

Wood Utilisation Plan Submission

for the

East Gippsland Forest Management Area Logging Years 2004/5-2006/7

**Prepared by the
Victorian Rainforest Network
29/2/2004**

Table of Contents

Issues:

- 1. FFG Action Statement.**
- 2. Forest Code of Practice**
- 3. Rainforest Sites of Significance**
- 4. Management boundary alterations**
- 5. SMZ Plans**
- 6. Systematic Monitoring & Evaluation**
- 7. Consultation process**

1.0 FFG Action Statement

The FFG Action Statement for rainforests represents the most important planning instrument for rainforest conservation and management within the existing policy and legislative framework. After 12 years, the release of the long awaited FFG Action Statement is imminent. This planning instrument is likely to alter the exiting interim minimum rainforest management strategies and zoning boundaries. Logging within RSOS areas *before* this critical planning instrument is released will result in logging operations pre-empting the planning review process.

The release of this action statement will require a review of existing rainforest management guidelines and zoning arrangements. A precautionary approach is warranted when a high degree of scientific uncertainty exists in relation to the effectiveness of existing rainforest conservation strategies. The risks posed by logging operations are proportional to the significance of particular rainforest stands. This entails that the most significant rainforest stands should be afforded greater caution in planning, especially when a major planning instrument is set to refine current guidelines and zone boundaries.

The VRN calls on the EG senior forester to defer logging in all RSOS to allow for the release, review and implementation of the long awaited FFG Action Statement. This would ensure the DSE is seen to be following due process, and not preempting a revision of the planning rules, now long overdue. Deferring logging in RSOS areas in order to implement a new planning instrument (i.e. the FFG Action Statement), would facilitate a more objective, transparent and systematic approach to rainforest conservation than currently exists. The EG FMP allows for:

“the provision to progressively refine management guidelines and the zoning scheme in response to new information. This is essential to ensure that native forest management is based on the best available information and is abreast of developments in natural resource management” (CNR, 1995: p.78).

Deferring logging operations to permit a reevaluation of strategies currently shrouded by scientific uncertainty, would ensure forest managers comply with the requirement to ensure plans are based on the best available information, as well as keeping mangers abreast of developments in the area of rainforest conservation and management.

Questions:

- When will the FFG Action be released?
- After over 12 years, why has the FFG Action Statement still not been released?

2.0 Code of Forest Practice

The Code of Forest Practice for Timber Production (CFP) outlines a number of goals, minimum prescriptions and guidelines to protect rainforest values.

Section 2.3.7 of the CFP specifies that:

“The most important rainforest areas should be accorded highest protection” (DNRE, 1996: p. 23). It also sets out minimum buffer widths that the EG FMP is statutorily bound to follow to protect significant areas of rainforest. The relevant sections of the CFP (1996: p.23) are:

s2.3.7(i) for stands of lesser significance- 40m buffers, or 20m exclusion plus a 40m modified harvesting strip.

s2.3.7(iii) For stands containing nationally significant rainforest- the highest degree of protection, generally subcatchment level, except where full protection can be provided by other measures, which are/will be outlined in approved plans.

The EGFMP sets out only 20m minimum buffers, in breach of the minimums set out by the COFP s2.3.7(i). VRN requests that all those coupes containing rainforest (**see Appendix 1**) be deferred pending independent field inspections, to ensue rainforest buffers are adequately marked. VRN intends to continue undertaking systematic code compliance surveys in the region to support the EPA auditing process.

At present, the EPA does not audit compliance to s.2.3.7(iii) of the CFP. This considerably weakens public confidence in the adequacy of existing rainforest protection strategies and prescriptions. In light of the relatively low level of rainforest compliance in the EG FMA identified by the EPA, it is not unreasonable to request that the department act with openness, transparency and accountability in providing evidence of compliance to the CFP s2.3.7(iii). Unless this is done, the community cannot be assured that the entire rainforest protection regime is working adequately to protect the full-suite of rainforest values.

The CFP also requires that “rainforest areas must be shown on the Forest Coupe Plan and buffers identified in the field” (DNRE, 1996: p. 24)

Questions:

- What is the minimum rainforest buffer which is applied in the field? For how long has this buffer been systematically applied?
- How does the DSE measure or quantify “full protection” of nationally significant rainforest stands?

- What kind of monitoring mechanisms are in place to determine the effectiveness of rainforest *planning* strategies, prescriptions and guidelines required by the code? If existent, for how long have these monitoring mechanisms been in use?
- Are training schedules available that record the date, place, trainer, and number of staff attendees involved in rainforest identification training?

3.0 Rainforest Sites of Significance

The Rainforest Sites of Significance (RSOS) objectively and systematically defined by Cameron and subsequently reviewed by Peel, outline the most significant rainforest areas across Victoria. As recommended by (Burgman & Ferguson 1995: 65)

“core areas within RSOS should be the focus of management planning because they represent judgements for the management of risks faced by rainforest, taking into account site topography, proposed management operations, disturbance history and susceptibility of rainforest values to operations”

The Victorian Rainforest Network has identified approximately 58 coupes proposed for logging inside RSOS (**see appendix 2**). The VRN requests that logging be deferred in these RSOS areas in order to permit an independent rainforest risk assessment and evaluation of current rainforest protection measures and strategies as recommended by Burgman and Ferguson (1995: p. 65).

To facilitate this rainforest risk assessment, the VRN formally requests the release of the rainforest Priority Zone maps and accompanying documentation for each RSOS. Please include the following layers with the Priority Zoning maps:

- Logging history,
- Proposed coupe boundaries
- Topography & streams
- Growth Stage & Relative age (SFRI)
- Eucalypt Species & Stand Height (SFRI)
- Rainforest (Rfor_gbc.shp or similar),
- Management zones (Fmz_f.shp or similar)
- Point localities of rare, threatened and/or endangered flora and fauna taxa (VROT's data-Wildlife Atlas and FIS).

Similar custom maps at 1:25000 scale have already been provided to the VRN in the Central Highlands, and have been very helpful in resolving rainforest

issues in a professional and non-confrontational manner. We respectfully request similar maps be generated and released for our review and comment to facilitate a more transparent and accountable rainforest management and planning process in East Gippsland. This would be in accordance with several recommendations made by the Burgman & Ferguson report, namely:

- ensure “full documentation of values and reasoning so that the process is transparent, thereby facilitating its use in forest planning and making it available for public scrutiny” (Burgman & Ferguson 1995: 55).
- “publish all maps of core areas and details of their rainforest values, together with rationalizations of protection prescriptions, in Forest Management Area plans where they may be subjected to public scrutiny” (Burgman & Ferguson 1995: p65).
- “implement specific procedures for supervision of compliance and independent monitoring of rainforest protection measures in all Forest Management Areas” (Burgman & Ferguson 1995: p65).

The EG FMP also acknowledges the importance of publishing critical planning information by stating that:

“Reports will be published that document Sites of Significance for Rainforest, core areas within these sites and the process used for deciding the management of each site” (CNR, 1995: p.19).

It is imperative that this formal management action be met to ensure proposed logging operations comply fully with FMP requirements. After 9 years, it would be reasonable to presume that such reports would have been completed, published and subject to peer review.

Similarly, the EG RFA makes direct reference to an “NRE Technical Report to be published by the end of 1997” which fully explains the system (COA, 1997: p.13). The EG RFA specifically states that:

“the [technical] report will include a description of Sites of Significance for Rainforest and their levels of significance (National, State, Regional) and how these are managed. The report will also detail how core zones, which contain the major rainforest stands, have been identified within each site of significance and how they contributed to the design of the SPZ in the Forest Management Plan” (EGRFA, 1997: p.13).

The Bill Peel report only partially meets the EGRFA commitments made above, by outlining the levels of significance of each site in an appendix. Regrettably, the Peel report does not provide a detailed description of each site, the core zones each site contains or the management process involved in the design of the SPZs. Despite the Victorian RFA Annual Report of 2000 claiming this RFA milestone has been met and been accepted by the Commonwealth, existing

reports and plans do not ensure full compliance with RFA Clause 64. Recently, this important issue was raised with the Ministers Office, and a briefing report was requested for their full consideration.

Releasing the requested rainforest planning documents and maps would help the DSE being seen to comply with the Brack's government's policy of open, transparent and accountable governance.

As an interim measure, it is requested that logging be deferred in all RSOS until such maps are released and a reasonable amount of time given to permit a thorough independent analysis of the proposed logging operations. The purpose of this independent review would be to ensure the designated protection measures and strategies take into account the conservation importance of rainforest stands, and the severity and proximity of proposed impacts. Again, this would help ensure the DSE is acting in accordance with the best available scientific advice and recommendations for rainforest protection. Logging within RSOS areas *before* this critical assessment is carried out will result in logging operations pre-empting the necessary FFG review process.

Burgman and Ferguson (1995: 57) also recommended that Rainforest Sites of Significance be fully documented in the FMP. The EG FMP does not fully document rainforest planning processes or outcomes. The VRN requests that such documentation be prepared and/or released as soon as possible to ensure compliance with expert recommendations.

Failing to implement the key recommendations from the Burgman and Ferguson review and/or implement the Forest Management Plan and RFA requirements, places the DSE out of step with scientific best practice and community expectations. The VRN does however concede that past budgetary and political constraints have made it difficult for the DSE to implement key rainforest recommendations. In lieu of this, the VRN is prepared to lobby government to help ensure the resources are found to improve DSE compliance with expert recommendations.

Questions:

- Can the VRN obtain the rainforest RSOS, priority zoning maps and the other layers listed in the above section (preferably in ArcView Shape file format)?
- What are the *landscape* level rainforest protection prescriptions for the EG FMA?
- How many coupes in Rainforest Sites of Significance have been logged since the introduction of the EG FMP? (please provide each individual coupe number, area (ha), zoning status, and year logged).
- Why has the proposed WUP actually increased the level of logging activity inside RSOS as compared to previous years?

4.0 Management boundary alterations

VRN undertook a longitudinal overlay analysis of the proposed WUP with previous WUPs. This desktop study indicated numerous management boundary alterations inside RSOS (**see Appendix 3**). The EG RFA and FMP both outline guidelines for reviewing management strategies and zones. According to the EG FMP:

“Each year an up-to-date zoning map and a list of any proposed zone amendments will be made available for public viewing and comment. Following consideration of comments received and relevant specialist advice, approval will be sort from the Secretary of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for adoption of the revised zones” (CNR, 1995: p.79).

The EGFMP goes on to note that:

“Each year the senior forester will:...consider new information, and if necessary, make recommendations on possible refinements or amendments to management strategies or the zoning scheme”. (CNR, 1995: p.78)

The Vic Rainforest Network would like to inspect the senior foresters recommendations on possible refinements or amendments to management strategies and the zoning scheme since the adoption of the EG FMP. In addition, VRN would like to receive the latest zoning map and the accompanying list of proposed zone amendments for public viewing and comment.

Question:

- Are the management boundary alterations listed in Appendix 2 of this submission fully documented, involved specialist advice, and been approved by the Departmental Secretary in accordance with FMP guidelines?

5.0 SMZ Plans

Six coupes with significant rainforest values are currently proposed for logging inside designated SMZs (**see Appendix 4**). VRN wishes to review and comment on these plans, to ensure rainforest values are not compromised by proposed logging operations. According to the EG FMP (1995: p.11), “management arrangements for areas in the SMZ will be determined on a case by case basis according to the values present”. The FMP goes on to note that “each area identified for conservation of other values will have a special plan prepared detailing where, and under what conditions, timber harvesting may occur” (CNR, 1995: p.11)

The FMP requires that for “each year the senior forester will...prepare detailed plans for harvesting of approved coupes in the Special Management Zone” (CNR, 1995: p. 78). The FMP also stipulates that “within SMZ areas available for timber harvesting the aim will be to integrate harvesting and wildlife conservation *within the zone*”. VRN wishes to independently assess these special plans, to help foster public scrutiny of the detailed planning process and ascertain whether this critical management aim is being met. To facilitate this public review process, VRN requests the timely provision of all SMZ plans for those RSOS areas logged since the adoption of the EG FMP. In particular, VRN would like to inspect the monitoring-related documents which pertain to the SMZ planning process (directly or indirectly).

Questions:

- Which RSOS within a SMZ have been logged since the adoption of the EG FMP?
- What documentation supports the SMZ planning process (e.g. summaries of departmental file sources providing input into the rainforest special plans)?

6.0 Monitoring and research

The EG RFA acknowledges the need for “*continuous improvement*” in the ESFM system in order for it to be considered an accredited sustainable management process. Continuous improvement, in-turn, requires three on-going and interconnected processes, namely;

6.1 Monitoring-

Ongoing monitoring of rainforest indicators is the critical foundation from which management and planning outcomes are scientifically benchmarked and accredited. There is an urgent need for the implementation of a systematic long-term monitoring program, as formally recommended by Burgman and Ferguson (1995: p.60). Without such a monitoring program, the ESFM cannot be benchmarked, and thereby qualify as an accredited rainforest management system

Regular monitoring, research and evaluations are necessary to ensure the performance and management accountability of forest managers. Clause 37 of the EG RFA concurs with this position by stating that:

“Parties agree that the current management system could be enhanced by further developing appropriate mechanisms to monitor and review the sustainability of forest management practices.” (COA, 1997; Clause 37, p.5)

The EG FMP itself acknowledges the importance of ongoing monitoring, research and evaluation in ensuring continuous improvement of planning and management operations, when stating:

“The senior forester for the FMA will be responsible for....monitoring and reporting to assess the effectiveness of the Plan and its implementation” (CNR, 1995: p.78).

The SMZ areas in particular, have special monitoring requirements to ensure significant values are retained within the zone. The EG FMP asserts that:

“Special plans will be prepared for each SMZ where harvesting is to be permitted. Harvested areas will be monitored for persistence of the featured species, survival of retained and the effects of retained trees on forest growth” (CNR, 1995: p.34).

The Burgman and Ferguson review placed considerable emphasis on the need to improve rainforest monitoring, research and evaluation standards. Burgman & Ferguson noted that forest managers ought to:

“implement specific procedures for supervision of compliance and independent monitoring of rainforest protection measures in all Forest Management Areas” (Burgman & Ferguson 1995: p65).

6.2 Research

Eleven specific research proposals were put forward, rated by importance (Burgman & Ferguson, 1995: p.xii). These proposals represent the best available expert advice on determining the effectiveness of rainforest protection strategies, prescriptions and guidelines. Burgman and Ferguson's key research recommendations sought to address major knowledge gaps in relation to rainforest management and planning effectiveness. The two most highly rated research proposals put forward by Burgman and Ferguson to address the most glaring research gaps were:

- “initiate a retrospective study of fire, topography, forest type and harvesting history in relation to rainforest stands” p.68
- “implement survey and monitoring programs for biotic and abiotic edge effects on rainforest” p.72

The implementation of these two recommendations is necessary to ensure a credible, scientifically grounded, rainforest planning and management process. The adoption of a transparent rainforest planning and management processes is essential to scientifically ascertain the effectiveness of existing reserves in protecting Rainforest SOS from probabilistic catastrophic events.

As explained by Bergman and Ferguson (1995: p.67), “until such data are acquired, it is incumbent on planners to treat rainforest threats cautiously, and to implement protection measures that will cope with the potential for long term and landscape scale impacts”. They go on to note that “rainforest must be afforded the benefit of the doubt in areas where the values are unique or irreplaceable, and where there is uncertainty about the impacts that may result from management” (Bergman and Ferguson, 1995: p.67). Assuming little or no research and monitoring activity is currently undertaken by the DSE in East Gippsland, it is plausible to conclude that considerable risk and uncertainty exists in relation to current rainforest management and planning proposals. Hence a more cautious management regime is warranted which does not preempt the recommendations of planning instruments, nor the results of critical monitoring and research programs.

6.3 Evaluation- An adaptive and scientifically accredited forest management system requires an ongoing quality assurance program. The EG RFA Clause 30 sets out a five yearly review period, permitting an evaluation on the performance and progress of the EG RFA (COA, 1997: Clause 30). This review along with the “on going quality assurance program, are the pivotal evaluation mechanisms for the FMP and associated planning instruments.

The EG RFA acknowledges the importance of external evaluation as part of an accredited continuous improvement ESFM system. Clause 29, of the EG RFA states:

“Victoria will further develop the transparency and accountability of its forest management processes through the implementation of an ongoing quality assurance program. The program will be implemented in 3 years, utilizing expertise external to the forest agency in the Department of Natural Resources and Environment or its equivalent” (COA, 1997: p.4).

and that,

“Victoria and the Commonwealth [are] to develop sustainability indicators” (COA, 1998: Clause 40p. 26)

It is imperative that these clauses and management actions be met, and that they specifically address rainforest management issues to ensure public confidence in the overall forest planning and management process. The WUP cannot be drafted in accordance with the RFA and/or the FMP, if important actions required by these policy and planning instruments are not first met. Finally, it must be emphasized that reviews are an important aspect of performance evaluation and ongoing management accreditation, and extensive public input must be sought.

Questions:

- The VRN formally asks what rainforest-related research projects, if any, are currently underway?
- How many of the Burgman and Ferguson high-priority rainforest research recommendations have been adopted?
- The VRN formally requests what monitoring and reporting actions are currently being carried out by the DSE
- What is the methodology for the “ongoing quality assurance program” currently used? How does this quality assurance program assess the effectiveness of rainforest protection strategies?
- Is the quality assurance program open to public scrutiny? If so, how? If not why?
- Has the required 5 yearly RFA review been conducted and public comment sought in accordance with FMP and RFA performance evaluation provisions?

7.0 Consultation process

VRN would like to take the opportunity to formally note its concerns with the WUP consultation process as a mechanism for public participation in forest planning and management decision making..

WUP limitations

- 7.1 **Data availability**, - preparation of a thorough WUP submission requires ready access to numerous data-sets to permit a GIS desktop analysis of proposed logging operations. At present, much of the spatial data available is not easily accessible to the community, and effectively inhibits the creation of detailed and comprehensive submissions. A ‘level information playing field’ would greatly enhance public participation processes, fostering a more open, transparent and accountable planning and management system.
- 7.2 **Format**, -The WUP should be available in a GIS format to enhance public involvement in the WUP consultation phase and beyond.
- 7.3 **The 28 day deadline**- For state-wide groups such as VRN, the 1 month consultation period is grossly inadequate. Due to the sheer number of coupes scheduled across a number of FMAs which contain rainforest values, 1 month does not allow sufficient time to prepare thorough submissions. In lieu of this, VRN reserves the right to raise new information and issues past the WUP submission deadline period.

7.4 Carryover coupes,- Carryover coupes scheduling in previous WUPs should be listed in the proposed WUPs. This would provide a more accurate picture of planned logging operations and allow for more concrete assessment of proposed logging impacts on rainforest values. Listing carryover coupes would enhance the transparency of the existing WUP process.

7.5 No formal conflict resolution process- Resolution of planning issues appears to occur in an ad hoc, unsystematic manner, often resulting in public confrontation and conflict. The VRN would like to work with the DSE to help devise a more systematic, transparent and accountable process for resolving WUP planning disputes. A number of models exist nationally and internationally which could be used as a basis for a WUP conflict resolution process.

Questions:

- In detail, how does the senior forester resolve WUP planning disputes?
- How many logging coupes have been removed from proposed WUPs because of public concerns raised via the submission process, since the adoption of the EG FMP?

Appendix 1- Logging Coupes containing rainforest outside RSOS*

Block	Coupe #	Notes
825 Loongelaat	825-508-0006	Rf, SPZ adj reserve
866 Little River Swamp	866-510-0004	Rf
	866-512-0009	Rf
867 Dinner	867-504-0001	Rf, Thinnings
	867-504-0002	Rf, Clearfell
	867-505-0005	Rf, Thinnings
	867-503-0005	Rf, Thinnings
868 Lind	868-506-0008	Rf, Thinnings
	868-506-0002	Rf, Thinnings
	868-506-0006	Rf, Thinnings, Adj SPZ
	868-507-0011	Rf, Clearfell, Adj SPZ
870 Pyramid	870-504-0004	Rf, Clearfell
	870-504-0007	Rf
	870-507-0008	Rf
	870-507-0006	Rf,
871 Upper Tonghi	871-506-0002	
	871-504-0007	Thinnings
	871-505-0009	
	871-505-0006	adj SPZ ?
	871-506-0008	adj SPZ
	871-506-0015	thinnings adj SPZ ?
	871-501-0005	Thinnings
	871-572-0004	Thinnings
	867-503-0005	
874 Drummmer	874-506-0012	
	874-506-0011	Thinnings
	874-507-0007	adj SPZ, adj SMZ
	874-512-0006	adj SPZ, thinnings
875 Cooaggalah	875-516-0001	Thinnings
876 Buckland	876-516-0003	adj SPZ
884 Lockup	884-520-0001	adj SMZ
	884-504-0005	adjSPZ
	884-514-0001	
	884-51?- ?0015	
	884-507-0002	adj SPZ
	884-504-0007	cross SPZ
	884-502-004	adj SPZ
885 Cobon	885-507-0010	
	885-502-0014	
	885-510-0015	
	885-511-0011	adj res
	885-514-0012	
	885-513-0011	
886 Quodra	886-505-003	adj SPZ
	886-505-0010	adj SPZ
	886-506-0005	adj SPZ
887 Sister	887-505-0007	
891 Goongerah	891-504-0001	

	891-510-0009	
893 Bonang	893-501-0009	
825 Loongelaat	825-512-0002	part SPZ
	825-509-0002	adj reserve, part SPZ
829 Murrungowar	829-510 -0009	part SPZ part SMZ
	829-515-0009	
830 Kuark	830-507-0014	
	830-508-0010	
	830-511-0008	adj SPZ part SMZ
	830-511-0009	adj SPZ
	830-512-0010	
831 Jirah	831-503-0010	part smz
	831-503-0080	part smz
832 Cabbage Tree	832-502-0003	adj spz
836 Martins creek	836-507-0004	
	836-509-0017	
	836-527-0010	
	836-524-0005	
	836-521-????	
	836-521-001?	
	836-516-0002	adj SMZ
	836-517-0003	adj SPZ
	836-517-0002	part SPZ
840 Brodibb	840-501-0036	adj reserve
842 Rich	842-512-0017	part Spz
	842-516-0018	
	842-516 0017	
	842-519- 0012	part SPZ
	842-516-0010	adj SPZ
	842-516-0016	adj SPZ adj SMZ
843 Misery	Missing	
844 Sardine	844 -501 0010	
	844 -502 0007	
	844-504-0001	
845 Tabby	845-509-0015	adj SMZ
	845-508-0004	
846 Yalmy	846-511-0008	adj SPZ
	846-504-0013	
	846-504-0012	

Rf = Rainforest adj = adjacent

* This is not an exhaustive list.

Appendix 2- Logging Coupes inside RSOS areas

RSOS #	Coupe #, Year	Notes
EG 43 Silvertop Hill	825-512-0002	part/adj to RSOS, rainforest inside coupe
EG 44 Yalmy sidecut	897-501-0003 1st yr	adj SMZ, adj to core rainforest area
	846-513-0014 2nd yr	Borders Snowy Rvr NP, M.Ash, OG
EG 45 Little Yalmy River	836-517-0004 1st yr	
	836-517- 1st yr	adj SPZ
EG 51 Brodribb Rvr	829-509-0015 3rd yr	adj Npark
EG 52 Murrungowar	829-516-0011 3rd yr	rainforest inside, Old growth
	829-516-0012 3rd yr	
	829-516-0013 3rd yr	old growth
	829-516-0007 2nd yr	rainforest inside
EG 57 Martins Crk	836-501-0004 3rd yr	old growth?
	836-501-0001 3rd yr	adj SPZ. Old growth?
EG 62 Lower Bemm	866-508-0006 2nd yr	Thinnings, adj rainforest
	836-509-0018 3rd yr	Thinnings, adj SPZ (Bemm), rainforest inside
EG 63 Bemm River	867-510-0010 3rd yr	adj rainforest, part in RSOS
	867-509-0008 1st yr	adj SPZ, part RSOS
EG 65 Pheasant Crk	833-508-0003 3rd yr	Thinnings -partly in RSOS, adj SPZ
EG 68 Little Arte River	830-501-0016 2nd yr	
	830-501-0015 2nd yr	rainforest inside
	830-501-0019 1st yr	rainforest inside
	830-501-0013 1st yr	
EG 69 Arte River Falls	833-512-0014 3rd yr	Bordering Arte River, adj SPZ, OG
EG 70 Glen Arte	830-512-0007 1st yr	rainforest inside, Old Growth
	830-512-0011 1st yr	Thinnings, adj rainforest, logged 1977
	830-512-0004 3rd yr	rainforest inside, Old Growth
	830-513-0002 2nd yr	adj SPZ, rainforest inside
	830-513-0007 3rd yr	adj SPZ, rainforest inside
	832-502-0007 2nd yr	Thinnings, logged 1977, adj SMZ
EG 79 Sassafras Basin	837-506-0003 3rd yr	Old Growth, SOS
EG 80 Goonmirk Rocks	837-505-0003 3rd yr	Bordering Errinundra NP, OG
EG 81 East Errinundra River	892-522-0011 1st yr	within SMZ
EG 83 Bungywarr Crk	885-511-0012 2nd yr	Bordering Errinundra NP, Aboriginal V
	885-511-0014 1st yr	
	885-512-0005 3rd yr	
	885-512-0013 3rd yr	
	885-513-0016 1st yr	adj SPZ, core rainforest area
	885-514-0007 1st yr	part adj SPZ
	885-??????? 3rd yr	rainforest core area inside
EG 85 Hensleigh Creek- Far Creek	885-503-0015 2nd yr	Rainforest inside
	885-503-0009 2nd yr	Reforestation
	885-503-0013 2nd yr	adj SPZ, part RSOS
	886-504-0014 1st yr	SMZ 886-1 ,Rainforest
	886-509-0011 2nd yr	Thinnings, adj SPZ, Rainforest inside
EG 86 Three Sisters		

EG 87 Serpentine Crk	867-502-0009 1st yr	adj Rainforest
	864-505-0002 1st yr	adj SPZ, adj core Rainforest,
	868-505-0005 1st yr	Thinnings, Rainforest adj
EG 88 Sydd Creek	864-507-0001 3rd yr	Thinnings, Rainforest
EG 91 Upper Tonghi (Jungle-Waldron Mt)	871-504-0008 1st yr	adj SPZ,
	???-???-0015 1st yr	thinnings, part RSOS, Rainforest, adj SPZ
	871-504-0007 3rd yr	Rainforest, thinnings
EG 101 Brown Crk (Future Trail)	874-512-0006 3rd yr	thinning, part RSOS, adj SPZ, Rainforest
EG 105 East Thurra	875-504-0004 2nd yr	thinnings, adj SPZ, SOS,
EG 107 Mount Drummer	874-506-0011 1st yr	Thinnings, logged 1977, adj core Rainforest, rainforest inside
	874-505-0009 1st yr	adj core Rainforest, adj reserve

Red= National RSOS, Blue= State RSOS, Black= Regional RSOS

*** Please note this is not an exhaustive list, as it is based on incomplete map sheets.**

Appendix 3- Management boundary alterations inside RSOS areas

RSOS #, Name

EG 29 Murrindal	
EG 35 Tara Range	
EG 38 Lower Snowy	
EG 49 Cabbage Tree Crk	
EG 51 Brodribb Rvr	
EG 54 Mount Pinnak	
EG 58 Big River	
EG 59 Mount Jersey	
EG 62 Lower Bemm	
EG 63 Bemm River	
EG 64 Mount Billy, Mckenzie River	
EG 68 Little Arte River	
EG 70 Glen Arte	
EG 71 Mount Tanglefoot	
EG 73 Upper Goolengook	
EG 76 Kanuka Crk (Sth Branch)	
EG 77 West Errinundra River	
EG 78 Cobb Hill	
EG 81 East Errinundra River	
EG 82 Combienbar River	
EG 83 Bungywarr Crk	
EG 86 Three Sisters	
EG 87 Serpentine Crk	
EG 100 Thurra Crossing, Princess Hwy	
EG 103 Mount Future	
EG 104 Black Snake Crk, West Thurra	
EG 105 East Thurra	
EG 110 Upper Wingan	
EG 113 Royd Creek	
EG 114 Genoa	

Red= National RSOS, Blue= State RSOS, Black= Regional RSOS

Appendix 4- Logging Coupes proposed inside Special Management Zones with rainforest values

RSOS #	Coupe #	Notes
EG 85 Hensleigh Creek- Far Creek	886-504-0014	SMZ 886-1, Rainforest inside
EG 81 East Errinundra River	892-522-0011	
831 Jirah	831-503-0010	part smz
	831-503-0080	part smz
830 Kuark	830-511-0008	adj SPZ part SMZ
829 Murrungowar	829-510 -0009	part SPZ part SMZ