



**Respondent No:** 310

**Login:** Anonymous

**Email:** n/a

**Responded At:** Jul 05, 2018 09:39:47 am

**Last Seen:** Jul 05, 2018 09:39:47 am

**IP Address:** n/a

Q1. <b>First name</b>	Elisabeth
Q2. <b>Last name</b>	Mortimer
Q3. <b>Phone</b>	[REDACTED]
Q4. <b>Mobile</b>	not answered
Q5. <b>Email</b>	[REDACTED]
Q6. <b>Postcode</b>	[REDACTED]
Q7. <b>Country</b>	Australia
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>	Ms
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>	No

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

It is all important as my concern is that our unique bushland and its marvellous diversity is conserved for its precious gifts to humanity now and for future generations.

**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 think these proposals have only negative outcomes for the environment and the timber industry alike. The Natural Resources Commission has stated "it is not possible to meet the Government's commitments around both environment values and wood supply" let alone taking into account "emerging threats from climate change and changing fire regimes".

---

**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 draft puts up proposals that will have negative impacts if implemented. For example, increasing areas of clearfelling from .25ha to 50ha will be catastrophic for flora and fauna. With re-cuts every 21 years, how are hollow-dependent species to survive? Hollows take decades to form. Slow-germinating plants will be annihilated. Allowing such logging intensity will quickly use up our entire native timber resource; therefore jobs in the industry will be dead-end. We already supply our timber needs with 86% plantation. A transition to 100% would benefit the environment and secure workers' jobs. All that compensation the Government pays to Boral under the disastrous RFAs would be better spent on a just transition for workers and forest rehabilitation from the destruction you have enabled.

---

**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)?**

Sham.

---

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

It would be completely catastrophic for reasons stated above and in 'Comments' . I comprehensively oppose the draft Coastal IFOA.

---

**Q21. General comments**

I am alarmed that a massive 140,000 ha will be turned into stick plantations by virtual clearfelling. I am dismayed that definitions of old growth and rainforest are being manipulated so that more - up to 78%! - of our unique native forests can be trashed. The reduction of stream buffers to a ridiculously inadequate 5m will not stop erosion or protect water supply/quality. These changes will result in annihilation of habitat. The expert panel on threatened species has said: "these practices are effectively clearfelling diverse native forest to replace with even-age native plantations in a deliberate manner", that timber extraction is given priority over conservation. It is irresponsible to remove specific protections for threatened species. You must mandate pre-logging surveys and protect koala high use areas. Hollow-bearing, habitat, mature recruitment habitat and eucalypt food trees must all have protections. These proposals will be the nail in the coffin of the koala, whose population has decreased by 50% in the last 20 years in northern NSW. "Selective" logging is a misleading misnomer, yet this unsustainable practice is set to double in intensity! Unsustainable practices have also caused dieback and you should be mandating rehabilitation. Nature-based tourism is far more lucrative than logging and creates many more jobs. Local and overseas tourists alike come for the biodiversity and beauty of mature, unspoilt forests. Trees are worth more left standing. We need our forests for soil and water quality, biodiversity, climate change mitigation through carbon storage and the creation of moist ecosystems, recreation, health spiritual and cultural values. Public native forests belong to the public. You have no right to destroy our natural heritage. Worse still, you have no right to make us pay for it.

---

**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

---