

PO Box 36
Hove SA 5048
28 May 2018

Dear Minister,

RE: Concerns regarding matters of National Environment Significance and Jobs regarding Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers Seaport proposal

I write to lodge a formal objection to Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers' proposed Seaport at Smith Bay on Kangaroo Island.

I have reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by the proponent (KIPT), and I strongly believe that the proposed development should NOT proceed.

I would like to start by stating for the record that this project should never have been granted Major Development Status by the previous government. The entire North Coast of Kangaroo Island is zoned Coastal Conservation for a reason, namely to prevent precisely this type of destructive development from spoiling the island's beautiful coast. The coastal land will obviously suffer greatly if a port were to be constructed at Smith Bay, however the damage would not stop there.

Smith Bay's marine environment would also suffer greatly, due to dredging and the movement of sediment. Smith Bay is home to seadragons and pipefish which are protected under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act. These iconic animals, including South Australia's marine emblem, the leafy seadragon, must be protected.

Finally, there is the matter of the large koala population which resides in the timber plantation. In 2012, the Australian Government declared the koala as vulnerable under the EPBC Act in New South Wales, the ACT and Queensland. While South Australia was excluded at the time, koala populations in our state are also declining and losing genetic diversity. Earlier this month the Australian Koala Foundation announced they believe "there are no more than 80,000 koalas in Australia", making the species "functionally extinct."

Kangaroo Island is currently the exception due to the koala habitat provided by the plantation timber blue gums. Koalas are one of the top reasons tourists visit South Australia, and could also be a driver of tourists to Kangaroo Island. The clearing of blue gum forests on Kangaroo Island should not proceed until there is a koala protection plan in place.

With respect to jobs, most of the jobs gained by this project are largely temporary in nature. Due to Kangaroo Island's small workforce, KIPT will be required to bring in workers. After the construction period most of the workers will be gone. The timber jobs that KIPT proposes creating are not exciting careers: truck drivers and dock hands, jobs that will vanish as the 21st century progresses.

Kangaroo Island should instead be taking advantage of its beautiful natural environment to attract the jobs of the future, jobs such as renewable energy, marine science, agriculture technology, etc., while leveraging its traditional strengths in tourism and hospitality.

Kangaroo Island cannot be simultaneously marketed to the world as a “pristine and unique nature experience”, while at the same time degrading its environment and killing its iconic Australian land and sea animals.

Which is it to be? Kangaroo Island *“too good to spoil”* (as the slogan goes), or Kangaroo Island *“too spoilt to be good”*?

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Susan Myers". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Susan Myers