



# Analysis of Public Submissions

## Parks of the Central Fleurieu Peninsula Draft Management Plan 2023

The Parks of the Central Fleurieu Peninsula Draft Management Plan was released for public consultation from 22 May to 28 August 2023.

During that time, 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.

74 submissions were received, including 9 written responses and 65 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

Sub #	Name	Respondent
1	Patrick Sandeman	Park visitor, interested individual
2	Steve (surname not supplied)	Park visitor
3	Elissia Harris	Park neighbour
4	Kylie Roesler	Park neighbour
5	Stefan (surname not supplied)	Park visitor
6	Michael Rumbold	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
7	Robert (surname not supplied)	Park visitor
8	Matthew Forte	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer, interest group
9	Nick (surname not supplied)	Park visitor, interested individual
10	Simon (surname not supplied)	Park visitor, interested individual
11	Barbary O'Brien	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member, environmental volunteer
12	Cathy Smythe	Park visitor
13	Andy P Baker	Park visitor, local community member, environmental volunteer
14	Julie Sellick	Park visitor, interested individual
15	Pam Quick	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer
16	Al Li	Interested individual
17	Christina Macdonald	Park visitor, local community member, environmental volunteer
18	Chris Hochwald	Park visitor, interested individual
19	Peter Sharley	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member, environmental volunteer, park neighbour
20	Jonte Bates	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member, environmental volunteer. other (NRM Coordinator)
21	Mark Kohler	Park visitor, interested individual, non-governmental organisation
22	Anthony Abley	Local community member, environmental volunteer, government
23	Mark Mann	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer
24	Peter Vowles	Interested individual
25	Barry Brown	Local community member
26	Tim (surname not supplied)	Park visitor
27	Paul Birkwood	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
28	Lee Jeffery	Government
29	Heather Webster	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer
30	Robyn Furniss	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
31	Bryan Haywood	Interested individual, environmental volunteer
32	Marilyn Henderson	Local community member
33	Brendan Rorison	Park visitor
34	Lianda Deans	Park visitor
35	Tyson Smith	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer, other (Previously worked within many of the parks)



36	Suzanne Turner	Park visitor
37	Craig Brownlie	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer
38	Leigh Sparks	Park visitor
39	Julia Patten	Park visitor, interested individual, interest group
40	Colin Boulden	Park visitor, interested individual
41	Tania (surname not supplied)	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
42	Kerstin Hahn	Park visitor, local community member, interest group
43	Michael Cornish	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer
44	Sarah (surname not supplied)	Park visitor, interested individual
45	Judy Rees	Park visitor, interested individual
46	David Rawson	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member, interest group
47	Rob Ruediger	Environmental volunteer
48	Luke Chester	Park visitor
49	Rory Kalka	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member, park neighbour
50	Timothy (surname not supplied)	Park visitor, interested individual
51	David Butcher	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
52	William Brooker	Park visitor, interested individual, non-governmental organisation
53	Leigh (surname not supplied)	Park visitor, interested individual
54	Jeff Thomas	Park visitor, interested individual
55	Sam (surname not supplied)	Interested individual, local community member
56	Dean Richardson	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
57	Belinda Steeles	Park visitor, interested individual, local community member
58	Brian Clements	Park visitor, interested individual
59	Chris (surname not supplied)	Interested individual
60	Deb (surname not supplied)	Interested individual
61	Bronwyn Anderson	Interested individual, local community member
62	Leisa Moore	Interested individual
63	Lorraine Rogers	Local community member
64	Nick Barker	Park visitor, interested individual, environmental volunteer
65	Elen Shute	Non-governmental organisation
66	Sean Clarke	Park visitor, interested individual
67	Erik Dahl	Interested individual
68	Manon and Brett Maley	Park neighbour
69	Rob Ruediger	Environmental volunteer
70	Melanie Sjoberg	Friends of the Heysen Trail
71	Rod Quintrell	Walking SA
72	Kristy Bevan	Nature Conservation Society of South Australia
73	Sue Millbank	Park neighbour
74	Olivia Prohoroff	Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Board



Table 2: Analysis of feedback

Number	Comment	Submission Number	Plan Altered	Response	Criteria
<b>General</b>					
1.	Provided general support for the direction of the plan.	11, 18, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 38, 41, 52, 56, 58, 60	No	Submission supported the plan with no changes sought.	4
2.	Expressed concern that the opening of Hindmarsh Valley National Park will impact the roads, result in greater vandalism, robbery and trespassing on surrounding properties.	4	No	Noted. The plan highlights that maintaining good relationships with park neighbours will be central to working together to manage land and coordinate responses.	9
3.	Suggested including a focus on compliance of activities not permitted in parks.	26, 39, 47, 73	No	Noted. Compliance programs are operational in nature and not necessary for this plan which is strategic in nature. Unauthorised activities in parks are monitored as a part of on-going park management.	6
4.	Suggested working with First Nations to explore the possibility of employing Aboriginal Rangers to undertake park management activities.	26	No	Funding and resource allocation is beyond the scope of this plan. However, the Department for Environment and Water has targets around improving employment of Aboriginal people including increasing the number of Aboriginal Rangers.	6
5.	Suggested the appendices should contain a comprehensive list of flora and fauna species in the parks.	31, 72	No	The appendices and details in the plan are to provide examples of species that the outcomes of objectives and strategies can benefit. Providing direction for all species and including all species in appendices is outside the scope of a strategic document such as this plan. Species lists are available online for all parks.	7
6.	Suggested that the plan should contain detailed maps of each park including features such as boundaries, gates, trails, hydrological features, major vegetation communities, topography, zoning and infrastructure.	31, 72	No	These parks have no management zones and limited infrastructure to display. Other detail such as topography, vegetation communities etc is not required for a strategic plan of this nature. Detailed information is utilised at the park operations level.	6



7.	Expressed the opinion that the Acknowledgement of Country on page 2 should include Ramindjeri and Ngarrindjeri.	32	Yes	Rather than name 4 nations in the Acknowledgement, the text has been amended to acknowledge First Nations peoples as traditional custodians.	3
8.	Suggested more staff are required to manage the parks.	34	No	Funding and resource allocation is beyond the scope of the plan.	6
9.	Suggested initiating a booking system and charging an entry fee to recover costs and limit visitor numbers.	39	No	Park entry fees and online bookings is a state level policy. Changes to the payment arrangements for the parks is beyond the scope of the plan.	6
10.	Suggested 15 parks in one management plan is inadequate and that separate management plans are needed for individual parks.	65, 72	No	The plan reflects the unique values, challenges, management issues and threats of each park at the appropriate level for a strategic document. The parks have been grouped in clusters in the 'Park significance and purpose' section based on ecological and geographic features. Including 15 parks in one plan enables a consistent framework to guide operational plans for managing issues specific to certain parks.	6
11.	Questioned why some of the common names of plants and animals are followed by scientific names, but others aren't.	67	No	When a species is first mentioned in the plan both the common and scientific name is used. Each time the species is mentioned thereafter only the common name is used for simplicity.	9
12.	Expressed support for covering 15 parks in one management plan.	71	No	Feedback is in support of the plan. No change necessary.	4
13.	Suggested that the plan does not contain enough operational detail to effectively manage the parks and in its current form it is a management strategy, not a management plan.	65, 72	No	Detailed and prescriptive information is out of scope for a strategic document of this type. Subordinate operational plans will include detail on specific management actions.	6
14.	Expressed the opinion that multi-park plans in lieu of individual management plans effectively prevents community consultation on priorities for individual parks and does not meet the requirements of the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972</i> .	72	No	The community was provided an opportunity to make a submission regarding the draft plan during the 3-month consultation period, including issues relative to specific parks. The plan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972</i> .	9
15.	Suggested lists of all threatened species (national, state and regional) and ecological communities are identified	72	Yes	The text in Theme 1 and Theme 2 has been amended to include reference to recovery plans and conservation advice statements for species listed under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity</i>	3



	and that recovery plans, documents on key threatening process, and threat abatement plans are identified.			<p><i>Conservation Act 1999</i>. Strategies to address this have also been added in Theme 1 and Theme 2.</p> <p>The plan and the appendices includes national and state threatened species as examples of plants and animals that the objectives and strategies can benefit. Providing comprehensive lists including regional species is not required for a strategic document such as this plan.</p>	
16.	Suggested that timeframes for the completion of actions that contribute to the strategies outlined in the plan should be specified.	72	No	The actions to be undertaken including timeframes and resourcing are done at the operational level and are not required in a strategic document of this nature.	6
17.	Suggested replacing 'not envisioned' with 'not permitted' in reference to the provision of mountain biking in Hindmarsh Valley National Park in the 'Directions for management' section on page 5.	74	No	The term 'envisioned' in the context of this section is used to describe that mountain biking is not an activity planned for the future. The text in Theme 3 makes it clear that mountain bike will not be permitted in the parks. However, the word 'envisioned' has been replaced by 'envisaged' in the Directions for management section to make it clearer that mountain biking is not something being contemplated in these parks in the future.	7
<b>Park significance and purpose</b>					
18.	Suggested that the reference to the traditional lands of the Kurna and Peramangk peoples should be moved to the start of the section, before reference to wildlife.	67	Yes	Change made as suggested.	2
<b>Challenges and opportunities</b>					
19.	Suggested separating challenges and opportunities on page 13 to clarify what is a challenge and what is an opportunity.	74	No	This section is not designed to separate challenges and opportunities. In some circumstances they are not mutually exclusive.	7
<b>Theme 1: Conserving heathlands, woodlands and forests</b>					
20.	Expressed the view that feral animals including foxes, cats, rabbits and deer are a major threat to conservation and the plan should be more explicit about their control.	13, 29, 30, 34, 45, 46, 65, 67, 72	Yes	Theme 1 has been amended to highlight that even in low numbers pest animals can have significant impacts on biodiversity and will require management to their limit effects on biodiversity. The strategy has also been amended to identify pest animal control will be to limit their impact on biodiversity and support the recovery of threatened	2



				species. The detail regarding specific pest management programs will be detailed at the operations level.	
21.	Suggested that specific effort should be made to record lesser known fauna such as invertebrates before restoration activities commence.	31	No	This is detail considered too prescriptive for the plan which is strategic in nature. Operational planning for restoration activities will include a focus on the specific aims and desired outcomes.	6
22.	Expressed support for humane control of kangaroos when required to achieve ecological benefits.	35, 67, 74	No	No change necessary. Feedback supports direction in the plan.	4
23.	Expressed concern for the management of kangaroos.	45	No	Theme 1 details the impacts from kangaroos and the circumstances where active management will be considered in order to protect conservation values.	9
24.	Expressed concern for large areas being managed by prescribed burning.	45	No	Outside the scope of the management plan. Prescribed burning is subject to careful planning based on the desired outcomes. The development of a fire management plan for these parks will provide further clarity on prescribed burning.	6
25.	Expressed support for acknowledging that feral deer are an increasing problem in the region and landscape scale partnerships for their control are a good approach.	67	No	No change necessary. Feedback supports the direction in plan.	4
26.	Expressed the view that total grazing pressure is a coarse measure of impact and non-native herbivores should be controlled first, with native herbivores controlled only when strictly necessary.	72	No	Noted. Management programs to control impacts from herbivores will be based on an integrated approach. In some instances however, native herbivores are creating the biggest impact on conservation values and may be the priority species for management.	7
27.	Suggested referencing the Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Boards' draft Regional Pest Plant and Animal Strategy 2023-2028 to ensure consistency with prioritisation approaches and management objectives across the region and that the department's responsibility to control declared pest species under the <i>Landscape South Australia Act 2019</i> should be acknowledged.	74	Yes	Theme 3 has been updated to acknowledge that once finalised, the Hills and Fleurieu Landscape Boards Regional Pest Plant and Animal Strategy 2023-2028 will provide guidance on prioritising pest plant and animal management in the parks, consistent with priorities across the Hills and Fleurieu region. Parks are managed in accordance with all relevant legislation. There is no need to reference all legislation that applies with regard to park management.	1
28.	Suggested establishing and promoting citizen science projects to assist in the collection of data.	15, 51	Yes	The benefits of promoting public participation in citizen science has been added to Theme 1.	



<b>Objective 1: Manage ecosystem health by gaining a better understanding of species distribution and ecology to guide habitat restoration programs and effective threat management.</b>					
29.	Supports gaining a better understanding of the ecology of these parks but suggested more focus on programs to control the threats we know.	13, 20	Yes	The objective has been reworded to 'Protect ecosystem health by enhancing habitat and managing key threats' in order to emphasise the focus on active management.	2
30.	Suggested that more detail is needed regarding ecological monitoring.	65	No	Monitoring is addressed in Theme 1. Specific requirements will be developed at the operational level and not required in a strategic document of this nature.	6
<b>Theme 2: Conserving Fleurieu Peninsula Swamps</b>					
31.	Supports the theme in general but urged that more detail is needed to conserve Fleurieu Peninsula Swamps and that key federal documents relating to swamps need to be referenced in the plan and taken into account to guide their management.	65, 72	Yes	Theme 2, including an additional strategy, has been amended to reference that the <i>Conservation Advice for the Swamps of the Fleurieu Peninsula ecological community</i> will guide actions to stop the decline and support recovery of Fleurieu Peninsula Swamps. Further detail and prescriptive information is out of scope for a strategic document of this type. Operational plans will include detail on management actions and locations informed by the best available scientific information.	3
<b>Theme 3: Visitor management</b>					
32.	Expressed the view that mountain biking should be allowed in the parks.	2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 57, 59, 64, 66	No	Mountain biking is not permitted in the parks, including Hindmarsh Valley National Park, for reasons outlined in the plan.	7
33.	Suggested that bike riding, horse riding and dogs be allowed.	4, 40	No	These activities are not currently permitted in the parks and are not envisaged in the future.	7
34.	Expressed the view that public access for hiking, mountain biking and adventure activities is important for visitor numbers and benefits for mental and physical health.	2, 65	No	Opportunities for low-impact activities such as walking and hiking are provided in many of the parks. However, as outlined above, mountain biking is not permitted in the parks.	5
35.	Expressed the opinion that visitors should be able to explore the parks on motorbike.	7	No	There are no public roads in these parks and the riding of motorbikes within the parks is not permitted.	7
36.	Suggested incorporation of walk in or bike in campsites.	10, 51	No	The plan identifies opportunities for basic camping within Hindmarsh Valley National Park may be considered in the future.	5





37.	Requested maintenance of Heysen Trail signals.	12	No	The plan sets out the need to maintain tracks and signage, including sections of the Heysen Trail in Theme 3 and the first strategy.	5
38.	Suggested that information and interpretive signage needs to be updated regularly in order to maintain up-to-date information about each park.	14, 61	No	Theme 3, including Strategy 7, includes the provision of interpretive material to support meaningful connections for park visitors to the natural and cultural values of the parks. How often the signs are updated is subject to resourcing and need.	5
39.	Suggested that there should be car parking to accommodate up to 10 cars near entrance points to each park to reduce damage to road verges and park infrastructure and to minimise weed and disease spread.	15	Yes	Theme 3 has been amended to include future consideration of basic car parks in response to serious safety issues from visitors parking on road verges in order to access parks.	2
40.	Expressed the view that dogs should not be allowed in the parks.	15, 62	No	Noted. No change necessary. Feedback aligns with current position on dogs in these parks.	4
41.	Expressed the opinion that more funding should be provided for trails and signage.	16	No	Funding and resource allocation is beyond the scope of the plan.	6
42.	Not supportive of camping in Hindmarsh Valley National Park.	19, 68, 73	No	The plan identifies that basic camping facilities may be considered in the park in the future subject to detailed planning and assessment of risks, site suitability and consultation with park neighbours and the community.	9
43.	Expressed the opinion that visitor infrastructure should be improved to provide toilets, car parks and water tanks due to road side safety issues and people using the bush as a toilet.	56	Yes	Additional text has been added to Theme 3 to clarify that new small-scale facilities or upgrades may be considered in the conservation parks to support low-impact visitation separate to any infrastructure planned for Hindmarsh Valley National Park. Comment 39 has addressed consideration of future car parks for safety reasons if necessary.	2
44.	Expressed the opinion that development in Hindmarsh Valley National Park should be limited to walking trails for bushwalking, birdwatching and nature appreciation only.	30	No	Noted. Basic car parking is planned for Hindmarsh Valley National Park to support low-impact recreation, provide safe access to the park and prevent blockage of neighbouring driveways. Additional visitor facilities may be considered if community sentiment and visitation shows a demand.	7
45.	Expressed the opinion that there should be a specific focus on engaging with First Nations to highlight areas of	31	Yes	Theme 3 has been updated to make it clear that consultation with First Nations will ensure that sites are protected from impacts associated	1



	cultural significance in each park before activities are undertaken.			with public visitation, conservation programs park maintenance and development activities.	
46.	Expressed support for not developing mountain bike trails in Hindmarsh Valley National Park.	35, 37, 45, 46, 53, 72	No	No change necessary. Feedback supports direction in the plan.	4
47.	Expressed support for minimal development in the parks.	37, 45, 46, 62, 63, 71	No	No change necessary. Feedback supports direction in the plan.	4
48.	Suggested the provision of campgrounds that can cater for groups of up to 60 people (e.g. scouts groups).	42	No	The plan identifies that opportunities for basic camping within Hindmarsh Valley National Park may be considered in the future. The layout and size requirements will be part of the planning, assessment and consultation process.	6
49.	Suggested the inclusion of dog friendly walks in the parks.	48	No	Dogs are not currently permitted in the parks and are not envisaged to be allowed in the future.	7
50.	Suggested the provision of rest points in parks and a cycle route linking tracks in parks with the public road network to support cyclists to engage with the parks.	51	No	The development of a cycle route across the landscape by linking tracks on parks with the public road network is outside the scope of the management plan.	6
51.	Suggested more detail is needed on how the risk of phytophthora spread will be managed.	65, 70, 72	No	The management of phytophthora is covered in Theme 1 and is included as a strategy. Detailing the risk management strategy for minimising the spread of phytophthora will be done at the operational level.	6
52.	Requested that the car park in Hindmarsh Valley National Park off McEwin Rd is not visible from neighbouring properties, is clearly sign posted and that the top of the road is kept clear for farm equipment and emergency access to private properties.	68	No	Noted. Consultation will occur with adjoining neighbours to ensure concerns and requirements are considered in the detailed designs for car parking and infrastructure.	6
53.	Suggested clarifying that even though there are no campsites in the parks the sections of the Heysen Trail can be walked as either day walks or sectional-hikes.	70	Yes	The text in Theme 1 on page 19 has been updated to clarify this.	3
54.	Requested that the entrance to Hindmarsh Valley National Park off McEwin Rd is secure so visitors can't enter freely at any time.	73	No	Car park opening hours will be considered in consultation with adjoining park neighbours.	6



<b>Objective 3: Provide low-impact opportunities and experiences in nature where risks to ecological values can be minimised.</b>					
55.	Expressed the opinion that conservation values of these small parks may be negatively impacted by recreation activities and facilities.	37, 50	No	Noted. Theme 3 outlines that the impact of visitation will be monitored and appropriate action will be taken to ensure that visitation remains sustainable.	7
<b>Strategies</b>					
56.	Suggested an additional strategy to enable mountain biking, particularly within Hindmarsh Valley National Park.	2, 5, 6, 9	No	Mountain biking in the parks covered in this plan is not permitted, including Hindmarsh Valley National Park for reasons outlined in the plan.	7
57.	Suggested increasing the focus on the management of known pest plants and animals.	13, 17, 63	Yes	The strategy referring to pest animals has been amended to specify that control will be to limit their impact on biodiversity and support the recovery of threatened species. The detail regarding specific pest management programs will be detailed at the operations level.	2
58.	Suggested improving strategies to maximise public access.	16	No	Management of these parks has a focus on protecting high conservation values. Maximising visitor numbers can create unsustainable impacts.	7
59.	Suggested an additional strategy to link vegetation across parks and private properties to create nature corridors.	19, 43, 46	Yes	Strategy 6 has been updated to include partnering with neighbours to create corridors across public and private land.	3
60.	Expressed the opinion that the management of deer and western grey kangaroo should be the highest priority in order to protect threatened plants.	20	No	The management of both deer and western grey kangaroo is considered appropriately covered in Theme 1, including in the strategies.	5
61.	Expressed the opinion that car parks should not be provided at Hindmarsh Valley National Park as a way to limit visitation and therefore limit spread of phytophthora.	20	No	Noted. The provision of basic car parking is planned to support low-impact recreation, provide safe access to the park and prevent blockage of neighbouring driveways. Measures described in the plan will be in place to manage the risk of phytophthora.	7
62.	Expressed the opinion that there is not enough burning of coral fern and too much burning of other areas.	20	No	Noted. However this detail is too specific in nature to be included in the management plan which is a strategic document. The plan includes a strategy to develop a fire management plan for the parks which will address fire for ecological outcomes.	6



63.	Expressed the opinion that fire is a good tool for regenerating areas and the public should be educated about it.	20	No	Noted. However this detail is too specific in nature to be included in the management plan which is a strategic document.	6
64.	Suggested the addition of regeneration by cool burns should be a strategy.	23	No	Considered to be appropriately covered by Theme 1 that includes a strategy to use prescribed burning to enhance habitat quality. The plan also includes a strategy to develop a fire management plan for the parks which will address fire for ecological outcomes.	5
65.	Suggested allowing recreational hunting as a management tool to control pest animal species.	33, 49	No	Recreational hunting in the parks covered in the plan is not permitted, irrespective of the target species.	7
66.	Suggested that historical uses or activities within the parks should be noted and acknowledged in signage.	36	No	Theme 3 includes a focus on providing interpretive material at strategic locations to help create meaningful connections for park visitors to the natural and cultural values of the parks. The development of content will include consideration of past use.	6
67.	Suggested that the rehabilitation of cleared land should have more focus.	37, 55, 63	No	No change required. Theme 1 includes a strategy to rehabilitate cleared areas. Strategy 6 in Theme 1 has been updated to include partnering with neighbours to create corridors across public and private land.	4
68.	Provided support for the addition of land to the parks to make them larger.	43, 46	Yes	The last strategy under Theme 1 includes exploring opportunities for further additions to parks as they arise. However, the text in Theme 1 has been updated to include the consideration of adding adjacent land to the parks where feasible and the values align to the priorities for the states protected area network.	1
69.	Requested that if camping is enabled in the future that the requirement for online booking is removed.	44	No	Park entry fees and online bookings is a state level policy. Changes to the payment and booking arrangements for the parks is beyond the scope of this management plan.	6
70.	Suggested a strategy to add hygiene stations at major park access points to limit the spread of phytophthora.	47, 69	No	The management of phytophthora is covered in Theme 1 and is included as a strategy. Detailing where phytophthora hygiene stations will be located will be done at the operational level.	6
71.	Suggested the provision of a toilet at Cox Scrub Conservation Park.	53	No	Noted. The provision of facilities is addressed in the plan. Detailed planning and decision making on facility locations are made at an operational level	6



72.	Suggested that inoculation of the soil to control phytophthora is a strategy that should be explored.	54	No	The management of phytophthora is covered in Theme 1. Inoculation of soil will be considered at the operational level based on situational need.	6
73.	Requested that walking trails, including the Heysen Trail, continue to be sensitively managed and maintained.	71	No	Park infrastructure is managed and maintained within available resources to ensure it is fit for purpose and aligns to the protection of park values.	3

**Table 3 – YourSAy Survey questions**

The questions included in the survey are outlined below. In most cases, respondents provided a mix of quantitative (checkbox) and qualitative (open text) data within the survey. Where survey respondents did not provide additional text for questions 5 to 13, the respondent's feedback has been interpreted by the level of support indicated for the themes and objectives in questions 5 to 10.

Number	Question	Question type
1	Name	Open text
2	Suburb	Open text
3	Postcode	Open text
4	What is your relationship with these parks?	Checkbox
5	Do you support Theme 1: Conserving heathlands, woodlands and forests, or have any comment on how they could be improved?	Checkbox and open text
6	Do you support Theme 2: Conserving Fleurieu Peninsula Swamps, or have any comment on how they could be improved?	Checkbox and open text
7	Do you support Theme 3: Visitor management, or have any comment on how they could be improved?	Checkbox and open text
8	Do you agree with Objective 1: Manage ecosystem health by gaining a better understanding of species distribution and ecology to guide habitat restoration programs and effective threat management, or have suggestions for improvement?	Checkbox and open text
9	Do you agree with Objective 2: Maintain a healthy wetland ecosystem and enhance habitat for species of conservation significance, or have suggestions for improvement?	Checkbox and open text
10	Do you agree with Objective 3: Provide low-impact opportunities for recreation and experiences in nature where risks to ecological values can be minimised, or have suggestions for improvement?	Checkbox and open text
11	Are there any strategies in this plan that could be improved?	Open text
12	Are there any strategies that should be removed or added?	Open text
13	Finally, are there any other matters about the management of the parks in the central Fleurieu Peninsula more generally that you would like considered in finalisation of the plan?	Open text