

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Agriculture Resources and Environment Committee](#)  
**Subject:** Submission against changes to North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011  
**Date:** Sunday, 27 October 2013 2:59:09 PM

---

To whom it may concern (Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee, Queensland Parliament)

I am a long time user of Stradbroke's natural environment and a home owner at Dunwich. I am not against sand mining as such but I believe there should be proper safeguards against irreversible habitat destruction and a timeline and plan that sees the short term mining economy give way to a long term eco-tourism economy. For this to happen

- Critical areas for vulnerable animals and plants should be scrupulously avoided.
- Water sources and storage areas should be completely protected (for the animals and plants and for our future use.
- As well, a timeline and plan for changing to an eco-tourism economy should be delineated in the bill if the words "Protection and Sustainability Act" have any meaning for the environment or the economy of Stradbroke Island at all.

It is the **government owned** natural resources on Stradbroke which are being mined and through which the natural environment is being destroyed. This is temporarily good for the economy. However the government, through its laws, **must** enable a vibrant **post-mining** economy as well. The original amendments do this. Leave them in place.

I believe that the proposed amendments should not be made because

- The bill will remove any baseline environmental studies and increase environmental hardship beyond the mining lease, especially because of the mine's position adjacent to national parks and the internationally significant Ramsar wetlands, leading to increased habitat destruction not less.
- The bill will mean there are no declared weeds on rehabilitated areas and lead to harm to nearby freshwater perched lakes. To create an ultimately healthy, natural environment that can be accessed by future eco-tourist operators, rehabilitation by the mining operator needs to be monitored and proscribed. Not to do so, will allow second rate rehabilitation and future generations will have lost the biodiversity that makes Stradbroke the special place that it is, being so close and accessible to greater Brisbane.
- The bill removes restrictions on the mine path that were designed to protect the habitat of threatened species like the Wallum Sedge frog. Leaving the rules up to the mining company will lead to loss of species. The government has a **responsibility** to minimise environmental destruction when government owned resources are used not maximise it.

The Bill also amends the *Vegetation Management Framework Amendment Act 2013* to remove the requirement for an applicant for vegetation clearing to provide a significant beneficial impact (SBI), for example revegetation of a watercourse or erosion control, and to demonstrate how the applicant will minimise and mitigate the effects of the proposed clearing. Again - this is government owned resources being used to benefit an economy, and it is therefore implicit that the government should be guardian and steward to minimise negative results.

The bill claims that it will help transition Stradbroke's economy away from mining towards nature based tourism, but there are no plans or investment commitments to do this. Can these please be added?

Quandamooka traditional owners and native title holders have not been consulted or given the opportunity to give or withhold their consent. Considering recent land rights granted to the Quandamooka people and possible litigation in the future if sensible stewardship protocols are not kept, consultation should occur before the passing of this legislation not after.

Yours faithfully

**Jan Buhmann**

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.