
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 21 August 2012 3:19 PM
To: EHPP Landscapes & Ecosystems Section Mailbox
Subject: Private Native Forestry and Koalas - 2012 Consultation

Mr_ Christian Name Surname,
Office of Environment and Heritage,
Level 12, P.O. Box A210,
SYDNEY SOUTH NSW 1232

21st August 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Native Vegetation Regulation Review

My congratulations to the office for the generation of 2 exceptionally well-prepared consultation documents pertaining to Koalas and Private Native Forestry:

- (1) Review of the Native Vegetation Regulation: Private Native Forestry and Koalas – Discussion Paper
- (2) Draft Private Native Forestry Code of Practice – Northern NSW – 2012.

I am a generalist in ecological matters rather than a specialist in Koalas. However, I hope I am correct in summarising the critical matter at hand in the consultative process is the challenge of optimising hardwood timber plantation yield while not threatening species viability of Koalas (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) in a practical, lawful and sustainable manner.

I have not had more than an “in principle” relationship with Australian wildlife however it seems to me that the codes as presented would not starve koalas to extinction. I would guess that the stipulated number of trees would keep a small family of koalas chubby enough not to be a national embarrassment. My instinctive assessment is not based on a dietary check of koalas but rather by rough comparison with human dietary consumption rates and biomass maintenance.

I presume also that core koala habitat has either taken “*koala corridors*” into account or has devised alternatives based on prior observations in relation to healthy gene pool maintenance requiring local populations to breed with non-local populations (ie. to prevent INCEST and related genetic weaknesses). Private Native Forestry is presumably a supplementary provision to a much more robust plan to protect the species within the context of legislation related to NOT Crown-timber land.

- Of course, it is incumbent on the EPA to be thoroughly confident in relation to the above matters (viz. that sufficient enduring legislation exists for substantive species protection).

On the topic of corridors I am inclined to consider that species protection could perhaps best be afforded by a distinguishment between passive and active corridors:

(1) Passive corridors – A connected band of preferred species food trees (a roads width or greater as migration capability permits) which connects significant areas and their populations which are otherwise separated by human activity, occupation or some other barrier.

(2) Active corridor – Separate populations in separate areas connected by dedicated actions of rangers and volunteers in periodic active transfers.

These could compliment tourist observation sites with wildlife feeding opportunities in which tagging, capture-release programs are conducted.

This arguably would attract greater interest in:

- reproductive genetics and species preservation;
- greater tourism industry potential and
- both family and scholastic togetherness in biodiversity maintenance.

It would also assist humans to cope with proximity and dominion in relation to an animal that is an important Australian icon anywhere.

A full consultation by the EPA in relation to Koalas would of course require an across time (decades) species count including best estimates from:

- National Parks and Wildlife Service NSW
- Zoos
- Sanctuaries
- Native Title holders
- Volunteers for Wildlife Conservation
- Wires
- Australian Koala Foundation
- The Greens
- University Academics - Zoologists and Botanists
- Other key stakeholders

This would mean that the future of the koala would not be subject to good intentions but indeed to good and effective management.

I look forward to affirming news in relation to the facts of successful preservation in terms of population health and numbers.

NB. It is well overdue time for the Australian Bureau of Statistics to have conducted a mini-census to research the species that Australians are willing to give their time and attention to maintain, protect and manage. Although any commitment would be

circumstances dependent, indicative preferences would provide powerful planning information.

Yours truly,

Jo Citizen
SOUTH GRAFTON 2460

(Note: reason for actual name withheld are identical to those of the Office of Environment and Heritage in relation to the consultation documents).