



**Respondent No:** 236

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** Jun 29, 2018 15:08:38 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 29, 2018 15:08:38 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

- Q1. **First name** Judith
- 
- Q2. **Last name** Cooney
- 
- Q3. **Phone** [REDACTED]
- Q4. **Mobile** not answered
- Q5. **Email** [REDACTED]
- Q6. **Postcode** [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?**  
Extension of RFAs without a review of their failings or accounting for the effects of climate change. Review of the National Forest Policy Statement and principles that underpin the RFAs. New laws rather than rollover of RFAs
- 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?**  
None Environmental protection not guaranteed. Timber supply over committed

**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?**

Reassessment of old growth trees and rainforest trees to enable them to be logged is dishonest. Reducing buffers on headwater streams allows erosion and removes protection of riverine banks. Not enough protection of threatened species particularly koalas and maintenance and repair to habitat for wildlife. Irreparable damage to valuable mature seed trees.

---

**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)?**

Permanent protection is not possible for a dynamic ecosystem when climate change is not factored in and the definition of trees suited for logging can be changed to suit by the government.

---

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

No. The Natural Resources Commission's analysis of the IFOAs states that it is not possible to meet the Government's commitments around both environmental values and wood supply. They suggest that the 2015 extensions to the Wood Supply Agreements were "ill-advised", when Boral was granted a five year extension as part of a high quality wood supply quota buyback on the North Coast. We, the Public, paid for it.

---

**Q21. General comments**

It is obvious that the drive by State Forests to make money is their first priority and that the only way is to change the rules as to what trees should be logged regardless of their ecological value. The devastating clear felling which is happening all around this area of northern coast public forests, including where I live, is a testament to the avaricious attitude of government and big logging companies. According to credible forest economists there is enough timber being grown in plantations to meet our needs with a view to leave our native forests to function for the public good, biodiversity, pure water catchments and climate warming mitigation.

---

**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

---