



Respondent No: 394

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jul 07, 2018 14:36:14 pm

Last Seen: Jul 07, 2018 14:36:14 pm

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. **First name** [REDACTED]
- Q2. **Last name** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Phone** [REDACTED]
- Q4. **Mobile** [REDACTED]
- 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** None
- 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, 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?**
All because they should ALL be abandoned!
- 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 have positive outcomes 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?

All have negative outcomes for the environment

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)?

We need strong permanent environmental protection. Not laws that are constantly watered down & eroded!

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

No. It totally abandons environmental values. See my comments below.

Q21. General comments

I am horrified that the changes have even been suggested. The scale and intensity of this proposed logging is not 'repairable' by simply planting new trees. It will permanently change the face of the land for ALL Australians. I thought that we, as a nation, were beginning to realise that our whole eco system needs to be protected & appreciated. With the knowledge that we have today I cannot understand how such changes can even be considered, let alone adopted!!!! * The new logging law will govern more than two million hectares of public native forest with proposals to permit logging in exclusion zones which are part of the reserve system, and dramatic increases to the scale and intensity of logging. This will change Country, is irreversable and violates the spiritual rights of Indigenous people and degrades the environment for all future generations. * These new logging laws will reduce headwater stream buffers areas around waterways that cannot be logged. They will be reduced from 10 metres to five. These buffers: protect the quality of the water we drink; intercept non-point source pollutants carried by surface water runoff and remove the excess nitrogen, phosphorus and other substances that can pollute water bodies; stabilize stream banks and minimize erosion; decrease the frequency and intensity of flooding and low stream flows; prevent sedimentation of waterways; and through shading, reduce swings in stream temperatures and prevent elevated temperatures harmful to aquatic life; provide food and habitat for wildlife of the land, water and air. The greater the buffer the more effective they are. * The NSW Govt's logging law places several threatened species at direct risk. The proposed "intensive harvesting zone" covers 140,000 hectares of coastal forests between Taree and Grafton. The intensity of logging in "selective" harvesting zones will, on average, double. These forests are in the Forests of East Australia's global biodiversity hotspot and includes the proposed Great Koala National Park. Koalas prefer large trees and mature forests, yet the intensive logging zone will cover almost half of identified high quality koala habitat. Legally, loggers will only have to keep 10 trees of 20cm diameter per hectare – far too few and too small for koalas. The Federal government's conservation advice for the marsupial greater glider clearly states the negative impact of habitat loss and fragmentation through intensive logging. The national recovery plan for the swift parrot proposes the retention of all trees over 60cm diameter – clearly incompatible with the proposed intensive harvesting zone – while the recovery plan for the regent honeyeater identifies all of their breeding and foraging habitat as being critical to their survival. Both birds are priority species under the Australian government's Threatened Species Strategy. * The new logging laws will permit the logging of giant trees up to 140cm in diameter, or 160cm in the case of blackbutt and alpine ash (preferred timber species). Trees absorb CO2, removing and storing the carbon while releasing oxygen back into the air. In one year, an acre of mature trees absorbs the same amount of CO2 produced when a car is driven 30,000 km. In one year an acre of mature trees can provide enough oxygen for 18 people. Cutting down mature trees is in direct conflict with the Federal Govt's initiatives and obligations re climate change agreements and its commitment to combat excess CO2 in the environment. * NSW will effectively be asking the Federal government to agree to changes that directly contradict the Federal Threatened Species Strategy and several species recovery plans. It will also require that the fed govt reduce the extent of the reserve system. It will require a back-down by the federal govt on it's CO2 policy Direct Action Plan re protecting forests. The Federal government has a responsibility to act in the best interests of the people of Australia and my best interest is served by maintaining a strong Federal environmental law arrangement with the states -Regional Forest Agreements (RFAs), an agreement that increases reserve land, protects wildlife habitats, protects old growth forests and mature trees, and increases the headwater stream buffers to 15 metres. I am totally opposed to these changes!

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
