



Respondent No: 4

Login: Anonymous

Email: n/a

Responded At: May 21, 2018 09:45:07 am

Last Seen: May 21, 2018 09:45:07 am

IP Address: n/a

Q1. First name	████
Q2. Last name	████
Q3. Phone	not answered
Q4. Mobile	████████
Q5. Email	████████████████████
Q6. Postcode	████
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?	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?	<p>Ensuring there is no reduction of available area and conditions within available area for timber harvesting. Forestry Corporation is already heavily regulated with a number of exclusion zones where harvesting is not permitted. Furthermore even within areas available for harvest, threatened plants and animals are protected in a number of ways which is adequate to ensure long term survival of these species.</p>

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?

Clumping is an excellent outcome which is of benefit both to the harvesting operation to allow extraction of timber to be simplified and threatened species to have an undisturbed area away from harvesting. Clumping should not be required however if there are nearby exclusions zones adjacent the harvest area as there is already an undisturbed area of refuge.

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?

Flora exclusions should not be present around threatened flora species which are disturbance based species where it can be shown that harvesting and roading increases the abundance of the species. There should be a reduction of exclusion zones for koalas as regrowth forests increase the abundance of Koala numbers. The EPA unit needs to change its methodology of investigation to working with Forestry Corporation in its operations rather than being against it by only being involved when a potential breach has occurred and not suggesting any way to improve Forestry Corporations best practice.

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)?

Its is a new way to view and manage State Forests however the limits of intensive harvesting should be increased to allow the removal of poor form trees to allow future commercially valuable trees in their place. Low basal area removal with increase the proportion of this problem in State Forests.

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

Yes with modifications made as suggested above. It give industry certainty for the time ahead while not degrading environmental values.

Q21. General comments

Thank you for the opportunity to comment

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
