

## SUBMISSION

In providing this submission I refer directly to the key provisions of the legislation which may be amended.

<b>1. Removing High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture from the Vegetation Management Framework</b>
---

This change will take away the ability of land holders to clear small areas of land to develop farms. Throughout northern Queensland energy and protein become limiting in cattle diets during the dry season and this can cause farmers issues with stock survival and welfare through years of drought. HVA and IHVA permits have provided farmers in northern Queensland with the opportunity to grow fodder and grain for supplementing in the dry season and finishing off stock for market.

It is wrong to take away this option for future business operations and stock welfare. It could impact the survivability of our business into the future. Removing HVA and IHVA would limit our capability to undertake drought proofing options for our business in the future and for future generations

This could affect food and fibre production for a growing nation, and a growing world population.

<b>2. Retaining Self-Assessable Codes</b>
---

Science-based self-assessable codes help farmers carry out the routine vegetation management practices necessary to sustainably produce food and fibre.

If the Self-assessable codes are taken away and we are required to undertake a development assessment and gain approval through lengthy official channels to do the same activity this would limit our ability to effectively manage our property in a timely and confident manner.

The self-assessable codes help us ensure trees and grass stay in balance, avoid soil erosion and feed animals in drought. Currently we are not required to obtain permits for work done under the self-assessable codes and are only required to notify the Queensland Government.

Self-Assessable codes have reduced the cost and time taken to manage vegetation sustainably and responsibly on our property.

3. Including High Value Regrowth as an additional layer of regulation under the Vegetation Management Framework on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land

The re-inclusion of High Value Regrowth (HVR) as an additional layer of regulation on leasehold, freehold and indigenous land is an overt grab by Queensland Government in search of targets for meeting international treaties such as the Paris Protocol. In 2009 when initially introduced, this HVR layer was prepared hastily in a 'desk-top' mapping exercise with associated errors including areas of non-native vegetation (such as orchards) and bare earth.

There are concerns that if this is implemented will the maps and indicative vegetation be truly 'on the ground' accurate? Will there be channels of redress for the land owner if we have an issue with mapping by the department. If so, how easy is it to amend inaccuracies and just how much will it really cost landowners? This is a big concern.

The Government is essentially adding an extra regulation over FREEHOLD/indigenous land. Do we tell people who live in the city they cannot remove a tree to put in a pool, a new pavement or shed in their backyard?

We have some land that we have not yet cleared but did have future plans to do so. This option may now be taken away. It is frustrating and difficult to manage a property sustainably when vegetation management rules are constantly changing and being further restricted.

This additional regulation will further impact future productive value and our ability to expand our business and also reduce the dollar value of our land.

4. Increasing Category R regrowth watercourse vegetation to include additional catchments in the Burnett Mary, Eastern Cape York and Fitzroy Great Barrier Reef Catchments.

In addition to the high value regrowth layer being added back onto freehold and indigenous land, landholders will also be impacted by overnight changes to the regrowth watercourse mapping and the extent of essential habitat mapping.

This seems to contradict the strong focus on developing Northern Australia. The Queensland State Government Vegetation Management Framework is preventing these farmers from developing agriculture projects.

The area of land the Government has regulated overnight, with no warning may impact any future productive value and our ability to expand our business.


How will any of the 'developing' the North get off the ground if it is not even a possibility in the first place?

Yet more red tape for land owners to contend with.

<p>5. That no compensation will be payable to landholders subject to added layers of regulation – high value regrowth, regrowth watercourses and essential habitat during transitional arrangements</p>
<p>The issue of compensation arises with the addition of these layers. Where is the recompense for Queensland farmers and what is the estimated dollar value of these layers?</p> <p>Will land owners ever see compensation for these new regulations which will have substantial impacts on sustainable production and efficient management of properties?</p>
<p>6. Increasing compliance measures and penalties under vegetation management laws.</p>
<p>The Bill potentially breaches fundamental legislative principles (FLPs) as outlined in section 4 of the Legislative Standards Act 1992.</p> <p>Legislation should have sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals and consequently should not adversely affect rights and liberties, or impose obligations, retrospectively.</p> <p>In addition, penalties have effectively been tripled indicating there is a sense the Government does not think farmers who mistakenly clear vegetation are being penalised enough.</p> <p>Most landowners are willing to manage their properties in a sustainable way to ensure future production success. Land owners successfully manage the land to reduce erosion, protect waterways, ensure the protection of wildlife, flora, fauna and stock in a well balanced manner.</p> <p>It is very difficult to keep up with all the new compliance measures and vegetation management laws. There needs to be more understanding when some vegetation is truly cleared mistakenly. Land owners need to clear or thin some areas of their property to increase grassland and therefore production with the added important benefit of a safer work environment when mustering.</p>
<p>7. Other matters relevant to the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 that the review committee should consider appropriate and worth some consideration</p>
<p>The effects that these amendments may have on our family property and our agricultural region in the Central Highlands, Queensland, Australia are vast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmers/producers will develop sustainably if given the appropriate frameworks.</li> <li>• We need legislation not to change every 5 seconds otherwise we cannot plan for the future,</li> <li>• We cannot get investment from banks or private investments due to constant change when governments change</li> <li>• We want the opportunity to drought proof our business for a sustainable future</li> <li>• Self-Assessable Codes have been very useful and more cost effective than lodging applications</li> </ul>

We currently manage the vegetation on our property in a sustainable manner and incorporate high environmental standards.

We are concerned that if these amendments are passed it may affect the future management and sustainability of our business and may further hinder agricultural growth and food production in Australia which will no doubt affect everyone who likes food on the table.

Signed:	
Address:	
Date:	22 March 2018