



Respondent No: 97

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jun 20, 2018 14:47:53 pm

Last Seen: Jun 20, 2018 14:47:53 pm

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. **First name** [REDACTED]
- Q2. **Last name** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Phone** not answered
- 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?

A report on the proposals from the Threatened Species Expert Panel reveals that almost no data was available to design the new environmental protections which the new draft Coastal IFOA aims to implement, and there was great uncertainty as to whether they will work. One panel member commented: "The intensive harvesting zones are being formally introduced to prop up an unsustainable wood supply arrangement at the expense of the environment. It is frustrating trying to be part of the solution when the underlying driver of the wood supply agreements fundamentally restricts any chance of a balanced approach." This is frustrating because the government is using a reshuffle/renaming/amalgamation of the coastal IFOAs, whatever you want to call it to push through unsustainable and environmentally damaging practices to meet industry quotas they cannot meet under the current legislation.

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, The government cannot meet wood supply and maintain environmental values with sustainable timber production. This was reported in the NSW Natural Resources Commission. Making up the lack of timber promised should not mean the government decides to amalgamate the 4 coastal IFOAs into one, just so they can open up exclusion zones to meet the targets the industry demands at the expense of 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?

Logging in declared exclusion zones, these are not supposed to be touched and are apart of reserves. If these reserves can be touched then there will be nothing left in the reserves. This will also go against and undermine the Federal threatened species strategy and the 1992 National Forestry Policy Statement. The impact on streams and waterways - decreasing the zone from 10m to 5 m, this will have a greater impact on the streams, rivers and waterways. The logging of giant trees up to 140-160cm in diameter will also have a negative effect on threatened species. In northeast NSW, a new "intensive harvesting zone" will cover 140,000 hectares of coastal forests between Taree and Grafton. These forests are in the Forests of East Australia global biodiversity hotspot and many are included in a proposed Great Koala National Park. These should not be opened up to meet the quota.

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)?

I think it's useless when the government can amalgamate IFOAs to suit them so they can create new "protections". The new proposals move towards a retention model where habitat features are to be retained in clumps over several logging cycles. This "retention approach" is good in theory, but is undermined by the landscape-wide intensification of logging – particularly in the intensive zone – and the need to maximise timber production, not the conservation of forest species. Although hollow-bearing trees are to be retained, no younger trees – which will eventually replace their elders – are required to be protected. This means the inevitable loss of hollow-bearing trees, exacerbated by logging rezoned old-growth. There is no longer any requirement to protect eucalypt nectar trees, vital resources for the critically endangered regent honeyeater and swift parrot.

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

No I don't think it will be as the government has promised the industry something which cannot be fulfilled without damaging environmental values - risking damage and having a negative impact on the environment and ecosystem. So the government wants to repackage the IFOAs to deliver new legislation to help them meet the industry target they promised at the expense of the environment and several pieces of federal legislation. The commission recommended the NSW government "re-map and rezone" old-growth forest and rainforest to increase the area that can be logged and make up timber shortfalls....this is not effective environmental management nor is it a "Sustainable" timber industry.

Q21. General comments

I think it is ridiculous that there are three kinds of zones that make up protected forest reserves. The first zone requires an act of state parliament to revoke, but the second and third can be revoked by the state forestry minister....the state forestry minister by the way has a background in teaching and as an LGA councillor. I do not see how he is in anyway educated to make such decisions. refer to the conversation article for more information. <https://theconversation.com/proposed-nsw-logging-laws-value-timber-over-environmental-protection-97863>

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
