



Respondent No: 226

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jun 29, 2018 11:55:05 am

Last Seen: Jun 29, 2018 11:55:05 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. **First name** [REDACTED]

Q2. **Last name** [REDACTED]

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?** No

Q14. **Can the EPA make your submission public?** Yes, but anonymous

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?**

Every part of it seems to reduce the protections for Nature. In particular the reductions of stream buffers, the starting of clearfelling, the remapping of established old growth and rainforest, the reduction in flora and fauna protections.

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?**

I can see no positive outcome s for the environment.

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?

Sustainable timber comes from plantations, very selective logging of native forests is ok but clearfelling is just outrageous!

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)?

They are completely inadequate!

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

No! It is an environmental vandalism. Opening it up to

Q21. General comments

This whole proposition is an utter disgrace. The proposal to decrease stream buffers down to 5m is criminally negligent. Studies have shown that buffers need to be a minimum of 30m to be effective. To willfully jeopardise water supplies downstream like this all for the sake of getting a few more trees is staggeringly stupid. These stream buffers are important corridors for wildlife and a 5m will drastically reduce this function. These streams are homes to many rare crayfish turtles etc who will not cope with the huge increase in sediment running into their homes. The proposal to open up 140,000 ha to clearfelling is also completely unacceptable. There will be carnage to the forest inhabitants. Transitioning 140,000 ha to what will essentially be a blackbutt monoculture will drastically reduce the forests value as habitat for hundreds of species. Koalas do not eat blackbutts, you are essentially turning koala habitat into a place they cannot live. I don't know how any right thinking person could accept that. Hollows take 70+ years to form and are vital for over 100 species survival. There should be at least 20 hollows per ha, these changes will not allow hollows to form. The remapping proposals to reduce the amount of preserved designated old growth and rainforest areas are also an utter disgrace. It is possible to have a sensible logging regime and a rich resilient ecosystem but these proposals seem to want to completely sacrifice the environment which belongs to all NSW citizens for the sake of a few vested interests. History will judge those who allow this to happen VERY harshly.

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
