

From: [duckz](#)
To: [Health and Community Services Committee](#)
Subject: Submission re: Amendments to the Nature Conservation Act 1992
Date: Thursday, 12 September 2013 4:37:34 PM

To Health and Community Services Parliamentary Committee. hcsc@parliament.qld.gov.au

Submission re:

Amendments to the Nature Conservation Act 1992

Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No 2) 2013

1. Changing the Object of the Act from “the conservation of nature” to encompass “social, cultural and commercial use of protected areas” is in conflict with the intention of the existing Act. We believe the existing intention of the Act is the right intention. Further, there will be an erosion of wildlife conservation overall because the three proposed additions only refer to protected areas, when the Act also contains provisions relating to the conservation of wildlife outside protected areas.
2. We strongly oppose abolishing a number of classes of protected area. Specifically in scientific and high conservation areas it is important that visitation is minimised so fragile ecosystems are protected. These areas require a separate set of regulations just as we have had. Additionally combining of conservation parks and resource reserves into one ‘regional park’ class significantly dilutes the conservation protection currently afforded our conservation park areas.
3. Substantially changing the management principles of national parks to expand provisions for education, recreation and ecotourism will refocus national park management lessening the conservation intent of the Act. Surely as it exists, there is opportunity for these activities while still maintaining conservation status as the primary concern.
5. It is of concern the forest reserve tenure that was introduced as part of the SEQ Forest Agreement process to be a holding tenure for State forest land that was destined to become national park, but contained a number of encumbrances that had to be negotiated before the land could become a protected area could be abolished. Does this mean that none of this land is destined to be protected? There is nothing gained by its loss, but future opportunities have been lost if it no longer exists.
6. Abolishing the requirement to prepare management plans for all protected areas and replacing it with a requirement to prepare management statements is retrograde in that there will be no statutory instrument to protect the conservation values of our national parks.

The proposed amendments take conservation of our natural resources back 30 years. It leaves one perplexed at the motives of the architects of these changes.

Faithfully,
Jennifer Watts and Peter Duck

 Maryborough QLD

12 September 2013