



Respondent No: 147

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jun 22, 2018 13:21:04 pm

Last Seen: Jun 22, 2018 13:21:04 pm

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. **First name** [REDACTED]
- Q2. **Last name** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Phone** not answered
- Q4. **Mobile** not answered
- Q5. **Email** not answered
- Q6. **Postcode** [REDACTED]
- Q7. **Country** not answered
- 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?** not answered
- 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?**
not answered
- 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?**
N/A

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 see in your IFOA Conditions paper no strategy of sustainable timber production as explained in the file attached, subject Harvesting Regimes. Negative outcomes are also listed in the attachment.

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)?

I think the EPA is impotent in protecting native forest, ecosystems and landscape at any level except the two dimensional level of paper. See attached file, subject Reporting

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

NO, see attached file

Q21. General comments

not answered

Q22. Attach your supporting documents (Document 1)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Q23. Attach your supporting documents (Document 2)

not answered

Q24. Attach your supporting documents (Document 3)

not answered

Integrated Forestry Operations Approval

Quota's- Allowed volumes of wood that can be cut have doubled compared to previous years, expected negative impacts:

- Sensitive fauna habitat loss
- Long term drying of the state due to reduced forest cover
- Increased forest die-back due to over exploitation of existing forest
- Reduced recreational value of forest and subsequent loss of tourism

Harvesting regimes

- Clear cutting of up to 45ha in intensive harvesting will cause soil degradation, soil erosion, habitat loss, loss of CO₂ to the atmosphere and is generally see as an outdated, destructive and unsophisticated technique
- Selective harvesting where between 10 and 12 m³ of tree basal area is retained can hardly be seen as selective logging but rather more as 'selective retention' of some tree in a clear-cut regime

Species protection

- Not enough species are protected under this proposal
- Koala's and (potential) koala habitat and trees are not sufficiently protected
- Forestry Corporation NSW (FCNSW) get ample opportunity to brush off harm to protected species as 'accidental' felling

Reporting

- There is no independent, third-party control in place to address corruption, breaches of regulations or negligence by either FCNSW, EPA or DPI
- In a number of instances FCNSW can choose to either report to EPA or DPI, resulting most likely in confusions and reducing accountability of all parties
- All reporting is done by FCNSW to either EPA or DPI who only control FCNSW submissions *on paper* without any intention of double checking the actual state of affairs in the field. If, for example, coarse woody material, which is protected and is not allowed to be moved, is burned in a post- harvest burn-off, nobody will ever know
- In this way most species and habitat protection stands and falls by the goodwill of FCNSW without proper checks and balances