

Analysis of Public Submissions

Murray River National Park Draft Management Plan

The Murray River National Park Draft Management Plan was released for public consultation on 1 September 2022. Consultation closed on 1 December 2022. This followed a period of consultation with key stakeholders.

During the formal consultation period, members of the public had the option to provide feedback on the draft plan by providing a written submission or completing a survey on the YourSAy website.

Thirty submissions were received, including two written responses and 28 surveys. Table 1 outlines the submissions received and Table 2 summarises the feedback received and how it was considered in finalisation of the plan. Table 3 contains a copy of the YourSAy survey questions.

All submissions on the draft park management plan have been reviewed against the following criteria:

Feedback meeting criteria 1-3 below, result in alterations:

1. Feedback provided additional information of direct relevance to the draft plan;
2. Feedback suggested an alternative approach that was considered more appropriate than that proposed in the draft plan;
3. Feedback highlighted omissions, inaccuracies or a lack of clarity.

Feedback meeting criteria 4-9 below **do not** result in alterations:

4. Feedback clearly supported the draft plan;

5. Feedback was already addressed in the draft plan;
6. Feedback addressed issues beyond the scope of the draft plan, or recommended the inclusion of detailed or prescriptive information that is not appropriate for a strategic plan of this type;
7. Feedback proposed an alternative approach but the recommendation of the draft plan was still considered the most appropriate option;
8. Feedback was based on incorrect information;
9. Feedback offered an open statement, or no change was sought.

Table 1: Submissions received

Submission #	Name	Respondent type
1	Joshua Quinn	Local community member, Park neighbour
2	Helen McKerral	Park visitor, Interested individual
3	Lisa	Park visitor, Interested individual, Local community member, Environmental volunteer
4	Barry Brown	Interested individual, Non-government organisation
5	Anna	Park visitor, Interested individual
6	Bronwyn Caldwell	Interested individual
7	Amy	Park visitor, Interested individual, Local community member
8	Denys Smith	Park visitor
9	Christopher Coulson	Park visitor, Interested individual, Environmental volunteer
10	Tanya	Park visitor, Interested individual
11	Sally Letcher	Park visitor, Environmental volunteer, Non-government organisation
12	Kent Smith	Park visitor, Interested individual, Local community member
13	Gurney	Park visitor, Interested individual
14	Peter Pfeiffer	Park visitor, Interested individual
15	Rob Gazzola	Park visitor
16	Andrea Szabo	Interested individual, Local community member
17	Kym Werner	Park visitor, Interested individual, Local community member, Tour operator
18	Barry Brown	Park visitor, Interested individual, Non-government organisation
19	Karen	Park visitor, Interested individual
20	Laura	Park visitor, Interested individual
21	Barry Pahl	Interested individual
22	Vicki Twyford	Park visitor
23	Christopher Coulson	Park visitor, Interested individual
24	Colin Hughes	Park visitor, Interested individual
25	Sarah Macdonald	Park visitor, Interested individual
26	Mick Hemsley	Park visitor, Interested individual
27	Tracey Alexander	Government
28	Jim Rosenthal	Interest group
29	Friends of Paringa Paddock	Volunteer group
30	State Planning Commission	Government

Table 2: Analysis of submissions

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
General					
1	Supported the themes, objectives and strategies outlined in the park management plan.	4, 8 ,9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 23, 25, 26, 27,29, 30	No	Feedback supports the plan.	4
2	Recommends that all Park Management Plans contain a specific section that articulates the envisaged land uses for the National Park, based on the land use definitions used in Part 7 of the Code.	30	No	This is considered too specific for a park management plan, and would impact on the readability and accessibility of the plan.	6
Theme 1: Protecting natural values					
3	There is a need to prevent any large scale developments that would impact on the conservation value of the park.	2, 3, 6, 13,	No	The plan already outlines an approach that prevents any large-scale disruptive developments, and notes the value of the park as an undeveloped place.	4, 5
4	Would like to see local hunters given the opportunity to eradicate invasive pests from the park.	1	No	Local hunters can apply for permits for the removal of pest or over-abundant species under the management regime outlined in the plan. This can only form part of the overall pest management approach, given the scale of the issue.	5

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
5	Supportive of Thiele's Flat addition to the park.	7	No	Feedback supported the approach outlined in the plan.	4
6	Feral animals should be eliminated from the park.	21	No	The park plan outlines some of the most damaging pest species that are priorities for control. Complete elimination of pest animals is however not considered feasible given their prevalence in the landscape.	9
Theme 2: Providing recreation opportunities					
7	Develop low impact, free or low cost walk-in only or canoe-in only campsites.	1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 19	Yes	While the draft plan did mention low impact free canoe camping, the plan has been amended to highlight this opportunity. Hiking only camping is not considered a priority in Murray River National Park.	3
8	Ensure that recreational fishing access is maintained and enhanced.	18	No	The draft plan encourages recreational fishing access. There are no plans to in any way restrict recreational fishing access through park management, noting that fisheries are managed by separate agencies.	9
9	Restricting motorised watercraft in parks outside of events.	17	Yes	A blanket restriction on motorised vessels within park boundaries is considered impractical, given the network of waterways that contain stretches within and without park boundaries, and challenges with policing. However, this is recognised as a legitimate concern and risk to park user safety. Edits have been made in relation to this.	1

Comment No.	Comment	Sub No	Plan altered	Response	Criteria
10	Honour system payment systems for campers should be brought back.	24	No	Views on the online camping payment system are noted, but it is beyond the scope of this plan to change state-wide camp payment policies.	6
11	There should be more monitoring of illegal dumping of rubbish, and/or the installation of additional bins near popular areas.	3, 7, 9	No	This is an ongoing park operational matter that is beyond the scope of this plan. This remains helpful feedback for park operational management.	6
12	Additional toilets are required near campsites and popular areas.	7, 8, 15	No	This is recognised as useful and welcome feedback for park operational management; however, it is beyond the scope of this plan to outline additional toilets. Additional facilities within Visitor Use Zones will be developed as funding permits.	6
13	Develop additional boat ramps and extend existing campsites with no loss of vegetation.	28	No	The management plan sets aside the development of additional facilities within Visitor Use Zones.	6
14	Mention should be made of private tourism ventures, or connection with adjacent privately managed schemes.	29	No	It was determined mentioning by name specific eco-tourism operators or adjacent schemes would date the document.	7
Theme 3: Working with community					
15	Working with First Nations people should be a priority across all aspects of park management.	5, 20	Yes	While there is a theme regarding First Nations specifically, collaborating with First Nations across all aspects of park management is recognised within the current plan as vitally important.	3
Theme 4: Water					
16	Provided commentary management of the Murray River more generally	8, 12	No	Management of the Murray River more generally is beyond the scope of this plan. This plan can only outline park management.	6