

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 expert knowledge and understanding that landholders hold after decades of sustainable land management.

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).

There is a large difference between regrowth that is 15 years old and 29yr old. Regrowth that is has not been cleared since 1989 may well have established echo system however regrowth that is 15 years old would not be. In this large decrease in time allowed to manage regrowth from 29years to 15years. Why is this the case? We all know that the cost of managing regrowth is huge and it is something that all landowners have to save for long periods of time to allow for this to occur, to maintain land value and productivity of our country.

In making these changes to stop landowners to clear remnant vegetation for high value agriculture (to cultivate crops) decreases the potential income for these landowners and as well as decreases there value of the country. This reduces income for our government. In not allowing clearing reduces productivity for the industry. Less land to crop for both human and animal consumption impacts Australia greatly. Australia already has to import huge amounts of food to stain our growing country. Farmers are already have had to reduce numbers in livestock due to the last several years of weather conditions.

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.”

I don't know where or how to find the new maps

It may be fair enough to maintain habitats for wildlife but other measure need to be put in place to protect these area if they are passed. No point providing a dense bush land that comes at a huge expense to the landowner for the species to be wiped out by wild cats, dogs and pigs. These areas will need to be monitored regularly and if they become unhabituated by these protected species then removed from the mapping as essential habitat so the landowner can continue to manage regrowth vegetation in the country best interest.

Are these landowners compensated financially for this inability to utilise these areas? If not WHY NOT

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.

In our experience where there regrowth has not been treated on the water course grass coverage has decreased causing erosion and sediment run off. Were we have little regrowth the grass is thick. Our country floods often yearly and by our experience when regrowth is managed the grass coverage maintains and so does the soil when the flood and rain comes, putting less run off into the water ways hence the great barrier reef.

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."*

In changing thinning will mean for our property that all future suckers that grow will not be able to be managed and controlled. This will decrease our property value and our family future.

Thinning is essential to maintain our property productivity by increasing and maintain grass value. In thinning our suckers has allowed thicker grass coverage to establish. If we do not continue to manage our sucker regrowth by thinning this will lead to an unproductive property financially by reduced grass coverage for animal food. In looking at neighbouring property where no thinning management has been undertaken for some time the grass coverage is poor and the land is open to sediment run off with each local storm. By continuing to manage our regrowth allows us to ensure that ground coverage is maximised, reducing sediment run off.

Not being able to responsibly manage regrowth on our property will make it difficult to muster and handle stock. Access to grass lands will be more difficult and in some areas not at all.

Increased timber regrowth come with large amounts of debris which is a huge issue for our neighbouring properties due to flood fencing. The time and cost of this is huge as this country get water flow at least yearly. Not allowing us to manage future suckers will increase flood debris on our property.

Without continuing to be able to thinning future sucker growth the ability of control weeds will be harder as to the control of feral animals.

Former self assessable code was an easy cost effective process in managing our country.

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.

This section does not affect our property however from life experience on the land fodder harvest is essential in some areas to sustain livestock. In drought situations this is all that is available to sustain life at times. In keeping farmers on the farm supplying beef to our country as well as paying taxes to the government. I do not recommend that this be only available to be used in drought declared situation. As from my experience that one property can have gone without good rain for many months/years and surrounding properties are not so bad hence the area not drought declared.

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.**

It is inappropriate as a landowner wants what is best for their land and ensure the property maintains value and productivity. THE PENALTIES FOR MAKING A MISTAKE IS TOO HARSH.

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."

Between the two of us we have had 56 years life experience on the land. We have seen firsthand with how leaving suckers to grow. This affects the quality of the properties and grass coverage and sediment run off. In managing regrowth suckers this enables property owners to maintain grass coverage and productivity of their properties and lively hood.


Thinning needs to be able to continue to ensure Australian is productive and at a rate that is acceptable to ensure adequate grass coverage and property production.

Landowners should be compensated for the changes made. If changes were made to properties within a metropolitan area ie needing to put buy passes in then the properties would be purchases at a value. This would not be possible in the land however more consideration needs to be made when making decisions that are affecting rural people, there lively hood, there passion and their futures. The reef is important to all Australians but these changes are only affecting the rural communities, more input needs to be taken from those who are to be affected.

We brought our block with the vision to clean it up (manage the overgrown suckers that were starting to grown) and establish better grass coverage. The value of the tea tree and gum suckers seen by government more important than productivity of our family farm. Tree suckers don't pay taxes we do.

Why do city people decide what rural people should or should not do when it comes to property management?

Signed:



Date:

20/3/18