The survival of the Planet as a whole - "some see the trees while others see the forest." Present unsustainable forestry practices are increasing not decreasing at a rate that no living organism is safe. There is not one section or word in the objectives of the IFOA that details sustainability for the state, country or planet. It strictly refers to: * reducing costs associated with implementation and compliance, * improve clarity and enforce ability of the conditions for protecting the environment, * threatened species and fisheries in state forests without detail, incorporate innovations in best regulatory practice and advances in technology to basically increase profits for the logging industry many of which are foreign owned and to deliver a contemporary regulatory framework that is fit for purpose of delivering higher profits with no real benefits to the plebs of society (Refer to attachment)
Q17. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA do you think have a positive outcome on the management of environmental values or the production of sustainable timber? Why?

As a citizen and concerned resident I see no long term benefits for the general populace, the trees, fauna inhabitants or the environment. Unless a scheme similar to that which operates in Finland can be incorporated into the Australian system and include an EIS including soil management prior to harvesting on each block the schemes as proposed will only ensure a more rapid exploitation of our forests.

Q18. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA do you think have a negative outcome on the management of environmental values or the production of sustainable timber? Why?

These conditions; are consistent and outcomes-based to • ensure conditions are practical to implement and enforce, • provide controls that are commensurate to the risk, • allow suitable amendments in an efficient and timely manner, • improve ease of implementation by reducing the number and complexity of conditions, all appear to ensure that our forests destruction will all be expedited more rapidly, rather than slowed or negated. Taking a landscape-based approach is a common environment protection practice in jurisdictions such as Tasmania, Canada and the United States of America. Citing these countries as good examples falls far short of good sound research as all three have shown bias towards logging and mining companies in forested areas, low rates of prosecution and/or illegal logging operations as being rife. Tasmania has seen the reintroduction of logging old growth forests can hardly be conducive to protecting forest diversity for future generations and halting the unsustainable logging industry. "UN. calls for a halt to logging in Tasmania's World heritage areas," Canadian authorities are concerned with having a reliable data source, capable of imaging during critical time periods, and therefore unhindered by atmospheric conditions. Also in Canada state forest are levelled to allow mining companies access for exploration and pipe lines which are not necessarily conducive for wildlife habitation or survival. The USA has one of the best management projects available it must be noted that Major impacts by illegal logging include environmental, economic and social aspects. Environmental impacts include the loss or degradation of forests, as illegal logging tends to be associated with poor forest management. This results in the loss of habitats, biodiversity soil and water degradation. Finland’s Forest Act stipulates similar “best practices” as state-defined BMPs in the United States. The Forest Act requires that logging activities leave sufficient potential for stand regeneration and growth, but also necessitates the replanting of stands if natural regeneration is insufficient. The Forest Act also requires that logging activities avoid damage to remaining trees, soils, and sensitive habitats such as water bodies, sandy soils and bluffs, as well as “luxuriant herb-rich forest patches.” Application of these practices is ensured by forest management plans, which detail forest conditions, maps, proposed harvest activities, operational notes, and land-owner recommendations. While forest management plans are not required, they are encouraged by economic incentives that help finance forest activities for land owners that have management plans. “Forest use declarations” on the other hand, are mandatory for land owners, and must be presented to the Finnish Forest Centre (a state funded organization) at least 10 days prior to any logging activity. Forest use declarations contain information such as location, key characteristics of the felling, purpose and methods of timber harvest, considerations or methods for regeneration and known habitats of importance. The Finnish Forest Centre then uses the information provided in forest use declarations to assess the quality and implementation of timber harvest and other forest management operations. It has been successfully used to ensure threatened species habitat is maintained during and after logging, which improves the ability of species to continue to use an area and helps forests return to their pre-logging state more swiftly. By using guidance material in place of strict process-based regulation opens the system up to personal interpretation, abuse and corruption of officials and illegal logging.
Q19. What are your views on the effectiveness of the combination of permanent environmental protections at the regional, landscape and operational scales (multi-scale protection)?

Interesting use of the word "PROTECTION" when in fact destruction and death of every tree felled with the demise of whatever fauna is associated and relied on that environmental habitat is destroyed so the remaining wildlife cannot sustain life. The only way the word "PROTECTION" can be correctly incorporated is if logging is excluded from every sensitive land, every corridor, every wetland, every watercourse, cross sectional environments and ensures the full and uncompromising protection of every rare, vulnerable or essential food chain linked species on the planet including Homo sapien. In short what is needed is a National Environmental PROTECTION conservation agency that is independent of the forestry structure and has an equal number of votes to the other bodies combined. The exclusion of private interests which have a pecuniary interests in the destruction/harvesting of our forests and natural resources.

Q20. In your opinion, would the draft Coastal IFOA be effective in managing environmental values and a sustainable timber industry? Why?

Absolutely not. Since returning to Australia to retire I have wondered across several variable logging districts and on every block have encountered rare, vulnerable or protected species which have been erroneously or deliberately destroyed or have had their environments substantially changed to the detriment of the other inhabitants of the environment. These include and are not restricted to: * Destruction of Allocassuarina litoralis that were feeding grounds to the black cockatoo,* Destruction of habitats of protected ground orchids, * Destruction of habitats and grading and left Cyathea leichardtiana - to die a slow death by the logging track. Fortunately two survivors of such a grading are now growing in my garden, * destruction of trees hosting Dendrobium aemuleum, * Destruction of tree canopy exposing Dendrobium kingianum to the elements, * radical habitat change in an area where a possible new species of Plectranthus has been discovered. * The removal of habitat and killing of Gingidia rupicola, * The recent discovery of a possible new species of Woodroach, * The recent discovery of a possible new species of Assasin bug, I have absolutely no faith in what I have personally seen and reports of water theft and corruption verifies, why I have no faith in government bodies supposedly working for the best interest of the public on public land for the public and the environment. When private interests are at stake the deceit with greed are an extremely potent mixture for the continuation of the destruction of OUR public land, environment and future with probable greater bias towards this group leading to the increased degradation of the land.

Q21. General comments

Refer to my attachment.

Q22. Attach your supporting documents (Document 1)

not answered

Q23. Attach your supporting documents (Document 2)

not answered

Q24. Attach your supporting documents (Document 3)

not answered
Submission to save Our Forests - Re Forests4Ever

I'm opposed to any extension of the Regional Forests Agreements or changes to the Integrated Forests Operations Approval for the following reasons that allows for further destruction of our forests, deforestation or degrading of state or national forests. This opposition includes clear felling, intensive logging, logging adjacent to or near any sensitive area or wetlands including rills, creeks, streams and rivers, weakening of wildlife protection habitats, destruction of viable wildlife corridors and the transition to stereotype or mono type plantation timbers.

It is important to note that "Neanderthals never invented a written language, never developed agriculture or progressed past the use of Stone Aged implements in their own right. At the same time, they had brains just as big in volume as modern humans'. The question of why we Homo sapiens appear to be more significantly intelligent than the similarly larger brained Neanderthals and why our dominant genes survived and proliferated while Neanderthals genes were recessive?

A greater percentage of the Neanderthal's brain seems to have been devoted to vision, hearing, control of their larger bodies, and awareness of their relatively stable environment at the time.

In today's modern world Homo sapien is the only living organism that is losing sight of its dependence upon its environment and surrounds.

Every living organism from educated Scientists, doctors and even now the farming community is aware of the importance the environment is to our ultimate survival.

Looking at what the three groups feel about uncontrollable deforestation and the lack of attention to Global warming finds all three groups in Australia worried about the paths we are opting to walk.

Scientists:
Scientists from botanists to zoologists are clear that halting tree-felling and land clearance is not enough to save our forests without large scale dedicated programs to forest restoration in degraded areas.

The ecological and carbon damage of forest destruction goes on accumulating for years after nations halt the conversion of canopy into farmland and urban spread and the costs associated with restoration which are substantially higher than preservation.
Scientists worldwide strongly believe that "to meet ambitious targets, global strategies to combat climate change," are imperative to survival, – "The halting to further deforestation and forest restoration should have started years if not decades ago."

**Why?**

* Forests are the carbon sinks of released industrial combustion of fossil fuels that assist in the limitation of global warming,
* Destruction or devaluing forests releases centuries of stored carbon back into the atmosphere to accelerate global warming and climate change.
* The destruction of forests destroys the very root of carbon storage from industrial waste,
* The impacts are ongoing and do not cease because deforestation has halted. Scientists were unanimous in their conclusion in the journal; 'Current Biology' "That even if deforestation had completely halted in 2010, time lags ensured there would still be a carbon emissions debt equivalent to ten years of global deforestation and an extinction debt of more than 140 bird, mammal, and amphibian forest-specific species, which, if paid, would increase the number of 20th century extinctions in these groups by 120%,”

"Given the magnitude of these debts;’ already foisted on forests in Australia, "commitments to reduce emissions and biodiversity loss are unlikely to be realized without specific actions that directly address this damaging environmental legacy.” This means we need to act locally through local organizations, Councils, State, Federally and Globally.

This research is a restatement and confirmation of the message from other studies in regards to 'the relationship between the forests, the atmosphere, the species that depend on forest ecosystems and the unquestionable links on the trajectory of global warming and Climate Change.'

Scientists have repeatedly warned, that destruction of the great rainforests invites an unequivocal, catastrophic climate change and the deployment of mass logging of subtropical and temperate forests will only hasten the short term and long term affects for centuries to come.

They have also warned that rising global average temperatures, and consequent shifts in climate patterns, will accelerate the process of drought which will turn rainforests into carbon emitters rather than carbon sinks.

Coupled with rising sea levels which will see more extinctions with coastal forests and mangroves perish and consequently the
fish breeding hubs of the world severely affected even on the most conservative estimates.

To allow forests to regrow; from this point of time, on lands that have been deforested can help to create ‘new’ suitable areas for species to survive, while allowing some of the industrial excess carbon to be stored back in the new trees rather than emitted into the atmosphere but it does not replace the already loss of carbon into the atmosphere for at least another 100 to 1000 years.”

Traditional identification methods, do not fully capture the complexities of a forest, so could potentially misjudge the true responsive impacts that biodiversity and functioning of forests on the land already disturbed, let alone the mass destruction of a forest replaced by roads, buildings and agriculture.

In conclusion scientists and science have proven conclusively that what we have achieved from obliterating large sections of the planets forests is a legacy for our children not for a decade but probably for a millennium even if we completely change our approach to our wanting deforestation now.

**Doctors:**
Doctors dedicated to health and well being stand united in claiming forests add value to our lives in so many ways. Apart from re-purifying our air; which decreases hospitalization through asthma attacks and bronchitis. Forests also cleanse the water; we rely so heavily for drinking and cleaning, promote rain formation and protect soils from salinity and erosion.

Forests all forests are a rich source of foods, bioactive compounds for modern medicines, including plants whose potential medicinal and nutritional value is yet to be determined. With fewer than 16% of plants having already been researched it seems despicable that we are intent on destroying much with over 84% still requiring urgent research. The estimated value of proven herbal medicines to date is valued at in excess of 83 billion dollars per year and that is with an exploitation of less than 16%.

Forests and Botanic Gardens have shown that multiple health benefits are gained by just strolling amongst trees. Studies have conclusively proven that spending time in a forest lowers blood pressure, cortisol levels and feelings of stress.

These in return can save the Australian community millions of dollars in medical and hospital visitations.

**How?**
* Forests boost the **immune system**,
* Forests lower blood pressure,
* Forests reduce stress,
* Forests improves mood and decreases mood swings,
* Forests increases the ability to focus, even in children,
* Forests accelerate the recovery from illness,
* Forests increase energy level,
* Forests improve sleep,
* Forests decreases convalescing periods in post operative surgery,
* Forests substantially decreases hyperactivity in children with ADHD
* Forests decrease obesity saving hospital premature visitations for diseases like diabetes and heart disease,

Doctors for the environment "have noted that for the past 20 years, Regional Forest Agreements that were introduced into Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia to conserve Australia’s forests while permitting logging have failed to deliver promises to the public thus their benefits have not flowed onto the public and into the health system."

Initially, the RFAs were set up to be reviewed every five years, however the failure to implement these policies has seen the loss of forests with sustainable jobs for forestry workers eventuate.

"With so many benefits, being realized then actively not protecting our public forests is an absolute no brainer."

**Farmers:**

According to Fiona Simson, president of the National Farmers’ Federation, people on the land can’t and won’t ignore what is right before their eyes. “We have been experiencing some wild climate variability.” ..... "Regional Australia has turned the corner when it comes to acknowledging the reality of climate change."

"While we are a land of droughts and flooding rains, absolutely at the moment people are seeing enormous swings in what would be considered usually normal. They are getting all their rainfall at once, even though they end up with an annual rainfall that’s the same, it’s all at once, or it’s in so many tiny insignificant falls that it doesn’t make any difference to them."

“And the heat. We’ve had some record hot summers and some weird swings in seasons”. “Overwhelmingly, it’s got to the point where the science is very acceptable”. 

"People are really frustrated at the moment with the politics."
She says “We have turned quite a corner ourselves, and our approach now to this is quite different than it was in those days [when Labor pursued emissions trading], when the [previous NFF] leaders chose that path.”

Consensus needs to be reached because the damage inflicted by the last decade of policy warfare is going to take time to unwind, and the key to unwinding the destruction is policy certainty. “I have some sympathy for [the Nationals] because I know that our sector has had some wide-ranging discussions to come to the agreement that we have.”

Over 150,000 km² of forests are cleared each year, mainly in tropical regions, and another 150,000 km² are degraded through logging. This clearing is not a sustainable action and is one that compounds the affects of Global warming, climate change, higher sea levels and ultimately the profitability of all farmers.

Some of the benefits derived from having healthy forests and trees on farms include:
* Shade and shelter which increases the health of stock,
* Wildlife habitat which increases the beneficial predators surrounding farms and decreases the reliance and cost of chemicals,
* Reduces soil erosion,
* Improves water retention,
* Decreases soil salinity,
* Increases production rates through better insect and bird pollination,
* All the medical benefits mentioned above,
* Higher profits especially to those farmers who are certified organic,
* Tertiary and secondary environmental impacts are lessoned on neighbouring farms,
* The added knowledge of preserving the farm for future generations.

As farmers as a whole own the majority of the land and forests in the country they should be entitled to share the benefits and real subsidies for retaining forests intact and reforesting their properties for future generations. The forests should be made an asset not a liability- An oxygen rebate scheme.

The possible extinction of *Homo sapiens* and the planet as we know it equates to the disappearance of the dinosaurs 96 million years ago. - One cataclysmic event lasting just a few minutes wiped out a completely balanced environment over the pursuing years. In the realms of reality our actions today are comparable to the era of the dinosaurs. Our actions for the
past two centuries are comparable to the disappearance of Neanderthal.

Who survives and who perishes is based on our brains ability to project our forest action plans of today; based on the past 200 years of degradation and deterioration, into sustainable survival plans and action for the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts and those who surround me whom are not as well versed in expressing their opinions and concerns re the path we are choosing to walk down”.

Andrew (andi) Mellis (Diploma in Environmental Science) & Liu (Nan) Ying.