

Appendix 2. Letter to Coordinator-General from Cheryl Watson

From: Cheryl Watson <cheryl.watson5@bigpond.com>
Subject: Proposed SDA changes Gladstone
Date: 10 Mar 2014 14:57:29 GMT+10
To: State development Areas <sdainfo@dsdip.qld.gov.au>

The Coordinator-General
C/- Manager, Gladstone SDA
State Development Areas Division
Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning,

10th March, 2014.

As a person who has actively been interested in the SDA since it was extended to include over 6,000 hectares of Curtis Island, I, as an individual, a member of the South End Progress Association and Treasurer of the Gladstone Conservation Council would think the Government would include in their consultation process those individuals and groups who will be effected by or have an interest in any decisions you may make. It appears that instead of wanting to engage a wide variety of citizens the Government designs this process so that basically it fails in terms of community engagement. If you do not wish the publics opinions then please don't waste our time and tax payer dollars pretending that you do. An advertisement is put in the local paper which is not purchased by everyone and the time frame makes it almost impossible for an individual or group to put in a well researched submission. I would think that one way to approach this would be to at least contact all those who put in a submission on the previous changes. Another would be to have more than one meeting for the general public as a great number of people in Gladstone work long hours during the week and do not have the time or inclination to attend meetings at these times.

Curtis Island.

I was told early in the timeframe of the SDA on Curtis Island that we would have access via road to Laird Point. By the map I do not see that being possible. Could you please clarify.

Why is half of the EMP still in the SDA? The part that has been transferred out of the SDA is it managed by National Parks or is it National Park? I believe the whole of the EMP should be National Park and the area allotted for Arrow should be returned to that National Park. Curtis Island is part of the GBRWHA and therefore allowing more industry on there is unthinkable. From all accounts Arrow Energy is not going to be built as a separate identity so a good faith act by the Government would be to return this back to nature. From my understanding the area where this site is

situated is unsuitable for shipping because of the currents and the amount of dredging that will be required. Dredging in this area will also bring with it the same problems that occurred when mudflats were dredged near the LNG Precinct.

Industry Investigation Precinct

This I find disturbing on several fronts, the first being the open ended title e.g. does this include heavy and noxious industries which will be on the fore shores. Will mudflats and mangroves once again either be smothered with spoil or will they be removed for dredging? Surely you must have an idea of what sort of industries you would allow to be put here or is it a matter of anything as long as it is industry. Cannot some of the northern shoreline of the Gladstone Harbour be set aside simply for the environment?

Unfortunately I am unable to comment on the rest of the SDA proposals as I simply do not have time to research them.

I include the following [a PowerPoint presentation, THE] which was compiled in 2008 by Gladstone Conservation Councils President Jan Arens, which follows the timeline of the SDA. I am sure this will clarify our concerns.

Thanking you,
Cheryl Watson