Respondent No: 22 Login: Anonymous Email: n/a	Responded At: Last Seen: IP Address:	Jun 12, 2018 15:28:57 pm Jun 12, 2018 15:28:57 pm n/a
Q1. First name		
Q2. Last name		
Q3. Phone	not answered	
Q4. Mobile		
Q5. Email		
Q6. Postcode		
Q7. Country	Australia	
Q8. Stakeholder type	Individual	
Q9. Stakeholder type - Other		
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, but anonymous	
Q15. Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?	No	

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

How breaches of the IFOA will be monitored, enforced and what penalties will apply. Currently breaches reported to the EPA have not been investigated on the North Coast and no company or individual has been prosecuted. This proposal gives carte blanche licence to loggers to devastate our natural resources that belong to the people - not to corporations. Leave native forests alone. Are there any penalties for breaches in this new proposal? Who will enforce them? Will anyone be taken to court?

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?

There are no positive environmental outcomes proposed. Intensive harvesting and mass deforestation does not result in positive environmental outcomes. It results in degradation, erosion, loss of top soil, weed invasion. We need forests for the air we breathe, for water and carbon storage. Don't log native forests. Only log in single species plantations. The only positive outcome is for the production of timber which is not sustainable. Only log in single species plantations.

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?

The whole proposal. The push to give loggers unfettered access and harvesting rights in native forests will lead to mass extinctions of species. The draft Coastal IFOA proposes to set minimum thresholds for permanent protections for native plants, animals and their habitat, across the forest landscape. Our unspoiled landscape needs maximum protections enforced, not minimal thresholds. Since settlement 54 known animals have become exctinct, may be more we don't know about. About 37 Australian plant species are thought to be extinct. 41 new species of animals and plants are added to the official list of those edging towards extinction. We have now entrenched our record as the world leader in biodiversity loss. This IFOA proposal will simply accelerate these loses, adding to our shameful world record. Currently more than 1300 flora species and 450 fauna species are threatened. We are not meeting any of our targets for endangered species. The proposed mass deforestation leads to soil erosion and top soil run off into local waterways. Burning timber products will add to global warming. A proactive government department should be leading on the solution to global warming by switching from burning wood products to producing clean energy. An environmental protection agency should be protecting the forest not logging it.

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)?

Aspirations are fine but protections on paper are worthless after the forest has been raped and pillaged. It may have taken hundreds of years to get to the stage it is at now with canopies and hollows and large trees. Once it is logged it cannot be replaced equal for equal. That is a fallacy. The only way to get permanent environmental protections is to stay out of the native forests. Leave them all intact. If no one enforces the environmental protections, then in reality no protections exist.

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

Not one iota. The outcomes listed don't appear to be measurable, which only benefits loggers to the detriment of the environment and biodiversity contained in it. Don't log native forests. Only log single species plantations.

Q21. General comments

Enforce the EPA vision of a healthy environment. A healthy environment cannot be achieved by logging it and destroying all the biodiversity. This plan will not improve environmental and human health. It is simply designed to give loggers access to our native forests, including where I live on the north coast. The forest is simply seen as a dollar resource to be exploited. There is no vision in this proposal to maintain native forests intact for environmental tourism. It is clear this IFOA was written simply to benefit loggers and commercial interests which are at loggerheads with environmental health. The only way to protect our wildlife/biodiversity is not to log any native forests. The koala population on the North Coast has halved over the last twenty years. Logging up to 95% of native forests will remove 95% of their habitat which cannot be replaced. No koala sanctuaries were identified by the coalition government this year in its reserves. Koalas need a lot of habitat to survive and may be in areas currently unmapped. Scientists are discovering medicinal products from wildlife eg the cancer reducing toxin found in the Brazilian wasp. The Australian masked bee holds the key to produce cellophane-like nesting material which may be a biodegradable alternative to plastic.

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