

STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC LAND

Dear Sir / Madam,

I wish to make a submission on various aspects of the Statewide Assessment of Public Land. There is obviously a range of issues, and legislative reform is certainly needed. I agree with all your recommendations, except for the comments below:

1. Recommendation R1

- State Parks are a valuable level of reservation between National Parks and other classifications. They are generally smaller, contain State rather than National values and some have regulations not generally appropriate in National Parks. If these parks are renamed as National Parks without modification, they will degrade the meaning of that classification. Any confusion with State Forests could be resolved by deleting the word State from State Forests, but I believe the greatest source of confusion is with Forest Parks, which under your recommendation would be changed anyway.
- You recommend 3 classifications – Conservation Park, Nature Reserve and Natural Features Reserve – what is the difference? This will create new confusion – they could all be one title together, either Conservation Park or Nature Reserve.
- The word Park has been overused – I agree with renaming Wilderness Park and National Heritage Park. It should not be used for Marine Park, as this is confusing with Marine National Park (Multiple-use Marine Protected Area is quite ok).
- The term “Reserve” suggests a public area of some kind and is therefore inappropriate for Earth Resources and Plantations, just call them “Areas”, as for Services & Utilities.
- Resources Reserve is misleading and cumbersome for Mineral Springs, just call them Mineral Springs Reserves.

2. Recommendation R11

- You point out that there are clusters of under-represented EVC’s. I don’t understand the significance of this. What does it matter if they are in clusters? EVC’s that are not in clusters deserve just as much attention. I was disappointed with the lack of detail in the lists of underrepresented EVC’s – you have 2 lists – the Statewide extent of the 22 most extensive EVC’s – what about the rest of them? Your second list – the 40 EVC’s that require the greatest additional areas... doesn’t cover the smaller EVC’s – in percentage terms they may be very poorly represented but considering their small size, may be easy to add small areas to, to improve their status.

3. Recommendations R12, R13, R14, R15

- You recommend conducting reviews and inventories of various land categories, but propose no actions coming from these reviews. What comes next if significant values are discovered?

Yours sincerely,
Neil Tucker