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

1. Data that forms the basis of proposed changes is misleading

The data that relates to vegetation management in Queensland has been misused as it relates to for cleared areas, rather than examining the purpose of the clearing, most of which is for normal management purposes to be able to conduct business. The data does not identify areas that have reach remnant status and as a result it appears on the surface that there has been substantial areas of untouched native vegetation cleared illegally, which is untrue. This point has been exploited by groups against responsible vegetation clearing, to the detriment of giving a clear picture of the true situation.

2. Similar restriction have not been placed in urban environments

The proposed laws are favour urban areas where "development" or tree clearing can still be undertaken in the name of progress without the restrictions being imposed on rural areas. Examples of this are continuously evident (such as widening of highways, building of railway lines, new housing estates) where vegetation is being removed. These localities are often have representation vegetation of local habitats, but are permitted to be cleared because of population pressures.

3. Replacement land management options are required to be kept. (HVA, IHVA)

- As development for urban or industrial purposes swamps what was once prime agricultural land, replacement land is required so that at a minimum, production can be sustained. The state is littered with localities where agricultural land is being removed from production for the use of houses, airports, interstate rail lines, defence, roads, industrial areas and the like.
- At a property level, managers need the ability to be flexible in their management to utilise land that is fit for purpose by being able to responsibly farm new areas more suitable for production than other areas on a property. Changing markets, flood zones, resumption of land by authorities, local laws, better understanding of land capabilities and the like, all can influence selection of land for best use.

4. Proposed Category R regrowth watercourse vegetation on Great Barrier Reef Catchments.

The proposed restrictions on watercourse regrowth are course and rudimentary and do not take into account different stream order levels. In a basic context, a stream order 1 (which is usually a "ditch" or nondescript gully) will have the same restriction as a higher order stream (like a large river) and this does not make any sense. Other provisions (Water Act) already offer protection to recognised water courses including different levels of protection for different stream orders. There is no reason to introduce this Category.

5. Compensation will be payable to landholders subject to vegetation regulation

All freehold landholders pay rates and with further declining potential of land use due to vegetation restrictions, the rate base for locked up vegetation requires a separate category in land valuations (call it "conservation" or similar) where landholders are compensated by the State Government by a rebate on rates. This needs to also be extended for the lost production potential for locked up land.

Provision needs to be made for Local government to be compensated for the reduction in rate base caused by restriction in vegetation management.

To extend the above concept further, the State Government should make cash payments to freehold landholders who wish to develop their land further but are unable to due to vegetation restriction.

6. Increasing compliance measures and penalties under vegetation management laws.

- Compliance, environmental studies and red tape is imposed by the State Government and all associated costs for landholders dealing with government requirements for regulated vegetation management needs to be borne by the State Government and not passed onto

freehold landholders who need to make a return on their investment as well as feed the world and their own family.

- Normal laws processes, such as being innocent till proven guilty, need to apply.
- Overt penalties are not acceptable. Proposed increases in penalties do not reflect the nature of the infringement.

7. Reducing the relevance of "Freehold" title

While there are valid reasons for responsible environmental management, restriction on freehold land has reduced the relevance of the concept of freehold land. The increase in government restrictions on freehold land has not been matched with compensation of any balanced approach whatsoever and the cost of environmental management, force on landholders by community and government, has been borne by landholders.

8. Laws complex, changing and not understood

The majority of rural landholders do not understand the complexities of vegetation laws which is made worse by repeated changes. Simple and fair laws need to be established that enable responsible management of properties.

9. Duplicate and additional laws at different levels of government.

State laws are further complicated by local government laws which may not agree with other levels of government (State) and add further restrictions on land management

10. Duplicate vegetation mapping at State government level

The State government produces two sets of maps by two separate departments that aim to represent the same thing, being remnant vegetation. The Department of Natural Resources and Mines produces the maps that generate the Regulated Vegetation maps and the Queensland Herbarium produce maps that are the basis for the Maters of State Environmental Significance (MSES). Both these map sets have implication to landholders but have slightly different boundaries. Duplication is costly for the government and confusing to the landholder.

11. Positive approach to land management

Positive enforcement has many benefits. Landholder get ownership of making improvements on their property. Industry can make supportive advances. Councils can offer conservation programs to enhance biodiversity. Communities can have great euphoria by participating in beneficial programs. The legislation does nothing to enhance any of these. Part of my paid work is to get landholders to acknowledge and endorse the role that vegetation has in the management of their property. And yes, you can make money from trees, but not just from chopping them down as timber, but through an integration with land management.

The programs I have been working with in the last several years has seen kilometres of creek fenced off, hundreds of hectares of land now with off stream water that has encouraged stock away from creeks and other biodiversity hot spots. I encourage the use of shade trees, protection of riparian zones and creeks. For the life of me, I fail to see how the proposed legislation will enhance vegetation preservation or give land holders any ownership of protecting and expanding vegetated areas on their property. There is no provision in the legislation to encourage good management practices – it is all about being punitive, being negative, being regressive. I fear the legislation will do the opposite of what it is intended to do. It gives no encouragement to voluntarily preserve, or indeed expand, existing areas of vegetation. To the contrary, it will do the exact opposite.

Signed:	
Address:	
Date:	21st March 2018.