

SUBMISSION

I provide my submission on rejection of the changes proposed in the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 ("the Bill").

This constant change in legislation severely impacts on the ability of farm managers to plan and implement effective long-term property and business management decisions. Ecological processes work in much longer timeframes and can be severely compromised when mismatching regulations are enforced. Farmers have long called for certainty with the vegetation management regulatory framework. I am totally opposed to continued uncertainty and attacks on the viability of myself, the long-term sustainability of my business as well as attacks on fellow farmers.

The impacts of the proposed changes to the Vegetation Management Act include;

- The purpose for High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture will be removed.
- Extends Category B areas (remnant vegetation) and Category C (regrowth vegetation) to freehold land, and indigenous freehold land. Additional 862 000ha High Value Regrowth and water course buffers to all reef catchment, Burnett Mary, Fitzroy, Eastern Cape York.
- Thinning will require Development Application to be lodged for approval.
- The purpose for High Value Agriculture and Irrigated High Value Agriculture will be removed.

Describe the impacts the changes will make to stall agriculture, discourage investment, and increase costs and time to manage vegetation.

According to scientific evidence there is far greater number of trees in the SW of Queensland since white man first came into the areas which proves that the management of timbers has been well managed so the call for sustainable vegetation management and all the restrictions in the new bill is heavy handed.

The problem we face in our country is the invasion of false sandlewood thickening. We have had two ringbarking permits to control the sandlewood which was a great success. I then applied for a third one and with a change of rules, we had to leave 70 stems per ha, as this would leave too many sandlewood trees to spread seeds to germinate, and I considered this a waste of money as ringbarking is very expensive. Ringbarking costs us about \$125.00 per ha. When left alone the trees gets so thick that the grass doesn't grow and too tick for any habitat.

Forget the koalas as they only live along the rivers, if there is any. In 59 years, in working in this area, I have never seen a koala away from the rivers. The main ones chasing the koalas away from their habitat is the coastal city sprawls so why don't you put some restrictions on the city expansions if the government is that serious about the koalas.

If we can't manage regrowth, it is going to restrict our carrying capacities which in turn affects our income and therefore there is not the money to spend in our local town which in turn affects the local shops and then they close down, leaving us to travel further to purchase our basic requirements.

As well we have mulga country which is a great resource in times of drought which means we can hold onto some of our stock until the drought break otherwise we would have to sell our stock at reduced values so lessens our income once again. If we want regrowth mulga so the stock can feed themselves before we have to cut or push the mulga, the old mulga needs to be pushed or cut for

this to happen which will saves us from a great expense. As mulga only regenerated when you bring down up to 90% of the trees. If these trees can't be harvested after they get too tall for the stock to feed themselves with, they get too thick and grass will not grow underneath them and there too tick for any habitat.

We hope that the committee will take this on board from people who have experience

Signed:

Tim Agar

Address:

Date:

27/03/2018