

P1/5

TO: propose THE CHAIRMAN;  
content of the original SELECT COMMITTEE into  
certain Aspects of Queensland Government Administration  
related to Commonwealth Government Affairs, final  
stages awaiting a decision by the Coordinator General.  
The former coordinator-gen I am a resident of ACLAND  
on the Darling Downs in Queensland, affected by  
Mining lease Applications since about 1998 for  
open cut coal mining. This area covers valuable  
feed producing land which forms part of the head  
waters of the Murray-Darling System and is home  
to flora, fauna, migratory species and regional  
ecosystems which are listed under the EPBC Act.  
National significance. Whilst most of my issues with the  
QLD Government possibly relate to a time prior to the  
election of the L-NP government many of the issues  
are being reinforced and added to by this Green  
T government.

landowners My comments mainly relate to Terms  
of Reference 1 c, d, e and g.  
are impacted New Hopes Stage 3 Mining Project at  
Acland was referred to the Commonwealth in March  
2007 (Referral 2007/3423) and at the time of the  
2012 election the EIS was in its final stages  
awaiting a decision.

protecting the The L-NP promised that Stage 3 would  
not proceed if it won government. Subsequent to  
the election, the L-NP changed their mind and  
a new EIS was launched for Stage 3 expansion,  
which involved varying the Referral to the Commonwealth  
in November 2012.

Mining My concern is — What made the L-NP change  
their mind? Was this due to pressure from the

proponent? I am also concerned about the content of the original Referral (2007/3423) and its variation in November ~~2012~~ 2012.

The first EIS for Stage 3 was in its final stages awaiting a decision by the Coordinator General. The former coordinator-general (expressed to be an independent officer) was replaced when the L-NP government was elected. Why was the Coordinator General replaced, and why was a new EIS announced when the LNP changed their mind about Stage 3 not proceeding?

There are certain environmental issues which transcend State boundaries. They are of National significance and should continue to be dealt with by the Federal Government.

The Mineral and Energy (Common Provisions Bill) 2014 (QLD GOVT) was designed to reduce "Red & Green Tape" and removed many rights formerly held by landowners and affected people which can include all Australians when matters of National Significance are impacted.

Even though it is still possible to object to an Environmental Authority for a Mining Lease, in my experience, EAs are not effectively policed by the Queensland Government and are useless in protecting the environment.

In QLD, under the L-NP government, the changes to law that affect mining projects also means that the power of the Minister for the environment is diminished because of the dominating influence of the Ministers for Mining and Planning, Infrastructure & Development. These changes to Mining Law have been largely

influenced by the mining industry. There is no evidence to suggest that the QLD State Government has any will to protect the environment. Before the L-NP iron office, the behaviour and pathways of governments and mining companies at Acland was described as immoral at best. Cries of "Royal Commissions" were made from all four corners! In government the L-NP turned these pathways into freeways, acquiescing to the influence of mining companies to the detriment of the environment. PBC Act for the Revised Project.

Under the 2nd EIS for Stage 3 expansion the company that all but demolished the town of Acland, bought the school grounds and buildings for \$220,000, entered into agreements to purchase Tom Doherty Park and its Soldiers Memorial, jointly objected with the Roalio Shire to the heritage listing of the Acland N<sup>o</sup>2 Colliery, purchased the Acland N<sup>o</sup>2 Colliery from the Toowoomba Regional Council, dumped demolished building rubble including asbestos into the headwaters of the Murray Darling system drainage system, now has an Acland Management Plan!! It seems we don't have governments anymore. We just have Mining Companies. I forgot to mention the ~ 40 Bottle Trees removed from the town in anticipation of Stage 3 being approved in 2009! (ie preparation for mining)

Australian Residents who are either scientifically or subjectively concerned about their environment are being left out of the loop.

Most of the Consultancy work for the EIS Studies at Acland has been done by Sinclair Knight Merz. In my view it presents the findings in a way which lacks independence and objectivity, & promotes the agenda of the proponent.

In my submission to the EIS, Stage 3 (Veried) I presented photographs of 2 separate sightings of Rufous fantail - a migratory species and have recently photographed a third sighting (17/10/14) at Acland. The response was that Migratory species was not one of the controlling provisions under the EPBC Act for the revised Project.

— WHY NOT!

I also drew attention to *Rhaponticum australe* which is likely to be affected by the footprint of the Mammingvale West Pit of Stage-3. (Other people have also witnessed this occurrence). It is listed as vulnerable under both QLD & EPBC Acts, yet the proponent refuses to acknowledge its presence and therefore is not considering it in the referral. There is no point of having public scrutiny through a EIS if no one takes any notice.

As I understand it the R.E 11.3.21 was reviewed from endangered to critically endangered (Not added to as the referral to the Commonwealth suggests?)

At Acland New Hope have used the threat of Mining law to acquire land for its Pastoral Company. The Pastoral Company's management of the land has ~~led~~ resulted in much environmental damage ~~to~~ being done since their acquisitions.

It is my experience that New Hope, (the proponent for Stage 3) with the help of their EIS consultants and media spin, do all they can

P5/5

P1/5

to conceal the existence of significant environmental values that might hinder their project advancing.

The Proposal by the Federal Government to reduce 'red and green tape' and devolve its environmental responsibility to the QLD govt. which has already cut 'red & green tape' is NOT APPROPRIATE.

Our environment needs more care and repair: not less. Though financial and economic values are important, sometimes other values are more so.

Thankyou,

G M Beutel.

NAME: GLENN NORMAN BEUTEL

10th November 2014.

of Repren

New River Stage 3 Planning Project at Adelaide River reported to the Commonwealth in March 2007 (Approved by the Dept of Environment and Heritage) and at the time of the 2012 election the project was in the final stages awaiting a decision.

The LNP promised that Stage 3 would not proceed if it was government. Subsequent to the election, the LNP changed their mind and a new EIS was launched for Stage 3 expansion, which involved varying the Referral to the Commonwealth in November 2012.

My concern is - what made the LNP change their mind? Was this due to pressure from the