

# SUBMISSION TO THE EPBC ACT REVIEW

ANON-K57V-XZ74-A

## Name

ADELIA BERRIDGE

## State or Territory

Queensland

## Areas of Interest

Threatened species; Environmental Impact Assessments;

## Attachment provided

No

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

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

## SUBMISSION RESPONSES

**QUESTION 1: Some have argued that past changes to the EPBC Act to add new matters of national environmental significance did not go far enough. Others have argued it has extended the regulatory reach of the Commonwealth too far. What do you think?**

It did not go far enough.

Our country has watered down laws and protections to developer funded politicians.

**QUESTION 2: How could the principle of Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD) be better reflected in the EPBC Act? For example, could the consideration of environmental, social and economic factors, which are core components of ESD, be achieved through greater inclusion of cost benefit analysis in decision making?**

The 3 essential elements are not being considered except economical.

The environmental is in the hands of developer funded politicians making sure they return the favours to mates who's funding was essential to get them elected.

The social needs are completely ignored. it's a case of economy instead of social and environment, not as well as social and environment.

**QUESTION 3: Should the objects of the EPBC Act be more specific?**

yes. One example is there is no point in a koala protection law that allows their habitat and food to be destroyed. The environment needs to be a part of our sustainability not instead of.

**QUESTION 4: Should the matters of national environmental significance within the EPBC Act be changed? How?**

The future of Australia's native wildlife is on the brink, and this year's bushfires have only made it much worse. We estimate 1.25 billion animals have been killed by the fires. This might just be the last straw for some of our most threatened wildlife already at risk of being lost forever.

Australia has the worst mammal extinction rate of any country in the world. In the last decade, three of Australia's native species have gone extinct and hundreds more are on the verge of extinction.

Surely, this alone means the ACT needs to be changed

**QUESTION 5: Which elements of the EPBC Act should be priorities for reform? For example, should future reforms focus on assessment and approval processes or on biodiversity conservation? Should the Act have proactive mechanisms to enable landholders to protect matters of national environmental significance and biodiversity, removing the need for regulation in the right circumstances?**

The EPBC Act is supposed to protect the homes and habitats of our most threatened species, but in the 20 years since the laws were passed more than 7.6 million hectares of threatened species habitat has been destroyed – that's an area bigger than the whole of Tasmania.

It's clear the Government needs to do more – much more - to protect our wildlife and the places we love before we lose more of our precious animals forever. You call this reform. We call it urgent action.

Our environmental laws are failing to protect our wildlife and the places we love.

Without urgent change we're guaranteed to lose more of our precious animals forever.

We can stop Australia's extinction crisis but the question is, will the government stop pretending to be doing something like asking for submissions and then take a year to obtain more research before ordering a Royal Commission down the track to see why protected wildlife have become extinct.

**QUESTION 6: What high level concerns should the review focus on? For example, should there be greater focus on better guidance on the EPBC Act, including clear environmental standards? How effective has the EPBC Act been in achieving its statutory objectives to protect the environment and promote ecologically sustainable development and biodiversity conservation? What have been the economic costs associated with the operation and administration of the EPBC Act?**

You can answer that question yourselves, you don't need us to do that. The government is fully aware what needs to be far better protected and how this can be done immediately. Instead, you use smoke and mirrors to look like there is a care and concern factor. Going out to the people asking them what they think is a delaying tactic and we all know the wildlife and protection of the environment has been researched to death.

**QUESTION 7: What additional future trends or supporting evidence should be drawn on to inform the review?**

Climate change is real and finally this government and others are finally having to say yes, it's real. since you started this delaying tactic of a 5 month submission the massive fires have answered this

question for you. The question now is, are you listening and recording the information at your fingertips or are you just turning a blind eye?

**QUESTION 8: Should the EPBC Act regulate environmental and heritage outcomes instead of managing prescriptive processes?**

Well someone has to step up. If not Environment and Protection then who else? Seriously, what choices are there? of course it has to be part of the solution instead of a watch and report office.

**QUESTION 9: Should the EPBC Act position the Commonwealth to take a stronger role in delivering environmental and heritage outcomes in our federated system? Who should articulate outcomes? Who should provide oversight of the outcomes? How do we know if outcomes are being achieved?**

To answer the last question, step outside and look around. not hard to see everything environmental disappearing in front of our eyes. we know over 90% of our koalas have gone, and that was before the fires. Seeing the wildlife come back would be a good way to see if the purpose has been achieved.

Who should provide the oversight of the outcomes-someone who really cares. someone who will not be controlled by big developers or politicians funded by developers. Very hard to find people who are not in a role for self interest.

**QUESTION 10: Should there be a greater role for national environmental standards in achieving the outcomes the EPBC Act seeks to achieve? In our federated system should they be prescribed through:**

- **Non-binding policy and strategies?**
- **Expansion of targeted standards, similar to the approach to site contamination under the National Environment Protection Council, or water quality in the Great Barrier Reef catchments?**
- **The development of broad environment standards with the Commonwealth taking a monitoring and assurance role? Does the information exist to do this?**

Is this a nonsense question? Common sense says step up and get it right and stop asking questions so you analyse, shift, display, think again, replan etc and all the while there is and never has been an action plan.

Put verbs in sentences and make a change. Just do it!

**QUESTION 11: How can environmental protection and environmental restoration be best achieved together?**

you've already asked this but in a different format which tells me that who ever is putting this together is in it to justify their existence and get paid.

**QUESTION 12: Are heritage management plans and associated incentives sensible mechanisms to improve? How can the EPBC Act adequately represent Indigenous culturally important places? Should protection and management be place-based instead of values based?**

more time wasting questions. the government has researched this to death. They have these answers tenfold.

**QUESTION 13: Should the EPBC Act require the use of strategic assessments to replace case-by-case assessments? Who should lead or participate in strategic assessments?**

Someone who has a brain, a heart and has no self interest

**QUESTION 14: Should the matters of national significance be refined to remove duplication of responsibilities between different levels of government? Should states be delegated to deliver EPBC Act outcomes subject to national standards?**

What a stupid question the first one is. dead set, you can't be serious?

**QUESTION 15: Should low-risk projects receive automatic approval or be exempt in some way?**

- **How could data help support this approach?**
- **Should a national environmental database be developed?**
- **Should all data from environmental impact assessments be made publicly available?**

in an ideal world of data, yes. However, we can't even manage a council election without failed web site data, data taking 2 days to update, no communication to candidates, people driving 40 mins every day to collect information at 4.30pm because no one can manage a phone system, the list goes on. How on earth can the State manage something as significant as this?

**QUESTION 16: Should the Commonwealth's regulatory role under the EPBC Act focus on habitat management at a landscape-scale rather than species-specific protections?**

yes.

**QUESTION 17: Should the EPBC Act be amended to enable broader accreditation of state and territory, local and other processes?**

yes

**QUESTION 18: Are there adequate incentives to give the community confidence in self-regulation?**

Definitely not. When you have corrupt politicians in local government we can't possibly self regulate. We need ICAC in Qld

**QUESTION 19: How should the EPBC Act support the engagement of Indigenous Australians in environment and heritage management?**

- **How can we best engage with Indigenous Australians to best understand their needs and potential contributions?**
- **What mechanisms should be added to the Act to support the role of Indigenous Australians?**

Best ask Indigenous Australians what they want

**QUESTION 20: How should community involvement in decision-making under the EPBC Act be improved? For example, should community representation in environmental advisory and decision making bodies be increased?**

We have practically covered this in prior questions. We need more independent bodies, removed from political interference

**QUESTION 21: What is the priority for reform to governance arrangements? The decision-making structures or the transparency of decisions? Should the decision makers under the EPBC Act be supported by different governance arrangements?**

Less layers is the key. Less box tickers. Less tick and flickers. Surely it's not that hard to actually protect the environment instead of just pretending to protect it with half measures? Just get people in the job that put verbs in sentences instead of walking around with clip boards justifying their existence.

**QUESTION 22: What innovative approaches could the review consider that could efficiently and effectively deliver the intended outcomes of the EPBC Act? What safeguards would be needed?**

Safeguard would be less consultancy from self interest groups like the building lobby groups.

This would also be an innovative approach, While you have consultants and interference from the building lobby you will never get true protection. If you want to really protect the environment, you can. it's not hard. the problem is standing up to the people who fund government and interfere with councils, such as we have seen in Redland City Council.

**QUESTION 23: Should the Commonwealth establish new environmental markets? Should the Commonwealth implement a trust fund for environmental outcomes?**

Yes

**QUESTION 24: What do you see are the key opportunities to improve the current system of environmental offsetting under the EPBC Act?**

The key opportunities is health. without an effective ecosystem we have poor health.

The Corona virus has pushed us into distancing and so it should be and we are living and moving far too close to each other. we need more green buffers for people to distance. environmental protection is also in cities and suburbs.

**QUESTION 25: How could private sector and philanthropic investment in the environment be best supported by the EPBC Act?**

- **Could public sector financing be used to increase these investments?**
- **What are the benefits, costs or risk with the Commonwealth developing a public investment vehicle to coordinate EPBC Act offset funds?**

It's our duty to have offset funds that protect our health and well being. It's our duty address mental health as a major issue. Like rates and taxes, it's the duty of investors and businesses to give a percentage back. It needs to be legislated as a need not a desire. to invest in our environment.

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

No

**QUESTION 27: Is the EPBC Act delivering what was intended in an efficient and effective manner?**

You know it's not otherwise we wouldn't have submissions with forms that are designed to ensure people do not respond. The process of making a submission to tighten a very loose EPBC Act should be easy. you have made this so complicated and time consuming that most people will not bother.

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

Look around and the answer to that question is obvious. It's just box ticking by trained box tick and flickers.

**QUESTION 29: Is the EPBC Act sufficient to address future challenges? Why?**

You know it's not otherwise we wouldn't have submissions with forms that are designed to ensure people do not respond. The process of making a submission to tighten a very loose EPBC Act should be easy. you have made this so complicated and time consuming that most people will not bother.

**QUESTION 30: What are the priority areas for reform?**

Serious? Australia has the fastest land clearing in the Western World and Qld can claim their honour of the largest contributor. We have just had the scariest fires across Australia that were predicted due to our heating and you ask what's the priority?

**QUESTION 31: What changes are needed to the EPBC Act? Why?**

Already covered this

**QUESTION 32: Is there anything else of importance to you that you would like the review to consider?**

just do it and stop reporting about it for 2 years and then sitting on it for 2 years. Action means now, not 2024. We commissioned a koala report in 2014. it took 2 years to report we'd lost 80% and was released 2016. It took another 2 years to actually say we need to talk about this because we have lost 80% of our koalas. No you haven't. That was 2014. The loss now while you have been talking about it means they are on the brink of extinction and now in 2020, you get more consultants to ask questions covered in the koala report of 2014. Save the koalas and you will just about save everything else. If you can't save the koala what can you save?