

Queensland Parliament
Primary Industries and Resources Committee

Submitted online: <https://gldparlcomm.snapforms.com.au/form/mineral-resources-and-other-legislation-amendment-bill-2026>

1 October 2026

Re: Submission on the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

Please accept this submission on the *Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026*¹.

1. Introduction

Environmental Advocacy in Central Queensland (**EnvA**) strongly opposes the *Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026* (**the Bill**).

EnvA is a Central Queensland community organisation committed to ensuring that land use is sustainable and does not significantly impact on the environment. We are particularly concerned about the proposed amendments to the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*² and *Environmental Protection Act 1994*³ that would substantially restrict community objection rights and reduce the circumstances in which mining approvals can be considered by the independent Queensland Land Court.

EnvA considers that these amendments would weaken an important element of Queensland's environmental decision-making framework and reduce the ability of Queenslanders to participate meaningfully in decisions about major mining projects.

The proposed restrictions are particularly concerning because many of the impacts associated with large-scale mining are not confined to the immediate vicinity of a mine site. Greenhouse gas emissions, impacts on threatened species and ecological communities, changes to water systems, cumulative environmental impacts and climate impacts on nationally and internationally significant areas such as the Great Barrier Reef can extend across regions and, in some cases, far beyond the 125 km zone proposed by the Bill.

EnvA therefore recommends that the Bill **not be passed in its current form**.

At a minimum, the Bill should be substantially amended to preserve meaningful community objection rights, retain automatic access to the Land Court where a properly made objection is lodged, and ensure that the full range of environmental and public-interest matters can be considered independently.

¹ [Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026](#)

² [Mineral Resources Act 1989 \(Qld\)](#), particularly proposed sections 260, 271, 271A and 271C

³ [Environmental Protection Act 1994 \(Qld\)](#), particularly proposed sections 183–192 concerning objections, submissions and referral to the Land Court.



2. The Bill would substantially restrict community objection rights

The current framework allows a properly made objection to a mining lease application to be considered by the Land Court.

The Bill would fundamentally change this arrangement.

Under proposed section 260 of the Mineral Resources Act, an objection to a mining lease application could only be made by an "eligible entity". This would include an affected person, an occupier of land within the proposed mining lease, or an owner or occupier of land wholly or partly within a new 125 km eligibility zone. The Bill also introduces the same eligibility concept into objections concerning draft environmental authorities and progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedules.

The Bill therefore moves away from a system in which a broader range of members of the community and public-interest organisations can formally object to a mining proposal and have those objections considered through the Land Court process, towards a system in which formal objection rights are principally determined by geographical proximity or specified interests in the land.

EnvA considers this inappropriate for major mining projects.

A large mining project is not simply a private land-use matter affecting neighbouring landholders. Mining can have consequences for:

- regional water resources and catchments;
- threatened species and ecological communities;
- biodiversity and habitat connectivity;
- greenhouse gas emissions and climate change;
- agricultural land and regional land-use patterns;
- downstream waterways and the Great Barrier Reef;
- communities well beyond the immediate mine site; and
- future generations who will experience the cumulative consequences of environmental degradation and climate change.

The people affected by these impacts cannot reasonably be defined by a 125 km boundary.

2.1 A geographical test is not an appropriate test for environmental standing

EnvA accepts that some impacts of a mining project may be predominantly local.

Noise, dust, lighting, traffic and some amenity impacts may be experienced most directly by people living near a mine.

However, other impacts are fundamentally different.

For example, greenhouse gas emissions are not confined to the mine site or surrounding region. Similarly, destruction and fragmentation of habitat may affect threatened species populations and ecological processes across much larger areas.

Water impacts can also extend downstream through interconnected catchments.

Climate impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions are inherently global. The consequences of climate change are subsequently experienced locally and regionally through increased heat, extreme weather, flooding, drought, bushfire and impacts on ecosystems.

The Great Barrier Reef provides a particularly important Central Queensland example. Activities undertaken in the Bowen and Galilee Basins can contribute to pressures affecting a World Heritage-listed ecosystem extending along Queensland's coast.

It is therefore inappropriate to determine who should have a voice in assessing these impacts simply by measuring the distance between a person's home and the boundary of a proposed mining lease.

3. Environmental organisations represent communities, not merely their office location

The proposed 125 km test is particularly problematic for incorporated community and environmental organisations.

EnvA is based in Central Queensland and represents members and community interests across the region. Our physical office location does not define the geographic extent of the communities we represent or the environmental issues about which our members are concerned.

Environmental organisations perform an important public-interest function by:

- examining complex technical applications;
- engaging scientists and other experts;
- identifying deficiencies or uncertainties in environmental assessments;
- representing community concerns;
- making detailed submissions;
- bringing relevant evidence before decision-makers; and
- monitoring whether approval conditions adequately address environmental risks.

A community organisation should not lose its ability to participate in an independent merits process merely because its office happens to be located outside an arbitrary geographical boundary.

Indeed, environmental organisations often have greater capacity than individual community members to undertake the substantial work required to scrutinise complex mining applications.

The Bill risks creating a situation in which an organisation can undertake extensive work on behalf of Central Queensland communities, identify serious environmental concerns, and make a detailed submission, but then be denied the right to have those concerns considered by the Land Court because its office falls outside the 125 km zone.

That would undermine rather than strengthen meaningful community participation.

4. The Bill would remove automatic access to the Land Court

EnvA is particularly concerned about the proposed removal of automatic referral of properly made objections to the Land Court.

Under the proposed amendments, referral to the Land Court would become discretionary.

For mining lease applications, the Resources Minister would be able to refer the application generally or refer a specific matter to the Land Court. Where only a specific matter is referred, the Bill provides that objections are referred only to the extent the Minister considers them relevant to that matter.

This creates a significant change in the balance between the community, government and proponents.

The current system provides an important safeguard: where a properly made objection is lodged, the matter can proceed to an independent Land Court hearing for consideration.

Under the proposed system, access to the Land Court would depend upon the Minister deciding to make a referral. The Chief Executive could then make the referral only if a properly made objection had been received. This means that, unlike the existing framework, the lodging of a properly made objection would not itself secure access to an independent merits-based hearing.

EnvA considers that this is a significant reduction in procedural independence.

A person or organisation that has spent considerable time examining an application should not have to persuade the same administrative decision-making system that its concerns are sufficiently important to justify independent Land Court consideration.

The purpose of an independent merits-based court process is precisely to provide an additional level of scrutiny where significant public-interest issues arise.

5. The Bill would allow the scope of Land Court consideration to be narrowed

The proposed section 271C would permit the Minister to refer a mining lease application generally or a specific matter stated by the Minister to the Land Court.

Where a specific matter is referred, the Chief Executive is required to provide the Land Court with objections only to the extent that the Minister considers them relevant to that matter.

EnvA is concerned that this creates the potential for important issues raised by objectors to be excluded from independent consideration before the Court has had an opportunity to assess them.

The Land Court should be able to determine the relevance and significance of matters raised in a properly made objection rather than having the scope of its consideration predetermined administratively.

If the Government considers that Land Court proceedings should be more focused, this can be achieved through ordinary case-management powers, directions hearings, evidence requirements and the Court's existing ability to strike out objections that are frivolous, vexatious or an abuse of process.

The Land Court should be able to determine the relevance and significance of matters raised in a properly made objection, rather than having the scope of its consideration predetermined administratively before the Court has heard the objection.

6. The Bill narrows the grounds of objection

The Bill also proposes to restrict the grounds on which an objection to a mining lease can be made.

Proposed section 260(4) provides that the grounds of objection must relate to matters the Minister is able to consider under proposed section 271(1).

The Bill simultaneously removes environmental harm from the matters the Minister may consider under the mining lease decision-making criteria to the extent that the criterion relates to environmental harm.

This creates a significant structural change.

Environmental impacts that are currently capable of being considered in the mining lease process would increasingly be separated from the mining lease decision and dealt with through the environmental authority process.

While there may be administrative merit in avoiding unnecessary duplication between the Mineral Resources Act and Environmental Protection Act, the solution should not be to reduce the ability of communities to have environmental issues considered by an independent court.

Environmental issues are not neatly separable from the broader public-interest question of whether a mining lease should be granted.

7. Major environmental impacts are not local impacts

EnvA strongly supports the principle that environmental impacts should be assessed according to their actual geographic extent rather than an arbitrary administrative boundary.

The distinction is particularly important for the following matters.

Greenhouse gas emissions

Greenhouse gas emissions from mining operations contribute to atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases and climate change.

The consequences are not confined to the mining lease, the surrounding property or even Central Queensland.

Climate change affects communities, ecosystems and infrastructure throughout Queensland and beyond.

The Land Court has recently demonstrated the relevance of these broader impacts.

In the Sonoma East matter, the Court considered climate change and human rights in assessing the proposed coal mine expansion and recommended that the environmental authority include a stronger greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan with specific and measurable targets.

This demonstrates the value of an independent forum in which climate impacts can be properly examined rather than treating them as irrelevant because they occur outside the immediate project area.

Threatened species and ecological communities

The impacts of clearing and habitat fragmentation can extend well beyond a mining lease boundary.

Threatened species do not recognise cadastral boundaries or administrative zones.

The loss of habitat can contribute to fragmentation of populations, reduced connectivity and cumulative pressures on species already subject to multiple threats.

Environmental organisations frequently possess specialised knowledge about these broader ecological issues that individual landholders may not be able to present.

Water resources

Mining can affect groundwater, surface water, waterways and downstream environments.

Water systems are connected. The geographic consequences of a mining activity therefore cannot necessarily be assessed by reference to where a particular individual lives.

The Great Barrier Reef

Central Queensland's mining regions are connected to catchments that ultimately drain to the Great Barrier Reef.

The environmental consequences of mining, including sediment, water quality, habitat loss and greenhouse gas emissions, can therefore have implications far beyond the immediate mine site.

A 125 km standing test is incapable of reflecting these ecological connections.

8. EnvA's experience demonstrates the value of independent scrutiny

EnvA has previously participated in six matters involving mining or resource project approvals and Land Court proceedings.

These matters demonstrate in practical terms why community objection rights and independent review are important.

8.1 Sonoma East coal mine expansion

EnvA challenged the Queensland Government's approval of the Sonoma East coal mine expansion.

In April 2026, the Land Court recommended that the mining lease be granted but called for stronger climate accountability, including an environmental authority condition requiring a greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan containing specific and measurable targets.⁴

The Court also considered the relationship between climate change, human rights and the public interest.

This matter demonstrates that an independent court can identify issues requiring stronger regulatory conditions even where the project ultimately proceeds.

8.2 Rolleston Spring Creek North extension

EnvA challenged Glencore's proposed Spring Creek North extension of the Rolleston Open Cut Coal Mine.

In its judgement, the Land Court noted that there was extensive evidence provided to the court which did not exist at the time the draft EA was notified, nor when submissions were made and objections registered. The objections and the additional material enabled a more comprehensive consideration to be given to the draft EA [para 271].⁵

The Land Court ultimately recommended approval subject to additional conditions.

Those conditions included requirements concerning greenhouse gas abatement, air-quality monitoring, air-emissions management, and surface and groundwater monitoring.

Again, the importance of the objection process was not limited to whether the project was ultimately approved or refused. The process improved the information available to the Court and contributed to stronger conditions.

8.3 Ensham Life of Mine Extension

EnvA participated in the challenge to the Ensham Life of Mine Extension.

In March 2025, the Land Court recommended that the mining lease not be approved unless

⁴ [QCoal Sonoma Pty Ltd & Ors \[2026\] QLC 3](#)

⁵ [Rolleston Coal Holdings Pty Ltd v Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation \[2025\] QLC 22](#)

and until the applicants demonstrated "real and significant progress" towards mitigating greenhouse gas emissions.⁶

The Court's consideration of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change illustrates why environmental and climate issues should not be artificially excluded from an independent merits-based assessment of a mining project.

Although the Queensland Government subsequently approved the project, the Land Court process provided an important independent examination of the project's climate implications.

8.4 Blue Energy coal seam gas project

EnvA appealed the approval of an environmental authority for Blue Energy's Bowen Basin gas project based on the lack of environmental information provided for two of the three proposed extraction areas.

The matter subsequently settled, with the proposed project substantially reduced.⁷ The settlement resulted in a reduction of the proposed gas well program of almost 80 per cent.

This demonstrates that legal challenges can result in material changes to resource projects without the need for a final contested judgment.

It also demonstrates why communities need meaningful access to a process in which concerns can be raised, evidence examined and negotiations undertaken.

8.5 Lake Vermont Meadowbrook coal mine extension

EnvA also objected to the Lake Vermont Meadowbrook coal mine extension in the Land Court.

In September 2026, the Land Court recommended approval of the project, but the Court process resulted in significant changes to the proposed environmental authority.⁸

These included:

- a greenhouse gas abatement plan with public reporting requirements;
- improvements to progressive rehabilitation and closure requirements;
- requirements concerning levee construction;
- stronger groundwater monitoring conditions; and
- requirements for a Social Impact Management Plan.

The Court also noted that more comprehensive expert reports were provided during the proceedings and that expert recommendations resulted in changes to the proposed environmental authority.

Importantly, the Court stated that these changes would not have occurred without the intervention of the Court process.

This is a particularly clear demonstration of the value of community participation.

The purpose of an objection is not simply to obtain refusal of a project. It is also to ensure that environmental information is properly examined, deficiencies are identified, conditions are improved and decision-makers are required to confront issues that might otherwise receive insufficient attention.

⁶ [Sungela Pty Ltd & Anor \[2025\] QLC 5](#)

⁷ [Environmental Advocacy in Central Queensland Inc v Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation & Ors \[2025\] QLC 7](#)

⁸ [Bowen Basin Coal Pty Ltd v Queensland Conservation Council Inc & Ors \[2026\] QLC 18](#)

8.6 Coppabella mine environmental authority amendment

The recent Land Court proceedings concerning amendments to the Coppabella Mine's Environmental Authority provide a further and particularly timely example of the value of community participation and independent scrutiny.

The Land Court recommended approval of the amended Environmental Authority, but the proceedings resulted in significant changes to the environmental requirements applying to the mine.⁹

The amended Environmental Authority includes strengthened requirements relating to:

- groundwater monitoring and management;
- dust and particulate monitoring;
- biodiversity;
- impacts on threatened species habitat;
- impacts on threatened ecological communities;
- incident reporting;
- rehabilitation; and
- the mine's final landform.

The rehabilitation arrangements were also changed, including the replacement of four residual voids with a single aggregate residual void with a maximum lake surface area of 80 hectares.

Importantly, the Court identified the removal of a requirement for Aboriginal input into post-mining rehabilitation and conservation outcomes. The Court recommended that this requirement be reinstated unless equivalent requirements are incorporated into the mine's Progressive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan.

This is precisely the type of outcome that demonstrates the value of an independent merits-based review process.

The Coppabella proceedings did not result in the mine being refused. They did, however, result in detailed scrutiny of the proposed environmental conditions and changes to the requirements that will govern the mine.

The Coppabella case therefore demonstrates that the value of objection rights cannot be measured solely by whether a project is approved or refused; the process can materially improve the environmental conditions under which an approved project operates.

9. Community participation requires more than the ability to make a submission

The Bill would continue to allow some people to make submissions even where they cannot make formal objections. EnvA does not consider this an adequate substitute for an objection right.

There is a fundamental difference between:

1. being permitted to send information to a decision-maker; and
2. having a statutory right to challenge an approval through an independent merits-based process.

⁹ [Peabody Coppabella & Ors v Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation \[2026\] QLC 20](#)

Community members and organisations invest substantial time and resources in reading environmental impact statements, technical reports, draft environmental authorities and rehabilitation plans.

They do this because they expect their concerns to be genuinely considered.

Where a submission raises significant unresolved issues, the community should retain a pathway to have those issues independently examined.

Otherwise, public participation risks becoming a one-way process in which Queenslanders are invited to comment but have no meaningful mechanism to challenge a decision when they consider that their concerns have not been adequately addressed.

10. Constitutional considerations

EnvA is concerned that the Bill is difficult to reconcile with important principles expressed in the Constitution of Queensland 2001¹⁰ (**the Constitution**).

The Constitution's preamble states that the people of Queensland:

- adopt the principle of the sovereignty of the people, under the rule of law, and the system of representative and responsible government;
- resolve to build a society based on democracy, freedom and peace;
- honour the Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the First Australians, whose lands, winds and waters we all now share; and pay tribute to their unique values, and their ancient and enduring cultures, which deepen and enrich the life of our community; and
- determine to protect Queensland's unique environment.

These principles do not necessarily create a freestanding constitutional right for every person to challenge a mining approval.

However, they are important constitutional statements about the character and purposes of Queensland's system of government.

EnvA considers that legislation which substantially removes opportunities for members of the Queensland community to participate in decisions affecting the State's environment should be examined carefully against these constitutional principles.

The Bill would:

- restrict who can formally object;
- impose a 125 km geographical eligibility test;
- restrict the grounds on which objections can be made;
- remove automatic referral of properly made objections to the Land Court; and
- allow the scope of matters referred to the Court to be determined administratively.

Taken together, these changes substantially reduce opportunities for independent scrutiny of major mining decisions.

EnvA therefore recommends that the Committee obtain detailed constitutional advice on the compatibility of the proposed amendments with the constitutional principles of popular sovereignty, representative and responsible government, democracy and environmental protection.

¹⁰ [Constitution of Queensland 2001 \(Qld\), including the Preamble.](#)

11. Human rights considerations

The Bill also raises significant human rights issues. The Government has provided a Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights in connection with the Bill. EnvA considers that the proposed restrictions warrant closer examination, particularly in relation to the rights to take part in public life under section 23 and to a fair hearing under section 31 of the Human Rights Act 2019.

The Human Rights Act 2019¹¹ recognises that human rights are essential to a democratic and inclusive society and provides that human rights may be limited only by reasonable limits that can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

Section 23 of the Human Rights Act recognises the right of every person in Queensland to participate in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

Section 21 protects freedom of expression, including the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas.

Section 31 protects the right of a party to a civil proceeding to have the proceeding decided by a competent, independent and impartial court or tribunal after a fair and public hearing.

The Queensland Human Rights Commission has also recognised that the Land Court acts as a public entity when undertaking its administrative functions in mining objection matters and must therefore consider human rights in accordance with the Human Rights Act.

In *Waratah Coal Pty Ltd v Youth Verdict Ltd & Ors*¹², the Land Court accepted that objectors could raise human rights issues in mining objection proceedings.

The proposed restrictions therefore have implications for meaningful public participation and, where an individual would otherwise be a party to proceedings, access to an independent tribunal.

EnvA acknowledges that the Human Rights Act does not give corporations or incorporated associations human rights in their own right. The relevant rights belong to individuals.

However, environmental organisations such as EnvA provide a mechanism through which individuals and communities participate in public affairs.

A legislative change that prevents individuals from obtaining access to an independent decision-making process because they live outside an arbitrary geographical zone raises legitimate questions under section 23.

Similarly, where an individual would otherwise have access to a civil proceeding but is prevented from becoming a party because of the proposed standing restrictions, the implications for section 31 warrant careful consideration.

The Human Rights Act requires any limitation of a protected right to be demonstrably justified, including consideration of whether there are less restrictive reasonably available alternatives.

EnvA considers that the Bill has not demonstrated why the proposed restrictions are necessary when less restrictive alternatives are available, including:

- retaining existing objection rights;
- requiring the Land Court to manage proceedings proportionately;

¹¹ [Human Rights Act 2019 \(Qld\)](#), particularly sections 13, 21, 23 and 31.

¹² [Waratah Coal Pty Ltd v Youth Verdict Ltd & Ors \(No 2\) \[2021\] QLC 4](#).

- allowing the Court to strike out frivolous or vexatious objections;
 - imposing appropriate evidence and procedural requirements; and
 - allowing the Court to determine which issues require detailed consideration.
-

12. The role of the Land Court should be protected, not diminished

The Queensland Land Court provides an important independent forum for considering complex disputes involving mining and environmental approvals.

It has specialist expertise in mining, land use, environmental and resource matters.

EnvA's experience demonstrates that its role is not simply to decide whether a mine should proceed.

The Court can:

- test evidence;
- hear expert witnesses;
- identify shortcomings in applications;
- examine competing evidence;
- consider human rights;
- recommend additional conditions;
- require stronger monitoring and reporting;
- facilitate changes to proposed approval conditions; and
- provide an independent assessment of matters of significant public interest.

Reducing access to this process should therefore not be treated simply as an administrative streamlining measure.

It changes the substantive balance between proponents, government and communities.

13. Recommendations

EnvA recommends that the Committee recommend that the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 not be passed in its current form.

If the Government proceeds with reforms to the mining objection framework, EnvA recommends the following amendments.

Recommendation 1 — Retain broad community objection rights

The right to lodge an objection should not be restricted by the proposed 125 km eligibility zone.

Any person or organisation with a genuine interest in the environmental, social, economic or public-interest consequences of a proposed mining project should retain the ability to lodge a properly made objection.

Recommendation 2 — Recognise the role of public-interest organisations

Environmental and community organisations should be expressly recognised as legitimate participants in mining approval processes.

Standing should not depend on the physical location of an organisation's office.

Recommendation 3 — Retain automatic Land Court referral

A properly made objection should continue to provide a statutory right to have the objection considered by the Land Court, subject to the Court's existing powers to manage proceedings and strike out objections that are frivolous, vexatious, outside jurisdiction or an abuse of process.

The independent Court, rather than the Minister or administrative decision-maker, should determine the appropriate scope and conduct of the proceedings.

Recommendation 4 — Do not allow administrative decision-makers to determine which objection issues reach the Court

The legislation should not allow the Minister to determine unilaterally which aspects of an objection are sufficiently relevant to warrant independent consideration.

If a properly made objection is referred, the Court should have jurisdiction to determine the relevance and scope of the issues raised.

Recommendation 5 — Retain broad grounds of objection

Objectors should be able to raise all relevant matters concerning the proposed mining lease and associated environmental authority.

Environmental impacts should not be excluded simply because they are also assessed under the Environmental Protection Act.

Recommendation 6 — Recognise cumulative and regional impacts

The legislation should expressly recognise that mining impacts may extend beyond the immediate project area.

This should include:

- greenhouse gas emissions;
- climate change;
- threatened species and ecological communities;
- water resources and downstream impacts;
- cumulative environmental impacts; and
- impacts on nationally and internationally significant environmental assets, including the Great Barrier Reef.

Recommendation 7 — Obtain further constitutional and human-rights advice

Before proceeding with the Bill, the Queensland Government should obtain and publish detailed independent advice regarding:

- the compatibility of the proposed restrictions with the constitutional principles expressed in the Constitution of Queensland 2001; and
- the compatibility of the proposed restrictions with the Human Rights Act 2019, particularly sections 21, 23 and 31 and the proportionality requirements in section 13.

14. Conclusion

Queenslanders should not be expected to spend months reading complex mining applications, identifying environmental risks and preparing detailed submissions if the legislation then prevents them from having those concerns independently examined.

Community objection rights are not an unnecessary obstacle to good government. They are an important part of ensuring that major decisions affecting Queensland's land, water, wildlife, climate and communities are subject to proper scrutiny.

EnvA's experience demonstrates that community participation can make a tangible difference.

At Sonoma, the Land Court recommended stronger greenhouse gas accountability.

At Rolleston, the Court noted that extensive evidence was provided that had not been available when the draft environmental authority was notified and objections were made, enabling more comprehensive consideration of the proposal.

At Ensham, the Court identified significant concerns about greenhouse gas emissions and recommended against approval unless meaningful progress was made on emissions mitigation.

In the Blue Energy matter, EnvA's appeal resulted in a revised environmental authority and a substantial reduction in the proposed gas development.

At Lake Vermont, the Court process resulted in changes to environmental and rehabilitation requirements, including requirements concerning greenhouse gas emissions, groundwater, levees and social impacts.

Most recently, at Coppabella, the Court recommended approval of the amended Environmental Authority while the proceedings resulted in stronger requirements concerning groundwater, dust, biodiversity, threatened species habitat, rehabilitation, residual voids, incident reporting and Aboriginal input into post-mining outcomes.

These outcomes demonstrate that independent scrutiny is not simply about whether a project is approved or refused. The value of an objection right is that it provides a safeguard: evidence can be tested, environmental conditions can be scrutinised, deficiencies can be identified and approval requirements can be strengthened before decisions with potentially decades-long consequences are finalised.

That safeguard should not depend on whether an individual happens to live within 125 kilometres of a mine or whether a community organisation's office happens to fall inside an arbitrary geographical boundary. Environmental impacts do not stop at 125 kilometres. Neither should Queensland's system of environmental accountability.

Environmental Advocacy in Central Queensland therefore strongly opposes the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 and recommends that the Bill be withdrawn or substantially amended to preserve meaningful community objection rights and independent access to the Queensland Land Court.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the *Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026*.

Kind regards



Dr Coral Rowston
Director
Environmental Advocacy in Central Queensland Inc.