



Respondent No: 583

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jul 13, 2018 16:10:38 pm

Last Seen: Jul 13, 2018 16:10:38 pm

IP Address: n/a

Q1. First name	Nancy
Q2. Last name	Pallin
Q3. Phone	██████████
Q4. Mobile	not answered
Q5. Email	not answered
Q6. Postcode	████
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?	<p>I am alarmed that the draft Coastal IFOA will permit more intensive logging of our remaining publicly owned forests. Increasing the area which is able to be logged in each patch will lead to further degradation of native habitats, leading to increased weed invasion and deterioration by bell minor associated dieback.</p>
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?	not answered

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?

Any further intensification of logging in native forests will have negative outcomes. Reducing the widths of stream buffers and logging the largest of trees will remove further wildlife habitat. Nomadic pollinators such as swift parrots and flying-foxes depend on nectar and pollen from native trees which flower patchily in space and time. Loss of more mature forest will further push flying-foxes to move into urban areas which cause friction with residents.

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)?

Permanent protection for all public native forests would be economically and ecologically beneficial. It is unacceptable that the tax payer has to subsidise native forest logging.

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

No, because it is no longer possible to have a 'sustainable' timber industry in native forests anywhere in publicly owned native forests due to past logging practices. The decline in this industry is proof of this.

Q21. General comments

Instead, timber from native tree species must be sourced from plantations established on private land. existing pine plantations are currently providing enough construction timber. Native forests in the public estate outside national parks must be assessed for their ecological values, including water supplies, koala and flying-fox habitat, community health values etc, then either permanently protected for conservation or active outdoor recreation while maintaining the network of habitat values. Regional economies have benefited far more from national parks due to tourism than from timber extraction.

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
