



Respondent No: 482

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jul 10, 2018 21:46:07 pm

Last Seen: Jul 10, 2018 21:46:07 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. First name Jason

Q2. Last name John

Q3. Phone [REDACTED]

Q4. Mobile [REDACTED]

Q5. Email [REDACTED]

Q6. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Q7. Country Australia

Q8. Stakeholder type Individual

Q9. Stakeholder type - Other

not answered

Q10. Stakeholder type - Staff

not answered

Q11. Organisation name not answered

Q12. What is your preferred method of contact? Email

**Q13. Would you like to receive further information
and updates on IFOA and forestry matters?** Yes

Q14. Can the EPA make your submission public? Yes

**Q15. Have you previously engaged with the EPA on
forestry issues?** No

Q16. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA are most important to you? Why?

The proposal to continue logging on any non plantation forest, which is the opposite of what we need to address climate change, and enhance biodiversity, and live as better neighbours with the rest of life.

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?

not answered

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?

continued logging of non-plantation forest, because it prioritises non sustainable timber supply over biodiversity, reduces the integrity of our water catchment in some cases, and fragments the landscape for animals which will need to be able to migrate freely as they adapt to climate change.

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)?

see below

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

the opening up of large areas to intensive harvesting, even if the amount is limited each year, effectively turns native forest into plantation, unless the area is going to be replanted with a mix of commercial and non-commercial species. we have "Blackbutt dominated" forest still has many other species in it. The waterways in the plantation near us, after intensive harvest, have become weed choked, even though there are buffer zones on either side of the stream. 5m of buffer allows far too much light in, and now privet, camphor laurel and water weeds dominate the banks, and choke the waterways, growing in all the top soil which washed down into them.

Q21. General comments

I read the claim that harvest shortfall is due to increased protections of koals etc. About 5 years ago I was part of a Boral pseudo-consultation, which they eventually abandoned because the market for the ESD pulp they were wanting to harvest dried up. During the discussions it was clear that even then the wood supply promised to Boral was far in excess of what could be sustainably harvested. Some of that was purchased back (by us the taxpayer, even though it never actually existed the first place). My understanding is that since then more timber was promised to Boral, despite the clearly demonstrated unsustainability of the first contracts.

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