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PORTFOLIO: State Development

1. INTRODUCTION

Based on the 1938 Act of the same name, the 1971 State Development and Public Works Organisation Act’s long title states that it is:

An Act to provide for State Planning and development through a coordinated system of public works organisation, for environmental coordination, and for related purposes.

The State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Bill 1999 amends the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 (Qld) (SDAPWOA) in 4 ways:

1. extension of acquisition and access provisions for the provision of infrastructure by third parties;
2. adding to section 29, the environmental impact procedures;
3. a new conflict of interest code for members of Project Boards;
4. enforcement of approved development schemes in State development areas.
This Bulletin will deal only with the second of these, namely the changes to section 29 of the Act. The background and history of s 29 and the role of the Coordinator-General are examined before discussing the proposed changes.

2. SECTION 29

Section 29 is the only section in Part 4 of the Act, headed Environmental Coordination. The current section 29 provides as follows:

(1) The Coordinator-General shall, of the Coordinator-General’s own motion or at the direction of the Minister, coordinate departments of the Government and local bodies throughout the State in activities directed towards ensuring that in any development proper account is taken of the environmental effects.

(2) In considering an application made to it for the granting of an approval for a development or in considering the undertaking of works, it is the responsibility of -

(a) any department of the Government;
(b) any Crown corporation or instrumentality or other person or body representing the Crown;
(c) any local body;
(d) any board, body, authority or corporation constituted or incorporated by or under any statute and authorised by statute to perform public functions or carry on a public undertaking;

when it appears that the undertaking of such development or works is likely to have major environmental effects, to take such environmental effects into account, and in doing so to have due regard to such policies or administrative arrangements as may be approved from time to time by the Minister to the extent that the same are compatible with legislation for the time being in force in the State.

It is apparent from this that s 29(1) outlines the Coordinator-General’s responsibility to coordinate departments where development is being undertaken to ensure that environmental effects are taken into account. This can be contrasted with s 29(2) which places the onus on government departments to consider environmental effects where there is development likely to have major environmental effects.1

---

3. HISTORY OF SECTION 29

The *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971* (Qld) was preceded by a 1938 Act of the same name. The 1938 Act was a post depression measure aimed at improving the general economic welfare of the State and generating employment through the construction of public works in a coordinated manner, rather than any specific environmental objectives. It was amended a number of times before its repeal and replacement by the 1971 Act. Environmental measures began to gradually creep in during this amendment process. For example in 1964, amendments to the 1938 Act inserted a provision giving the Governor-in-Council power to authorise the Coordinator-General to construct and maintain any works for coastal protection and preservation. In 1970, amendments to the 1938 Act inserted s 30 which established a body called the Environmental Control Council.

The Environmental Control Council was composed of representatives from most Queensland government departments. The listed functions of the Council included coordinating the work of the Queensland state and local governments, statutory bodies, and all persons and associations directed towards environmental control, and to ensure consistency in their respective policies and objectives; developing and maintaining close liaison with Local Authorities and with persons and associations working in the fields of environmental control and improvement; to continuously review the state of the environment; to review and investigate submissions made to it concerning the environment; to disseminate environmental information both within Queensland Government departments and at large; to make recommendations for prevention of environmental deterioration caused by, for example, pollution, and for the proper disposal of waste; and to advise the Queensland Government on matters concerned with environmental control. The Council could also initiate investigations into environmental improvement generally and all matters calculated

---

2 See the preamble of the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1938* (Qld).

3 *State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Act 1964*, s 4 inserting s 20E.

4 Renumbered as s 29 in the 1971 Act.


to ensure the efficient performance by the Council of its functions.\footnote{7} The Coordinator-General had a duty to provide for the Council such technical, clerical, and secretarial assistance as was required for its proper operation.\footnote{8}

In 1978 the amendments to the Act abolished the Environmental Control Council, and substituted a version of s 29 very similar to the current one. That is, responsibility for coordinating environmental matters in Queensland became that of the Coordinator-General. The reasons for abolishing the Environmental Control Council seem to be based on the view that undue emphasis was being placed on environmental considerations in decisions which had economic implications, and specifically this was tied in to the decision by the Fraser government to ban sandmining on Fraser Island, most likely on the recommendation of the Council.\footnote{9}

As the Hon TG Newbery said\footnote{10}:

\begin{quote}
A comprehensive approach which would allow engineering, economic, social, physical and environmental aspects to be assessed together within a department will ensure a balanced approach to decision-making.
\end{quote}

4. ROLE OF COORDINATOR-GENERAL AND S 29

The concept of a coordinator-general was established under the Forgan-Smith Labor Government in September 1938. The hope was that increased government spending, through a Coordinated Public Works Plan for the whole of Australia, would aid recovery from the Depression. This initiative led to the creation of the office of Coordinator-General of Works within the Commonwealth and the

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item\footnote{7} State Development and Public Works Organisation Act Amendment Act 1970, s 4 inserting s 34.
\item\footnote{8} State Development and Public Works Organisation Act Amendment Act 1970, s 4 inserting s 36 (which was later renumbered s 35 in the 1971 Act).
\end{itemize}
establishment of the Coordinator-General in Queensland.\textsuperscript{11} The principal task of the Coordinator-General’s department was the coordination of the State’s capital works program in a manner which complemented the economic development requirements of the State. At that time, the creation and location of public works was the Government’s principal method of influencing the economic development of the State.\textsuperscript{12} Until the 1970s the Coordinator-General maintained a large engineering organisation and undertook the most significant public works in its own right. The Coordinator-Generals’s major projects include\textsuperscript{13}:

- University of Queensland;
- Tully Falls Hydro-Electricity Project;
- Riverside Expressway including Captain Cook Bridge;
- Brisbane Markets;
- Wivenhoe Dam and Hydroelectric Power Station.

This role changed after the enactment of the 1971 Act. The current Act provides the Coordinator-General with duties and powers in relation to undertaking investigations, planning, coordinating and enforcement of a program of works, planned developments and environmental coordination for Queensland.\textsuperscript{14}

Section 29 initially dealt with administration expenses only. It provided that “all expenses of carrying this Act into execution shall be paid out of moneys to be from time to time appropriated for the purposes.” In 1964 sections 29A-F were inserted which specifically dealt with the Coordinator-General’s money borrowing power. As mentioned under the previous heading, the environmental powers of the Coordinator-General under s 29 was enacted in 1978.

Since that time the primary focus of the Office of the Coordinator-General has been “to make sustainable development happen in Queensland”.\textsuperscript{15} The Office has the


\textsuperscript{12} Down, p 2.

\textsuperscript{13} Down, p 2.

\textsuperscript{14} Down, p 3.

\textsuperscript{15} Queensland, Office of the Coordinator-General, Annual Report 1992-93, Office of the Coordinator-General, Brisbane, p 3.
responsibility for the attraction and facilitation of major projects for the State.\textsuperscript{16} The Office is the first point of contact for the private sector interested in undertaking economic development in Queensland. It services enquiries and requests from companies and industry groups, the idea being to ensure that development projects don’t lose their way in the government and bureaucratic process.\textsuperscript{17} Particularly, the Coordinator-General’s office plays an important role in the Queensland government’s “Major Project Facilitation Process”.\textsuperscript{18} Major project status is reserved for a relatively small number of projects which are generally going to offer significant sustainable employment opportunities; investment exceeding $50m; complex approvals; multi-departmental and inter-governmental issues; and strategic industries/regional development significance.\textsuperscript{19} The Department of State Development evaluates project proposals and refers them to the Coordinator-General’s Major Projects Committee for designation.\textsuperscript{20} The process includes the assignment of a senior, experienced Project Manager from the Queensland Department of State Development to provide a single point of contact and coordination across government; the availability of strategic, confidential assistance with respect to a range of project-specific issues, support measures, and dealings with the Commonwealth Government, Local Government and other statutory bodies; and coordination of impact assessment.\textsuperscript{21}

Currently although s 29 has a broad application, its “policies and administrative arrangements” are not mandatory.\textsuperscript{22} The existing procedures and administrative arrangements for the impact assessment process are outlined in the Coordinator-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{16} Guy McKanna, ‘Sharpshooter for Cutting Through Red Tape’, \textit{Australian Financial Review}, 31 August 1993, p 45.
\item \textsuperscript{17} McKanna, p 45.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Queensland Department of State Development, ‘Major Project Facilitation’.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Queensland Department of State Development, ‘Major Project Facilitation’.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Queensland Department of State Development, ‘Major Project Facilitation’.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Queensland Department of Premier, Economic and Trade Development, \textit{State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Act and Regulation: Exposure Draft for Public Comment}, Brisbane, September 1995, p 2.
\end{itemize}
General’s booklet *Impact Assessment in Queensland*. These procedures have remained in place for over a decade although they have come under review in recent years.

They have also come under criticism for being open-ended, informal and reliant on administrative procedures, and out of date and out of step with the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment 1992. Further, Fisher argues that the process created by s 29 and the policies and administrative arrangements approved under it are sufficiently flexible in nature that the potential for judicial scrutiny is very limited.

This is illustrated by *South-East Brisbane Progress Association v Minister for Transport*, the only case which has dealt with s 29. In that case the Progress Association (‘the applicant’) was seeking judicial review of a decision by the Minister to allow an expansion of a railway line. The applicant argued that the environmental Impact Assessment Study (IAS) on which the Minister relied in making the decision was flawed because it severely underestimated the amount of rail traffic presently using the line and the numbers of houses affected. The applicant argued that because of this flaw, the Minister’s decision did not meet the requirements of s 29, that is, the Minister’s decision failed to take into account the major environmental effects as required by the section. However Justice Derrington rejected this argument, dismissing the alleged flaw in the IAS as a question of fact and therefore irrelevant to the judicial review application before the Court.

---


27 *South-East Brisbane Progress Association & Ors v Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development*, Derrington J. Qld Supreme Court, Unreported Judgement, 627 of 1993, 5 November 1993.
5. WHAT DOES THE BILL DO?

The main objectives of the s 29 amendments are to enhance the supervisory role of the Coordinator-General in ensuring that proper account is taken of environmental effects associated with “significant projects”.28

5.1 PRELIMINARY/GENERAL CHANGES

Clause 3 of the Bill inserts a new definition of ‘environment’, which is the same wide definition used in the Environmental Protection Act 1994 (Qld) and Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Qld). Environment includes people and communities; all natural and physical environments; the qualities and characteristics of locations that contribute to their biological diversity, integrity and amenity; and the social, economic, aesthetic and cultural conditions that affect these factors. It is intended to be a more modern definition of the term and to provide greater consistency across government.29

Clause 4 renumbers the present s 29 as s 29A. Clause 6 inserts into the proposed s 29A a provision that excludes significant projects from s 29A(2) (the current s 29(2)). In other words, the obligation on departments and local bodies to take into account environmental effects associated with development undertaken or approved by those departments, is maintained. However, this does not apply to significant projects which are dealt with in the proposed ss 29B - 29ZA. As well, it is intended that the Integrated Planning Act will apply to these agencies after 30 March 2000, and so proposed s 29A(2)-(4) will expire at this time.30

Clause 5 inserts a new definition section for Part 4 of the Act and renumbers it as s 29. For example “development approval” is defined as a development approval under the Integrated Planning Act. Under the IPA, development approval is defined as a decision notice that approves development applied for in a development application. It can be in the form of a preliminary approval, or a development approval notice.


30 See Integrated Planning Act, ss 1.5.1 and 6.1.40. Note also IPA s 5.8.3 which states the IPA does not affect any of the Coordinator-General’s powers and functions under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act.
permit or an approval combining both. It can include any conditions which are attached to the development approval.\textsuperscript{31}

5.2 **SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS**

Much of the detail of the proposed amendments is concerned with what is termed **significant projects**. The Coordinator-General may declare, in the gazette, a project to be a significant project for which an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required (Clause 29B). If the development requires a decision under the Integrated Development Assessment System (IDAS) pursuant to Chapter 3 of the IPA, then the Coordinator-General must give a copy of the gazette notice declaring the project as a significant project to the assessment manager of the project (Clause 29B(3)). The effect of this gazette notice is described in the Explanatory Notes to the Bill as\textsuperscript{32}:

...the ‘trigger’ which removes the development from IDAS to the EIS under section 29 of the SDPWOA.

Similarly, if the project involves mining, then the Coordinator-General must advise the Minister administering the Mineral Resources Act 1989 of the declaration of a significant project (Clause 29B(4)).

The discretion to declare a significant project is guided by Clause 29C which requires the Coordinator-General to have regard to at least one of the listed factors. These include the:

- project’s potential effect on relevant infrastructure;
- employment opportunities that will be provided by the project;
- potential environmental effects of the project;
- level of investment necessary for the proponent to carry out the project;
- strategic significance of the project to the locality, region or the State;
- complexity involved in the requirements of local, State or Commonwealth governments.

5.2.1 **The EIS Process**

Environmental impact assessment (EIA) is a process by which the effects of an activity on the environment are required to be considered in undertaking public

\textsuperscript{31} See Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Qld), Schedule 10.

projects, licensing private projects and other public agency decision-making.\textsuperscript{33} It can include the production of an environmental impact statement (EIS) but is not limited to that.\textsuperscript{34} It has developed in the last few decades as a tool to assist policy makers in balancing the desire for economic development with the desire for environmental protection.\textsuperscript{35}

The proposed Division 3 only applies to projects which are declared under Clause 29B to be significant projects. It outlines the procedures to be followed by the proponent and the Coordinator-General in the preparation of the EIS.

Clause 29E requires that the Coordinator-General must advise the proponent that an EIS is required for the project. Also the Coordinator-General must publicly notify that an EIS is required for the project; the availability of the draft terms of reference for the EIS; and that the public is invited to commented on the draft terms of reference.

When finalising the terms of reference for the EIS, the Coordinator-General is required under Clause 29F to have regard to comments received.

The Coordinator-General is given power to refer details, including the terms of reference, to any entity the Coordinator-General considers may be able to give comment that will assist in the preparation of the EIS (Clause 29G). Where timeframes are set by the Coordinator-General for information in preparation of the EIS for the significant project, all entities will be obliged to respond within that time if their information is to be considered. This is in line with similar provisions in the IPA, dealing with the information gathering stage.\textsuperscript{36}

The EIS prepared by the proponent must address the terms of reference to the Coordinator-General’s satisfaction (Clause 29H). Once the EIS is prepared to the Coordinator-General’s satisfaction, then the proponent must publicly advertise where a copy of the EIS is available for inspection; where a copy of the EIS can be obtained at a stated reasonable cost; that submissions about the EIS may be made to the Coordinator-General, and that the submission period during which a submission can be made (Clause 29I). The EIS can also be made available electronically on


\textsuperscript{35} For a more detailed discussion of EIS and EIA in Queensland see Pini, generally.

CD or floppy disk or on the internet on the Department of State Development’s web-site.\(^{37}\)

The public can make submissions during the submission period to the Coordinator-General about the EIS and the Coordinator-General must accept properly made submissions. There is a discretion for the Coordinator-General to accept written submissions even if they are not properly made (Clause 29J).

The Coordinator-General must, after the end of the submission period, consider the EIS, along with the submissions made and any other material the Coordinator-General considers relevant to the project. The Coordinator-General may ask the proponent for additional information about the EIS and the project. The Coordinator-General must prepare a report evaluating the EIS and give a copy to the proponent (Clause 29K). The idea is that the Coordinator-General’s report is the whole-of-Government response to the EIS prepared by the proponent of a significant project.\(^{38}\)

### 5.2.2 Relationship with the Integrated Planning Act.

The *Integrated Planning Act 1997* (Qld) (referred to as IPA) was intended to overcome the complexity of development regulation in Queensland and to ensure an integrated approach to land use and infrastructure planning.\(^{39}\) Specifically the stated purpose of the Act is to achieve ecological sustainability by:

- coordinating and integrating planning at the local, regional and State levels; and
- managing the process by which development occurs; and
- managing the effects of development on the environment.\(^{40}\)

Under the SWAPWO Amendment Bill, proposed Division 4 outlines how the s 29 EIS applies if the project involves development requiring an application for a **development approval** under the Integrated Development Assessment System.

---


40 Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Qld) s 1.2.1.
Development approval is generally required for **assessable development** (s 3.1.4 IPA). Assessable development is defined as **development specified in Schedule 8** or for a **planning scheme area** - development that is declared under the planning scheme for the area to be assessable development (Schedule 10 of IPA). Development specified in Schedule 8 is a long list of various procedures in relation to different types of property (for example carrying out operational work for road works in a control district under the *Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995* or operational work including painting or plastering that substantially alters the appearance of a building that is a registered place under the *Queensland Heritage Act 1992*). A planning scheme area refers to the entirety of a local government’s area (s 2.1.2 IPA).

Where there is an application for a development approval which involves a **material change of use** or requires impact assessment under the IPA, or both, then the s 29 EIS is taken as fulfilling requirements under the information and referral stage and the notification stage of IDAS (**Clause 29M**). This clause also states that there will be no other referral agencies for the significant project and that the Coordinator-General’s report is taken to be a concurrence agency’s response for the application under IDAS. However, the Explanatory Notes state that relevant government agencies will still be consulted, particularly those that would be IDAS referral agencies for the particular significant project. Referral agencies can be either concurrence or advice agencies. An advice agency must be consulted before an application is decided, however it may only make recommendations, unlike a concurrence agency which has authority to require conditions be attached to the development approval (ss 3.3.18-3.3.19 IPA).

If the application only involves a **material change of use** requiring code assessment then consistently with the IPA, there is no appeal (**Clause 29M(2)**).

**Clause 29N** provides that the decision stage under IDAS will start when the Coordinator-General gives the assessment manager a copy of the Coordinator-General’s report; or if the Coordinator-General is the assessment manager then

---

41 Note however that these provisions do not appear to have commenced at the time of writing.

42 Referral agencies are defined as advice or concurrence agencies which for the purposes of development applications are entities prescribed under a regulation as an advice or concurrence agency (Schedule 10 IPA).

43 Material change of use of premises means the start of a new use of the premises; or the re-establishment on the premises of a use that has been abandoned; or a material change in the intensity of scale of the use of the premises (s 1.3.5 IPA).

when the Coordinator-General gives the proponent a copy of the report. The report may state the specific conditions that must attach to any development approval, or that approval is only preliminary or partial. Alternatively if there are no conditions to be attached, then the report must state that there are no conditions attached or that the application for development approval is refused (Clause 29O(1)-(2)). Development approval can only be refused in this circumstance where the Coordinator-General is satisfied there are environmental effects in the development that cannot be adequately addressed (Clause 29O(3)). Reasons for these statements in the report must be given (Clause 29O(4)).

5.2.3 Relationship with Mineral Resources Act 1989

Division 5 applies to a significant project that involves an application made for a mining lease under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 (Qld). The purpose of the Division is to avoid duplication of process and delay. For example Clause 29Q replicates a number of the Mineral Resources Act (MRA) definitions.

This division also provides for the Coordinator-General to notify the mining registrar that the environmental management overview strategy (EMOS) is sufficient for the purposes of the mining lease application and to set timeframes for the lodgement of objections under the MRA (Clause 29R and 29S).

Specifically, where a certificate of application has not been issued then despite s 245 of the MRA, the mining registrar must accept a statement of proposals or the EMOS, if the Coordinator-General gives the registrar a written notice stating that the statement or EMOS is sufficient for the application under that section (Clause 29R). Where a certificate of application has been issued then despite the certificate stating that the last objection day for the application is the day endorsed by the mining registrar on the certificate, the last objection day will be the day the Coordinator-General publicly notifies as the last objection day (Clause 29S).

---


46 Certificate of application under s 252 of the Mineral Resources Act means the certificate which is issued for a mining lease by the mining registrar, once the registrar is satisfied that the applicant for the mining lease is eligible to apply for the mining lease and that the applicant has complied with all the requirements of the Mineral Resources Act.

47 Section 245 lists the requirements for an application for the grant of a mining lease. Particularly, s 245(1)(p) which provides that the application must be accompanied by an environmental management overview strategy, acceptable to the mining registrar, stating strategies for protecting the environmental and managing environmental impacts on, and in the vicinity of the land to be covered by the proposed lease; and progressive and final rehabilitation of the land.
Explanatory Notes to the SDAPWO Amendment Bill state that the reason behind this is that:

For major projects it has been the practice for the EMOS to be prepared in conjunction with the EIS. Because the EIS may also deal with off-lease matters, such as transport infrastructure, it is common that the EMOS will be completed before the rest of the EIS. Thus, there is no reason to delay the advertising of the mining lease application until the EIS is complete. Indeed there are advantages for both the applicant, in avoiding delays, and persons who wish to lodge objections to the mining lease application or make submissions on the draft EIS, if the submission and objection period have a common closing date.

Further under s 252 of MRA the certificate of application which (under s 245(1)(p) MRA) must include the EMOS, initiates the objection period for the mining lease application. The Explanatory Notes suggest that if the registrar was to issue the certificate of application (COA) for a significant project, it is possible that the COA objection period may close before the Coordinator-General is satisfied that there has been sufficient opportunity for public comment on the EIS. Further the Explanatory Notes state that the dates of issuing the COA and closure of objection period would, in most cases, be set by the Coordinator-General to coincide with the timing of the public notification stage of the s 29 EIS (Clause 29I).

Clause 29T is akin to clause 29O and outlines how the Coordinator-General’s report is to be applied to the issue of a mining lease. The Coordinator-General may recommend to the Minister administering the MRA, any conditions that must be attached to the mining lease. Alternatively, the report must recommend that there are no conditions to be attached to the mining lease. The report must give reasons for the Coordinator-General’s recommendations. The Coordinator-General must give a copy of the Coordinator-General’s report to the Minister administering the MRA (Clause 29U). The report is taken to be the result of a study requested by the Minister (administering MRA) into the environmental impact of granting the application, pursuant to s 268(9) MRA (Clause 29V).

---


50 Section 268(9) provides that where there is a hearing of an application for the grant of a mining lease, the Wardens Court must not take evidence until the results of any study into the environmental impact of the grant, requested by the Minister, are available to the Court.
5.2.4 Relationship with Other Legislation

Where a project has been declared a significant project by the Coordinator-General, and the project requires a decision under legislation other than the IPA or MRA, then the provisions of proposed Division 6 will apply (Clause 29W). This Division follows a similar pattern to Divisions 4 & 5. That is, the EIS prepared under this part for the project will be taken to be a statement that satisfies the requirement of the other Act (Clause 29X). Further, the Coordinator-General’s report may recommend to the person who would give approval to the project under the other legislation, the conditions that must be attached to any approval given under the other legislation. Alternatively, the report must recommend that there are no conditions to be attached to any approval given under the other Act. The report must also give reasons for the Coordinator-General’s recommendations (Clause 29Y). As well, the Coordinator-General must give a copy of the Coordinator-General’s report to the person required under the other Act to approve the project (Clause 29Z). There is also an obligation on the person required under the other Act to approve the project, to take into account the Coordinator-General’s report (Clause 29ZA).

6. CONCLUSION

The s 29 changes proposed by the State Development and Public Works Organisation Amendment Bill have a strong emphasis on coordination, the need for integration with other Queensland legislation, and a whole-of-government approach in the provision of public infrastructure. They provide a more transparent framework for the Coordinator-General’s EIS procedures and clarify issues regarding the Coordinator-General’s discretion and duties, and the proponent’s obligations, whilst strengthening some of the public participation measures. The amendments focus on significant projects, recognising the need to facilitate these projects by streamlining certain procedures and time frames under the Integrated Planning Act and the Mineral Resources Act. They also recognise the public expectation for the modernisation of the standards for environmental impact assessment for these projects.
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### APPENDIX A - LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Certificate of Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOS</td>
<td>Environmental Management Overview Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS</td>
<td>Impact Assessment Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAS</td>
<td>Integrated Development Assessment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Qld)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA</td>
<td>Mineral Resources Act 1989 (Qld)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDAPWO</td>
<td>State Development and Public Works Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>