



Respondent No: 441

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: Jul 09, 2018 09:44:06 am

Last Seen: Jul 09, 2018 09:44:06 am

IP Address: n/a

- Q1. **First name** Laura
-
- Q2. **Last name** Noble
-
- Q3. **Phone** not answered
-
- Q4. **Mobile** not answered
-
- Q5. **Email** [REDACTED]
- 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?** 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
- Q15. **Have you previously engaged with the EPA on forestry issues?** Yes
- Q16. **What parts of the draft Coastal IFOA are most important to you? Why?**
re-assessment of old growth forests, buffer water zones, protection of threatened flora and fauna species, habitat and food trees, sawlog volumes, see general comments
- 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?**
None - see general comments

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?

All - see general comments

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)?

The effectiveness does not seem to be controlled. EPA seem inadequate and while the timber industry is supported heavily with taxpayer dollars and the government having an unsustainable sawlog volume quota, thousands of reported regulatory breaches have not been acted on. CAR and ESFM promise has not been met. see general comments

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

NO see general comments

Q21. General comments

When reviewing and rewriting the logging rules for public native forest, Integrated Forestry Operations Approval (IFOA), please focus on sawlog volumes from plantations only and be of the mind set to protect our public forests. The past 20 years has shown that thousands of regulatory breaches have been reported but no action has been taken. The EPA have not investigated first hand what has occurred and the State Government has failed to adequately respond to public concerns over the impacts that the current and proposed changes will have on our native fauna and flora. Please: - STOP logging from old growth and public native forests; - DO NOT lock in to overcommitted Wood Supply Agreements. The time is coming for a Commission Inquiry into the interaction between Governments, EPA, Forestry and sawmillers; - DO NOT Increase the sawlog volumes on the north coast or the logging of old growth forests. - DO NOT Reduce buffer zones on waterwaters; - DO NOT Remove the need for surveys before logging; - DO NOT Remove protections for threatened species and mature habitat trees - DO NOT remover the need to look for and protect koalas and their high use areas. Returning a fragmented logged forest without old growth habitat or food trees which is suffering from dieback and over run with lantana is a sham and a disgrace. The logging industry is not rehabilitating areas, handing them back to the public. Such areas may tick your percentage targets/quotas of areas given back to koalas and other wildlife but it is uninhabitable for fauna survival. A rapid transition out of public native forest logging and into a 100% plantation based timber industry should be the plan. Using millions of dollars of taxes to prop up the timber industry and allowing them to clear old growth native forests is only delaying the development and reliability of timber plantations and destroying the environment, biodiversity, protection of flora and fauna, water quality and effects on climate change. Other adverse effects would be for recreation, tourism and cultural values.

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
