

Respondent No: 162 Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jun 25, 2018 10:26:51 am **Last Seen:** Jun 25, 2018 10:26:51 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. First name	
Q2. Last name	
Q3. Phone	not answered
Q4. Mobile	not answered
Q5. Email	
Q6. Postcode	
Q7. Country	AU
Q8. Stakeholder type	Environment group
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

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

Q14. Can the EPA make your submission public?

Q15. Have you previously engaged with the EPA on

forestry issues?

Your efforts to make protections of native forest quality weaker, lack of independent research for koalas and other threatened species. Your efforts to turn OUR native forests into monoculture plantations which will not return to a functioning native forest. EPA is considered another arm of Forest Corp but sliding FC off to Land Services will likely be much worse.

Yes

Yes, but anonymous

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?

Your logging rules will not be enforced but will be treated as guidelines. Turning reserves and old growth into timber resources. We do not trust your evaluation of biodiversity and require independent ecologists to justify your conclusions. Allowing gun and bow hunting in flora reserves FFS.Reducing riparian buffers is without any environmental justification, just a way to increase logging yield.Removing the need to even look for koalas and threatened species is environmentally criminal. The red logging zones are disgraceful attempts to clear fell OUR forests and an act of bastardry.

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)?

BS. Time and time again we have shown the FC ("serial offender"-Justice Pepper) and the EPA DO NOT CARE, We show them clear offences and they use every method to avoid prosecution and when they cannot get out of bringing charges FC gets a slap on the wrist. If I trashed protected forest I would get a \$25,000+ fine.FC should be fined that for every tree or protected plant.

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

NO. Because we do not trust you. It is not possible, as you have been told, to do both. The constant propping up of the timber industry with our money is a scandal and the RFA agreement over timber which never existed in the forest resource shows just how biased you are. Even your farcical BMAD Committee was a sham with nothing being done to remediate the damage you have done.

Q21. General comments

The Government is biased towards the timber industry and determined to fund this failed industry, refusing to search for breaches and to prosecute with integrity. It has supported the EPA which should have been replaced years ago. Searches for threatened species will no longer even be given token respect and the whole process is aimed at turning our forests into nil tenure and a biological desert.

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