



**Respondent No:** 594

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** Jul 13, 2018 16:52:01 pm

**Last Seen:** Jul 13, 2018 16:52:01 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. <b>First name</b>	leon
Q2. <b>Last name</b>	Hoffmann-detenhoff
Q3. <b>Phone</b>	not answered
Q4. <b>Mobile</b>	not answered
Q5. <b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
Q6. <b>Postcode</b>	[REDACTED]
Q7. <b>Country</b>	australia
Q8. <b>Stakeholder type</b>	Individual
Q9. <b>Stakeholder type - Other</b>	not answered
Q10. <b>Stakeholder type - Staff</b>	not answered
Q11. <b>Organisation name</b>	not answered
Q12. <b>What is your preferred method of contact?</b>	Email
Q13. <b>Would you like to receive further information and updates on IFOA and forestry matters?</b>	Yes
Q14. <b>Can the EPA make your submission public?</b>	Yes
Q15. <b>Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?</b>	No

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

Here Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff. Please accept this email as my submission to the Review of the Draft Coastal IFOA. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes, as I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the logging rules and the removal of many protections for waterways, old growth forests, threatened species (such as Koalas, Gliders and Amphibien) and Giant trees. I call upon you to stop proceeding with these draconian changes for the following reasons: 1. I am opposed to increased logging intensity and "Intensive Harvesting" which means basically clearfelling 45 ha lots in one hit. This is nothing short of environmental vandalism and can not be allowed. "Selective Harvesting", which preserves 12 sqm of trees per hectar of old growth forest does not deserve the name "selective", given that 1 hectar is 10 000 sqm. I would consider 12 sqm of trees left standing in 10000sqm of harvested old growth forest also serious environmental vandalism. It can not be allowed. 2.I am opposed also because forests support Flora and Fauna. Clear felling large lots of forest will rob Flora and Fauna of their habitat. We have already lost an enormous percentage of our Koala population in the last 20 years. But there are also many other animals and plants threatend. We have to wake up. We don't live in the 1980`s any more. We have done a lot of damage since and are continuing to do so. The Greater Glider, and all other gliders will not be able to cope with the changes the IFOA proposes. These animals can only "fly" a distance of about 30 metres. 12 sqm of trees per hectar will not help those animals, nor will clumps of vegetation left behind. These animals will struggle along with all other animals, Koalas, Birds, Frogs, Snakes etc. because their habitat, their home, will disappear. This cannot be allowed to happen. 3.Large or "Giant" trees are a vital part of forest and enormously important to the wildlife.The proposed 140cm diameter at stump height, 160cm for Black Butt and Mountain Ash, would indeed be iconic and very very rare, indeed, in many areas completly non existant. I am strongly opposed to those standards for "giant" trees as they are proposed. All trees greater or equal to 100cm diameter should be retained as a matter of urgency-(see Brian Tolhurst from the Experts Panel) Especially given that old trees play a special and vital role in the global carbon cycle through their superior ability to store carbon. 4. I am strongly opposed to halving the width of protection given to head water streams from 10 to 5 meters. I do not believe that a 5 meter protection buffer is enough to afford protection to waterways from soil erosion and water polution. It has to be remembered that timber harvesting in that scale is being achieved by the use of massive machinery which create especially massive amounts of dust pollution. I would think that a 10m buffer would be the absolute minimum to cope with that kind of onslaught. A 5 meter protection is simply not enough, and I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the protection that is being afforded to our waterways. 5.I believe that we have a large responsibility to preserve the health of our forests and prevent any more extinctions of threatened Flora and Fauna. Our regional Forest Agreements have failed to deliver environmental protection to the forests. They also have failed to give the industry sufficient security. I believe that once these RFA`s have expired, the answer is not to ramp up logging as is the aim of the IFOA , but to effictively have the people of NSW buy back our forest by supporting the Forest industry towards a transition to 100% plantation sourced timbers. All old growth forest on public land needs to be preserved and protected. These forests will in the long run be of more benefit to the public than an unsustainable timber industry.These forests will capture carbon and will be a vital part for tourism and recreational industries and activities. It is our responsibility to preserve our forests and their health for us and generations to come. Yours sincerely, leon Hoffmann-detenhoff of 23 otentot crescent Mullumbimby 2482

---

**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?**

Here Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff. Please accept this email as my submission to the Review of the Draft Coastal IFOA. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes, as I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the logging rules and the removal of many protections for waterways, old growth forests, threatened species (such as Koalas, Gliders and Amphibien) and Giant trees. I call upon you to stop proceeding with these draconian changes for the following reasons: 1. I am opposed to increased logging intensity and "Intensive Harvesting" which means basically clearfelling 45 ha lots in one hit. This is nothing short of environmental vandalism and can not be allowed. "Selective Harvesting", which preserves 12 sqm of trees per hectar of old growth forest does not deserve the name "selective", given that 1 hectar is 10 000 sqm. I would consider 12 sqm of trees left standing in 10000sqm of harvested old growth forest also serious environmental vandalism. It can not be allowed. 2.I am opposed also because forests support Flora and Fauna. Clear felling large lots of forest will rob Flora and Fauna of their habitat. We have already lost an enormous percentage of our Koala population in the last 20 years. But there are also many other animals and plants threatend. We have to wake up. We don`t live in the 1980`s any more. We have done a lot of damage since and are continuing to do so. The Greater Glider, and all other gliders will not be able to cope with the changes the IFOA proposes. These animals can only "fly" a distance of about 30 metres. 12 sqm of trees per hectar will not help those animals, nor will clumps of vegetation left behind. These animals will struggle along with all other animals, Koalas, Birds, Frogs, Snakes etc. because their habitat, their home, will disappear. This cannot be allowed to happen. 3.Large or "Giant" trees are a vital part of forest and enormously important to the wildlife.The proposed 140cm diameter at stump height, 160cm for Black Butt and Mountain Ash, would indeed be iconic and very very rare, indeed, in many areas completly non existant. I am strongly opposed to those standards for "giant" trees as they are proposed. All trees greater or equal to 100cm diameter should be retained as a matter of urgency-(see Brian Tolhurst from the Experts Panel) Especially given that old trees play a special and vital role in the global carbon cycle through their superior ability to store carbon. 4. I am strongly opposed to halving the width of protection given to head water streams from 10 to 5 meters. I do not believe that a 5 meter protection buffer is enough to afford protection to waterways from soil erosion and water pollution. It has to be remembered that timber harvesting in that scale is being achieved by the use of massive machinery which create especially massive amounts of dust pollution. I would think that a 10m buffer would be the absolute minimum to cope with that kind of onslought. A 5 meter protection is simply not enough, and I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the protection that is being afforded to our waterways. 5.I believe that we have a large responsibility to preserve the health of our forests and prevent any more extinctions of threatened Flora and Fauna. Our regional Forest Agreements have failed to deliver environmental protection to the forests. They also have failed to give the industry sufficient security. I believe that once these RFA`s have expired, the answer is not to ramp up logging as is the aim of the IFOA , but to effectively have the people of NSW buy back our forest by supporting the Forest industry towards a transition to 100% plantation sourced timbers. All old growth forest on public land needs to be preserved and protected. These forests will in the long run be of more benefit to the public than an unsustainable timber industry.These forests will capture carbon and will be a vital part for tourism and recreational industries and activities. It is our responsibility to preserve our forests and their health for us and generations to come. Yours sincerely, leon Hoffmann-detenhoff of 23 otentot crescent Mullumbimby 2482

---

**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?**

Here Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff. Please accept this email as my submission to the Review of the Draft Coastal IFOA. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes, as I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the logging rules and the removal of many protections for waterways, old growth forests, threatened species (such as Koalas, Gliders and Amphibien) and Giant trees. I call upon you to stop proceeding with these draconian changes for the following reasons: 1. I am opposed to increased logging intensity and "Intensive Harvesting" which means basically clearfelling 45 ha lots in one hit. This is nothing short of environmental vandalism and can not be allowed. "Selective Harvesting", which preserves 12 sqm of trees per hectar of old growth forest does not deserve the name "selective", given that 1 hectar is 10 000 sqm. I would consider 12 sqm of trees left standing in 10000sqm of harvested old growth forest also serious environmental vandalism. It can not be allowed. 2.I am opposed also because forests support Flora and Fauna. Clear felling large lots of forest will rob Flora and Fauna of their habitat. We have already lost an enormous percentage of our Koala population in the last 20 years. But there are also many other animals and plants threatend. We have to wake up. We don`t live in the 1980`s any more. We have done a lot of damage since and are continuing to do so. The Greater Glider, and all other gliders will not be able to cope with the changes the IFOA proposes. These animals can only "fly" a distance of about 30 metres. 12 sqm of trees per hectar will not help those animals, nor will clumps of vegetation left behind. These animals will struggle along with all other animals, Koalas, Birds, Frogs, Snakes etc. because their habitat, their home, will disappear. This cannot be allowed to happen. 3.Large or "Giant" trees are a vital part of forest and enormously important to the wildlife.The proposed 140cm diameter at stump height, 160cm for Black Butt and Mountain Ash, would indeed be iconic and very very rare, indeed, in many areas completly non existant. I am strongly opposed to those standards for "giant" trees as they are proposed. All trees greater or equal to 100cm diameter should be retained as a matter of urgency-(see Brian Tolhurst from the Experts Panel) Especially given that old trees play a special and vital role in the global carbon cycle through their superior ability to store carbon. 4. I am strongly opposed to halving the width of protection given to head water streams from 10 to 5 meters. I do not believe that a 5 meter protection buffer is enough to afford protection to waterways from soil erosion and water pollution. It has to be remembered that timber harvesting in that scale is being achieved by the use of massive machinery which create especially massive amounts of dust pollution. I would think that a 10m buffer would be the absolute minimum to cope with that kind of onslaught. A 5 meter protection is simply not enough, and I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the protection that is being afforded to our waterways. 5.I believe that we have a large responsibility to preserve the health of our forests and prevent any more extinctions of threatened Flora and Fauna. Our regional Forest Agreements have failed to deliver environmental protection to the forests. They also have failed to give the industry sufficient security. I believe that once these RFA`s have expired, the answer is not to ramp up logging as is the aim of the IFOA , but to effectively have the people of NSW buy back our forest by supporting the Forest industry towards a transition to 100% plantation sourced timbers. All old growth forest on public land needs to be preserved and protected. These forests will in the long run be of more benefit to the public than an unsustainable timber industry.These forests will capture carbon and will be a vital part for tourism and recreational industries and activities. It is our responsibility to preserve our forests and their health for us and generations to come. Yours sincerely, leon Hoffmann-detenhoff of 23 otentot crescent Mullumbimby 2482

---

**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)?**

Here Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff. Please accept this email as my submission to the Review of the Draft Coastal IFOA. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes, as I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the logging rules and the removal of many protections for waterways, old growth forests, threatened species (such as Koalas, Gliders and Amphibien) and Giant trees. I call upon you to stop proceeding with these draconian changes for the following reasons: 1. I am opposed to increased logging intensity and "Intensive Harvesting" which means basically clearfelling 45 ha lots in one hit. This is nothing short of environmental vandalism and can not be allowed. "Selective Harvesting", which preserves 12 sqm of trees per hectar of old growth forest does not deserve the name "selective", given that 1 hectar is 10 000 sqm. I would consider 12 sqm of trees left standing in 10000sqm of harvested old growth forest also serious environmental vandalism. It can not be allowed. 2.I am opposed also because forests support Flora and Fauna. Clear felling large lots of forest will rob Flora and Fauna of their habitat. We have already lost an enormous percentage of our Koala population in the last 20 years. But there are also many other animals and plants threatend. We have to wake up. We don't live in the 1980's any more. We have done a lot of damage since and are continuing to do so. The Greater Glider, and all other gliders will not be able to cope with the changes the IFOA proposes. These animals can only "fly" a distance of about 30 metres. 12 sqm of trees per hectar will not help those animals, nor will clumps of vegetation left behind. These animals will struggle along with all other animals, Koalas, Birds, Frogs, Snakes etc. because their habitat, their home, will disappear. This cannot be allowed to happen. 3.Large or "Giant" trees are a vital part of forest and enormously important to the wildlife.The proposed 140cm diameter at stump height, 160cm for Black Butt and Mountain Ash, would indeed be iconic and very very rare, indeed, in many areas completly non existant. I am strongly opposed to those standards for "giant" trees as they are proposed. All trees greater or equal to 100cm diameter should be retained as a matter of urgency-(see Brian Tolhurst from the Experts Panel) Especially given that old trees play a special and vital role in the global carbon cycle through their superior ability to store carbon. 4. I am strongly opposed to halving the width of protection given to head water streams from 10 to 5 meters. I do not believe that a 5 meter protection buffer is enough to afford protection to waterways from soil erosion and water pollution. It has to be remembered that timber harvesting in that scale is being achieved by the use of massive machinery which create especially massive amounts of dust pollution. I would think that a 10m buffer would be the absolute minimum to cope with that kind of onslaught. A 5 meter protection is simply not enough, and I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the protection that is being afforded to our waterways. 5.I believe that we have a large responsibility to preserve the health of our forests and prevent any more extinctions of threatened Flora and Fauna. Our regional Forest Agreements have failed to deliver environmental protection to the forests. They also have failed to give the industry sufficient security. I believe that once these RFA's have expired, the answer is not to ramp up logging as is the aim of the IFOA , but to effectively have the people of NSW buy back our forest by supporting the Forest industry towards a transition to 100% plantation sourced timbers. All old growth forest on public land needs to be preserved and protected. These forests will in the long run be of more benefit to the public than an unsustainable timber industry.These forests will capture carbon and will be a vital part for tourism and recreational industries and activities. It is our responsibility to preserve our forests and their health for us and generations to come. Yours sincerely, leon Hoffmann-detenhoff of 23 otentot crescent Mullumbimby 2482

---

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

Here Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff. Please accept this email as my submission to the Review of the Draft Coastal IFOA. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes, as I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the logging rules and the removal of many protections for waterways, old growth forests, threatened species (such as Koalas, Gliders and Amphibien) and Giant trees. I call upon you to stop proceeding with these draconian changes for the following reasons: 1. I am opposed to increased logging intensity and "Intensive Harvesting" which means basically clearfelling 45 ha lots in one hit. This is nothing short of environmental vandalism and can not be allowed. "Selective Harvesting", which preserves 12 sqm of trees per hectar of old growth forest does not deserve the name "selective", given that 1 hectar is 10 000 sqm. I would consider 12 sqm of trees left standing in 10000sqm of harvested old growth forest also serious environmental vandalism. It can not be allowed. 2. I am opposed also because forests support Flora and Fauna. Clear felling large lots of forest will rob Flora and Fauna of their habitat. We have already lost an enormous percentage of our Koala population in the last 20 years. But there are also many other animals and plants threatend. We have to wake up. We don't live in the 1980's any more. We have done a lot of damage since and are continuing to do so. The Greater Glider, and all other gliders will not be able to cope with the changes the IFOA proposes. These animals can only "fly" a distance of about 30 metres. 12 sqm of trees per hectar will not help those animals, nor will clumps of vegetation left behind. These animals will struggle along with all other animals, Koalas, Birds, Frogs, Snakes etc. because their habitat, their home, will disappear. This cannot be allowed to happen. 3. Large or "Giant" trees are a vital part of forest and enormously important to the wildlife. The proposed 140cm diameter at stump height, 160cm for Black Butt and Mountain Ash, would indeed be iconic and very very rare, indeed, in many areas completly non existant. I am strongly opposed to those standards for "giant" trees as they are proposed. All trees greater or equal to 100cm diameter should be retained as a matter of urgency-(see Brian Tolhurst from the Experts Panel) Especially given that old trees play a special and vital role in the global carbon cycle through their superior ability to store carbon. 4. I am strongly opposed to halving the width of protection given to head water streams from 10 to 5 meters. I do not believe that a 5 meter protection buffer is enough to afford protection to waterways from soil erosion and water pollution. It has to be remembered that timber harvesting in that scale is being achieved by the use of massive machinery which create especially massive amounts of dust pollution. I would think that a 10m buffer would be the absolute minimum to cope with that kind of onslaught. A 5 meter protection is simply not enough, and I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the protection that is being afforded to our waterways. 5. I believe that we have a large responsibility to preserve the health of our forests and prevent any more extinctions of threatened Flora and Fauna. Our regional Forest Agreements have failed to deliver environmental protection to the forests. They also have failed to give the industry sufficient security. I believe that once these RFA's have expired, the answer is not to ramp up logging as is the aim of the IFOA , but to effectively have the people of NSW buy back our forest by supporting the Forest industry towards a transition to 100% plantation sourced timbers. All old growth forest on public land needs to be preserved and protected. These forests will in the long run be of more benefit to the public than an unsustainable timber industry. These forests will capture carbon and will be a vital part for tourism and recreational industries and activities. It is our responsibility to preserve our forests and their health for us and generations to come. Yours sincerely, Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff of 23 Otentot Crescent Mullumbimby 2482

---

**Q21. General comments**

Here Leon Hoffmann-Detenhoff. Please accept this email as my submission to the Review of the Draft Coastal IFOA. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes, as I am strongly opposed to any weakening of the logging rules and the removal of many protections for waterways, old growth forests, threatened species (such as Koalas, Gliders and Amphibien) and Giant trees. I call upon you to stop proceeding with these draconian changes for the following reasons: 1. I am opposed to increased logging intensity and "Intensive Harvesting" which means basically clearfelling 45 ha lots in one hit. This is nothing short of environmental vandalism and can not be allowed. "Selective Harvesting", which preserves 12 sqm of trees per hectar of old growth forest does not deserve the name "selective", given that 1 hectar is 10 000 sqm. I would consider 12 sqm of trees left standing in 10000sqm of harvested old growth forest also serious environmental vandalism. It can not be allowed. 2.I am opposed also because forests support Flora and Fauna. Clear felling large lots of forest will rob Flora and Fauna of their habitat. We have already lost an enormous percentage of our Koala population in the last 20 years. But there are also many other animals and plants threatend. We have to wake up. We don't live in the 1980`s any more. We have done a lot of damage since and are continuing to do so. The Greater Glider, and all other gliders will not be able to cope with the changes the IFOA proposes. These animals can only "fly" a distance of about 30 metres. 12 sqm of trees per hectar will not help those animals, nor will clumps of vegetation left behind. These animals will struggle along with all other animals, Koalas, Birds, Frogs, Snakes etc. because their habitat, their home, will disappear. This cannot be allowed to happen. 3.Large or "Giant" trees are a vital part of forest and enormously important to the wildlife.The proposed 140cm diameter at stump height, 160cm for Black Butt and Mountain Ash, would indeed be iconic and very very rare, indeed, in many areas completly non existant. I am strongly opposed to those standards for "giant" trees as they are proposed. All trees greater or equal to 100cm diameter should be retained as a matter of urgency-(see Brian Tolhurst from the Experts Panel) Especially given that old trees play a special and vital role in the global carbon cycle through their superior ability to store carbon. 4. I am strongly opposed to halving the width of protection given to head water streams from 10 to 5 meters. I do not believe that a 5 meter protection buffer is enough to afford protection to waterways from soil erosion and water polution. It has to be remembered that timber harvesting in that scale is being achieved by the use of massive machinery which create especially massive amounts of dust pollution. I would think that a 10m buffer would be the absolute minimum to cope with that kind of onslought. A 5 meter protection is simply not enough, and I am strongly opposed to any changes being made to the protection that is being afforded to our waterways. 5.I believe that we have a large responsibility to preserve the health of our forests and prevent any more extinctions of threatened Flora and Fauna. Our regional Forest Agreements have failed to deliver environmental protection to the forests. They also have failed to give the industry sufficient security. I believe that once these RFA`s have expired, the answer is not to ramp up logging as is the aim of the IFOA , but to effictively have the people of NSW buy back our forest by supporting the Forest industry towards a transition to 100% plantation sourced timbers. All old growth forest on public land needs to be preserved and protected. These forests will in the long run be of more benefit to the public than an unsustainable timber industry.These forests will capture carbon and will be a vital part for tourism and recreational industries and activities. It is our responsibility to preserve our forests and their health for us and generations to come. Yours sincerely, leon Hoffmann-detenhoff of 23 otentot crescent Mullumbimby 2482

---

**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

---