

Technical Services for Contaminated Land

Decision Regulatory Impact Statement



Prepared by: Regulatory Reform, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

© State of Queensland, 2014.

The Queensland Government supports and encourages the dissemination and exchange of its information. The copyright in this publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia (CC BY) licence.



Under this licence you are free, without having to seek our permission, to use this publication in accordance with the licence terms.

You must keep intact the copyright notice and attribute the State of Queensland as the source of the publication.

For more information on this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/deed.en>

The Queensland Regulatory Impact Statement System

The Queensland Government is committed to applying Regulatory Best Practice principles to reduce the regulatory burden on the community and to ensure that where regulation is used it is efficient, effective and in the public interest. The Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) System Guidelines, issued by the Treasurer require all Queensland Government agencies to carefully assess the impacts of proposed regulation on business, community and the government. Consultation is key to improving regulatory quality at all stages of the regulatory development process. Where a regulatory proposal may provide a net benefit to the community but at the same time it is likely to have significant adverse impacts on a section or sections of the community, a Consultation RIS is required. The Consultation RIS provides the community with the opportunity to consider the options and their impacts. Stakeholder responses to the Consultation RIS provide decision makers with valuable information on which to base their policy decisions and to avoid unintended consequences and unnecessary compliance burdens. The results of consultation inform the next stage of the policy development process. A Decision RIS is produced articulating the relevant issues raised by stakeholders and how the issues have been addressed or incorporated into the revised regulatory proposal. Further information on the RIS System, including a copy of the Treasurer's Guidelines, is available at www.qca.org.au/obpr/ris/.

Contents

Executive summary	1
Issues statement.....	3
Policy objectives	5
The legislative framework for contaminated land in Queensland	5
Options and alternatives	7
Option 1	7
Option 2.....	8
<i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>	10
Option 3.....	13
Impact assessment.....	14
Restrictions on competition	14
Option 1	18
Option 2.....	19
Change in regulatory burden.....	21
Option 3.....	22
Consultation	23
Consultation process.....	23
Preferred option	24
Other initiatives in the regulatory proposal.....	24
Expanding the criteria requirements for contaminated land reports.	24
Minor amendments including removing the requirement for soil disposal permits and modifying notification requirements for land purchasers.....	25
Restructuring Chapter 7 of the EP Act to modernise, streamline and improve clarity of contaminated land provisions.....	26
Issues considered outside scope.....	27
Consistency with other policies and regulation.....	28
Competition principles agreement	28
Fundamental legislative principles	28
National framework	28
Implementation, evaluation and compliance support strategy	29

Executive summary

A Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement (RIS) was prepared to assess the costs and benefits of options for facilitating the provision of technical expertise in contaminated land matters to inform regulatory decision making under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* (EP Act). This is a key priority and essential to effectively and appropriately manage the significant risks that contaminated land can pose to public health and the environment.

The regulatory proposal is one component of a broader contaminated land reform program to review, modernise and streamline the contaminated land provisions within the EP Act and the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* (SPA). Consistency across environmental and land use planning legislation is essential to ensure a level playing field for all stakeholders with land that is listed on one of Queensland's contaminated land registers and to protect public health and environmental values by reducing the potential for contaminant exposure.

Three options for facilitating the effective provision of technical contaminated land advisory and assessment services were presented in the Consultation RIS. Option 1 outlines the current situation whereby the government provides technical contaminated land expertise. Option 2 involves private sector provision of technical expertise by requiring compulsory certification of contaminated land reports before being submitted to government. Option 3 is a hybrid model whereby the government procures the technical expertise from the private sector via contracts.

The Consultation RIS identified Option 2 as the preferred option for facilitating the technical expertise for contaminated land. This option mandates that contaminated land reports are certified by an approved auditor before being submitted to the department. This will reduce assessment timeframes and delay costs, enhance stakeholder confidence and facilitate the development of a competitive auditor market.

Three other broad initiatives were also covered in the Consultation RIS, including:

- expanding the prescribed criteria requirements for contaminated land reports
- introducing minor amendments to the EP Act including removing the requirement for soil disposal permits to reduce duplication and streamline approval processes; and modifying notification requirements that apply when selling land that is listed on a contaminated land register. This would improve the balance between the rights of buyers and sellers of land listed on one of the contaminated land registers.
- restructuring Chapter 7, Part 8 of the EP Act to modernise, streamline and improve clarity of contaminated land provisions.

Amendments to the scope of the assessment triggers and the type of development assessment required under SPA for contaminated land have been progressed in parallel.

There are potentially significant stakeholder impacts from the proposal to mandate that an approved auditor certify contaminated land reports before they are submitted to the department. Currently, technical expertise can be sourced from the government or the private sector. The regulatory proposal means that technical services will need to be sourced from the private sector only. Where the private sector is able to competitively supply a service there is no compelling reason for the government to compete to provide the same service. The public benefits to the broader community of the proposal outweigh the private cost of technical assessment services, which will be internalised by those who use the services - to developers and industry.

The Consultation RIS was released for targeted consultation for a period of 28 days from 9 April 2014 to 16 May 2014. It was published on the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection's (the department's) website, on the Get Involved website and the Queensland Competition Authority website. To notify stakeholders of the document's publication and the consultation period the following steps were taken:

- Greentape e-newsletter was sent to 1557 subscribers
- Environmental Regulatory Update 4/2014 was sent to 1233 subscribers
- Direct emails to 67 key stakeholders
- Media external to the department including the WME Business News and Business Environment Network, notified subscribers or discussed the regulatory proposals in the Consultation RIS
- The department held meetings with approved auditors to discuss, inform and seek feedback on the regulatory proposals put forward for consultation.

Summary of results of consultation

A total of 16 written submissions on the regulatory proposals contained in the Consultation RIS *Technical Services for Contaminated Land* were received from industry, government and non-government stakeholders. The majority of respondents were generally supportive of the preferred option-Option 2 being progressed by compulsorily requiring that contaminated land reports be evaluated and certified by private sector contaminated land auditors approved under the EP Act.

Analysis of the submissions also revealed several common themes of interest to stakeholders including:

- early engagement of approved auditors
- auditor supply – how the supply of auditors will be increased to ensure proposed contaminated land projects proceed on time
- an approval or certification system recognising suitably qualified persons (SQPs) in addition to approved auditors.

The results of consultation revealed a general lack of understanding about the current legislative framework particularly around roles, responsibilities and the regulatory functions that auditors are approved to perform on behalf of the department. Additional information is included in the Decision RIS to enhance stakeholder understanding of these issues and the approved auditor framework more broadly.

This Decision RIS identifies the issues that were raised by stakeholders during consultation and responds by outlining how the issues have been addressed or incorporated into the regulatory proposal. It is anticipated that the regulatory proposal articulated in this Decision RIS will be decided by Queensland Parliament by early 2015.

Changes to recommendations

No significant changes have been made to the regulatory proposals as a result of the public consultation period.

Changes to Costs and Benefits

No significant changes have been made to the benefits and costs of the regulatory proposals as a result of the public consultation process.

Preferred option

In summary, the results of consultation confirmed Option 2 as the preferred option. Approved auditors from the private sector will be engaged by stakeholders requiring a contaminated land report for their technical contaminated land expertise and to certify contaminated land reports before being submitted to government either via the EP Act or SPA.

Issues statement


Site contamination is recognised as a major environmental issue for Australia. In addition to posing a potential threat to public health and the environment, contamination can have significant economic, planning and legal implications for the affected site. Contamination may limit land use potential or increase costs for developers, government and the community.

There are currently 22,000 actual and potentially contaminated sites across the state listed on one of Queensland's two contaminated land registers. Between February 2013 and February 2014, 930 sites were notified for listing on the environmental management register (EMR) and over the same period 300 sites were removed from either the EMR or the contaminated land register (CLR). This illustrates the importance of ensuring technical contaminated expertise informs decision making to reduce the risks of contaminated lands.

The majority of sites listed on the EMR and CLR do not require immediate remediation or management. This is because the current use of the land poses a low risk to human health and the environment. The risk profile is more likely to change when a new use, particularly development, is proposed for that land. Specialised technical contaminated land expertise ensures that contaminated or potentially contaminated land is suitably managed or remediated so that new land uses can be conducted in a way that is safe for human health and the environment.

Consistent with the government's contestability and renewal agendas, the department has considered the best way of ensuring technical contaminated land expertise is available, i.e. either by government or by third parties, and how that expertise is paid for, so that the risks (Diagram 1: Risks of contaminated land) to human health and the environment are managed.

Diagram 1: Risks of improperly managing contaminated land



The department currently provides a range of technical services including advice on contaminated land matters, assessment and approval of contaminated land reports and decision-making about listing sites on the contaminated land registers.

In March 2012, a statutory framework for auditors was formalised in the EP Act. The auditor framework stipulates an application and approval process for qualified persons to be approved as an auditor and to perform specific technical and advisory functions as an alternative to the department providing these services. See the department's website <http://www.qld.gov.au/environment/pollution/management/contaminated-land/auditing/>

Considerable improvements in knowledge about contaminated land have enabled the standardisation of management techniques across Australia. The auditor framework recognises that business and industry is well placed to efficiently provide services where performance can be accurately measured against standards.

Approved auditors are highly qualified and skilled individuals with extensive experience in environmental science, environmental engineering relating to site contamination or environmental auditing. When statutory decisions are required on contaminated land matters, approved auditors can review, evaluate and certify that site investigation reports, validation reports and site management plans¹ meet the standards of the National Environmental Protection Measure (NEPM) for contaminated sites. The department then considers the certified report conclusions to make decisions about the status and extent of contamination, if further management action is required, the land use change or development proposal and whether the site should be listed on the relevant contaminated land register.

As the auditor framework is voluntary in nature (there is no provision within Chapter 7 Part 8 of the EP Act requiring a contaminated land report to be evaluated and certified by an approved auditor) the use of private sector auditors has been low. Developers have preferred to use low-cost government provided services to assist them meet their regulatory requirements for contaminated land rather than pay for the services of private sector auditors.

It is timely to consider how the provision of technical services for contaminated land could be improved by potentially changing the structure and management of service delivery. The private sector has the capacity and is willing to supply technical advisory and assessment services for contaminated land—raising the question as to whether the government should be offering the same services. Over the past 10 years, the department's capacity to provide technical advisory and assessment services has diminished, in part due to competition with the private sector as an employer. This has challenged the department's responsiveness to fluctuations in demand for contaminated land assessment services.

The department's Regulatory Strategy sets a new strategic direction for regulating environment and heritage matters. It is achieved by working collaboratively with industry and the community to set standards and clarify expectations for acceptable industry performance. The department's traditional role as technical assessor of applications and reports is shifting to being an enabling regulator. This is consistent with the government's renewal agenda recognising that business and industry are best placed to determine how to achieve the desired environmental outcomes and operate within the limits of their approvals.

The provision of low cost technical expertise by the department has limited commercial opportunities for potential auditors and stifled auditor supply to the market. Since the release of the Consultation RIS in April 2014, the number of approved contaminated land auditors has just over doubled from four to nine. While still not representative of the contaminated land professionals in Queensland or other states capable of satisfying the requirements for approval as an auditor, it does reflect growing private sector confidence about the long-term market potential for auditors in Queensland.

Increasingly, the community is demanding more efficient expenditure of limited public resources towards high value environmental outcomes. Government provision of low or no cost technical services for contaminated land has largely been subsidised by the community, with direct benefit to a relatively small stakeholder group who actually use the services. Departmental provision of assessment services, estimated at approximately \$0.6 million per annum, has a high public cost and a high private benefit to the development industry.

User-pays principles are broadly accepted as the most efficient way of allocating limited resources or providing services. By internalising the cost of technical assessment services for contaminated land to the user e.g. development industry, the real value of all of the components that make up that service would be reflected in the usage costs. This means that those who use and benefit from the services would pay for them. Efficiency is maximised as the service is provided to those who require and are willing to pay for the full cost of assessment services, as an input to their business. The full range of costs of doing business should be borne by the users/beneficiaries rather than externalised and subsidised by the community at large.

Land development and development approvals are coordinated under SPA with referral agencies assessing applications against the requirements of legislation and planning schemes. Under amendments to the Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009 (SP Reg), which commenced on 4 July 2014, the Queensland Government changed the type of assessment for development on contaminated land from code assessment (i.e. assessable development against the SDAP) to compliance assessment. Compliance assessment involves certification by an auditor. This change was made because, while the assessment of development of contaminated land is highly technical and not appropriate for self assessment, there are well known and published standards and assessment against the standards can be performed equally well by private experts.

¹ The three reports required under the EP Act including site investigation reports, validation reports and draft site management plans will be collectively referred to as "contaminated land reports".

The trigger for assessment for material change of use (MCU) relating to contaminated land matters was simplified. The assessment trigger for reconfiguring a lot (ROL) has also been removed. Approximately 40% of MCU and ROL applications historically referred for State assessment through SPA were concerned with sites that are listed on the EMR that pose a low contamination risk to the environment and/or public health and did not require State assessment.

These figures indicated that the contaminated land assessment triggers in the SP Reg were too broad and caused landowner and developer confusion about matters that must be referred for State assessment. Confusing and complicated assessment triggers can also result in missed applications. This is a problem where development could pose a risk to human health and the environment.

Alternatively, it also indicated that the assessment services provided by the department were too low in cost to motivate developers to properly scrutinise whether the proposal actually required State assessment. If an assessment or service fee were to be charged reflecting the market value of the technical services provided, developers may be more likely to confirm whether the application requires State assessment or not. Regardless, assessment loads in excess of regulatory requirements have a high cost burden on both the department and the community.

The government's program for renewal is growing a four pillar Queensland economy based on tourism, agriculture, resources and construction. An economic upturn is likely to result in more development applications involving contaminated sites that require assessment. Prompt action will ensure the ready availability of technical assessment services for contaminated land and increasing the availability of land for development by the construction sector.

Policy objectives

The overarching contaminated land reform program will be progressed over several years. It will ensure that arrangements for contaminated sites in Queensland meet the State's obligations for the protection of the environment and public health using efficient and targeted legislation.

The policy objectives of the regulatory proposal contained in this RIS are:

- to continue to manage the environmental and public health risks of contaminated land for the safety of the community
- to improve service delivery and modernise the regulatory approach for contaminated land
- to ensure technical expertise in contaminated land and an efficiently operating auditor market informs regulatory decision making under the EP Act and SP Act into the future
- to enable a departmental shift to being an enabling regulator as per the public sector renewal agenda.

The preferred policy option is the option, which best supports the achievement of each policy objective.

The legislative framework for contaminated land in Queensland

The EP Act is Queensland's main legislation for environmental protection. It establishes a statutory framework for managing contaminated land, which involves listing sites that are contaminated or potentially contaminated on one of Queensland's two registers for contaminated land—the EMR or CLR. The registers provide a mechanism for ensuring that prospective purchasers are aware of the contamination, and that development of sites takes appropriate account of it.

The EP Act interacts with SPA Queensland's planning legislation, to ensure that the risks of contaminated land to public health and the environment are appropriately managed. Until recently, contaminated land was assessable development against the State Development Assessment Provisions (SDAP) under SPA. The SDAP outlined 'performance outcomes' that must be met and 'acceptable outcomes' as options for meeting the performance outcome. There were two contaminated land assessment triggers—for an MCU and ROL, both of which were referred to the State for assessment.

SPA was recently amended so that contaminated land is now compliance assessable rather than code assessable against the SDAP. To progress a proposal for development or land use change that involves land listed on the EMR or CLR, landowners and developers can either submit contaminated land reports for assessment under the EP Act or, have the reports assessed by an auditor and obtain a compliance permit to change the use of the land to another use.

If the EP Act pathway is chosen:

- A landowner, developer or industry engages a suitably qualified person (SQP) to develop a contaminated land report providing evidence of the status and extent of contamination. The contaminated land report is then submitted to the department where it is reviewed and evaluated. The conclusions of the contaminated land report inform a decision about the status and extent of contamination for the site and whether or not information on the contaminated land registers needs to be updated. For instance, a validation report produced for a listed site and submitted to the department, may demonstrate that following activities to remediate the land, there is no longer any contamination at the site and that the site is suitable for any use. The department is able to use this information to update the EMR or CLR and remove the site from the registers. If a development application was then to be lodged under SPA, a contaminated land assessment would not be triggered as the site is not listed on either the EMR or CLR.

If the SPA pathway is chosen:

- A landowner, developer or industry with a site that is listed on the EMR or CLR must obtain a compliance permit prior to commencing the change of use of the land. Contaminated land reports and plans are submitted to support the request for a compliance permit and provide information regarding the extent and status of the contamination and any risks to human health or the environment. This will inform any decisions regarding suitable uses of the land and compatibility with the proposed use or development in a way that manages the risks of contaminated land. A copy of the compliance permit is lodged with the department. The department is able to use this information to update the EMR or CLR by for example, removing the site from the registers.

Options and alternatives

The Consultation RIS presented three policy options for facilitating the effective provision of technical contaminated land expertise and payment for those services, and to support regulatory decision making that ensures the environmental and human health risks of contaminated land are managed. The options presented were:

- Option 1: Maintain the status quo.
- Option 2: Mandate that contaminated land reports are certified by an approved auditor before being submitted to the department.
- Option 3: Status quo plus an administrative fee to cover costs of contracting out the technical contaminated land function of the department.

Option 1

Maintain the status quo

Option 1 is the current situation. The EP Act already contains a framework for approved contaminated land auditors providing landowners and developers with the choice of accessing technical contaminated land advice and assessment services from the department or approved auditors in the private sector.

For a proposed land use development, landowners and developers are required to engage a suitably qualified person (SQP) experienced in land contamination matters to undertake site investigations to assess the extent of contamination and any works required to remediate the land, write validation reports demonstrating the land has been successfully remediated and/or draft or amend site management plans outlining how the contaminated site will be managed in accordance with the proposed use of the land.

An approved auditor may also be engaged to assess and certify the contaminated land report written by the SQP. When an approved auditor is not involved, a SQP submits a contaminated land report for departmental assessment on behalf of the proponent along with a statutory declaration that they are qualified to assess the site and that any report submitted meets the Guideline for Contaminated Land Professionals.

There is no assessment fee for submitting contaminated land reports to the department except for a site investigation report, which carries an assessment fee of \$1196 per lot. Once submitted, the department reviews and assesses the contaminated land report to determine whether the site is contaminated and the extent of the contamination. For validation reports that demonstrate the land is no longer contaminated, the department removes the site from the register and prepares a site suitability statement identifying the land is suitable for any use. The site suitability statement is then issued to the landowner, applicant and local authority (e.g. local government).

For draft site management plans, the department assesses the draft plan to determine whether it contains measures and monitoring actions that will ensure the contamination identified on the site is appropriately managed. As part of approving a SMP, the department may set conditions to ensure a desired environmental outcome is achieved. As such the department has an ongoing compliance and enforcement role for SMPs. This is not the case for investigation or validation reports.

On the basis of the report and any additional work required, the department decides whether the site should be listed or removed from the CLR or the EMR.

In relation to SPA, an MCU or ROL for contaminated land proposals no longer trigger state assessment. Compliance assessment under SPA means that an approved auditor will need to certify a contaminated land report in order for the proponent to obtain a compliance permit. Maintaining the status quo is not a viable option as it does not deliver the policy objectives. Diminishing technical expertise and difficulties attracting and retaining the expertise to the department prevents the in-house provision of these services into the future without a commensurate increase in risk to public health and the environment. It also creates delays in assessment times and adds to development costs. This is not acceptable for the Queensland community.

Where the private sector can supply a service, there is no supporting argument for the continued government provision of the same services. Option 1 is not consistent with the government's agendas for economic growth and contestability of services. It is also inconsistent with the Regulatory Strategy, which shifts the focus of the department to being an enabling regulator, providing more flexibility to proponents in determining the best way to manage risk.

Results of consultation

In response to the proposal to maintain the status quo, five of the 16 submissions received clearly stated that they did not support Option 1 as a viable option. No respondents showed support for Option 1.

One of the five respondents that did not support the option suggested a risk-based approach combining Options 1 and 2 be administered by the department. It was suggested that Option 1 be used to address simple contaminated land issues such as soil aesthetics or odour issues. Option 2 would be used where further assessment or remediation is required, or for more complex sites. This suggested hybrid-option is noted and while it has some merit, it does not address the technical contaminated land expertise and capacity issues and does not achieve the policy objectives. Nor is it consistent with the Regulatory Strategy, which articulates the department's strategic focus on enforcing compliance rather than undertaking assessment activities.

Six of the 16 submissions received raised issues around SQP self-assessment or accreditation. Four of the six submissions suggested that a SQP approval or accreditation program be established in addition to approved auditors. One respondent questioned the continued use of a SQP self-assessment system as it could increase industry risk where a person overstates, or fails to understand, the importance of relevant experience to a contaminated land project. One submission suggested a SQP register based on a state based assessment process or the proposed framework set by Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment (CRC Care).

A SQP accreditation system would involve a SQP register, an approvals system for each SQP, and for each function, and compliance and enforcement requirements. The department has never approved SQPs or managed a list of SQPs. A SQP register managed by the department would be administratively burdensome on both the SQP and the department. The department does not intend to develop and administer a SQP accreditation program under the EP Act.

A proponent should choose a SQP based on the specifics of the listed site and every case differs. Guidelines for assessing SQPs describe the required skills that must be demonstrated in order to be suitably qualified. These guidelines inform proponents about the types of skills and experience to look for when searching for a SQP to meet their needs.

A SQP is required to sign a statutory declaration confirming they are suitably qualified to undertake the site assessment and write the contaminated land reports relevant to the contaminated land proposal. Penalties apply for false declarations providing a disincentive to a person overstating their professional experience due to the need for professional accountability for the work performed.

The department recognises the merits of a certification scheme for contaminated land professionals and has communicated that it supports in-principle the commercial development of such schemes by representative or scientific bodies like CRC Care.

Industry regulation of SQPs are best placed to meet practitioners' needs, lift industry standards and can operate more flexibly across State-jurisdictional boundaries than a government systems-based in a single state. Peer review of industry performance is often viewed by industry as more reputable than government systems.

Option 2

Amend the EP Act to mandate that contaminated land reports are certified by approved auditors and operate consistently with compliance assessment under the Sustainable Planning Regulation

Mandating that contaminated land reports be certified by an auditor approved under the EP Act, before being submitted to the department, would apply to all contaminated land reports regardless of the legislative trigger and process through which they were initiated (i.e. proponent initiated under the EP Act or, development approval via SPA). Recent amendments to the SP Reg changed the type of assessment for development applications on contaminated lands from code assessable (SDAP) to development requiring compliance assessment.

Option 2 creates a new obligation for government and non-government stakeholders who require a contaminated land report to engage an approved auditor² to evaluate and certify the report and prepare a site suitability statement.

² An approved auditor is an individual with specific qualification and expertise who has been approved through the relevant process under the EP Act to perform a specific role and functions in relation to contaminated land.

Engaging an approved auditor is in addition to engaging a SQP who will still be required to fulfil the roles and functions as outlined in Option 1 (e.g. determine remediation works, write contaminated land reports). Approved auditors are engaged by a proponent or landowner via contractual arrangements to fulfil the regulatory requirements associated with appropriately managing the risks of contaminated land. The role of the approved auditor is to independently review assessment, remediation and validation reports to ensure the technical components of the report are accurate and correct and to ensure that any risks to the environment or public health from the contaminated site are being appropriately managed. In certifying reports the auditor will make decisions about the status and extent of contamination for a site, risks to environment and human health and land use activities suited to the site.

Criteria prescribed in the *Environmental Protection Regulation 2008* (EP Reg) are used to measure all assessment, remediation and management of sites listed on the EMR or CLR providing the grounds to accept or refuse a contaminated land report.

On the basis of the certified contaminated land report and any risks to human health and the environment, an approved auditor will also be responsible for making decisions about land use suitability, and determining whether the site should be listed or removed from the EMR or CLR. Consistent with the regulatory decision making responsibilities of approved auditors, a high level of performance accountability is expected. The code of conduct and Guideline for Contaminated Land Auditors under Chapter 12, Part 3A outline the department's expectations for auditor performance. The proponent is best placed to decide at which stage of the project to hire an approved auditor. This is primarily a commercial decision. Anecdotal evidence suggests that engaging an approved auditor early in a project will be more beneficial than in the later stages of project development.

By simultaneously engaging the services of a SQP and approved auditor early in the project, greater engagement between the two could be facilitated providing the proponent with greater certainty that the right outcomes will be achieved. This is likely to save developers time and money compared to the current situation where, the department requests additional information to support regulatory decision making for an average of 40% of contaminated land reports submitted for assessment. Information requests extend assessment and approval timeframes.

As part of Option 2, the department is responsible for delivering four key functions essential for the efficient and effective operation of the statutory auditor framework. The department will retain responsibility for approving draft site management plans (SMPs). A SMP differs from other types of contaminated land reports due to the ongoing need to manage the site. An approved SMP may be subject to conditions to ensure that the contaminated land risks are appropriately managed for public health and the environment. Conditions commonly cover issues such as imported fill material, soil excavation and removal, surface capping and building and construction requirements. The responsibility for managing compliance will remain with the department as the administering authority and will not transfer to the approved auditor.

The key delineation between the roles and responsibilities of the department, as the administering authority, and the approved auditor is that:

- The approved auditor must certify that a SMP will achieve the desired environmental outcomes to manage contamination on the site (by reference to a statutory guideline). The auditor will not be required to impose the conditions of the SMP.
- The administering authority would accept the approved auditors certified report and issue the approval subject to the conditions that the administering authority considers necessary or desirable.

Ongoing monitoring and compliance arrangements will be incorporated into the department's compliance plan. The department will maintain responsibility for updating the EMR and CLR so that the public has access to accurate contaminated land information. The department will not be required to review an auditor's report in order to make a decision. The decision about updating the EMR or CLR on the basis of the auditor's report must be made within 10 business days of receiving the report. The department will also be responsible for monitoring the operation of the auditor framework for effectiveness and enforcing a framework of compliance. For instance, if a person fails to fulfil their obligations as an approved auditor under the EP Act, the department would take compliance action which may include suspending the approval as a contaminated land auditor.

It is also worth noting that the current assessment fee of \$1196 per lot that applies only to site investigation reports will no longer apply as the auditor will have assessed and certified the report before it is submitted to the department.

Sustainable Planning Act 2009

Clarifying the scope of the assessment triggers and changing the type of development assessment

In a planning context, the primary risk associated with contaminated land is where a change in the use of land could result in people, particularly the elderly, young and infirm, being exposed to hazards where they live, are educated, shop, play or receive health care.

The Consultation RIS outlined amendments relating to SPA and Schedule 3 of the SP Reg. Amendments to the MCU and ROL triggers as well as the category of development that applies for contaminated land, are now in place in the legislation.

In parallel with Option 2, two amendments to Schedule 3 of the SP Reg were made to improve efficiencies for industry, government and the community. The first amendment simplified and clarified the triggers for when development is assessable for contaminated land.

The MCU trigger was simplified. The new trigger focuses on higher risk activities, such as the use of land for a place frequented by children or the elderly. It provides greater certainty about whether development is triggered or not. The regulation now only triggers those developments which are making a MCU from a non-sensitive use (e.g. industrial use) to a sensitive use (e.g. childcare, education facilities, retail, residential, recreational, sport or entertainment facilities) or a mixed use or commercial use that includes a sensitive use or to a mixed use or commercial use with underground accessible facilities (e.g. a basement car park or workshop or utilities room or office).

The second amendment changed the category of development that applies for contaminated land from development requiring code assessment to development requiring compliance assessment. Compliance assessment is similar to self-assessable development, with the exception of the requirement for auditor certification that the development meets the required standard with the certification provided to government to demonstrate compliance.

Changing the type of development assessment from 'assessable development' to 'compliance assessment' has the effect of making the use of an approved auditor for the certification of contaminated land reports compulsory as evidence of meeting the required standard. Landholders are still able to choose to address the contamination status of sites listed on the EMR or CLR through the EP Act prior to making a development application. In these circumstances, the development would not trigger assessment under SPA for contaminated land. A compliance assessment approach enables only those works that are required for the land to be suitable for its intended use to be completed as the development proceeds, with contamination not needing to be addressed until after the development approval and other relevant approvals are obtained. This approach allows greater and easier engagement of technical expertise as an auditor can be more easily accessed during all stages of project development, which can also increase certainty about assessment outcomes.

These amendments will ensure legislative consistency between the EP Act and SPA so that the risks of contaminated land are managed for the safety of the community and the environment. The compliance assessment approach and the use of auditors supports the growth of private sector auditors and complements the proposal to mandate the approved auditor framework in the EP Act. The requirement to use approved auditors applies to the assessment of contaminated land reports irrespective of the legislative pathway, i.e. the EP Act or SPA.

Results of consultation

The results of consultation support Option 2 as the preferred option to be progressed and implemented in legislation. Thirteen submissions from industry, government and non-government stakeholders included clear supporting statements mandating that contaminated land reports be reviewed and certified by approved private sector auditors before being submitted to the department. Five of the 16 submissions received clearly stated that they did not support Options 1 or 3 as viable options.

Analysis of the submissions revealed a general interest in how the supply of approved auditors would be increased so that contaminated land projects are not delayed as a result of shortages in technical contaminated land expertise. Some of the other commonly raised issues include SQP accreditation, early auditor engagement, governance arrangements for auditors, assessment timeframes and educating stakeholders about the new arrangements. The following discusses and responds to the issues raised during consultation relevant to Option 2.

Supply of approved auditors

Submissions from industry were generally interested in what the department is doing to increase auditor supply so that once the regulatory amendments are in place there are sufficient auditors to cater for demand. Some submissions showed interest in the steps taken to reduce collusion between auditors and prevent prohibitive auditor costs and significant delays for the completion of services. One submission questioned the time it takes for contaminated land professional to be approved as an auditor.

Since April 2014, the number of approved auditors has more than doubled from four to nine. The increase in supply reflects growing private sector confidence about the long-term commercial opportunities in the approved auditor market in Queensland. A suite of activities are assisting to improve stakeholder understanding and confidence as well as auditor supply:

- Clear public messaging around the Queensland Government's shift to being an enabling regulator as per the public sector renewal agenda has signalled the potential and significant shift in market opportunities for the private sector to provide a range of traditionally, government-provided services.
- Consistent with the shift to being an enabling regulator as per the public sector renewal agenda, the Consultation RIS signalled the consideration of alternatives to departmentally-provided technical contaminated land services to inform regulatory decision-making.
- Departmental meetings with approved auditors to inform and build capacity about roles and responsibilities of approved auditors and future potential to provide services for other environmental management issues under the EP Act.
- Targeting interstate auditors to apply for recognition as an approved auditor in Queensland.

The department will continue to meet regularly with approved auditors to build their understanding, awareness and capacity to perform the role and regulatory functions in line with the requirements of the approval and community expectations. Guidelines including a code of conduct are being developed to support auditors in performing their roles and functions. Auditor performance will be monitored to check auditors are operating in line with the approval, code of conduct and other requirements. If not, compliance action will be taken, which could involve suspension or cancellation of the approval as an auditor.

To manage the minor risk that auditor supply may initially be low (relative to demand), the department will retain the statutory capacity to assess specific contamination matters. It is not anticipated that the department will need to use these provisions, however they are included as a risk mitigation measure particularly for unforeseen circumstances. If for example, a situation arose whereby a certified statement could not be obtained from an approved auditor due to a lack of supply of expertise in a specific skill set such as a rare contaminant, the department could provide services on a cost recovery basis.

Early engagement of approved auditors

The results of consultation provide overwhelming support for the early engagement of approved auditors to contaminated land projects. Submissions identified benefits of engaging auditors early including: surety about the full range of contaminated land issues to be addressed and budgeting for them in advance; early advice on requirements rather than in the late stages of the project when remediation work has been completed and it is more expensive to retrospectively fix or there is no remaining budget for the work.

Submissions also identified risks of engaging approved auditors late in the process including that an auditor may not support the investigation methods or remediation works that were advised by a SQP. If this occurs late in the process it could result in delays and have cost implications for the project.

One submission suggested legislative provisions be included to direct the early engagement of approved auditors. While the benefits of early engagement are noted, it is intended that the early engagement of approved auditors is a business decision of proponents.

Clarifying responsibilities for SMPs

One respondent from industry requested that responsibilities for approving draft SMPs be clarified. To address this issue, additional information has been included above in Option 2 of this Decision RIS. It clarifies that responsibility for conditioning, approving and enforcing approved SMPs will be retained by the department.

Dispute resolution

One submission from industry suggested a dispute resolution process be incorporated into the approved auditor framework. This issue is noted. The EP Act includes provision for a person to make a complaint about an auditor. Auditors must comply with the code of conduct, which includes that the auditor must perform their regulatory functions in a manner that is honest, objective and free from misrepresentation or bias.

Additionally, an approved auditor will usually be engaged via contractual arrangements. The contract between the proponent and the auditor may set out methods to resolve any disputes about whether the auditor function has not been performed to the proponent's satisfaction (e.g. where the proponent believes that the auditor's decision is unreasonable).

If a contract between the parties is broken, the process of disengaging the auditor and hiring an alternative approved auditor would be guided by the terms of the contract. The cost of changing approved auditors would depend on the individual cost of the approved auditors concerned, contractual arrangements and the stage of the contaminated land project at which the contract was broken.

Auditing auditor performance

Three submissions raised issues around governance arrangements and auditor performance. Two submissions noted that part of the department's role has been in providing clear and certain decision-making on contaminated land matters. By transferring the liability for decision making to the private sector, it was suggested that the compulsory use of private sector auditors could potentially increase the cost of an auditor particularly if an auditor takes an overly conservative approach.

The concern was raised about the ongoing availability of contaminated land advice. The proposal does not interfere with the current arrangements for the provision of advice other than when development is not occurring.

The issues and concerns raised about the performance of auditors are noted. The department is producing a guideline to assist approved auditors to carry out the functions for which they are approved. The department will monitor auditor performance. The guideline can be reviewed and updated if any difficulties arise in practice. Additionally, the code of conduct is being strengthened to ensure a higher level of accountability and performance in line with the regulatory functions of approved auditors. The code will be prescribed in regulation, which ensures Parliamentary oversight of the code.

The department is responsible for monitoring the performance of approved auditor's to ensure they are operating in line with the code of conduct, approval conditions and other relevant guidelines. Consistent with the Regulatory Strategy, remaining in-house technical capacity will focus on compliance and enforcement activities to ensure environmental and human health is protected.

The department manages the process of assessing and approving contaminated land auditor applications with the assistance of a panel of experts in contaminated land matters. The panel assists to alleviate the approval load on the remaining in-house technical contaminated land expertise within the statutory timeframe of 30 business days to assess an application.

Education and awareness-raising

Two submissions suggested that the technical competency, recognition and registration of both SQPs and auditors be defined along with a list of the activities the SQP and approved auditor are required to undertake. It was also suggested that auditors do not undertake tasks that would be better performed by a SQP. One submission raised the issue that the Consultation RIS contained information about the role of the approved auditor that differs to that in Chapter 12 of the Draft Prescribed Guideline.

In response to these issues, the Decision RIS provides more detail on the roles and responsibilities of SQPs, approved auditors and the department, particularly in the context of the preferred option 2, which is to be progressed in legislation. As part of the approval process for the proposed regulatory amendment, other supporting documentation, including the presently draft prescribed Guideline, will be updated to consistently reflect the various roles and responsibilities of the parties within the 'approved auditor' framework.

Three respondents from industry identified the need for education and awareness raising activities to build stakeholder capacity to understand the whole regulatory proposal and how it will work. Two submissions from industry raised the need for guidance materials such as standards and guidelines to standardise contaminated land industry practices and to enable characterisation of when a site is suitable for removal from the EMR.

The department is developing guidance materials to facilitate the efficient operation of the approved auditor framework in its entirety. One example is the prescribed criteria which will be repositioned in the EP Act will assist auditors to determine the issues required to be considered before evaluating and certifying a contaminated land report. The requirement for an auditor to produce a site suitability statement specifying that the site is suitable for any use without conditions will assist in determining whether it is appropriate for a listed site to be removed from the EMR.

The department also welcomes the suggestion made in several submissions to partner with industry and representative bodies to build stakeholder capacity and awareness on all aspects of implementing the regulatory proposal. The department will directly contact those stakeholders who are willing to play a role in improving stakeholder awareness and capacity.

Option 3

Status quo and introduce a regulatory fee to cover the cost of contracting out the technical assessment services to the private sector

Contaminated land reports would be submitted to the department. A procurement process would be used to contract out the technical assessment and certification of the contaminated land reports to the private sector. The results of the technical assessment would then be returned to the department and the certification used to inform regulatory decisions.

The department would contract out the technical assessment of applications and contaminated land reports to individuals with the relevant technical qualifications and experience. A proponent would be charged an administration fee per report to cover the associated costs of procuring the technical services required. This fee would need to cover the technical assessment costs and the administrative costs associated with procuring the technical expertise.

The key difference between Option 3 and the status quo is the procurement process to contract out the technical assessment services for contaminated land reports. This would occur once the contaminated land report was completed and submitted to the department. This would overcome the issues surrounding the technical capacity of the department but does not provide for an approved auditor to be engaged in the early stages of the contaminated land project.

Option 3 does not create a competitive approved auditor market. A departmentally administered procurement process does not enable the terms, conditions or price of the services to be negotiated by the proponent and approved auditor. Option 3 would reduce price tension from reduced competition between approved auditors as well as efficiency.

Option 3 is more burdensome compared to Option 2 with an additional layer of administration to cover the cost of the department procuring the technical expertise to assess contaminated land reports. While the administrative fee would be determined by regulation, possibly at a graduated level to reflect the complexity of the assessment, it would not necessarily be commensurate with the size of the proposal. It would be difficult to devise a highly flexible fee structure that was suited to the range of contaminated site situations. This is likely to result in smaller proposals effectively subsidising larger proposals. Larger proposals would receive a large private benefit due to the potential to gain larger earnings and profits from a larger development proposal.

Results of consultation

Six of the submissions clearly stated they did not support Option 3 due to the additional costs in both dollars and time compared to Options 1 and 2. The proponent also forgoes any involvement in engaging the approved auditor for the project under Option 3. No respondents showed support for Option 3. One submission from industry went as far as suggesting that Option 3 would create a conflict of interest between the department and approved auditors. These issues are noted. It is also acknowledged that Option 3 is less efficient than Option 2.

Impact assessment

This section includes a detailed impact assessment of the three policy options presented for facilitating the effective provision of technical contaminated land advisory and assessment services to inform regulatory decision making under the EP Act and ensure that contaminated land risks on human health and the environment are appropriately managed.

Amendments to the SPA development approval process have been implemented in parallel with the proposed amendments to the EP Act. This will ensure the requirement to use approved auditors applies to contaminated land assessment irrespective of the legislative avenue—the EP Act or SPA.

Departmental provision of technical and assessment services is estimated at \$0.6 million per annum. Currently, these services are provided at low or no cost which is borne by the community at large. There is little justification to support the continuation of departmentally provided services where the private sector is capable of providing the same services. Options 2 and 3 provide benefits for all stakeholders affected by the proposal.

The regulatory proposal impacts on stakeholders including those who require technical contaminated land expertise, private sector suppliers of technical contaminated land expertise, the Queensland Government, and the Queensland community. The nature and distribution of the benefits, costs, and overall public welfare changes are noted under each of the three policy options.

Approved auditors and potential auditors, state and local government and the community may also be affected by the proposal.

The costs and benefits of the three options are analysed below. A summary of the costs and benefits for each of the options is provided in Table 1.

Restrictions on competition

There are no restrictions on competition. The preferred option will promote the competitive supply of approved auditors for contaminated land to the Queensland market.

Results of consultation

Two submissions included specific comments on the impact assessment that was presented in the Consultation RIS. One respondent indicated that the impact assessment did not cover all stakeholders or consider the ongoing impacts to business and industry. A second comment was that the costs and benefits included in the impact assessment were based on the developer's costs compared to land sale value and do not recognise ongoing, long-term industry operation.

One submission commented that the estimated costs of an approved auditor contained in the Consultation RIS were low and not reflective of the role of a contaminated land auditor. This issue has been noted. The impact assessment including the estimated cost of an auditor undertaken for the Consultation RIS were based on the best available information to the department. It is not possible to estimate the exact cost of an auditor as amongst other factors, the cost will be influenced by the status and extent of contamination, proposed land use, complexity of the proposal, geographical location, and the state of the economy.

In response to these comments, benchmarking the regulatory proposal against other Australian states did not identify any issues or long-term implications for industry. In addition, the impact assessment presented in the Consultation RIS was approved by the Office of Best Practice Regulation as satisfying the requirements of Queensland's RIS Guidelines.

Table 1: Benefits and costs of the options

Options/stakeholders	Benefits	Costs
Option 1: Maintaining the status quo		
Developers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to technical advice and assessment services for low or no cost. • Private benefits from low or no cost government provided services are maximised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased time delays for technical advice and assessment services experienced over time as economy improves and construction industry picks up.
Auditors		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low demand for technical contaminated land expertise provided by approved auditors. • Competing with heavily subsidised government provided services. • Lack of certainty about future demand for technical services from private sector auditors.
Government		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment load for contaminated land is beyond statutory requirements. • Statutory framework for approved auditors is not fully or efficiently implemented. • Out of step with government's agendas for contestability and economic renewal. • Inconsistent with National Environmental Protection Measure for Contaminated Land³. • Inconsistent with Regulatory Strategy. • Creates a market failure by reducing the competitive supply of private sector auditors for contaminated land.
Community		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The community bears the cost of government provided technical advice and assessment services. • High risk to the environment that contaminated land is not being managed most efficiently. • High opportunity cost of resources that could otherwise deliver environmental outcomes for the broader community.
Option 2: Mandate that approved auditors certify contaminated land reports prior to being submitted to the department		
Developers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An auditor provides independent and authoritative advice. • More confidence that reports satisfy contaminated land standards before being assessed for certification. • Reduced delay costs due to shorter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must engage the services of an approved auditor. • The cost of engaging an approved auditor to carry out assessment functions is borne by the developer.

³ One of the purposes of the NEPM is for a nationally consistent approach to assessing and managing site contamination. It also differentiates between the roles of auditors and environmental consultants.

	<p>assessment timeframes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low search costs for approved auditors. • Increased certainty about assessment outcomes. • Can select from a competitive pool of approved auditors with the skills and experience best suited to the project needs. • Approved auditor can oversee, evaluate and certify at various stages of the project to reduce approval times, particularly for complex projects. • Improves the development assessment and approval pathway under the EP Act. <p>SPA amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances consistency of assessment processes and provides certainty about the standard required for development approval. • Minimises delays to development that support the construction industry. • Reduces costs to developers by allowing remediation and other site management activities to be carried out when the proposal commences rather than upfront. • Greater flexibility. 	<p>SPA amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must engage the services of an approved auditor. • The cost of engaging an approved auditor to carry out assessment functions is borne by the developer.
<p>Auditors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced auditor confidence about the long-term demand for technical expertise, increase in willingness to supply auditor services. • Diversify range of professional services provided commercially. • Quickly respond to fluctuations in market demand for technical services. • Site suitability statement based on first-hand knowledge and experience with the project. <p>SPA amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides certainty to potential auditors about demand for technical skills. • Optimises the use of technical advisory and assessment skills available in the private sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher level of accountability for assessment and decision making about suitable uses of contaminated land. <p>SPA amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher level of accountability for assessment and decision making about suitable uses of contaminated land.
<p>Government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures the department gets reliable information on the status and extent of contamination of a site and any risks posed. • Reduced number of contaminated land reports and applications requiring technical assessment by the department. • Reduced administration cost of assessing and approving contaminated land reports and development applications. • More confident that the contaminated land risks to the environment and public health 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased training costs to ensure auditors understand and carry out their regulatory functions. • Increased cost of auditing auditor performance.

	<p>are being appropriately managed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can direct resources to ensuring the efficient and effective operation of the auditor framework—i.e. audit the auditors. • Consistent approach to assessing and managing contaminated lands in other states. 	
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not bearing the cost of technical services provided by the department at less than cost recovery. • High confidence that highly specialised technical expertise is informing regulatory decision making for contaminated land. 	
Option 3: Maintain the status quo and introduce a regulatory fee to cover the cost of providing the technical assessment services		
Developers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration fee provides certainty about the cost of accessing technical contaminated land expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased cost of administration fee for technical advice and assessment services for contaminated land.
Auditors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced confidence about the demand for technical services which could translate to an increased willingness to supply auditor services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More limited competitive environment as government is only purchaser.
Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains control over assessment and decision making for contaminated land matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with the government's agendas for contestability and renewal of the Queensland economy. • Not enabling, limits flexibility for proponent in managing risk. • Adds cost of procurement administration.
Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More confident that the risks of contaminated land are being managed appropriately. 	

Option 1

Status quo

Assuming that a contaminated land report meets the decision criteria, the department assesses a simple contaminated land report in about 20 business days. On average, 430 contaminated land reports are submitted to the department each year. Four assessment officers each take approximately 17.5 hours to assess a single contaminated land report.

The total cost of in-house technical assessment by the department is estimated at \$680,000 per annum⁴. The estimate includes the administrative and assessment activities performed, which are carried out pre and post assessment. Pre-assessment files/records are created upon receipt of a contaminated land report. The relevant contaminated land register is then updated. The cost of the department performing the assessment activities only (i.e. excluding administration costs) is \$570,000 per annum. This includes the cost of assessing the contaminated land report against national and state standards and regulations, peer review of the assessment and notifying the proponent of the assessment outcome.

An assessment fee of \$1196 per lot is charged for a site investigation report only as validation reports and site management plans do not require an assessment fee. The full cost of assessment is ultimately borne by the Queensland community as the services are provided at less than cost recovery.

The number of contaminated land reports submitted for assessment fluctuates along with the cyclical nature of the economy. In the event that an economic upturn results in more contaminated land reports being submitted for State assessment, and higher assessment loads are not matched by an increase in technical capacity to carry out the assessment function, delay costs to developers would increase beyond 20 days. A backlog of reports and applications would quickly develop.

Option 1 does not achieve the project objectives. It is inconsistent with National Competition Policy and user pays principles. Maintaining the status quo has a high cost and low benefit for the community. The continued provision of technical services by the department well below cost recovery prevents the efficient operation of the market for the statutory auditor framework. Private sector auditor confidence is low due to weak market signals for technical contaminated land expertise and this discourages them from entering the market.

The benefits of Option 1 accrue to landowners and developers, in that land is removed from the register, or an approval is received, enabling a change in development type or use of the land. These are private benefits that accrue to the landholder but are not paid for by the landholder.

While a general benefit is provided to the community that the public health and environmental risks are being well managed, the nature of the benefits is private. It is not fair or equitable for the community to pay for services that provide a private benefit to a small stakeholder group, in this case landowners and developers. Nor does this option represent an efficient allocation of public funds.

There is a high opportunity cost to the community from government expenditure of resources where the private sector could competitively provide them. Alternatively, public funds could be targeted towards high value environmental outcomes that could be shared by the broader Queensland community. The public cost of Option 1 exceeds the private cost of Option 2.

The contaminated land risks to planning, health and the economy are higher under Option 1 than Options 2 or 3, due to the potential for capacity constraints in the department during peak activity periods. Compared to Options 2 and 3, Option 1 has the highest cost to the community while delivering a high private benefit to landowners and developers, who use technical contaminated land advisory and assessment services.

⁴ This estimate is based on the average number of contaminated land reports received by the department over the four year period 2008/09-2011/12.

Option 2

Mandating that approved auditors under the EP Act certify contaminated land reports prior to being submitted to the department

This option will have the greatest benefit as proponents who require the services of an approved auditor will be able to search for and secure the services of an approved auditor with the experience and skills that best meet the needs of the contaminated land project/proposal.

The department maintains an up to date list of approved contaminated land auditors, which will assist in reducing search costs of developers when looking to identify and engage the services of an approved auditor that best meets the project needs. This list can be accessed from the department's website at www.ehp.qld.gov.au. Savings to the community and government will be maximised under Option 2 as the community will no longer bear the cost of providing technical advice or assessment services for contaminated land. These resources can be redirected to other activities with a higher value return on investment for the broader public benefit. Consistent with user pays principles, the cost of service provision will be internalised and paid for by those stakeholders who require and source technical contaminated land expertise from the private sector as a business input.

Option 2 enables the existing statutory framework for auditors under the EP Act to be fully and efficiently implemented. Strengthening market signals for private sector auditors will enhance auditor confidence about the viability of the market and assist to promote auditor supply. Competitive supply of technical expertise could increase price tension in the market, encouraging more timely service delivery and reducing the overall cost of service provision.

With adequate capacity and willingness of the private sector to supply technical contaminated land services, there is no compelling reason (market failure) for the government to supply the same services.

Competitive auditor markets operate in other Australian states. Table 2 identifies the number of approved auditors in Australian state jurisdictions. This provides a realistic indication of potential auditor supply that could be achieved in Queensland as demand shifts towards the use of private sector auditors who can competitively supply technical contaminated land expertise.

Table 2: Number of accredited (approved) auditors by Australian state

State	Number of Auditors
New South Wales	37
South Australia	26
Victoria	54
Western Australia	31
Queensland	9

There is a small risk that at the outset there may not be sufficient approved auditors to cater for the demand for technical contaminated land services. Initially, this could result in delays in assessment and decision making and short term spikes in the prices charged for technical services. With the right market signals, the number of approved auditors in Queensland is expected to further increase from nine to a figure closer to the number of approved auditors in other Australian states (see Table 3).

The department is actively encouraging auditor supply prior to any regulatory amendments taking effect. The release of the Consultation RIS signalled the increasing commercial potential for private sector approved auditors if the department no longer provides technical contaminated land expertise at low and no-cost in the near future. The department has also been consulting with potential auditors in Queensland who may qualify to apply for approval and amongst approved auditors in other states whose technical qualifications could be recognised in Queensland.

The private sector is able to respond quickly and more flexibly than government to fluctuating demand for technical assessment services. Option 2 recognises that industry is well placed to provide technical services where there are clear guidelines and standards against which risks are identified and performance is measured.

The estimated cost to a landholder or developer of engaging an approved auditor in Queensland is informed by comparison with the hourly rate charged by auditors approved in other Australian states. Table 3 provides estimated cost ranges for approved auditors in other states. These figures also represent stakeholder's willingness to pay⁵ for technical advice and assessment services for contaminated land.

Table 3: Estimated hourly cost of accredited (approved) auditors by Australian state

Australian State	Estimated cost of approved auditor per hour
New South Wales	\$250 - \$450
Victoria	\$200 - \$300
Western Australia	\$260 - \$400

It is difficult to assess the individual cost impact of engaging the services of an approved auditor as the price will vary according to the proposal type, size of the site, extent and complexity of contamination, remediation required, location and so on. Estimates provided here indicate the cost range that could be expected as a result of Option 2 being progressed.

The cost to a landowner or developer is estimated for both simple and complex contaminated land projects to be in a range of \$3,000 to \$36,000.

For a simple contaminated land project, it is assumed that an approved auditor is engaged at an early stage of the contaminated land project and spends two days completing a desktop and historical assessment of the site. Applying the lowest (\$200/hr) and highest (\$450/hr) hourly charge from Table 3 above, the estimated cost range of an auditor is \$3,000 to \$6,000.

For a complex contaminated land project, it is assumed that an approved auditor is required to undertake a site visit (two days); work with the SQP (two days), generate an auditor report (one day), review the contaminated land report produced by the SQP (five days) and certify and submit the contaminated land report (one day). Again, by applying the lowest and highest hourly charge from Table 3 above, to the number of auditor hours, the estimated cost range of an auditor is \$16,000 to \$36,000.

The cost of engaging an approved auditor is likely to be proportional to the size and the complexity of the project. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the cost of an auditor is not expected to be significant in comparison to the cost of remediation and will be integrated as an input cost into the day to day decision making of a business.

Table 4 provides examples of the cost of remediation compared to the economic value of development that has involved contaminated land. While the examples are not representative of every situation, they demonstrate the valuable input that technical contaminated land expertise provides to decision making, which can influence the profitability of a development. Technical expertise is of significant value to the developer and the value of that expertise should be paid for by those who use the expertise.

Table 4: Costs of remediation compared with development value for selected contaminated land sites

Name of contaminated site	Estimated cost of remediation	Estimated value of development
Newstead Gasworks	Reported cost of remediation was \$67 million over 3 years	\$500 million – \$1 billion
Willawong	\$40 – 50 million	Valuation of land is difficult post remediation as land uses combine public open space and Brisbane City Council

⁵ The hourly rate charged by auditors in other states is considered represent the price that a client is willing to pay as this is the price that is paid. While the cost of an auditor will depend on the size and complexity of a project, interstate comparisons can be used as an estimate, or indicator, of the likely potential cost of an auditor in Queensland.

		purposes.
Rhodes Peninsula (NSW)⁶	\$200 million	\$1.5 – \$2.5 billion

Proponents who require technical contaminated land expertise can access those skills and services in a competitive market place. This is fair in that those stakeholders using and benefitting directly from the technical expertise will pay for that advice and expertise in the same way that other costs of development of a project are paid for.

Additionally, sectors requiring the services of an approved auditor are for profit and will naturally place pressure on service providers to produce efficient outcomes in a timely manner. This will assist in creating price tension within a competitive market.

The requirement for an auditor certified report will be partly offset by reduced assessment and decision timeframes. Unlike the department, approved auditors will operate outside the administrative processes of government.

The requirement for an auditor certified report will be partly offset by shorter decision timeframes as the assessment and decision functions undertaken by an approved auditor occur outside the administrative processes of government.

Once a contaminated land report is received by the department, it takes approximately 1.25 hours to complete the administrative process for a single contaminated land report. It takes an average of 15 business days to assess a standard site investigation report and draft site management plan and an average of 20 business days to assess a validation report.

Where an approved auditor is used, it is estimated that assessment time could be reduced by at least 50% from 20 business days to 10 business days. The savings may be greater for more complex projects. An approved auditor could be engaged to oversee and evaluate all stages of project development as well as certify it at various stages. By engaging an approved auditor in the early stages of the project, developers would be more certain that the risks of contaminated land are being managed appropriately and the desired outcome is achieved as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Based on the assumption that the rate and number of contaminated land reports received by the department would be the same into the future, the estimated assessment cost could also represent the estimated annual savings of Option 2 from no longer assessing contaminated land reports, development applications or developing a site suitability statement.

Change in regulatory burden

The likely change in the regulatory burden is minor in terms of additional requirements or obligations imposed on business and industry.

⁶ RIS Proposed Contaminated Land Management Regulation 2013, NSW EPA

Option 3

Status quo plus introduce a regulatory fee to cover the cost of procuring the technical assessment expertise for contaminated land

Option 3 is the same as Option 1 but with the addition of an administration fee that would be charged to recover the cost of procuring the technical expertise from the private sector to assess contaminated land reports on behalf of the department. It is assumed that the cost of administrative activities for example, maintaining the contaminated land registers, would be borne by the government.

The marginal cost of procuring the technical contaminated land expertise from the private sector to assess and certify contaminated land reports is estimated to be \$25,000 per annum (see Attachment: Option 3 Procurement Cost). The cost of procurement includes administrative, procurement, evaluation and technical assessment components. This would involve establishing a procurement plan, identifying standing offer arrangements and requirements, advertising and calling for tenders from approved auditors, evaluating offers for tender from approved auditors, and developing and letting contracts for the technical assessment of contaminated land reports.

A procurement process can take up to three months from establishing arrangements to securing contracts with approved auditors. The process would be streamlined by creating standing offer arrangements with approved auditors. Effort is also required to monitor the contracts once in place to ensure they are implemented.

Option 3 is less efficient than Option 2 in terms of time and cost. Once a contaminated land report is submitted to the department, it would then need to follow a procurement process—the duration of which is represented to the proponent as a delay cost. Additional processing time is required to complete the administrative and approval processes for procurement than Option 1.

Option 3 also prevents the efficient operation of the auditor market because the government is the only purchaser and the proponent would not be able to choose an auditor. Pricing of auditor services would effectively be fixed for a certain period of time because the fee would need to be enshrined in regulation. A variable fee to reflect the complexity of the assessment would need to be considered so that there would be an incentive for auditors to participate. However, determining the criteria for and devising a graduated fee for different levels of assessment services would inevitably result in an artificial representation. It is unlikely such an arrangement could achieve the flexibility and competitive environment provided by an open market for auditor services.

In a fixed fee scenario, landowners, developers and industry with simpler contaminated land reports and/or development applications would effectively be subsidising more complex proposals. More complex proposals would likely receive a large private benefit due to the potential to gain larger earnings and profits from a larger development proposal.

Consultation

Greentape Reduction came into effect on 31 March 2013 reforming the core assessment and licensing framework for environmental approvals. An extensive consultation program was undertaken with key stakeholders from industry, community and government on each of the initiatives including for contaminated land.

The Greentape Reforms legally formalised the role of third party auditors in relation to contaminated land matters and more generally the use of auditors, by providing for 'approved auditors' under the EP Act. The function of approved auditors was specified including evaluating and certifying the three types of contaminated land reports. Auditor's functions may only be carried out by an approved auditor or the department. The intention however, was that the department would only perform the functions of an auditor where an auditor was not available.

Consultation process

Consultation on contaminated land matters commenced with the Greentape Reduction Project. An extensive community consultation program was progressed with key stakeholders from industry, community and government. Departmental officers met with several industry representatives and peak bodies to discuss the regulatory system.

Key stakeholder consultation has continued to inform a portfolio of information and guidance developed to support the approved auditor framework including:

- Draft prescribed guideline—contaminated land auditors under Chapter 12, Part 3A
- Draft prescribed code of professional conduct for auditors approved under Chapter 12, Part 3A
- Guideline for contaminated land professionals
- Guideline for assessing suitably qualified persons.

The *Technical Services for Contaminated Land* Consultation RIS was publicly released for a period of 28 days from 9 April to 16 May 2014. Key stakeholders and interested members of the public were invited to provide written submissions about the proposed regulatory amendment for careful consideration by the department before the proposed regulatory amendments are finalised.

A total of 16 written submissions on the proposals were received from industry, government and non-government stakeholders. This Decision RIS is the next step in the policy development process. It articulates the issues raised by stakeholders during consultation and how each issue has been addressed in a more detailed proposal for regulatory amendment. It is anticipated that any legislation to progress Option 2 as articulated in the Decision RIS will be decided by Queensland Parliament by early 2015.

Preferred option

Option 2 has the greatest net benefit for the community and will be progressed for approval.

Option 2 is consistent with the government's renewal and contestability agendas as well as user-pays principles. It promotes the competitive supply of technical contaminated land services to the market. Option 2 enables the existing statutory auditor framework in the EP Act to be fully and efficiently implemented. The competitive supply of technical contaminated land expertise will further increase price tension, encourage more timely service delivery and reduce the overall cost of service provision.

The preferred option provides an effective and proportional response to the current and forecast issues concerned with ensuring technical contaminated land expertise informs and supports regulatory decision making under the EP Act for the appropriate management of public health and environmental risks.

The proposed regulatory amendment enables further streamlining of the development approval path. Assessment and decision making timeframes will be reduced saving all stakeholders time and money. It enables an agile service delivery model capable of facilitating the provision of technical contaminated land expertise to the market in response to fluctuations in demand for that expertise.

Currently, developers have the option of using the framework for approved auditors or not. Consistent with the third party auditor frameworks in Victoria and Western Australia, the proposal will make it compulsory for landowners, developers and industry to use the approved auditor framework in the EP Act. While this removes the choice of using technical assessment services supplied either by the government or the private sector, it achieves broader public benefit.

The results of public consultation support the proposal for mandatory certification of contaminated land reports by private sector auditors before being submitted to the department. While some issues and concerns were raised, these issues were not significant enough to result in a significant shift in policy direction. This Decision RIS identifies each of the issues raised in the public submissions received on the Consultation RIS and responds to each of them.

The proposal does not compromise environmental protections in Queensland that are associated with managing the risks to human health and the environment from contaminated land.

Other initiatives in the regulatory proposal

In addition to the preferred Option 2, the proposed regulatory amendment includes three broad initiatives to streamline and modernise contaminated land regulation and improve transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of the auditor framework. Several submissions requested additional information to clarify and inform understanding about the more minor proposed regulatory amendments.

Expanding the criteria requirements for contaminated land reports.

To ensure auditor certainty about what each type of contaminated land report must contain, the prescribed criteria in the EP Regulation will be repositioned in the legislation for improved visibility and transparency. In response to submissions received on the Consultation RIS, further information is provided in this section of the Decision RIS, to clarify the proposal to expand the criteria requirements for contaminated land reports. The way that the legislation is currently written, it is unclear what specific information is needed in the three types of contaminated land reports. The content requirements of each contaminated land report needs to be transparent and easily understood for the SQP who writes the contaminated land report and for the approved auditor who reviews, evaluates and makes a decision to certify the report or not.

The prescribed criteria, which are currently listed in the EP Regulation, will be moved into the EP Act as content criteria for a contaminated land report. This will assist proponents as well as contaminated land professionals to better understand the matters that are to be assessed in the contaminated land report.

As part of assessing and certifying the contaminated report, the approved auditor will need to produce a site suitability statement. The test for removing a site from the EMR will be that the site suitability statement specifies that the site is suitable for any use i.e. it can be used for a sensitive land use, without conditions. The prescribed criteria will inform the suitability of the land, given the level of contaminated on the land and the location, nature and so on of that contamination.

The prescribed criteria will be deleted from section 115c of the EP Reg at the same time as the changes to the changes in the EP Act commence. These changes in the EP Act will commence by proclamation to enable this to happen.

The department will continue to use the prescribed criteria to inform decisions to add or remove sites from the EMR or CLR.

Results of consultation

Only two of the 16 submissions received specifically responded to the proposal to expand criteria requirements for contaminated land reports. General support for the proposal was noted. One respondent suggested that the prescribed criteria be determined and made available for public comment prior to the regulatory amendment taking place. To clarify this issue, additional information has been incorporated in the section of this Decision RIS titled *Expanding criteria requirements for contaminated land reports*.

Minor amendments including removing the requirement for soil disposal permits and modifying notification requirements for land purchasers.

Soil disposal permit

A soil disposal permit is currently required for the transportation of contaminated soil to a waste facility licensed to accept contaminated soil. An applicant is required to prepare and submit an application for a soil disposal permit. Approximately 130 soil disposal permits are issued per year.

The proposal involves repealing the requirement for a soil disposal permit from the EP Act in favour of using existing waste tracking requirements. This will necessarily involve including contaminated soil as a trackable waste in the EP Waste Management Regulation, which is currently being reviewed.

As a trackable waste, contaminated soil will be able to be monitored and tracked from source to destination, like any other trackable waste. Contaminated soil cannot be disposed of on clean sites. It must be disposed of at a Waste Disposal Facility or treated at a Regulated Waste Treatment Facility, both of which are regulated as an environmentally relevant activity (ERA), under the EP Act.

Concurrent to the broader contaminated land reform program, an industry-led Waste Strategy is being developed. As part of this process options are being considered to increase beneficial reuse of wastes in Queensland.

Low level contaminated soil will not be categorised as a regulated waste and therefore would not have to be transported by a licensed regulated waste transporter. Only contaminated soil posing a significant risk from hazardous contaminants would be classified as a regulated waste and require to be transported by a licensed regulated waste transporter like other regulated wastes. The thresholds for the application of trackable and regulated waste requirements will be clarified through the review of the relevant definitions.

In the case where a waste is being beneficially used under a beneficial use approval (BUA), then it is no longer characterised as a waste and can be transported or used once it is clean enough to meet the requirements of the BUA.

Benefits of the proposal include clarifying the legislation, streamlining application processes, removing duplication and reducing delay costs of approvals to developers.

Results of consultation

Nine of the 16 submissions received included specific comment on the proposal to remove soil disposal permits. Feedback on this proposal was mixed. Two respondents support the proposal noting that the current requirement for a soil disposal permit is not well understood by industry or consultants and creates unnecessary burden compared to waste tracking requirement for other waste types.

Two of the nine respondents do not support the proposal to remove soil disposal permits. More detail was requested on how the risks of soil disposal will be managed if a soil disposal permit is not required. Concerns that the proposal will contribute to higher human health and environmental risks, higher transportation costs associated with using licensed operators, and more illegal soil disposal, are noted.

Additional information to clarify the proposal to remove soil disposal permits has been included in this Decision RIS under the section *Soil disposal permit*. It also addresses issues raised during consultation including thresholds for contaminated soil, waste tracking provisions and low risk contaminated soil as a valuable resource.

One respondent raised the concern that by removing the soil disposal permit system it would reduce likelihood of meeting Queensland's waste reduction targets relative to contaminated soils. The issue is noted. The industry-led Waste Strategy is considering options to increase the beneficial reuse of wastes, which will go towards ensuring the waste reduction targets can be achieved. The concurrent review of the waste regulation will further develop policy around making contaminated soil a trackable waste to streamline, clarify and make the legislation understandable.

Notification requirements

The EP Act requires anyone selling or disposing (granting) of land that is recorded on either the EMR or CLR to give written notification to a prospective purchaser of the recording and details of any current or outstanding notices given under the EP Act in relation to the land. This ensures that potential buyers of land listed on either of the contaminated land registers can consider any costs associated with assessing and possibly remediating the land before they purchase the land.

The importance of informed decision making by prospective purchasers of land listed on a contaminated land register is reflected in common law, which requires due disclosure of such information when selling land. While only an issue for a very few cases, it is possible that this information is misused to break a contract of sale even after a contract has been in place for many years. A proposal to amend notification requirements and limit the period within which the purchaser has a right to rescind a contract will better balance the rights of the seller and purchaser.

The proposed amendments are to fix a disconnection between the intent of the existing provisions and how purchase contracts with developers generally work. Essentially, the notification requirement is written as if the purchaser has a relatively small amount of time between signing the contract and property settlement. While this may be the case for normal house contracts i.e. with a 30 day settlement period, it is not the case in many off-the-plan purchases where construction commences after the deposit is paid and settlement can occur a significant time following the purchase. An inequitable loophole has been created where a purchaser can wait months or sometimes years after being informed of the listing on the EMR before cancelling the contract. The proposed amendment resolves this by providing a timeframe after notification of the listing for the purchaser to cancel the contract.

Results of consultation

Mixed responses were received on the notification requirements proposal. One submission from industry provided general support for the proposal, while one other industry submission did not support the proposal to amend notification requirements.

It is acknowledged that the information on the proposal to amend the notification requirements in the Consultation RIS was brief. The Decision RIS has expanded the discussion on the proposal to better articulate why regulatory amendments are needed. Educational materials will be developed to assist conveyancers, local governments and other industry professionals to ensure that new owners are made aware of the potential for the transfer of liabilities with the transfer of land ownership.

Restructuring Chapter 7 of the EP Act to modernise, streamline and improve clarity of contaminated land provisions

At the macro scale, application and approval processes contained in the EP Act have been streamlined and updated in line with the needs of modern business. Chapter 7 of the EP Act relating to contaminated land was largely left untouched by the first round of Greentape Reduction initiatives. The proposed restructure of Chapter 7 will create a better fit with the rest of the EP Act and the proposed new sections. It will also clarify what is required for contaminated land to be properly managed. Currently, the purpose and content of contaminated land reports is unclear making it difficult to transparently achieve the certification of contaminated land reports by approved auditors.

The community will benefit from the proposed regulatory amendment through increased government efficiency and greater emphasis on monitoring and enforcing compliance with the regulations and standards for contaminated land established in the NEPM. Importantly, the engagement of technical experts on specific contaminated land projects, which will enhance community confidence that the health and environmental risks of contaminated land are being appropriately managed.

Results of consultation

One submission specifically responded to the proposal to restructure Chapter 7 of the EP Act and requested further consultation on this issue. This feedback is noted. Targeted consultation on an exposure draft of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill has been undertaken providing an opportunity for review and response on the proposed restructure of Chapter 7 of the EP Act.

To clarify this proposal further information has been included in this Decision RIS.

Issues considered outside scope

A number of issues were raised in submissions that are outside the scope of the policy proposal and objectives of the proposed regulatory amendments. These out-of-scope issues are not discussed in this Decision RIS but are noted below. Where relevant, submissions have been referred to the appropriate area of the department for consideration in other current reform programs such as the regulated waste review and review of waste environmentally relevant activities.

Industry:

- Free public access to EMR and CLR.
- Duration of time for approval as an auditor
- Amendments to SPA including ROL and MCU proposal were progressed separately to the regulatory proposal which is being carried forward as part of this Decision RIS
- Environmental, social and economic audit and analysis of all sites listed on the EMR and CLR
- RIS to inform planning processes and mechanisms including defining 'no-go' zones where land contaminated is unacceptable
- Land contaminated action targets that inform land use and industry production practices
- Waste reduction and recycling activities
- Waste management aspirations and linkages to NRM plans
- Setting threshold limits for natural resource assets to inform decisions by contaminated land professionals
- Maximum beneficial land use
- Work health and safety issues
- Investigation levels
- Wider economic and environmental issues of Australia
- Review of exposure assumptions
- The cost of salinity on agricultural land
- Risk assessment.

Consistency with other policies and regulation

Competition principles agreement

The department currently provides technical advisory, review and assessment services in competition with private sector auditors. These services are provided at low or no cost, which is contrary to the principles of competitive neutrality outlined in National Competition Policy.

The proposal is a minor regulatory amendment to the benefit of landowners, the development industry and other private sector business with technical expertise in contaminated land matters. It is not the intention that the proposed regulation restricts competition in any way. On the contrary, the proposal seeks to promote demand for, and supply of, technical contaminated land expertise from the private sector, to the market. The proposed reforms are consistent with Clause 5 of the Commonwealth of Australian Governments' Competition Principles Agreement.

The proposed reforms will not have a disproportionate impact on any one industry. Rather the reforms will deliver greater commercial opportunities for private sector service providers with technical skills and experience in contaminated land matters. The proposal would also ensure equity for stakeholders with land that is listed on the EMR or CLR despite the legislative pathway used to address issues of contamination, the EP Act or SPA.

Fundamental legislative principles

The *Legislative Standards Act 1992* contains a set of Fundamental Legislative Principles that must be satisfied when amending regulations. The four initiatives contained in the proposed regulatory amendment do not raise any fundamental legislative principles.

National framework

The *Commonwealth National Environmental Protection Council Act 1994* was enacted to ensure that people enjoy the same level of protection from pollution wherever they live in Australia and that business decisions are not distorted by variations between jurisdictions. The NEPM for assessing site contamination provides a nationally consistent approach which ensures sound environmental management practices by regulators, site assessors, environmental auditors, landowners, developers and industry.

The proposed amendment will fully implement the statutory auditor framework in the EP Act and align it with the nationally agreed approach for the assessment of site contamination, which involves site assessors.

Results of consultation

One submission received on the Consultation RIS noted that the proposal to mandate the certification of contaminated land reports by approved auditors from the private sector would bring Queensland's assessment requirements in line with other states and provide greater clarity about contaminated land assessment processes.

Implementation, evaluation and compliance support strategy

It is proposed that the legislation will commence by proclamation. This will provide some time for stakeholders to transition from the old approval system to the new auditor certification system. In addition, the legislation will contain transitional arrangements for when an application is made before the commencement of the legislation.

The proposed regulatory amendment will necessarily involve an increase in the use of contaminated land approved auditors under the EP Act. The department will continue to undertake education and awareness-raising about the expectations and obligations of auditors to ensure that auditors understand and fully adopt the role.

Approved auditors are responsible for evaluating contaminated land reports, against the NEPM to ensure best practice management of the environmental and health risks of contaminated land. With respect to remediated land, or contaminated land that can be managed via a site management plan, approved auditors make recommendations about suitable land uses to the department. Approved auditors will be held accountable for their professional expertise and decision making with respect to contaminated land.

The department maintains a publicly searchable, current and accurate list of persons, who have been approved under the EP Act as a contaminated land auditor. This will help to match demand for technical services with supply and reduce the associated search costs.

The department will monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the auditor framework. Raising awareness about the market opportunities for private sector auditors will be undertaken to ensure supply of technical contaminated land expertise adequately meets the demand for these services. This will also be essential in supporting construction sector in the Queensland's four pillar economy.

Auditing the performance of approved auditors will ensure that auditors are operating in line with the requirements and obligations of their approval, the code of conduct and guidelines for contaminated land professionals. Suspension or cancellation of approval of an auditor may be enforced in the case of non-compliance.

The statutory framework for approved auditors is contained in the EP Act, which is primary legislation and subject to review every 10 years. The regulatory proposal will be incorporated into the department's broader reform program to ensure relevance, effectiveness and efficiency is maintained over time and most importantly that the public health and environmental risks of contaminated land are being managed for the benefit and safety of Queenslanders.