

Respondent No: 544 Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

**Responded At:** Jul 13, 2018 09:07:25 am **Last Seen:** Jul 13, 2018 09:07:25 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. First name	Jim
Q2. Last name	Morrison
Q3. Phone	
Q4. Mobile	
Q5. Email	
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?	
Environmental protection .It is critical to the survival of our biodiversity	

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

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?

Increased logging intensity, reduced buffers on lower order streams, reduced buffers for many endangered fauna, less rigorous pre logging fauna surveys.

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)?

Our forests are sick from decades of exploitation and need full environmental protection ,not a piecemeal approach.

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

No. There is no indication that the NSW native forest logging industry is sustainable or can maintain the full suite of forest values into the future. see general comments

## Q21. General comments

Mr Jim Morrison 7 Spenser St Iluka NSW 2466 To the NSW Environmental Protection Agency Submission on remake of NSW Coastal IFOAs. I am totally opposed to all aspects of the proposed remake of the NSW Coastal Integrated Operations Approvals. The State Government committed there would be no reduction in environmental protection or timber volumes as a result of the remake. This could not be further from the truth given what is being currently proposed. The intensification of harvesting, reduction in protection of lower order streams, reduced buffers and requirements for real fauna surveys obviously reduce environmental protection and accelerate the loss of environmental values .At the same time I understand it is proposed to increase the annual quotas of timber to the industry. The so called consultation process associated with the RFAs and now the IFOA is a sham with predetermined outcomes to satisfy an insatiable timber industry. The overwhelming community opposition expressed in submissions on the recent RFA review indicate the timber industry no longer has a social license to operate in our public forests. The public native forest industry no longer provides significant employment in NSW .Over the past twenty years numerous regional State Forest offices have closed, accompanied by massive staff redundancies. In the forests, harvest crew numbers have been significantly reduced through mechanisation such as harvesting machines. The proposed increase in timber allocations at the expense of good environmental management will benefit a few large corporations at the expense of small millers. The NSW Plantation sector currently supports the overwhelming number of jobs in the industry as well as large economic returns to NSW. There should be a rapid transition out of public native forest logging and greater support given to the plantation sector. In a time of increasing threats to our biodiversity, with new inclusions to the threatened species list continually being added to already more than one thousand threatened plant and animal species in NSW, protection for Threatened species should be increased, not relaxed as is apparent in the proposed remake. I understand that a massive reduction in stream buffering for sensitive first and second order streams (from 10 down to five metres) is proposed. This will increase sedimentation entering our creeks and rivers impaction negatively on aquatic habitats . The increased logging intensity proposed will only serve to further reduce stream flow from forested catchments managed by Forest corp. and reduce water quality. While voluntary Landcare groups work to restore riparian habitats any benefits of their work is compromised by logging activities in upper catchments. Many of the Upper North East forests are severely impacted by Bell Miner Associated Dieback which require restoration not further logging disturbance. The recent independent causal review of BMAD ( Silver and Carnegie, 2017) clearly identifies canopy disturbance (ie logging) as the primary causal factor in the development of BMAD. This latest research was not included in the RFA reviews and has not been given due consideration in the IFOA remake. There are more than 100,000 hectares of BMAD impacted forests in the Upper North East. The forests in the Border Ranges and Richmond range are particularly badly impacted as a legacy of unmitigated and unsustainable logging practices, making a lie of any claims that Ecologically Sustainable Forest Management has been practiced over the past twenty years. Forest corps 'adaptive management trials' at Donaldson and Mt Lindsay State Forests have failed to demonstrate that Forest Corp is capable of managing post logging BMAD development. Global warming due to increasing carbon dioxide emissions is the greatest overarching long term threat to our environment. The impacts of climate change are best mitigated through proper management of our public forests through conservation management not further unsustainable exploitation for timber. I am not proposing that our State Forests should be locked up as unmanaged reserves. Rather their ecological restoration and ongoing active management for non timber values should be adequately funded. Proposals such as the Great Koala National Park will provide meaningful employment opportunities and economic returns in tourism, carbon storage and improved water quality and quantity. I fully support all the points made in the submissions to you by the North East Forest Alliance, the NSW National Parks Association and NSW Nature Conservation Council Yours Sincerely Jim Morrison.

## Q22. Attach your supporting documents (Document

not answered

1)

Q23. Attach your supporting documents (Document

not answered

3