

To the Health and Community Services Committee,

I am writing in regards to the amendments made to the Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Bill (No. 2) 2013. I do not agree with multiple amendments made to this Bill, however I will highlight just a few of the divergences I have below.

I agree with the view that national parks cannot be kept 'locked up', it is evident that society has moved past this view and we incorporate a reasonable amount of recreational activities into protected areas. This is not without impacts; the spread of weeds, litter, track destruction, vandalism and disturbance to wildlife are just some of the negative pressures that human presence in protected areas may pose. However, when managed correctly these impacts can be mitigated. There would be countless other impacts and issues caused by further recreational activities introduced into protected areas. Due to the fact management and monitoring of protected areas is so important, I question the decision to implement management statements rather than management plans, however expensive and time consuming they may be.

There are species in Queensland which are particularly susceptible to anthropocentric effects, and require minimal disturbance in order to survive. For example, the Kroombit Tinker Frog (*Taudactylus pleione*) is listed as critically endangered on the EPBC. Clarke et al. (1999) and Borsboom et al. (1998) outline the reasons for the decline of the species to include human impacts such as timber harvesting and visitor pressures. Four other species of *Taudactylus* in Queensland have also declined dramatically. The authors mentioned above also suggest the decline is mainly due to destruction of habitat and fouling of water by livestock. How much monitoring and research has gone into predicting the effects that introducing social, cultural and commercial use may have on these species? How many other species of frogs and other aquatic life may be under threat due to impacts of grazing? There would be countless other species found in Queensland that would suffer greatly from further pressures from human impacts.

I disagree strongly with the amendments made to this Act. I believe protected areas in Queensland should primarily serve the purpose of conserving biodiversity. If there does not prove to be huge negative effects on the natural environment in a certain area, then recreation may be introduced with sufficient research and monitoring into the effects it may have.

Yours Sincerely,

Elizabeth Crotty

Graceville
QLD 4075

Literature cited:

Borsboom, A., J. Clarke & M. Cunningham (1998). *Draft recovery plan for the Kroombit tinker frog Taudactylus pleione 1997-2001*. Qld Dept Nat. Res. & Qld Dept Env.

Clarke, J.M., A.C. Borsboom, M. Cunningham & H. Hines (1999). The recovery process for the Kroombit tinkerfrog, *Taudactylus pleione*. **In:** B.R. Boyes, ed. *Rainforest Recovery for the New Millennium*. WWF 1998 *SE Qld Rainforest Recovery Conference*. Page(s) 109-123. WWF, Sydney.