

# SUBMISSION TO THE EPBC ACT REVIEW

ANON-K57V-XYF4-R

## Name

Alasdair Stuart

## Organisation

Mr

## State or Territory

New South Wales

## Areas of Interest

Threatened species; International obligations; Heritage; Matters of National Environmental Significance; Environmental Impact Assessments; Climate change; Public participation in decision making; Biodiversity;

## Attachment provided

Yes

## Do you give permission for your submission to be published?

Yes - with my name and/or organisation (if included)

## SUBMISSION RESPONSES

### QUESTION 26: Do you have suggested improvements to the above principles? How should they be applied during the review and in future reform?

There is an adage in engineering  
Cheaper  
Faster  
Better

Choose any 2

The hope that reducing levels of review will improve outcomes is a chimera

### QUESTION 28: How well is the EPBC Act being administered?

The outcomes that we see show that there is lack of funding and staffing. Without decent resourcing there will be no improvement

## ATTACHMENT

Additional information was provided as an attachment to this submission. The attachment is provided on the following pages of this document.

Dear Professor Samuel and Independent Review Panel,

My submission to the Independent Review of the EPBC Act 1999 will address my concerns with the current outcomes in the environmental and heritage sphere. The preservation of our Natural Heritage is both a duty and of economic advantage.

While I live in a Sydney suburb I travel in country NSW and Queensland frequently. The changes I have observed during my life time are disturbing.

- 1 The interface between public and private space needs consideration much of the land required to ensure biodiversity is maintained is in private hands. There need to be mechanism that rewards preservation.
2. The multiple levels of government involved in the environment complement each other. While it is impractical for Federal Govt to manage every tree planting and removal the broad impact of loss of tree cover at national level is of concern.
3. The simplification of process that tries to remove need for multiple levels of management will prove both costly. We have the example of building industry self regulation in NSW as an example of what can go wrong when regulator frameworks are not fit for purpose.

### **Recommendations**

- Most of the disasters of the past year have been canvassed and warned of by capable and credible authorities. The failure of elected officials to act shows that independent statutory authorities ( an Australian invention ) are needed to manage this area .
- There must be sufficient attention to long term funding of these areas. We are talking about timeframes that stretch decades into the future. Annual budgets are not a suitable tool
- Species extinction is real. It happens on the local level frequently. Why are we reliant on obscure Tasmania cartoonists to bring this to public attention. We need concrete and credible plans to ensure threatened species survive and are restored
- The area of climate change will need special consideration. There are no silver bullets here, but business as usual is not possible. Time is of the essence. The kind of Pharonic projects being enacted to preserve Venice will not be possible everywhere

I am happy to have the opportunity to forward my concerns and that you will consider my submission, and would appreciate any feedback - I can be contacted at: [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

***Alasdair Stuart***, [REDACTED]