Respondent No: 254 Login: Anonymous Email: n/a		Responded At: Last Seen: IP Address:	Jul 02, 2018 15:19:59 pm Jul 02, 2018 15:19:59 pm n/a
Q1. First name	Mary		
Q2. Last name	Forbes		
Q3. Phone			
Q4. Mobile	not answered		
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?

All. I'm alarmed that the proposals prioritise timber extraction over environmental protection and fail to meet the commitments of the National Forestry Policy Statement of 1992.

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?

All

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)?

not answered

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

No

Q21. General comments

The Natural Resources Commission has stated "it is not possible to meet the Government's commitments around both environment values and wood supply" let alone taking into account "emerging threats from climate change and changing fire regimes [sic]". They conclude the changes are designed to obtain as much wood in as short a time frame as possible. The expert panel on threatened species has said: "these practices are effectively clearfelling diverse native forest to replace with even-age native plantations in a deliberate manner", that timber extraction is given priority over conservation. Don't you listen to your own people? I am alarmed that a massive 140,000 ha will be turned into stick plantations by virtual clearfelling. I am dismayed that definitions of old growth and rainforest are being manipulated so that more - up to 78%! - of our unique native forests can be trashed. The reduction of stream buffers to a risible 5m will not stop erosion or protect water supply/quality. It is irresponsible to remove specific protections for threatened species. You must mandate prelogging surveys and protect koala high use areas. Hollow-bearing, habitat, mature recruitment habitat and eucalypt food trees must all have protections. Intensive harvesting of 45ha lots, with re-harvesting at 21 years, will turn them into cemeteries for hollow-dependent species: hollows take decades to form. 45ha is a 180- fold increase on the old regulations: this is unacceptable. "Selective" logging is a misleading misnomer, yet this unsustainable practice is set to double in intensity! Unsustainable practices have also caused dieback and you should be mandating rehabilitation. Naturebased tourism is far more lucrative than logging and creates many more jobs. Local and overseas tourists alike come for the biodiversity and beauty of mature, unspoilt forests. Trees are worth more left standing. We need our forests for soil and water quality, biodiversity, climate change mitigation through carbon storage and the creation of moist ecosystems, recreation, health spiritual and cultural values.

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