answer to (1)(g)(iii).
-