Analysis of Public Submissions

Upper Eyre Hills and Mallee Parks Draft Management Plan 2024

The Upper Eyre Hills and Mallee Parks Draft Management Plan was released for public consultation from 10 October 2024 to 14 January 2025.

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.

4 submissions were received, including 2 written responses and 2 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	Col Hughes	Park visitor, interested individual
2	Ellen Turner	Interested individual
3	Michelle Clanahan	Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board
4	District Council of Cleve	Local Government

Table 2: Analysis of feedback

Number	Comment	Submission Number	Plan Altered	Response	Criteria
General					
1.	Provided general support for the direction and focus of the plan.	1, 2, 3, 4	No	Submission supported the plan.	4
2.	Supportive of existing partnerships and cross-sector collaboration opportunities	4	No	Submission supported the plan.	4
3.	Expressed concerns over the suitability of the *Whyalla Conservation Park Management Plan 1999*	3	No	Noted. No change required as Whyalla Conservation Park is not included in this plan.	9
Challenges and opportunities					
4.	Suggested that there is an opportunity to work in partnership with stakeholders to achieve landscape-scale pest management	3	Yes	An additional item has been included under the Challenges and opportunities section.	1
Conserving biodiversity in a fragmented landscape					
5.	Minor edits and clarification	3	Yes	Suggested changes were not regarding the substance of the draft plan but were minor grammatical or clarification edits that were accounted for in the final plan.	3
6.	Suggested an emphasis on feral goats being a priority pest in the Upper Hills area and collaboration with external stakeholders is required for landscape-scale outcomes.	3	Yes	Theme 1 has been amended to emphasise the importance of collaboration for control program outcomes.	1
7.	Suggested fencing be built into references to the control of pest animals.	3	No	This level of detail is not required in a strategic document of this type. The detail on specific pest animal control measures will be detailed at an operational level.	6
8.	Suggested referring to the Eyre Peninsula Landscape Board's *Pest Plant and Animal Control Policy* in the *Pest plant* section and further details on categorisation and control measures under the policy.	3	Yes	Theme 1 has been amended to acknowledge that the policy will provide guidance on the control of pest plants in the parks. The detail on specific pest plants and control measures will be detailed at an operational level.	1

9.	Expressed the opinion that there is an opportunity to consider partnerships with landholders in the development of native vegetation corridors between parks.	3	No	This level of detail is beyond the scope of this management plan. However, the plan is supportive of collaborating with stakeholders, including park neighbours, in programs which achieve conservation outcomes across the landscape.	4
Connecting community and parks					
10.	Feedback supportive of considerations for new walking and cycling opportunities	4	No	Submission supported the plan.	4
11.	Feedback supportive of development proposals within the visitor use zone	4	No	Submission supported the plan.	4
12.	Suggested including a reference to citizen science	3	Yes	Support for citizen science opportunities has been included in the existing plan strategies.	1

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	What is your suburb	Open text
2	What is your relationship with these parks?	Checkbox
3	Do you support Theme 1: Conserving biodiversity in a fragmented landscape, or have any comment on how this could be improved?	Checkbox
4	Do you support Theme 2: Connecting Community and Parks, or have any comment on how this could be improved?	Checkbox
5	Do you support Objective 1: Manage ecosystem health by gaining a better understanding of species distribution and ecology to guide biodiversity protection programs and effective threat management, or have any comment on how they could be improved?	Checkbox
6	Do you support Objective 2: Provide appropriate low-impact opportunities for recreation and experiences in nature where risks to ecological values can be minimised, and cultural sites and values are protected, or have any comment on how they could be improved?	Checkbox
7	Are there any strategies that could be improved?	Open text
8	Are there any that should be removed or added?	Open text
9	Finally, are there any other matters about the management of the parks in the central Eyre Peninsula more generally that you would like considered in finalisation of the plan?	Open text