

SUBMISSION

I provide my submission in respect of the proposed Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 to be included in the SDNRAIDC's detailed consideration.

In providing this submission I refer directly to the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, the Introductory Speech of the Hon Dr Anthony Lynham MP, Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy, of 8 March 2018, and the Explanatory Notes that encompass the proposed changes to the above Acts and a range of commentary and issues.

In my opinion the Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 proposed changes are oppressive, restrictive and onerous and do not reflect the scientific evidence, expert knowledge and understanding that landholders hold after decades of sustainable land management. Queensland's sustainable land management practices are championed around the world; however, they are not being acknowledged right here at home. The misinterpretation of data in the SLATS report does not give a true and accurate picture of the state's vegetation status, as it does not show natural thickening of timber that has occurred in the same period. The SLATS report does not differentiate between vegetation clearing for urban development and agriculture, however agriculture will feel the full force of these amendments if they are implemented.

I do not in any way support broad scale land clearing or land degradation however I do not support and cannot operate with our industry being heavily regulated and debilitated by new oppressive vegetation management laws.

My opinion is set out below:-

HIGH-VALUE REGROWTH

Clause 38 of the Bill (proposed new definition of 'high-value regrowth' (a) and (b) in Schedule (Dictionary) of the *Vegetation Management Act 1999*) and Clause 16 (omission of s22A(2)(k) and (l) to delete *high-value agriculture clearing* and *irrigated high-value agriculture clearing* as relevant purposes).

- Changing the definition of *high-value regrowth* vegetation - this term will now apply to vegetation not cleared in the last 15 years – rather than since 31 December 1989 (28 year old trees).
- Regulating regrowth on freehold land, Indigenous land and occupational licences in addition to leasehold land for agriculture and grazing.
- Removal of high value agriculture and irrigated high value agriculture as a relevant purpose under the *Vegetation Management Act 1999*. This will remove the ability to apply for a development approval for clearing for high-value and irrigated high value agriculture.

Introductory Speech - Dr LYNHAM: "I would like to draw the attention of the House specifically to the removal of provisions that allowed for clearing for high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture.....The bill will reinstate the protection of high-value regrowth vegetation on freehold and Indigenous land. The bill will change the definition of 'high-value regrowth' to ensure that additional vegetation that has significant environmental value is protected.....it is proposed to change the 'high-value regrowth' definition that currently exists from woody vegetation that has not been cleared since 31 December 1989 and forms an endangered, of concern or least concern regional ecosystem vegetation to high-value regrowth vegetation that has not been cleared for 15 years.....Under the new definition, high-value regrowth will continue to

be mapped as category C on freehold and Indigenous land, as well as on leasehold land, that is, agriculture and grazing leases. Restoring the pre-2013 mapping of high-value regrowth on freehold and Indigenous land protects approximately 630,000 hectares on freehold and Indigenous land.....With the changes I am proposing to the definition of 'high-value regrowth', our government will protect an additional 232,275 hectares. These two measures will protect an additional 862,506 hectares of high-value regrowth. Importantly for the environment, approximately 405,000 hectares or 47 per cent of this is within the Great Barrier Reef catchments."

*NB: A landholder could previously apply for a development approval to broadscale clear remnant vegetation for high value agriculture (clearing carried out to establish, cultivate and harvest crops) or irrigated high value agriculture (clearing carried out to establish, cultivate and harvest crops, or pasture, that will be supplied with water by artificial means).

The removal of High Value Agriculture (HVA) and irrigated HVA (IHVA) affects farmers in regions differently, with those in the north particularly hard hit. 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 provide farmers in northern Queensland with the opportunity to grow fodder and grain for supplementing in the dry season and finishing off stock for market.

The removal of HVA and IHVA is in direct conflict with the Australian Government White Paper on the Development of Northern Australia. An example of this is \$220 million being spent to upgrade roads to communities across Cape York, but Queensland State Government Vegetation Management Framework is preventing indigenous and non-indigenous land holders from developing agriculture projects.

In central and southern Queensland, HVA and IHVA provides opportunity for farmers to drought-proof properties and stabilise production and income over variable climatic and market conditions. Sustainable clearing for relatively small pockets of high value agriculture enable agricultural production to improve continuity of supply to food processors and meet the increasing requirements of international markets and Australia's Free Trade Agreements.

Indigenous development is particularly compromised by the re-inclusion of High Value Regrowth (HVR) as well as the stripping of the right to develop traditional lands as HVA or IHVA. For example, Indigenous landowners on the Gilbert River in northern Queensland preparing to submit IHVA applications have now been denied the possibility of stabilising beef production and employing community labour on their properties.

On the following page are some photos of unimproved high value agricultural land in the Isaac/Mackenzie River region. If this land was able to be developed agricultural production could be increased. In these photos the brigalow regrowth is taking over and inhibiting grass growth and reducing the carrying capacity of these paddocks and eventually making this land useless for agricultural production and therefore no better than waste lands. Not only is there not enough food for livestock but there is also a limited supply of food for native herbivores such as kangaroos and wallabies.



NEAR-THREATENED SPECIES

Clause 37 of the Bill (new Part 6, Division 13 – s141 ‘Proposed map showing essential habitat’ and s142 ‘Provision about essential habitat’).

- A map showing areas of proposed essential habitat for protected wildlife and near threatened wildlife will be published and land will be covered by an area management plan.

Introductory Speech - Dr LYNHAM: “Importantly, our government will be providing better protections under the vegetation management framework for near-threatened species. These are species that are listed under the Nature Conservation Act 1994, where our scientists have evidence that the population size or distribution of the wildlife is small, may become smaller or has declined and there is concern for their survival. Our near-threatened plants and animals were dismissed by the LNP government as not worthy of protection. On the other hand, the Labor party is of the firm belief that these species need our protection, otherwise we face the

regretful prospect of their decline. Near-threatened species were removed from the essential habitat mapping layer in 2013. When we compared the high conservation values' methodology to the existing statutory framework, it showed that near-threatened species have limited regulatory protection. The essential habitat mapping layer used in the Vegetation Management Act will be updated, protecting endangered, vulnerable and near-threatened species. The essential habitat of our valued animals and plants will be protected in both remnant and high-value regrowth vegetation. Offsets will apply to approvals for any significant residual impact on near-threatened species where the clearing of remnant vegetation cannot be reasonably avoided and minimised."

There is very limited information provided to access these proposed maps displaying essential habitat for near threatened species. The changes made by the Queensland Government to Queensland Globe to access Vegetation Management data goes to show how they are trying to make access difficult to what should be freely and readily available data for all Queenslanders. 'Cherry picking' information shows the lack of science to support claims as seen in the use of the SLATS report.

REGROWTH VEGETATION IN WATERCOURSE AREAS

Clause 37 of the Bill (new Part 6, Division 13 – s133 'How definition regrowth watercourse and drainage feature area applies during and after the interim period') and addition to *regrowth watercourse and drainage feature area* definition in the Schedule (Dictionary) of the *Vegetation Management Act 1999*

- Extension of Category R areas (from the Burdekin, Mackay Whitsunday and Wet Tropics Great Barrier Reef catchments) to include new catchments to encompass all Great Barrier Reef catchments
- Addition of three catchments – the Burnett-Mary, eastern Cape York and Fitzroy catchments – affecting regrowth vegetation in areas located within 50m of a watercourse or drainage feature located in these additional catchments.
- This regulation applies across freehold, indigenous and leasehold land.

Introductory Speech - Dr LYNHAM: "This bill will also extend protection to regrowth vegetation in watercourse areas for the Burnett-Mary, eastern Cape York and Fitzroy catchments, providing consistent protection to regrowth vegetation in all Great Barrier Reef catchments. This builds on the measures introduced in 2009 which regulate the clearing of vegetation within 50 meters of a watercourse in the Burdekin, Mackay-Whitsunday and Wet Tropics. The bill will also amend the Water Act to re-regulate the removal of vegetation in a watercourse under a riverine protection permit."

Explanatory Notes: Expanding the regulation of riverine regrowth to include these catchments will increase the protection for the Great Barrier Reef from sediment run-off and other impacts of clearing.

This increase in Category R provisions is a further restriction on development in Northern Queensland, which is in stark contrast to the development imperatives contained with the White Paper on Developing Northern Australia.

The science is completely unproven on the necessity to include ≥50 metre buffers along streamlines. In fact, a study conducted in Queensland and published in 2016 shows that grass is a far better assimilator for nitrogen to prevent leaching into waterways. The current bleaching of the Great Barrier Reef is not caused by high nutrient runoff from agricultural lands.

LOW-RISK ACTIVITIES

Clause 17 of the Bill (new s22B 'Requirements for vegetation clearing application for managing thickened vegetation' of the *Vegetation Management Act 1999*) and Clause 37 (new Part 6, Division 13 – s136 'Area management plans that are to remain in force for 2 years').

- Thinning redefined as '*managing thickened vegetation*' – s22A(2)(g).
- Withdrawal of Code for clearing of vegetation for thinning. *Managing thickened vegetation* now requires notification under the new interim Code until the Bill has passed when a development application will be required.
- Requirements to be demonstrated in a development application for managing thickened vegetation – location and extent of clearing, clearing methods, evidence restricted to prescribed regional ecosystems and restrictions and evidence that the regional ecosystem has thickened in comparison to the same regional ecosystem in the bioregion.
- New s136 phases out landholder-driven area management plans as a mechanism for managing low-risk clearing that is or may be managed by the accepted development vegetation clearing codes. This new section provides that an area management plan relating to the clearing for encroachment or thinning continues but only remains in force until 8 March 2020.
- Notification of an intention to clear vegetation made under the plan before 8 March 2018 may continue while the plan remains in force however an entity may not give notification under the plan after 8 March 2018.

Introductory Speech - Dr LYNHAM: *"The government is committed to retaining accepted development codes for low-risk activities, while ensuring they deliver appropriate protections.....Following a review by the Queensland Herbarium, and subsequent review by the CSIRO, a decision was reached that thinning is not a low-risk activity. Therefore I intend to withdraw this accepted development code from the regulation once this bill commences. In the interim, I am remaking the code to include the best scientific advice on how to minimise the risks until the code can be withdrawn. I will retain an assessment pathway in the legislation for those landholders who need to manage thickened vegetation. It will remain a relevant purpose in the Vegetation Management Act for which development applications can be made."*

Thinning is an important land management practice in heavily timbered landscapes. Thinning allows for reduction of over invasive tree species thus preventing detrimental encroachment of such species. Thinning also allows grasses and other ground cover species to establish and expand which has a two-fold benefit as it holds the soil together preventing erosion and it also provides food and fodder for both livestock and native animals.

FODDER CODE

Clause 37 (new Part 6, Division 13 – s139 'Revocation of particular area management plan')

- s139(1) – the 'Managing Fodder Harvesting Mulga Lands Fodder Area Management Plan' is revoked. A new revised Code is in place – 'Managing fodder harvesting accepted development clearing code'.
- s139(2) - A notice of intended clearing under the Plan ceases to have effect on 8 March 2018, and no further clearing can be carried out under the Plan from 8 March 2018. Landholders need to lodge a new notification under the new Code and follow the requirements of the new Code.

- **New s136 phases out landholder-driven area management plans as a mechanism for managing low-risk clearing that is or may be managed by the accepted development vegetation clearing codes. This new section provides that an area management plan relating to the clearing for fodder harvesting continues but only remains in force until 8 March 2020.**
- **Landholders need to lodge a new notification under the new Code.**

Introductory Speech - Dr LYNHAM: *"In conjunction with this bill, I asked my department to progress the review of the revised fodder code on which we consulted in 2016 and commence a rolling program to revise and implement the other acceptable development codes throughout 2018. The revised managing fodder harvesting code has been developed by my department based on scientific input from the Queensland Herbarium and the CSIRO. The immediate remake of the managing fodder harvesting and the managing thickened vegetation codes will invalidate all previous clearing notifications and introduce for the first time size and time limits on the areas able to be notified for clearing under an accepted development code. My department will be consulting throughout 2018 with stakeholders to finalise the remaining codes."*

Explanatory Notes: Revoking the Mulga Lands Fodder Area Management Plan reinforces the role and function of the accepted development vegetation clearing code for fodder harvesting being the supported mechanism in which low-risk clearing activities are undertaken. Landholders can continue to undertake self-assessable clearing under the accepted development vegetation clearing code for fodder harvesting, or alternatively, apply for a development permit under the Planning Act 2016.

The two year period recognises that, in some instances, the clearing requirements for encroachment, thinning and fodder harvesting under current area management plans may not be consistent with the best available science.

I believe people with a renewable drought proofing fodder source that naturally replenishes and sequesters carbon while supporting one of our strongest export commodities should be championed for. The actions of these farmers should not be condemned and they should not be bankrupted especially when many areas of Western Queensland are still very much in drought. If these business are unable to remain sustainable this will lead to job loss which will ultimately lead to people leaving the district and therefore will impact on the community as a whole, due to a reduction in services caused by the reduced population.

PENALTY UNIT INCREASES

Clauses 19, 22-23 and 25-33

- **Various amendments to Penalty Units for Maximum Penalty. Eg. s54B(5) 'Non-compliance with Restoration notice' - penalty increasing from 1665 to 4500 penalty units and s58(1) (false or misleading statement) – increasing from 50 to 500 penalty points.**

The harshness of the increased penalties in the instance of a mistake is excessive and shows the contempt of the Australian Labor Party and Dr Lynham for farmers. While not supporting those that degrade the land and clear illegally under the current laws, there are genuine minor offenses caused by mapping inaccuracies (especially as the lines are drawn on satellite images at a large scale and do not account for the topography of the land). Genuine accidental clearing should not destroy people's lives and businesses with such extreme punishments.

OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS

Introductory Speech - Dr LYNHAM: *"I believe this bill and the complementary measures that I have outlined will deliver on the election commitment to deliver a more sustainable vegetation management framework for Queensland. This government will continue to work with our vital agricultural sector so that together we can care for the environment and ensure that their farms can pass, in good condition and in safe hands, from generation to generation."*


"The amendments that I bring into the parliament are necessary to protect Queensland's remnant and high-value regrowth vegetation. It is all about restoring a sustainable vegetation management framework for managing a valuable resource on behalf of the people of Queensland."

"Within three years in Queensland clearing rates of remnant native vegetation increased from 59,800 hectares in 2012-13 to 138,000 in 2015-16. This amendment bill seeks to end the levels of broadscale clearing that the LNP legislation created."

As landholders we aim to protect and improve our landscape so that we can continue to keep it productive for both ourselves and future landholders. In fact, *in recent years there has been an increase in tree cover in Queensland*. Farmers and graziers need some certainty about where legislation is going to maintain viable businesses well into the future, as planning to maintain productive pastures is a long-term process especially in cases where controlling regrowth is involved. Controlling brigalow regrowth in Central Queensland to increase grass production to increase carrying capacity and thus increase productivity is a costly process so producers like myself aim to do so over a long period (up to 10, 15 or even 20 years). Landholders will usually plan to improve one paddock at a time, usually one paddock/year. This allows landholders to slightly improve the productivity of their property whilst still staying within budget limits. Therefore, in most cases by the time they have cleared their entire property the regrowth has re-established in the paddocks that were treated first, thus maintaining overall tree growth whilst also allowing for increased production to help meet our ever-increasing requirements of international markets and Australia's free trade agreements. Please reconsider changing the vegetation management legislation again as it is impossible for people like myself to plan improvements in our agricultural businesses and contribute to the Queensland economy when we have no certainty about how we will be able to use our land in the future.

Signed:

Date:


22nd March 2018