



**Respondent No:** 5

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** May 23, 2018 21:33:58 pm

**Last Seen:** May 23, 2018 21:33:58 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. <b>First name</b>	Susan
Q2. <b>Last name</b>	Adams
Q3. <b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
Q4. <b>Mobile</b>	[REDACTED]
Q5. <b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
Q6. <b>Postcode</b>	[REDACTED]
Q7. <b>Country</b>	Australia
Q8. <b>Stakeholder type</b>	Individual
Q9. <b>Stakeholder type - Other</b>	not answered
Q10. <b>Stakeholder type - Staff</b>	not answered
Q11. <b>Organisation name</b>	Ms
Q12. <b>What is your preferred method of contact?</b>	Email
Q13. <b>Would you like to receive further information and updates on IFOA and forestry matters?</b>	Yes
Q14. <b>Can the EPA make your submission public?</b>	Yes
Q15. <b>Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?</b>	No

**Q16. What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA are most important to you? Why?**

The suggested weakening of protection for our native plants and animals has no place in a world under threat from climate change. We have a bad record on the loss of species in Australia and the considered changes, to remove the requirements for pre-logging threatened species surveys, simply opens up the sure demise of more loss. Removing restrictions on intensive logging and clear-felling would be utterly irresponsible. Weed invasion and erosion will turn such badly treated land into wastelands and kill wildlife. The levels of extraction of timber from our native forests is unsustainable and needs winding bad, not sustaining and given more permission to destroy one of our nations most precious resources. The current proposals are appalling at many levels and must 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?**

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?**

I am writing to call on the Government to refrain from making destructive changes to the way our native forests are managed. The suggested weakening of protection for our native plants and animals has no place in a world under threat from climate change. We have a bad record on the loss of species in Australia and the considered changes, to remove the requirements for pre-logging threatened species surveys, simply opens up the sure demise of more loss. Removing restrictions on intensive logging and clear-felling would be utterly irresponsible. Weed invasion and erosion will turn such badly treated land into wastelands and kill wildlife. The levels of extraction of timber from our native forests is unsustainable and needs winding bad, not sustaining and given more permission to destroy one of our nations most precious resources.

---

**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)?**

Don't know

---

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

No, see above.

---

**Q21. General comments**

not answered

---

**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

---