



**Respondent No:** 554

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** Jul 13, 2018 11:57:02 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 13, 2018 11:57:02 am

**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. <b>First name</b>	william
Q2. <b>Last name</b>	Braines
Q3. <b>Phone</b>	not answered
Q4. <b>Mobile</b>	██████████
Q5. <b>Email</b>	████████████████████
Q6. <b>Postcode</b>	████
Q7. <b>Country</b>	not answered
Q8. <b>Stakeholder type</b>	Individual
Q9. <b>Stakeholder type - Other</b>	not answered
Q10. <b>Stakeholder type - Staff</b>	not answered
Q11. <b>Organisation name</b>	not answered
Q12. <b>What is your preferred method of contact?</b>	Email
Q13. <b>Would you like to receive further information and updates on IFOA and forestry matters?</b>	Yes
Q14. <b>Can the EPA make your submission public?</b>	Yes
Q15. <b>Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?</b>	Yes

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

The monitoring of protection areas ,harvest areas habitat trees etc, and made available by technology is a plus.Because it give the community a chance to watch forestry operations. However Forestry approve their own harvest plans and are in the habit of leaving off previously protected habitat zones.As no one is watching for this ,these harvest plans should be checked by the EPA as was done at the start of the RFA but somehow changed.There exists a 20 year rule whereby they don,t have to include these zones.!!! This sort of thing has to change as it defeats the purpose of habitat zones.

**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?**

I feel that this new IFOA hasn't changed much from the old one, Forestry will continue to breach these rules, without any tangible penalties. It will have no bearing on sustainable timber production as this lies with forest management and the way they maintain the loggable areas ie with suitable silviculture that should have commenced many years ago.

---

**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?**

Forestry are breaching the rules of the IFOA and have done since the start of the RFA. The reason being, there unrealistic logging quotas and need to show their industry is viable. They need to justify the many millions of Tax payers dollars that have been poured into their industry. Hasn't anyone noticed the jobs are gone along with the mills after being propped up with millions of tax dollars. Sustainable industry, what a joke, how much longer will this mismanagement continue. What has happened to the 5 yearly reviews that were supposed to monitor the progress, or not, of the RFA.

---

**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 feel that this is all well and good, but it is only any good if it is closely monitored along with all the other aspects of the IFOA. To date this has been reliant on community complaint. But the EPA has to take a more active role in breaches and greater penalties. The community, alas, have only the EPA as an avenue of justice against forestry's total control and abuses, but we have become skeptical of the EPA's operational capabilities.

---

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

Presently, the native timber industry is not sustainable, and because of this there is a great need of the IFOA due to their desperation for more decent timber, hence the continual and increased breaches. I can't understand why changing the existing IFOA and cost there in, will make such a difference in sustainability.

---

**Q21. General comments**

You have to go back to the start of the RFA to find the route of the problems we have in the industry today. The experts got it so wrong back then after some 8000 submissions over two rounds in 2000. With unrealistic projections and goals along with millions of tax payers dollars in hand outs to mills, employment, purchasing private land, silvicultural programs, the list goes on with no idea of how much was spent. It is no wonder the industry is struggling to show viability and justify these unrealistic outcomes, in log production and quotas. The mill owners have seen the writing on the wall and taken the hand outs and closed down. In addition the government gave 33 million toward national parks.

---

**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

---