



Respondent No: 11

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 29, 2018 18:13:28 pm

Last Seen: May 29, 2018 18:13:28 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. First name	Meg
Q2. Last name	Nielsen
Q3. Phone	[REDACTED]
Q4. Mobile	[REDACTED]
Q5. Email	[REDACTED]
Q6. Postcode	[REDACTED]
Q7. Country	not answered
Q8. Stakeholder type	Other
Q9. Stakeholder type - Other	Primary producer - Farmer. National Party member
Q10. Stakeholder type - Staff	not answered
Q11. Organisation name	not answered
Q12. What is your preferred method of contact?	Mobile
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?	Protections of our public state forests, old growth forests, wildlife habitat and headwaters. These forests are the common wealth and belong to the people of NSW. Psychologists agree that forests are essential to the mental health and well being of our people. They are an essential part of Earth's ecosystem, water retention and the most efficient carbon storage system we have. Our commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement and climate destabilisation already evident, make protection of our forests the only responsible decision.

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?

There are no positive outcomes for the management of environmental values . All previous protections have been removed or compromised . See below.

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?

Previously protected forests are being opened up endangering more of our wildlife and opening up the canopy allowing infestation of lantana and other weeds; I have observed numerous examples throughout this region showing that Forest Corp fail in management of the forests, failing to rehabilitate severely degraded areas of forest leading to BMAD dieback; I have also seen evidence of breaches of the existing regulations including obvious heavy machinery caused damage to old trees protected under the current regulations. The new draft rules slash protection of essential old hollow habitat trees and koala fodder trees. Protection zones around headwaters have been halved from 10m to 5m, effectively removing protection altogether, allowing silting & depletion downstream, adversely effecting landholders, farmers, food producers and irrigators. The current harvesting of our forests is not sustainable.

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)?

Firstly the harvesting techniques need to be responsible and sustainable... Clearly the current activities are neither. There needs to be a very careful, considered balance between harvesting timber sustainably and environmental protection. This would require detailed inspection of all our existing logging sites, recently logged sites & previously logged sites, by a group of independent experts and bureaucrats, to accurately measure the impact of logging. I would suggest a moratorium on logging in public state forests whilst this comprehensive review took place. I would be in favour of permanent protection of our public state native forests. Farm forestry and plantations are the way forward.

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

No, absolutely not. The only effective outcomes of the draft Coastal IFOA would be providing open slather for the timber industry to further deplete and degrade our public state native forests, further decimate our iconic koala population and further endanger our unique wildlife; Add to our already rising carbon emissions and further silt & pollute our precious waterways at a time when our water resources can only become more essential. The current timber industry is not sustainable.

Q21. General comments

There is too much at stake to risk the health of our forests and unique wildlife for the small profit gained from logging our state forests (after subsidies are considered.) Loggers could be more effectively employed in rehabilitation, clearing lantana and planting trees for the cost of these taxpayer funded subsidies. Our forests are a hugely valuable asset. Our NC forest tours are already very popular and there are far more jobs to be created in eco tourism, forest rehab and replanting. Check out the Queens Commonwealth Canopy project. This is a wonderful initiative to create a network of forests connecting right around the planet. Our public state forests belong to the people. Forest Corp must be held to account to rehabilitate the extensive damage that has been done to so many state forests before it can be trusted to extract more timber. I am not surprised that they did not want representatives from the Premier's Dept, Natural Resources Commission and Commonwealth to take part in in the tour of the Richmond Ranges with Dailan Pugh. Your people would have seen for yourselves the damage that has been done by their 'sustainable harvesting' techniques. This was a great opportunity to understand the concerns of the community; hands on effective community consultation. I recommend that your people proceed with this tour regardless of any negative opinion.

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
