



Respondent No: 137

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jun 22, 2018 12:20:14 pm

Last Seen: Jun 22, 2018 12:20:14 pm

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. **First name** Meg
-
- Q2. **Last name** Nielsen
-
- Q3. **Phone** [REDACTED]
- Q4. **Mobile** [REDACTED]
- Q5. **Email** not answered
- 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?** Yes
- Q16. **What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA are most important to you? Why?**
All. Please see general comments & 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?**
None. Please see general comments below & attachment.

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?

Most parts cause a negative outcome because timber quotas are unrealistic and much too high. Only GENUINE SELECTIVE logging can achieve genuine environmental protections. Please see general comments below & attachment.

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)?

This is just words! Greenwash, and in reality a nonsense. All the practices outlined at the briefing simply add up to far too much clearing of trees reducing habitat to the level of destroyed eco-systems. Please see general comments below and attachment.

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

Neither. This is the tragic reality of these plans. There is nothing sustainable. Our public native forests will be destroyed along with our wildlife and there will be no timber of any value to the loggers left in our native forests. Perhaps that is the desired outcome for Forestry Corp., leaving the land to be cleared for plantation.

Q21. General comments

The draft Coastal IFOA does not "balance environmental outcomes and timber production". Your website states "The aim of the public consultation is to gather feedback from key stakeholders and the wider community to assist the NSW Government in determining whether the proposed Coastal IFOA conditions achieve the appropriate balance between maintaining environmental values, wood supply and social outcomes in NSW public forests." It does not even come close to achieving the appropriate balance! It goes on to say "Over 3 million people visit NSW's coastal forests each year for a range of activities." Yes we do! "Native forests provide valuable habitat for threatened plants and animals." Yes it does and your draft plans reduce it, not protect it. "They are also an important resource for materials in everyday life like hardwood timber for high-end construction, furniture, fences and floors." The timber quotas are too high and unachievable from our native forests. Already over 80% of timber comes from plantation. Leave our public native forests to be the non-timber assets that they are. The people will not allow our North Coast forests to be damaged by unrealistic quotas, poor forestry management causing lantana infestation and logging dieback and our already threatened and endangered wildlife habitat further reduced. See attachment.

Q22. Attach your supporting documents (Document 1)

[REDACTED]

Q23. Attach your supporting documents (Document 2)

not answered

Q24. Attach your supporting documents (Document 3)

not answered

The NSW government recently announced its intention to change the rules of the Integrated Forestry Operations Approval (IFOA), without any prior community consultation on this important issue. Despite being a member of the National Party, I had not heard about this until one of our local environment groups alerted me. Having taken some time to study these recommendations and attended the information session with the EPA, NRC, DPI & FC, I am seriously alarmed by the proposed weakening of logging regulations which will drastically reduce protections for NSW's threatened species and their habitat, including our iconic koalas, our publicly owned native forests, old growth forests and waterways.

I urgently call for a halt to these irresponsible and frankly reckless changes to regulation. They can only result in the destruction of our public native forests, already severely damaged by poor forest management and failure to rehabilitate, decline of stream flows and reduced water quality and further decimate our wildlife.

Whilst we have been assured that these changes will result in improved protections for wildlife & a more efficient sustainable timber industry, this is deceitful rhetoric. It is patently obvious that the opposite is true. The damage these changes will cause to our public native forests will put an end to any long term future for the logging industry and the damage they will cause to our already endangered wildlife populations will destroy any hope for their future existence... and any hope that future generations will get to enjoy them. This is a 'Smash & Grab' exercise, too high a cost for me or my community to accept.

I call on the committee to :-

- 1. Recognise that the NSW government's brief is unrealistic and unachievable: Instead of efforting to make it look acceptable to those without time to thoroughly scrutinise the massive document, be genuine and clear in your advice to government. It is impossible to balance even current timber quotas with genuine environmental protections of native forest, wildlife or waterways. It certainly is not sustainable harvesting!*
- 2. Recognise that the current timber quotas are unrealistic, as can be seen from past buybacks at very costly taxpayer expense. With no doubt more to come.*
- 3. Recognise that the Regional Forest Agreements in their present form have failed to deliver environmental protection or industry security for the future.*
- 4. Recognise that these ill-considered, reduced regulations aimed at boosting the native forest logging industry, come at the unacceptable cost of species extinction, logging dieback, decline in stream flows and reduced water quality, at the same time destroying any possibility of sustainable forest based jobs.*
- 5. Rule out plans to log areas which were previously protected as habitat for koalas and other threatened species, old growth forests, rainforest areas and stream buffer zones.*
- 6. Rule out the plans to increase logging intensity and legalise clearfell logging along North Coast, NSW.*
- 7. Recognise that the benefits of non-timber forest values to communities are vital for the future of regional economies and ecosystems. Ensure that public forests are managed for the public good (ie: carbon sequestration and storage so essential for future generations, tourism and environmental repair both providing valuable sustainable jobs in the forest, important wildlife habitat, the provision of clean abundant water so essential for life, food production, agriculture and irrigation.)*
- 8. Considering that more than 80% of timber is already harvested from plantations, plan an orderly and just transition away from logging public native forests to 100% plantation. Transfer public native forests to protected areas as RFAs expire.*
- 9. Utilise existing subsidies provided to native forest logging operations to native forest restoration.*
- 10. Establish the recommended Great Koala National Park as an immediate priority, giving koalas and other wildlife a real chance to thrive.*

The North Coast community places great value on our wild places and our environment. It is the main reason why most people chose to move to the Northern Rivers and make this area their home.

Environmental damage will not be tolerated, as was seen in 2014 when the NSW government tried to force the CSG industry in this area. It is worth reminding both our state and federal governments that all seats in this region are very marginal and this is a battle they cannot win. I look forward to hearing of your response to the community's feedback.

Yours Sincerely,

Meg Nielsen



