



**Respondent No:** 148

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** Jun 22, 2018 13:29:44 pm

**Last Seen:** Jun 22, 2018 13:29:44 pm

**IP Address:** n/a

- Q1. **First name** [REDACTED]
- Q2. **Last name** [REDACTED]
- Q3. **Phone** not answered
- Q4. **Mobile** not answered
- Q5. **Email** [REDACTED]
- Q6. **Postcode** [REDACTED]
- 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?** No
- 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?**  

I would like to see the conservation of iconic Australian flora and fauna. As such, the environmental degradation and habitat loss that impact animals such as koalas, honey eaters, swift parrot, greater gliders, etc. is of concern to me.
- 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?**  
not answered

**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?**

not answered

---

**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?**

you should consult the federal framework towards priority species conservation

---

**Q21. General comments**

I have major concerns about the seriousness of the environmental protections. Why doesn't the NSW proposal align with federal outlines for species conservation? Retaining old, hollow trees is great for nesting, but if the animals just starve because everything else has been cut down...isn't that worse than just killing them outright? This seems to me, another example of government working for the benefit of business. The "protections" listed come across as lip service and nothing else.

---

**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

---