

I agree we have an amazing resource to share, here are a few thoughts I consider important.

- I see no problem with private operators in parks - even with infrastructure if they are operated well like on the Overland track where the huts are more or less invisible, helicopter operations are rare and they are ecologically run establishments
- I do have an issue with public being pushed out of an area by paying visitors
- I do not want to see helicopter joy flights or float planes disturbing the serenity of any wilderness area as one persons joy ride = disturbance for anyone on the ground for 10's of kilometers.
- As Mt Field NP is a primary node, a journey based trip terminating there which increases visitation and outdoor activity would be to extend the intercity cycle way from Hobart out to the park using the old railway corridor. This would be an incredible journey and make the park a hub for transport, accommodation and therefore visitation and be an excellent marketing platform for outdoor pursuit.
- Limiting any access to the park and closing down more trails I see as a detriment to the existing amenities and enjoyment of the TWWHA
- Keeping rangers in the field to see whats happening on the trails is also crucial to the upkeep and maintenance of existing infrastructure. Funding has to be improved for this.
- If ship based tourism is allowed, there needs to be clear guidelines as to the expectation on shore facilities. Elsewhere in the world guides from these vessels can lay down the rules and alleviate pressure on limited on shore resources. They just need guidance.(Specifically Melaleuca toilets).
- There should be ways to monitor and act on poor operators within the parks and either force them to change or get rid of them with no monopoly able to be held.

Thanks for your time

I have been involved in marine wilderness tourism for 20+ years, but also enjoy bush-walking and exploring our fantastic state privately.

Regards

Stephen Anstee