

### Extending Regional Forest Agreements

The questionnaire online of poor design and will provide very little if any useful data to inform better forest management.

The original forest agreements were written after several years of scientific survey and analysis at a cost of tens of millions of dollars. To consider this process a review without conducting a similar assessment is criminal. The baseline data from plots in most state forests is all there so the effectiveness of the current reserve system and the sustainability of forest use can be compared. If this not done then it is NOT a review. There is overwhelming evidence (NSW Save Our Species data) that the number of threatened species has increased dramatically since the original forest agreements were signed. Clearly the process has failed so must be discarded and a new approach developed and implemented.

Species which depend on hollow bearing trees, appropriate fire regimes and healthy forests and water particularly in Bell Miner Associated Dieback (BMAD) effected forests are under the greatest threat from current forestry practices.

There needs to be better compliance of existing laws. There needs to be an easier path to third party enforcement rights if the government will not enforce the rule of law in the forests. Simply closing a forest is just hiding the crime and making criminals of those trying to uphold the law. Forests belong to the community and provide ecosystem services such as drinking water. They are not disposable assets for shareholders of foreign corporations.

The proposed steep slope harvesting is a backwards step and will only damage catchments even more.