



PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA

PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Next Iconic Walk

Brought up by Ms Butler and ordered by the House of Assembly to be printed.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Legislative Council

Ms Rattray
Mr Harriss (Deputy Chair)

House of Assembly

Ms Butler (Chair)
Ms Burnet
Mr Shelton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2	BACKGROUND.....	3
3	PROJECT COSTS	5
4	EVIDENCE.....	6
5	DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE	32
6	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	33
7	DIVISION	34
8	DISSENTING STATEMENTS.....	35

1 INTRODUCTION

The Committee has the honour to report to the House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Works Committee Act 1914* on the -

Next Iconic Walk

2 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 This reference recommended the Committee approve a new multi-day hut-based walking experience in the Tyndall Range on the West Coast of Tasmania.
- 2.2 The Tyndall Range was selected as the Next Iconic Walk from a process that identified 35 possible locations and received 24 public submissions. Following the site selection, a feasibility study was completed in 2021, which identified that the preferred option of a three-day, two-night hut-based walk between Lake Plimsoll and Lake Margaret was feasible, iconic, and would produce the greatest economic returns for the West Coast and Tasmania generally.
- 2.3 The Next Iconic Walk proposal includes an approximately 31-kilometre walking track, commencing from the Lake Spicer Gateway and concluding at the Lake Margaret Power Station. It includes two accommodation nodes near Lake Huntley and Lake Margaret. The accommodation nodes include the option to stay in communal bunkrooms, stand-alone pods, or tents on dedicated camping platforms. Visitor numbers for the Next Iconic Walk will be capped at 44 at each node.
- 2.4 The proposal area is located to the east of the Tyndall Range, which forms part of the larger West Coast Range. The Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) is approximately 11 kilometres east of Anthony Road (at the Lake Spicer Track junction), approximately 5.6 kilometres from the eastern-most point of the track alignment and over 6 kilometres from the nearest hut site.
- 2.5 The starting point for the proposed walk is located approximately 19 kilometres directly south of Tullah, or approximately 29 kilometres when driving via Anthony Road from Queenstown. The end point for the proposed walk is approximately 8.5 kilometres directly north of Queenstown, or approximately 13 kilometres when driving via the Zeehan Highway and Lake Margaret Road.
- 2.6 The elevation of the proposed walk varies from approximately 320 metres above sea level in the Lake Margaret Power Station area to approximately 950 metres above sea level at the Chin Lookout, with most of the area located between approximately 700 to 900 metres above sea level.
- 2.7 The proposed works will include the following:
 - Approximately 31 kilometres of track, built to a similar standard to the Overland Track (Class 3 Australian Standard or T1-T2 Parks and Wildlife Service track classification), ranging in width from 500 millimetres to 700 millimetres on average;

- Three day shelters along the track;
- Ancillary infrastructure including seating, lookouts, and markers along the track;
- A shelter with a toilet at the end of the track;
- Two service depots at either end of the track, which will include storage space and a helipad for use both during construction and once operational; and
- Two overnight accommodation nodes.

2.8 The two accommodation nodes will have buildings and amenities to accommodate 44 walkers and up to three Parks and Wildlife Service staff or contractors, including:

- Six stand-alone pods;
- Bunkrooms;
- Tent platforms;
- Lounge, dining, and kitchen facilities;
- A separate toilet building;
- A helipad;
- A host ranger housing and services building;
- Water tanks;
- A micro-hydro system; and
- Raised greywater absorption beds.

3 PROJECT COSTS

3.1 Pursuant to the Message from Her Excellency the Governor-in-Council, the estimated cost of the work is \$40 million.

The following table details the current cost estimates for the project:

Item	Cost (excl. GST)
Consultants - Design, Planning and Approvals	\$3,210,000
Track and On-Track Infrastructure (including helicopters and remote allowance) ¹	\$23,580,000
Off-Track Infrastructure ²	\$2,710,000
Interpretation, Fit-out, Commissioning ³	\$1,430,000
Project Management	\$4,070,000
Contingency and Escalation Allowance	\$5,000,000
TOTAL COST	40,000,000

1. Includes track, overnight nodes, day shelters, signage and track markers
2. Includes depots, visitor parking, check in facilities and end of walk shelter/ toilet at Lake Margaret
3. Includes \$80K Government Art Scheme

4 EVIDENCE

- 4.1 The Committee commenced its inquiry on Tuesday, 10 February 2026 with a presentation of the proposed works at the West Coast Council Chambers. The Committee then resumed proceedings at the West Coast Council Chambers, whereupon the following witnesses appeared, made the Statutory Declaration and were examined by the Committee in public:-

Proponent

- Sophie Muller, Deputy Secretary, Parks and Wildlife Service;
- Keith Ryan, Project Director, Parks and Wildlife Service;
- Alek Cahill, Senior Project Manager (Construction and Logistics), Parks and Wildlife Service; and
- Joe Evans, Senior Project Manager (Planning, Design and Approvals), Parks and Wildlife Service.

Public

- Grant Dixon, Tasmanian National Parks Association;
- Andy Szollosi, President, Tasmanian Wilderness Guides Association;
- Jimmy Cordwell, Wilderness Society; and
- Chris Wilson.

The following Committee Members were present:-

- Ms Jen Butler MP (Chair);
- Hon. Dean Harriss MLC (Deputy Chair);
- Ms Helen Burnet MP;
- Hon. Tania Rattray MLC; and
- Mr Mark Shelton MP.

Overview

- 4.2 Ms Sophie Muller provided the Committee with an overview of the proposed works:

... This walk will be a game changer that will deliver economic and social benefits to both the west coast and to Tasmania by creating a new walking experience that will attract visitors, encourage them to stay longer and, importantly, spend more.

The walk aims to build on the success of the Overland Track and the Three Capes Track, and it will enhance Tasmania's reputation as one of the great walking destinations in Australia, if not the world. Multi-day walks epitomise our unique brand, and visitors recognise this and will travel to Tasmania specifically for this.

During the first stage of the project, the Parks and Wildlife Service called for public proposals to help identify the location for this new walk. We received 35 different locations and they were each assessed. The Tyndall Range was selected as the

preferred location, and this area was included in two of the 24 public submissions received.

The Tyndall Range was selected because of its extraordinary and dramatic glacial carved landscapes and unique geology, along with the Aboriginal history of the area. European heritage links to hydro power generation and mineral exploration collectively provide interpretive themes to enhance the visitor experience and tell the story of place.

Once the Tyndall Range was identified, the second stage of the project was to commission a feasibility study. Over 50 track routes options were considered during the feasibility stage, including a different number of nights, different tracks, return tracks, loop tracks, day walks and so on. During this stage there were over 1900 Australians surveyed to help inform the project and to develop the discrete choice modelling that was used to identify the options worthy of more detailed analysis and testing.

The final recommended option from the feasibility study was a three-day, two-night hut-based walk between Lake Plimsoll in the north and the Lake Margaret Power Station in the south. The study confirmed that this option was feasible, iconic and would deliver a positive benefit-cost ratio, both for Tasmania and the west coast. The feasibility was based on 5450 visitors over a six-month walking season, or about 60 per cent of the capacity during the six months.

The final proposal has been developed to allow for year-round operation and accounted for these costs in our business planning, with demand from walkers still heavily focused on the peak six-month walking season. Current demand is estimated at around 6857 visitors across the year, which corresponds to around 44 per cent capacity year-round.

The feasibility study concluded that the Next Iconic Walk has the potential to generate approximately 139 jobs during construction and, importantly, a further 40 jobs ongoing in fields such as tourism, hospitality, support services and transport operations.

The project itself has widespread support from the tourism industry, local employers, the west coast community, and we have letters of support from key stakeholders who we have been working with together to realise this project, including the West Coast Council, West by Northwest, the Tourism Industry Council of Tasmania, Hydro Tasmania and the Tasmanian Minerals Manufacturing and Energy Council. The support of these stakeholders demonstrates that the benefits of this project extend well beyond reserve management and really do touch the whole community.

4.3 Mr Alek Cahill provided further evidence on how the proposed works align with the 2021 feasibility study's recommendations:

There has been some feedback during the public consultation that the feasibility study is out of date. While plans for the walk have continued to evolve following more detailed site investigations, surveys, specialist inputs and stakeholder considerations, the final proposal is still consistent with the recommended option from the feasibility study which is the through-walk that will be completed over three days and two nights, staying in huts and tents, starting near Lake Plimsoll and finishing at the Lake Margaret Power Station.

Walkers will check in at Queenstown where they will receive a safety briefing, including Leave No Trace messaging before taking a shuttle to the start of the walk. At the end of the walk, they will be picked up by a shuttle at Lake Margaret Power Station and returned to Queenstown.

Walker numbers will be capped at 44 per day, comparable to the 48 departures per day on the Three Capes Track.

The feasibility study proposed 30 people in huts and 20 camping per day, and the current proposal offers 34 beds in hut-based accommodation, which is 22 in bunk rooms and 12 in stand-alone pods, and 10 beds on the camping platforms. The numbers of tent-based beds were reduced following public consultations where concerns were raised around the weather, with the change supported by additional market research. Any significant changes to the assumptions from the feasibility study such as adding standalone pods, reducing tent numbers or extending operations from six months to a year, have undergone further market testing to ensure they do not negatively impact the viability of the proposal.

We're confident the business case is still sound, and walker fees will cover the annual operating and maintenance costs, so the project will not be a drain on Parks' operating budget.

Site selection

- 4.4 Mr Keith Ryan provided evidence on the location of the proposed works and addressed concerns regarding the impact to the Tyndall Plateau and weather in the area:

...I'd like to talk about the location of the walk and the specific track route, and address some of the concerns that we've heard from the public and stakeholders during consultations to date. When the Tyndall Range was identified as a preferred location for the walk, there were concerns raised around potential impact on the sensitive flora of the Tyndall Plateau, along with concerns about the risk of severe weather on the exposed higher altitudes on that plateau. I can confirm that the final route does not go onto the Tyndall Plateau, but it is a route to the east of the Tyndall Range, sheltered from the prevailing winds and at much lower altitude than the exposed plateau, and avoids the sensitive alpine vegetation.

We also heard concerns about the amount of rainfall on the west coast. We know it rains around 200 days a year, so we have designed the walk with the weather in mind, knowing walkers will get wet and they will seek a dry, comfortable place to rest at the end of a day walking. The distances between huts are relatively short compared to other overnight walks, so in bad conditions, walkers can get out of the weather quicker. We have designed the overnight nodes to be comfortable in all conditions, with electric heating sustainably generated through micro hydro systems and solar panels. It will also be in all common areas and bedrooms. All walkers, including walkers, will have access to heated communal lounges. Kitchens with pots, pans and electric cooktops will also be provided, and this means lighter pack weights for walkers. All walkers will also have access to drying cupboards to dry wet weather gear and boots overnight, avoiding communal spaces becoming defacto drying rooms.

When thinking about the rain on the west coast, it's worth noting rainfall in the area is around 2400 millimetres in Queenstown and 3700 millimetres at Mount Read.

That's comparable to rainfall on the Overland Track with 2600 millimetres at Cradle Valley. This is far less than the rainfall received on walks at the west coast of New Zealand with the Milford Track receiving 6700 millimetres of rain and the Routeburn Track around 7000 millimetres of rain. Like the Overland Track, walkers will be advised to pack for all weather conditions year-round, regardless. Like the Overland Track, they will receive briefings to that effect at the start and in the pre-departure information.

Unlike the Overland, though, this walk does not extend into the Alpine zone well above 1000 metres above sea level. The majority of the walk is between 600 and 800 metres above sea level and both hut sites around 750 metres above sea level. Whilst we will see occasional snow on the higher parts of the track around 900 to 960 metres, it is not expected to persist for days and weeks, like it does at times on the Overland Track. We will have gear checks and briefings to make sure that walkers are prepared before they get there.

4.5 The Committee sought further evidence on the site selection process, and raised concerns with the weather conditions on the West Coast:

Ms RATTRAY - ... Given we know the climate in the area proposed for the walk is cold, wet and cloudy for much of the year, how is this Next Iconic Walk going to meet the aspirations of people who might want to come to Tasmania, particularly in regard to where we often are trying to increase visitation in the winter months - as it doesn't feel like this walk is something that's going to be an attraction in those colder, wet and cloudy months?

Why was this chosen and perhaps not something on the east coast, where the weather is somewhat more favourable and not as wet? I know there were 35 proposals - but how did we get to the west coast? ...

Mr RYAN - ... The criteria for assessment were a whole range of factors. There wasn't a specific directive or commitment to say this has to be on the west coast; everything was open and we opened it up to public submissions.

Ms RATTRAY - But this was the only one that had a feasibility study done for it.

Mr RYAN - Yes, so it was selected at the end of that process.

Ms RATTRAY - That's really my question; why wasn't something else across the state looked at for a feasibility study?

Mr RYAN - Well, I guess at the end of the location assessment that this location was determined to be the best option and the most feasible on a range of those factors. I will jump to some of those criteria.

Ms MULLER - While there might be days that are wet and cold, that's kind of part of the experience as well. It's not necessarily a bad thing, and the storytelling elements that we talked about, the interpretation that really brings you from looking at these incredible, big landscapes to kind of the micro, looking at fagus, looking at the pipeline, like it's an extraordinary place for telling stories and for bringing it to life. That will really deliver and be part of the experience. It is not necessarily about having beautiful, clear blue sky and ocean, it's about really immersing yourself in the rugged

terrain of the west coast and being exposed to the beautiful, incredible stories of the place.

Ms RATTRAY - The east coast or somewhere far northeast, far southwest didn't have that same appeal to those who made the decision?

Mr RYAN - I can't speak to the people who were making that decision, but it certainly didn't come out. There were certainly proposals all around the state.

...

They were considering a whole range of factors including what was already there and whether it complements existing activities and those sorts of things. That would've been a factor in choosing an east coast option given that the existing overnight walk opportunities that's already in that location. So, yes, the criteria included the offering, whether it complements something, the accessibility from major towns, the land tenure, the reserve status, the benefit to regional economic communities, the context and land use in the area and the operational benefits. There was a whole range of factors, and this came out as the one that stood out as the best proposal.

4.6 In response to questions taken on notice, the proponent provided further evidence on the Location Assessment Report that informed the site selection process:

The location assessment report identified the potential opportunities and impediments of each proposal against various criteria including visitor, environmental, economic, community and operational considerations (see page 6 of the location Assessment Report for a detailed explanation of the assessment criteria). The Location Assessment Report does not provide scores for each proposal against the assessment criteria, or a shortlist of proposals, rather it provides a high level visual representation of the opportunities and threats of each proposal (traffic light colour coded) assessed against the criteria (see Figure 1 below extracted from the Location Assessment Report, see Appendix A pages 11-13).

For the Trans-Tarkine proposal the visitor access, land tenure and operational considerations were seen as 'challenging impediments' to the proposal. The Trans-Tarkine proposal was not assessed as offering 'attractive potential' against any of the other criteria (compared to other locations/proposals that offered 'attractive potential' against one or more criteria – see Figure 1 below). A more detailed assessment of the potential and impediments of the Trans-Tarkine proposal is provided in page 30-32 of the location assessment report (see Appendix A).

Table key:

	Attractive potential
	Potential & impediments (strengths and weaknesses)
	Challenging impediment(s) (but not necessarily unsolvable)
	Untested

Location	Visitor				Environment		Economic		Community	Operation
	Access	Climate	S/D/U	Options	Reserve	Tenure	Towns	Competition		
16. Dover-Cockle Creek	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow		Yellow
17. Huonville-Cockle Creek	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow		Yellow
19. New Norfolk-	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow		Yellow
20. Maydena-Styx Valley	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow		Yellow
22. Lake St Clair-Lake Gordon	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Red	Yellow		Red
25. Macquarie Harbour Trail	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow		Red
26. Philosopher's	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow		Red
Tyndall	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow
27. Mt Sedgwick-Dubbil Barrill	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow		Red
28. Queenstown (Clark Valley)	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow		Red
29. Unnamed fall	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	Red	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow
30. Trans Tarkine	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow		Red

Figure 1: Potential and impediments of each proposal considered (note not all proposals included in above extract from the location assessment report) ¹

4.7 Mr Ryan then explained why the proposed works involve establishing a new track, rather than utilising existing infrastructure:

Ms BURNET - ... Why was a new track proposed, rather than anything that was existing?

Mr RYAN - It probably goes to the goal of trying to come up with an iconic track and something that is actually going to be an attractor to bring people to Tasmania. A lot of the problems with existing tracks is they have just evolved over time. They haven't actually been deliberately planned like we have done for the last seven years, looking at all the values, looking at the slope and the topography and the soils and considering what the best place to build that is. Often the bushwalking groups have gone through, or individuals have cut tracks and they've put rock cairns or marked trees or whatever. That then just becomes the route and it evolves into a track, and then it becomes this eroded mess over time. Often it is the case it was never constructed and never intended to be what it has become. Trying to fix those and turn them into a track would cost more than building a new track from scratch often, because you're trying to fix a track in a place where it probably shouldn't be. You'd be on really steep gradients and soils that are subject to erosion and environmental damage you're

¹ Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works Hearing – Next Iconic Walk – Questions on Notice, Parks and Wildlife Service response to PWC request for additional information, 27 February 2026, p. 3.

trying to fix. If you start from scratch, you probably wouldn't have even put the track there in the first place.

Route alignment and design of the track

4.8 The Committee heard evidence on the route alignment and design of the track:

Mr SHELTON - ...In determining the nitty gritty of just where this walk goes and the minute detail about where it goes, protection of landscape and that sort of thing, how much effort in design and all that sort of thing has gone into creating the best walk you guys can put in front of us?

Mr RYAN - There's been a huge amount of effort. I guess when we got past the location and identified this area, there were 50 different options and route alignments we looked at - through walks, loop tracks, multi-modal tracks that had mountain biking or kayaking incorporated into it, or a boat trip at the start and the end. We looked at a whole range of values, whether they're historic values, conservation values, natural values, Aboriginal heritage. We're trying to work around them but also you can incorporate those into the interpretation elements. It's that fine balance between appreciating the elements you're trying to bring people to but not destroying them at the same time. It's been years and years. Seven years to get to this point to narrow down the final alignment, the hut sites, and those sorts of things.

Mr SHELTON - I notice in the discussions that have been had, Bob Brown was mentioned earlier on. He is mentioned a couple of times in some of the documentation. There was also proposal or some comment on this site from, I take that it was the Bob Brown Foundation ... This aligns very much with what I saw on that of the Bob Brown one as well.

Mr RYAN - The Bob Brown Foundation - it might've been Bob Brown himself - wrote to the Department at the time when the Tyndall Range was identified as the location for the walk and marked up a map and said this is where the route should go, it shouldn't go up into the Tyndall Plateau. It's too exposed, there're safety risks for walkers and the vegetation up there is too fragile to cope with that amount of traffic. The alignment that he provided, if you put on top of our current alignment, they're very similar. But we've gone from following a ridge line on the first day to more on a valley floor. The rest of the alignment's very similar. The two hut sites are within hundreds of metres of where he proposed the hut sites to be. That was one of the first examples where we got feedback and we listened to that and we adjusted accordingly. Again, at that point we hadn't identified a specific route anyway. He was commenting on one of the public proposals which did identify a route which helped identify the Tyndall Range area as the location of the walk, but we hadn't then narrowed down that this is the alignment.

Impacts of the proposed works

4.9 Mr Joe Evans provided an overview of the impacts of the proposed works:

With regard to impacts on wilderness, there is understandable concern from the public and stakeholders of the impacts of the proposal on environments or other users of the area.

This walk will not prevent access for people to undertake activities they currently do in the area, including four-wheel driving on the Lake Spicer Track, rock climbing and bushwalking on the Tyndall Plateau, including walking off track in this area, fishing in nearby lakes or accessing the area for mineral exploration.

Some have concerns around the visual impact of the walk, particularly from the Tyndall Plateau. We acknowledge that there will always be visual impacts when clearing a new track and installing huts and other infrastructure in the landscape, but we have done everything we can to reduce the visual impacts whilst still locating the huts and track in suitable locations. We sought specialist advice on visual impact and this assessment determined the impact was acceptable for the setting.

It is important to note that visual impact was just one of many considerations in the site and track route selection, with others including the following: access to water for micro hydropower generation; firefighting sprinkler systems; backup drinking water; and opportunities for swimming. Another is avoiding threatened species and communities, along with Aboriginal cultural heritage, European heritage values and geo-conservation sites. Bushfire risk is obviously a big one, and the need to have clear to highly modified hazard management areas around buildings is a consideration.

...

It is also worth noting, from the Tyndall Plateau, where there is the greatest concern about visual impact, you can currently see various human impacts on the landscape, including Hydro Tasmania-managed dams and lakes, high-voltage powerlines, sealed highways, four-wheel-drive tracks, mine tailings dams, man-made canals, radio towers and forestry operations.

Another fear expressed is that walkers will head off track onto the Tyndall Plateau and trample sensitive alpine plant species, however the route deliberately avoids the plateau. The target market for this walk do not typically have the navigation skills, experience, confidence, or motivation to spend hours walking off track and bush-bashing through the scrub in search of a remote peak. The Three Capes and Overland Track experiences are that walking off track is rare. The vast majority of people aim to leave no trace, and only walk off the main track to take recognised and signposted side tracks. Host rangers will help reinforce these messages out on track, along with providing interpretation, daily weather updates, and assisting with emergency management as required.

- 4.10 Mr Evans also advised the Committee that the proposed works are being assessed by the Parks and Wildlife Service, and will also be referred for assessment to the Australian Government:

The environmental impacts of the proposal are currently being assessed through the Reserve Activity Assessment process, managed by the Parks and Wildlife Service, with input and review from various specialists outside of Parks, within the Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania. The proposal will also be considered by the Australian Government through the referral for assessment under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC), where impact on Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) and national list of threatened species and communities will be assessed.

- 4.11 The Committee heard evidence on the classification of the area of the proposed works, and noted its proximity to the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA):

Ms BURNET - I have a question in relation to the TWWHA, this being pretty close to the TWWHA. What's the likelihood of this being taken up as part of the TWWHA?

Ms MULLER - At this stage, we are not doing any work in terms of looking at the classification of the land. It is protected. It is a conservation area, largely. It's there for recreational purposes currently, so the proposed use is consistent with its current classification. We have taken the TWWHA into consideration in terms of visual impacts.

Ms BURNET - And the natural benefits? Obviously, it is a conservation area but the natural features of it: is it an important piece of land?

Ms MULLER - We have certainly done extensive work assessing and considering the impact on those important natural values.

Mr RYAN - Specifically in relation to the World Heritage Area, part of our assessment in terms of the hut locations was to identify sites that were not visible at all from the TWWHA.

Ms BURNET - That really wasn't my question. The question was whether this was going to be incorporated, or was there any thought of this area being incorporated into the TWWHA because of its natural values?

Ms MULLER - There's no work that we are undertaking currently to reclassify.

- 4.12 The Committee then heard evidence on the potential impact of mineral exploration in the area:

Mr RYAN - ... there's mineral exploration licences all throughout the west coast and throughout this particular area. We have met with TMEC, the Tasmanian Minerals and Energy Council, and Mineral Resources Tasmania on numerous occasions to discuss our walk, and how the walk and mineral exploration activities can co-exist. The walk starts off the Lake Spicer Track, which is an access track that was originally put in there for mineral exploration and continues to be used for mineral exploration. We are working in partnership with them to ensure that both activities continue and can continue at the same time.

Ms BURNET - So there could be a mine opened in this area, or is it just for exploration?

Mr RYAN - Well, it's a possibility if there is an exploration licence over the area. If they find something they would have to put in to -

Ms BURNET - We're going to spend \$40 million and that's a possibility, though?

Mr RYAN - Part of the selection of the track route was to avoid the centre of those - most of those exploration licence areas cover a big area, but if you actually look at the historical records of what is in those, it's generally the middle of them is what they're trying to find and there's a big buffer around the outside of that. We've tried to keep our track to the edge. There are sections of our track that aren't covered

by any mineral exploration licences and that's where we've obviously tried to concentrate on, to avoid that potential conflict.

- 4.13 The Committee sought further evidence regarding the land classifications that allow, and do not allow, for mineral exploration. In response, the proponent advised:

The Mineral Resources Development Act 1995 (MRDA) provides for the development of mineral resources and applies to all land in Tasmania.

Reserved land proclaimed under the Nature Conservation Act 2002 (NCA) is managed in accordance with framework outlined in the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002 (NPRMA). The exercise of a statutory power under another enactment is provided for in the NPRMA in certain reserve classes and if particular circumstances are met.

The Minister for Resources is not able to exercise their statutory powers under the MRDA in a national park, nature reserve, state reserve, historic site or game reserve, unless a management plan - made in accordance with the NPRMA and approved by the Governor - authorises the enactment and exercise of those powers.

The Minister for Resources is able to exercise their statutory powers under the MRDA in a conservation area, regional reserve and nature recreation area, unless a management plan restricts the enactment or limits their powers. ²

Interpretation

- 4.14 The Committee sought evidence on the proponent's approach to interpretation for the proposed works:

Ms RATTRAY - ... are you expecting to do a lot of interpretation on the track?

Mr EVANS - Yes. So, I think it might have come from Charlie Bravo Design, who are our interpretation consultants. It wasn't so much saying that they won't be doing lots of interpretation - there's lots of work they're doing - but one of the themes they're looking at is 'don't crowd the walk with interpretation,' in terms of physical interpretation. So, every few hundred metres, there won't be a track-marker-in-your-face type thing; allow the natural splendour to largely speak for itself. That comes from the interpretation consultants themselves. They're doing lots of work with the key themes and the sub-themes and looking at apps and work with consultants.

Ms RATTRAY - So, that's in conflict, really. We're not going to have a lot of interpretation but yes, we're doing a lot of interpretation.

Mr EVANS - At strategic locations.

Mr RYAN - I think that the point of difference there is that there's not a lot of interpretation on-track. The focus of the interpretation is around the hut sites and the shelter sites, rather than, like Joe said, every hundred metres you have a sign telling you what everything is. So, very focused interpretation around the built

² *Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works Hearing – Next Iconic Walk – Questions on Notice, Parks and Wildlife Service response to PWC request for additional information, 27 February 2026, p. 3.*

infrastructure, rather than creating more infrastructure just for the sake of interpretation.

Power generation and maintenance of facilities

4.15 Mr Ryan outlined how the accommodation nodes will be powered:

CHAIR - ... could you talk us through the way in which you're going to power these pods and the actual site itself? ...

...

Mr RYAN - Yes, we'll have a combination of power options. We'll be doing mini and micro, mini hydro systems. So, on the outflows of both Lake Huntley and Lake Mary, there will be a small outlet pipe that will draw water from the outlet stream into a small turbine that wouldn't even be as big as this desk and, once the water goes through there, it basically gets diverted back into the same stream. So, we have one of those at each of the hut sites.

Part of the orientation and shape and aspect of the buildings is also to have solar panels on the roofs, so we'll then have solar power that can generate electricity as well. They will both be fed through a battery system, so there'll be a central system that will switch between the two, so if we're getting lots of rain and no sun, the hydro will be drawing all the power, but if suddenly you get weeks like this where it's really dry and no rain, then the solar will be generating all the power. That will also be stored in batteries.

If we get a period where there's no solar gain and for whatever reason you're not running a mini hydro, you can have days of power from a battery system as well. We're pretty confident with those options. In isolation, the mini hydro will be enough to power everything that we have on site and, similarly, the solar will be.

4.16 Mr Ryan gave further evidence on the facilities provided at the accommodation nodes:

CHAIR - Will the campsites have access to the same bathroom and showering facilities as people in the pods or the bunks? Is that right? Or are they going to have separate facilities?

Mr RYAN - All the facilities are shared, so everyone staying there will use the same toilets and kitchens. There are no showers though. I must point that out.

...

There are not showers involved purely for environmental reasons. We have to try to manage the grey water. So yes, basically, toilets, sinks, interpretation space lounges and kitchen/dining, that's all shared.

We have individual drying cupboards for each bunk room and the standalone pods. We've also put some specific ones just for the tent-based campers within that same footprint of the main building. They can bring their wet weather gear and leave their boots overnight if they want to in the drying cupboards so that there isn't that temptation which happens on the Overland Track and places like that where everyone just pours all their wet weather gear into the main kitchen/dining/lounge

area, and you sit in there with smelly boots and socks trying to eat your tea. We're trying to keep those separate. And having that extra power over and above what we have anywhere else.

On the Overland Track and even Three Capes, you have to fly in gas to cook or for a heater, or wood pellets for heaters and that sort of stuff. We will have the ability to generate electricity for electric heating and cooking so we're not flying in gas or pellets on a regular basis for heating or cooking.

- 4.17 The Committee then heard evidence on the plan to manage waste from the accommodation nodes:

CHAIR - ... what is the strategy or the plan for the removal of waste from the site, and what would that look like?

Mr RYAN - The toilet waste will be collected in full-capture pods, the same system that we use on the Overland Track, Frenchmans Cap and Three Capes. Basically, we capture everything and then we fly individual pods out to a central location where they can be pumped out into a pump truck and taken to a sewage treatment plant. So everything from the toileting will be collected so we don't have to try to deal with that in the environment.

In terms of other waste, the grey water, say, from handwashing and washing up will go through a grey water system on site. But the toilet waste will all be flown off-site.

CHAIR - What about people who are hiking and might have wrappers and so forth? Whatever they bring in, they take out? Is that how it works?

Mr RYAN - Yes. Part of the walk will involve a briefing at the start of the walk. There will be safety messages in that; there will be gear checks; there will also be Leave No Trace messages. One of those bushwalking principles is whatever you carry in, you carry out. And having host rangers onsite at the huts also will help to reinforce those messages and make sure that people are carrying their waste out with them.

Biosecurity risk

- 4.18 Mr Cahill outlined the measures that will be in place to mitigate biosecurity risks in the area of the proposed works:

CHAIR - Do you have biosecurity measures in place to make sure that no contamination is coming from other areas into that site on people's boots and so forth? Have you got that far in, how you are going to protect that unique environment from outside contamination?

...

Mr CAHILL - We're planning to have boot-wash stations at the start of the track. We've got a biosecurity plan that was part of the environmental impact statement, so we'll be adhering to that through both the construction and operation of the walk. The construction phase as well is a really critical point in managing the potential to bring in pathogens and weeds, so there'll be strict wash-down procedures for contractors, vehicles, material, et cetera, during the construction as well - as well as messaging through the operation.

Bushfire risk

- 4.19 The Committee sought evidence on the history of bushfire in the area, and how the risk of bushfire will be mitigated:

Ms BURNET - ... I am curious to know what sort of fire activity there has been in the Tyndall Range.

...

Mr RYAN - The area has been burnt before. There's a history of bushfires in the area, particularly if you look at where the buttongrass is, particularly. Typically, those are areas that have been burnt historically. We have done planned burns in the area as well to try to protect some of the natural values in the area. The Tyndall Plateau, because it is traditionally fairly wet, my understanding is that it hasn't burnt historically. That's why you've got some pretty old valuable alpine species that people are pretty keen to protect from bushfire. We have done planned burns around the outside of the Tyndall Range to try to reduce fuel loads and reduce the risk of bushfire getting up onto the plateau.

Ms BURNET - It would be an important area and one of the highest risks, I suppose, with the project?

...

Mr RYAN - Potentially. I guess one of the benefits we will have is we won't necessarily be encouraging people to bring fuel stoves and things like that because we are providing all the electric cooktops and pots and pans, and all those sorts of things in the huts. So, it's only if people decide to cook outside of that for lunch, or something, that they might bring fuel stoves. Probably the biggest risk might be during construction with machinery. But we'd have emergency management plans and protocols around weather conditions.

Alek might be able to talk more about some of the things that the builders and contractors will have in place to prevent the risk of sparks and bushfires starting during the construction phase.

Mr CAHILL - There will be construction environmental management plans which will have to be strictly adhered to by the contractors during the build, and then action plans if there is a spark.

Mr RYAN - There may be days where the fire danger's too high, where you'll just say, there's no works. That's typical in all our reserves anyway. It's just like no hot works during these conditions because the risk of bushfire's too great.

- 4.20 The Committee also heard evidence on how the accommodation nodes will be protected from the risk of bushfire:

Ms BURNET - In relation to the bushfire protection modifications, what will need to happen around each pod?

Mr EVANS - If you look at the plan, there should be an orange dotted line and a purple dotted line on the site plan.

...

You will see there is a purple dash line and an orange dash line. They're our hazard management areas, mandatorily set by our fire engineers to protect the buildings. They will be managed to a certain height. I forget the height. Yes, a lowered cleared vegetation as a protection barrier, exclusion zone around the structures. The class of buildings, we don't require those for toilets or the rangers' services building. But you'll also notice the rangers' hut has a purple one as well. That's an exclusion zone. Basically, it's a buffer to protect from bushfire risk.

- 4.21 The proponents also gave evidence regarding the fire-rated materials that will be used on the buildings in the accommodation nodes:

Mr SHELTON - A question around the building design, and it was mentioned that fire is more prevalent in our environment now than what it has been, with the changing climate and so forth. The design in most of the pictures, or the artist's impressions, it appears to be timber-based, natural-based, all that sort of thing but, of course, that's not so fire retardant. In the design, are we looking at materials that look natural but are fire retardant?

Mr RYAN - That's one of those interpretation features that's built into the design. So, that is attributed to the woodstave pipeline, but it is largely decorative. So, it sits underneath a metal gutter, that's not actually a gutter as such - it's more just there for interpretation purposes. That's that feature. A lot of the materials - and Joe can probably talk to this better than I can - the fire rating of those materials is a key factor. All the buildings have been fire-rated and meet current standards for that environment.

Mr EVANS - It will all be signed off by a building surveyor. The architects are looking, for example, at F27, which is a fire-rated material, which is a blackbutt, for all the exposed timber. There's always that balance between costs and compliance, so anywhere there's exposed, structural timber at this stage, we're looking at a blackbutt F27, which is compliant with Australian standards for fire.

Mr RYAN - They have to meet the appropriate bushfire attack level standard for their vegetation type and the type of buildings that we have.

Lake Margaret Power Station

- 4.22 The Committee heard evidence on the design of the proposed works located within the Lake Margaret Power Station:

CHAIR - Can I ask a quick question around the end of the walk, where you have the power station? Are you intending to do any renovation works to that particular site? Is that going to be turned into a feature inside or is it just the facade that's going to be used?

...

Mr RYAN - Yes. Look, it's still in operation, so we can't really touch that main building. Visitor access to that space is pretty restricted as well, for safety reasons. There is an old hall there which we did consider at some stage as being the kind of end point for the walk, but it's heritage listed. There are a lot of issues in terms of, again, how do you access that site through a working power station. Where we've sort of settled is

to develop a standalone shelter and toilet outside the envelope of the current existing operation. It's still in that heritage site and we've tried to design it so it fits in with the existing buildings and the heritage themes of the area, but, yes, that will be a standalone spot for the shuttle to come in and pick people up.

...

We're still working through with Hydro, in terms of long-term licence agreement, for who's responsible for what and what elements of the site and that sort of thing, both during the construction and the long-term operation. We're looking at the possibility of incorporating tours of the power station and the village, which you can do on a paid tour at the moment, but potentially having that as an add-on to the walk. Or, it might just be simpler that we add that into the price of the walk and everyone gets that as part of the experience as well.

Ms RATTRAY - How far are those discussions or negotiations down the track? I mean, you don't want to leave that to the last thing and that's the sticking point.

Mr RYAN - We have contracts with Crown Law at the moment, which we're reviewing the details of. So, yes, it's pretty progressed. In our submission, you would have seen we had supporting letters from Hydro and we've had three of them over multiple years, basically reinforcing that they're supportive of the concept and willing to work with us to make it happen. It's more the fine details that we're nutting out, but there's high-level, in-principle agreement with Hydro and Parks to make it work.

Procurement and construction of the proposed works

4.23 The Committee heard evidence on the proponent's approach for procurement and construction of the proposed works should they be approved:

Mr HARRISS - Do we know what procurement looks like at the moment? Will it be one principal contractor, or will there be multiple ones overseen by Parks?

Mr RYAN - I think, realistically, we'll probably have multiple. Historically, we've typically separated different elements out. So you would have, say, the track as a different contract from the huts and then, within that, you might even break that down even further. You might offer both huts as separable portions, so you might get one builder doing one hut, another builder doing another hut. Economies of scale, it makes sense to probably combine them. The design is designed to be constructed off-site, prefabricated and built. If you are doing two of them, it's going to be more efficient than doing one separately. The only way you would probably do that is if there were real time pressures and you wanted to get it done quickly.

Probably the biggest time pressure is really around the track construction because you are building 30 kilometres of untracked area. That we might offer to multiple track construction crews to do different sections, and they might come from different ends. There's lots of different ways that you might offer the track tenders out as well. I guess to answer your question, we haven't finalised that but there are lots of different ways we can tender it. But more often than not, we will break that up.

The other element I didn't mention is also probably the helicopter operations that service both the track construction and the building construction. There are pros and cons both ways of going for a principal contractor that manages the helicopter as

well. But then how do you do that if you are then managing track builds as well as hut builds, and who gets priority for the lifts that day, and that sort of thing? Sometimes that's easier if we separate that and we manage the helicopter drops.

Mr HARRISS - If it's broken down, Parks will project manage that. Is that how it works normally?

Mr RYAN - Yes.

Mr EVANS - Further to Keith's comment, there are parts of the build that don't rely on helicopters. The depots are all accessible by road vehicles, so there may be opportunities to look at packaging up work so a smaller local contractor who may not be experienced with large heli-operations may have access to a smaller Lake Margaret Power Station or depot construction - a smaller piece of work - and isn't reliant on heli-ops to build that. It's a chance for more options, and more local options as well.

Stakeholder engagement

4.24 Ms Muller outlined the proponent's response to feedback received from stakeholders during the planning of the proposed works:

Ms MULLER - ... we have been consulting with stakeholders and listening to feedback we've received over a long period of time. I thought I'd quickly share some of the refinements and the changes that we've made following this feedback to highlight how we've demonstrated our commitment to delivering the best product possible, and how we've done that in a way that's been responsive to what we've heard.

We've moved the start of the walk, in response to concerns about walker safety, shuttle logistics, potential conflict with other users, and to improve the walker experience. We've moved the separate campground back to the hut sites in response to concerns about the construction footprint, additional servicing - so the efficiency of our operations, walker safety and emergency response difficulties, and equity and quality of the experience for tent-based walkers.

We moved proposed hut sites in response to concerns about visibility from the trail, servicing difficulties, and visitor experience and comfort. We have extended the last day of the walk in response to feedback that the overall walk distance was too short, that the three days were too similar, and concerns about proximity to Hydro dam infrastructure.

We've avoided the Tyndall Plateau and picked a track alignment at lower altitudes in response to concerns about environmental impacts and walker safety. We've rerouted the first day of the track in response to concerns about access to mineral exploration areas. We've moved the northern depot in response to concerns about the footprint of roadworks required on the Lake Spicer Track.

We've added drying cupboards for tent-based walkers to improve their experience, in response to concerns about shared living or cooking spaces being used to dry clothes. We've provided additional water tanks and bushfire sprinklers to complement the required bushfire protection measures in response to concerns about the future impact of climate change.

4.25 The Committee heard evidence on the proponent's engagement with tourism stakeholders regarding transport and accommodation for tourists:

CHAIR - ...Are there any plans or are there any discussions, say, with Tourism Tasmania about transport options for travellers who don't drive? It is quite a hard destination to get to if you don't have a car or a hire car.

Ms MULLER - ... We know that people who come for multi-day walks from interstate typically spend a night or two on either side of their walk. So certainly, this will be an attraction that will both bring people to the region but also then encourage them to stay for a few days on either side. Invariably, they will be looking for experiences that will complement their experience on the track, so I think you would expect to see a positive benefit across a range of businesses within the region, including the railway, for example.

CHAIR - It's always that impediment, isn't it? About how we get people here who don't drive.

Mr RYAN - Yes. We have been working pretty closely with tourism stakeholders along the way, including Tourism Tasmania, West by Northwest, the West Coast RTO (regional tourism organisation), over a number of years. And we continue to do that to look at the whole-of-trip experience, not just the walk. Obviously, up until now, Parks has been very focused on the walk, the huts and the track, getting them to the start and from the end. But how they get to Queenstown, where do they stay when they're here, all those sorts of things, is part of ongoing discussions with those stakeholders.

Even in the public information sessions, we had feedback from shuttle providers who take people to the Overland Track and pick people up from the Overland Track, and they're keen. They already see a market to help service, to get people to the start and pick them up from the walk, and loop into the Overland Track, potentially, and those sorts of networks.

Similarly, we have accommodation providers in Queenstown - and I've got a meeting with another one next week. So, we're constantly in discussion with hotel providers and accommodation providers going, 'When is this walk going to happen?', because they want to know when they can scale up their operations or do renovations, or upgrade things to cater for the walkers that will come for those nights or two either side, and how they get there.

4.26 The Committee then sought evidence on the expected demographic of walkers for the Next Iconic Walk, between local, interstate, and international visitors:

Ms BURNET - What is the breakdown in the modelling of the percentage of overseas and interstate visitors versus locals for using this?

Mr EVANS - The experience from the Three Capes and the Overland Track is that the Tasmanian contingent is pretty low. I think it's about - it's over 80 per cent, or less than 20 per cent of Tasmanians.

Mr RYAN - Yes, it's 17 per cent, I think, for Three Capes or Overland Track and 12 or 13 for the other. So you are looking at 80-plus from interstate or overseas.

Ultimately, if you are looking at the objective of the walk, it is to attract people to Tasmania and the west coast region, and encourage them to come here and stay longer, and spend more money. That's your primary market.

Mr EVANS - To clarify, 17 per cent of Three Capes Track walkers are Tasmanian and 12 per cent for the Overland Track.

Cost of the proposed works

4.27 The Committee sought evidence on the project's cost estimates, having noted a cost increase from \$20 million to \$40 million:

CHAIR - ... I will kick off with a question about the \$40 million cost. It's my understanding that the original cost was half of that price in 2019... Could you provide us with some details about why that cost has doubled from the original proposal and whether you believe that the \$40 million is an accurate cost because we know, with the Three Capes, it did increase significantly? ...

Ms MULLER - ... We know the cost of construction in recent years has significantly increased and that's certainly been an impact in terms of looking at the cost of delivering this project, so I think that \$20 million to \$40 million is partly in response to the cost of construction and partly in response to the work that was undertaken in terms of the detail around the delivery of the project.

What I can say is that, in recent years the work we have done has really had a laser-sharp focus on delivering to the \$40 million budget. That's been one of many considerations, but it's been a pretty key consideration around the design of the build. We know that there are certainly challenges in terms of delivering construction in remote areas, whether that's around workforce, access to materials, access to site and weather constraints. So, as much as possible, the proposal is around prefabrication of the huts, for example, to reduce some of that uncertainty and to better manage our costs...

Mr RYAN - ... just to clarify the timing, my understanding is that the \$20 million was an initial commitment and that was even before a location was identified for the walk. So, we didn't even have a concept in terms of what the walk would look like, how long it would be -

CHAIR - Was it 2017 or 2019?

Mr RYAN - It was 2018, I think.

CHAIR - I think it was an election commitment.

Mr RYAN - Yes, it was an election commitment. So, the election commitment came first and then we had to identify a location; that came out in 2019. Following the location assessment in 2019, that recommended doing a feasibility study to further scope out whether the proposal in that location would be viable and what would work best; whether it's a seven-day walk, a three-day walk, a 20-day walk - whatever.

Once we finished the feasibility study in 2021, that's when the ask was made for the \$40 million because we actually had a defined concept, a three-day, two-night walk, two huts and they had cost estimates at that point in time of what the track work

would cost and what the huts would cost. So, that's where the \$40 million change came from. So, \$20 million, an election commitment, very early on in the concept of the walk, then you have a fairly detailed concept and a proposal and a costing, which was why we went back for the \$40 million.

4.28 The Committee heard further evidence on how the costs of previous projects informed the planning for the proposed works:

CHAIR - Were there lessons learnt from the other walks, from the Three Capes Walk or the Overland Track -

Mr RYAN - Absolutely.

CHAIR - that you will be able to translate into this but also, 'well this is really more realistic about what things cost'. Did that help?

Mr RYAN - I guess we're constantly reviewing previous projects, whether that's the Three Capes or Overland Track or it might be track works - we've done a lot of track work recently in response to fires in the south west, so I think it was around \$9 million worth of what we called the fire recovery project, a lot of track work there. As you said, costs change and prices change and that sort of thing, so you go back to the most recent example that you have as a reference point. In terms of the current costings, we then can relate that back to a specific design and we can take that to QS - quantity surveyors- and get them to estimate what it costs, then we build in contingencies and those sorts of things as well to allow that. We've used that \$40 million as the point of reference to make sure that our costs can match that and then we've adapted our designs accordingly.

4.29 The proponents then provided evidence on how they are ensuring the proposed works will be delivered within budget:

Ms BURNET - ... Are you confident that you are not going to spend over \$40 million? What's the plan to deliver on that?

Ms MULLER - A couple of things. First, I think Keith referenced the contingency that we've built in, so there's a significant buffer that's built into the budget. As I said, we've had a really strong focus on designing the product to the budget and the budget has really helped to shape key decisions that we've made. For example, a standalone campsite to integrate the campsite into the two nodes has reduced the number of separate toilet buildings that we need. So, key decisions that we've made to ensure that we're able to deliver under that \$40 million.

Ms BURNET - Has the footprint reduced overall because there have been some changes there? Can you describe what sort of changes there might have been?

Mr RYAN - I will give you a quick intro, but if you want to talk numbers, you guys can jump in. The concept has changed along the way. As Sophie said, there were plans for a separate standalone campsite at one stage which, obviously, had its own footprint with its own toilet which has now been removed. There was a shelter with that as well. We've brought them back to the hut site, so we've lost a shelter and lost a toilet in terms of footprint. We've also reduced - I guess we've spread - there was enough to cater for 20 campers at that central campsite. We now have 10 at each of the two hut sites, so we are neutral in terms of the footprint, in terms of the platforms.

We have added from earlier concepts. When we went out to public consultation we had four pods. We have increased that to six now, so there is an increase in the footprint there, but that's probably more in response to our desire to ensure that this walk pays for itself and is a viable operation and doesn't drain the Parks' budget year to year. The standalone pods generate the greatest income. Tent platforms generate the least amount of income, so that was a factor in deciding the balance of those at the hut sites.

Concerns with the proposed works

- 4.30 Evidence received by the Committee from public submissions and members of the public who appeared at the public hearing raised concerns with the proposed works. Mr Grant Dixon, representing the Tasmanian National Parks Association, shared his concern with the site selection process and the 2021 feasibility study:

... it's worth noting that 35 locations were suggest by various public individuals or groups during the call for expressions of interest in 2018. Only two of those were on the west coast, and the other one has already been mentioned today as well - that was the Bob Brown Foundation proposal. The process that selected from those was basically opaque and the current proposal, around the Tyndalls, is essentially cherrypicked from one of them. It isn't really one of the proposals that came out. Parks made a choice in some opaque way.

Then, of course, there's been the feasibility study, solely into that choice, in 2021. A third option is briefly mentioned in that feasibility study, a third option in addition to two overnight options, and that was a series of day walks, making use of hubs on the west coast, like Queenstown. The Tasmanian National Parks Association and others have long argued that would be a better way of getting money into the community and bringing people to the west coast, than having a walk that's basically bus in, bus out, like Three Capes, for example.

In fact, in that 2021 cost-benefit study, even though the day walks weren't really assessed, they were just referred to as a benchmark, because it was all about an overnight walk already at that stage - the option for a series of day walks, for example, has a higher cost-benefit ratio. Seriously, if the benefits to the west coast communities and western Tasmania in general is really the priority, why are we talking about one of the options that didn't have the highest cost-benefit ratio? One of our strongest suggestions is that this latter option - reinvestigating the idea of a series of day walks and community hubs, rather than this massive amount of infrastructure in a currently undeveloped area, warrants consideration, before you start turning a sod.

- 4.31 Mr Dixon continued by outlining his concern with the cost estimates of the proposed works, and stated that the cost analysis conducted as part of the 2021 feasibility study was now outdated:

I mentioned the feasibility study that is being talked about and it is obviously fundamental to where we are now, but it was carried out in 2021. A lot of things have happened since 2021, I mean, the model itself has changed, they've relocated a few things, there are now more structures, it now has a longer season, the number of modelled walkers has increased, obviously all aiming to do the arithmetic so that the thing stacks up. But, it's worth bearing in mind that the 2021 feasibility study, even though it was using a slightly different model, still concluded it was only marginally

feasible and it was only marginally feasible if the budget was increased to \$40 million, which, of course, subsequently happened.

Once you factor in on top of that things like construction costs generally, not just in Tasmania but everywhere, have increased a lot in the last five years, it almost goes without saying that any government infrastructure project is going to go over budget. So we would question that this could ever possibly be built for \$40 million. If you want to be serious about it, it should go back and completely redo the feasibility study with all the current conditions and the current costing of everything, et cetera. If that's been done, great. It'd be nice for stakeholders outside like us to see the results, but I don't think it has. In order for the Committee to make an informed decision, I think you need to get an updated feasibility study.

- 4.32 Mr Jimmy Cordwell, on behalf of the Wilderness Society, shared a similar view with Mr Dixon regarding the 'hub' option and providing a series of day walks on the West Coast instead of the proposed works. He also shared with the Committee his concerns regarding 2021 feasibility study:

We are opposed to the project in its current form. That said, trying to be proactive about an option that's good for the west coast is looking at that hub idea of bringing folk in to not just Queenstown, but Tullah, Rosebery, Strahan, what have you, and creating a great walks hub. Hopefully, some of the things I say can feed into that.

...

...looking at the economic modelling that was used in the feasibility study of 2021, what was used was input-output modelling but there's other forms of econometric models. Partial and general econometric models were mentioned in the feasibility study but not used and that was because of financial reasons, but if we reassess the great hub option and look at saving some cash for the state then you have cash there that can be reused to reassess this program, one would argue.

- 4.33 Mr Andy Szollosi, President of the Tasmanian Wilderness Guides Association, provided the Committee with his perspective on the operational aspects of the accommodation nodes, based on his experience with the Three Capes Track:

... One of the challenges that the Three Capes, out of experience from an operational side, is mould in the huts as a result of condensation build up and from the wet environment these huts are in. We know that certain parts, like the window frames, have had to be stripped out of the Three Capes public huts and replaced. This problem is only going to be worse in the Tyndalls, and this is going to add to the ongoing maintenance costs. Not only that, because we have so many auxiliary buildings with no sealed doors, so there are no air locks, and when people are exiting and entering those pods especially, the water is going to get in. It is inevitable there are going to be mould issues in these huts, which are going to be a public safety hazard. That is going to be costing the taxpayers, and it's basically going add to the ongoing maintenance costs of this experience.

The power generation capabilities - it is great they are providing heating and cooking, but there is a fair chance that the power they are going to generate to supply such high demand is not going to be adequate. We have seen this on Three Capes. The batteries weren't enough; they had to fly in new batteries. There are one tonne diesel generators that have to be flown in to provide enough power that the rangers have

to turn on at 5.00 a.m. in the morning when the power runs out. That's not exactly environmentally sustainable. There is less sun, more rain. The hydro is a great idea. I am not sure how much power the hydro is capable of providing but I would be looking at the nitty gritty and getting engineers' perspective on how much power is likely to be required there.

- 4.34 Mr Dixon, Mr Szollosi, and Mr Cordwell raised with the Committee a report prepared by the Department in 1990 that recommended the Tyndall Range be included in the TWWHA. Mr Szollosi expanded on this:

...The report that Grant alluded to was a report prepared by Parks and Wildlife in 1990, provided to the then-Minister. That is the Tyndall Plateau, looking at Mount Geikie, and in this document there was basically a recommendation made to extend the World Heritage Area - I do have it kind of highlighted here - the glacial features and the flora tick two of the outstanding universal values requirements to be a World Heritage Area. So the recommendation was made to actually extend the World Heritage Area to include the Tyndalls Range, which - I just drew this up in LISTmap, that was basically the recommendation, the proposed walk pretty much goes right through the middle of that.

Parks in 1990 said, 'Hey, this should be a World Heritage Area', and in 2026 they want to clear 85,000 square metres of native vegetation in that proposed area. That's 12 soccer fields worth of native vegetation that they're going to brush cut, they're going to chainsaw, they're going to destroy, to build this walk. That is world heritage value.

- 4.35 Mr Szollosi also raised his concern with the biosecurity risks in the area:

Mr SZOLLOSI - *...Within the EIS or the Environmental Impact Statement, they've plotted the Phytophthora locations, which is great. There's just one clear consideration that's missing there. I will just point it out here. The walk is proposed to go through here, so where there's a red dot, there's Phytophthora there. That's a root rot disease that's carried in wet soil, bushwalker's boots. It's present very close to one of the nodes that's proposed. It's also present here, which is - the track's not shown here but the track does go pretty much to that point, and what needs to be considered is that experienced walkers might use the newly built walk to access the Tyndall Plateau from the eastern side, via Farquhar Lookout, and they might very well go through that spot where the Phytophthora is.*

Any kind of management of Phytophthora needs to include the possibility of walkers using the new track as an access route to go up to the top of the plateau from the eastern side, which is different to the western side where there is the current track that takes people up there. That needs to be considered.

...

Ms RATTRAY - *You just talked about the potential for the chance of root rot disease to be taken up to the sensitive Tyndall Plateau because they might well go from the eastern side and not the western side as they go now.*

Mr SZOLLOSI - *That's right.*

Ms RATTRAY - Are you meaning that these would be people who are on the walk, that they would have time to go up there, have a look, then come back and be part of the group, if they were seasoned walkers? Is that what you're saying? Or would they be walkers who were not part of the 44?

Mr SZOLLOSI - There's two options to that. It could be either. It could be walkers who are officially registered on the track, or in the off-season, potentially, when there are not many registered walkers. That's potentially when some of the more experienced local walkers might go out and use that track as a means of - maybe when there are no bookings and it's quiet, they might use that track to access. It's hypothetical, but it's not hard to imagine a scenario where someone might go off the built track, and go up the obvious spur that is the easiest means of access through that plateau straight through that Phytophthora zone there.

Ms RATTRAY - And take that rot up onto the plateau and that could wipe out the plateau. Is that what would happen?

Mr SZOLLOSI - It could have an impact on the plateau, absolutely, and that's where the world heritage plant communities are, your *Fagus* and alpinas as well.

- 4.36 The proponents were recalled to respond to the evidence provided by the public witnesses. In response to the evidence that a series of day walks on the West Coast would be the preferred option for the proposal, Ms Muller stated:

... From my perspective, I think the conversation around short walks, and investing in short walks versus investing in an iconic, globally significant, multi-day walk has been an interesting part of this afternoon's conversation. We know that multi-day walks trigger decisions to come to Tasmania. We know that we're full of incredible short walks all over the state, but I think building on the success of the Overland Track and the Three Capes Track as a really iconic showcase of the beautiful, remarkable natural environment; done in a way that's very sensitive that is minimising impact, I think will be a gamechanger economically to the west coast in particular.

We also know that when people come to Tasmania for these walks, they frequently return. The research shows that if you've done the Three Capes Track or the Overland Track, the vast majority of those people would be keen to come back and do that walk. If people are attracted here for that walk, once they've experienced the wonderful trip to Tasmania, they're far more likely to return again and again and again.

- 4.37 Ms Muller continued by discussing the feasibility study and the comparison of costs between the Three Capes Track and the Next Iconic Walk:

... there was some commentary around the feasibility study and whether there was a need to revisit that. On that note, I recognise that it was done at a point in time to determine the cost-benefit of the project and establish if it was a viable proposition. While the project itself has been refined and there have been some changes since that feasibility study was done, they haven't materially altered the offering, which is a three-day, two-night walk. So we continue to look at the costs, look at the revenue, but fundamentally, is there a need to revisit that feasibility study? It is our view that there isn't a need. It informed a decision at a point in time. It largely remains relevant

and regarding the cost-benefit to the west coast communities, the case is strong and the costs overall to the Tasmanian community as well still stands.

There was some commentary around the Three Capes Track and the operating costs of that track and maybe some of the experiences on it. As Keith's talked to, the team has looked closely at the Three Capes Track experience and that has informed the development of this walk. I should note it is quite a different walk in some ways in terms of costs, because it has the ferry, it has a shuttle and it has entry to Port Arthur, and the costs associated with those is around half of the operating costs of the walk itself. The walk here won't have those same sorts of overheads in terms of those operating costs. That is just one example of the difference between the two.

...

We have also learnt from the Three Capes Track in terms of some of the mould issues that we referred to, for example, and that has very much informed the detailed design work that has occurred, such as some of the approaches in terms of the drying rooms and cupboards...

4.38 Mr Ryan further responded to the concerns raised by Mr Szollosi regarding mould, ventilation, and power generation:

Following up particularly on the mould issue with the Three Capes that was raised, we've looked at all our huts from the Overland Track to Three Capes to even Frenchman's Cap, which is the closest one in terms of the ventilation system. That was raised in terms of ventilation and heat is one of the key ways to reduce mould. So all the sleeping areas in these huts will have low-level heating to raise the ambient temperature, which is one of the key factors in condensation forming in the first place.

With the hydro power and solar power that we will have, we will have mechanical ventilation and a heat recovery system; so, it's going to be another level of circulating air and taking the moisture out. We've basically engaged specialists in building health and the servicing of the ventilation and power systems to make sure that can cope and deal with the mould and ventilation issues.

...

... the power systems we have are a totally different scale and capability compared to what is in, say the Overland Track or Three Capes, which rely totally on solar and small battery systems. The hydro will basically be able to power the whole thing. In some respects, the solar is really there for backup if, for some reason, the lake levels drop. If we suddenly don't get the rainfall we expect, then the solar will kick in and that will kick in when, obviously, there isn't rainfall so there's higher solar radiation, so the two will complement each other.

We will also have a battery backup system which, if we had no power generation, we could still run the huts for, I think, three or four days, continuous power with all those systems operating at full capacity. If it all just failed, we could then scale things back and go, 'Okay, we're not going to have lighting to this place or we're not going to have heating in that room'. You know, there will be opportunity to scale back, to extend

that longer until you can get repairs done on those systems. We're pretty confident that that will work.

- 4.39 The Committee then sought a response to Mr Szollosi's evidence that the proposed works would clear 85,000 square metres of vegetation in the area:

Ms RATTRAY - You're comfortable with the 85,000 square metre footprint overall?

...

Mr RYAN - Well, that's misleading to some degree because that's the whole footprint.

...

It relates to the footprint of the whole development, which includes helicopter bases outside of the walk, road upgrades where there's already a road and we've included the whole width of that road for 2 kilometres. The actual footprint - Joe, you might want to give the actual figures - when you look at the actual huts and the track, it's considerably less than that. It might be worth sharing those.

Mr EVANS - Yes, so, 84,000 - almost 85,000 - was the figure in the EIS for construction impact. That allows for the four-wheel track corridor, which obviously allows for some micro-siting and flexibility - obviously the track won't be that wide.

Mr RYAN - Just jumping in on that. For the track corridor, we get approved to build within a 50 metre-wide strip; that's included in that footprint. The track is literally going to be a metre wide or less, so when you include those 50 metres in, for 31 kilometres, the numbers add up pretty quickly.

Mr EVANS - If you want to use the soccer ground analogy - as Keith mentioned - both depots are about 7000, so pitch size. One's just outside Lake Margaret Power Station on existing road; one's just off Anthony Road, outside of that wilderness rating - it doesn't factor into that. And, as Keith mentioned, the track. But, when we're looking purely at the hut sites, and there's been a lot of commentary on Lake Huntley, it is down around that 1500 square metres. It's worth looking at the break-up, I suppose, when considering that 85,000 construction impact because, as Keith mentioned, you're not going to build a track that's 50 metres wide.

- 4.40 The proponents also gave evidence on the 1990 report cited by Mr Dixon, Mr Szollosi, and Mr Cordwell:

Ms BURNET - ... We heard of the Parks proposal for world heritage inclusion of this area in 1990. Why the departure from that position?

Ms MULLER - I'm unfortunately not able to comment on deliberations in 1990 and what's transpired between then and now. I think that it's certainly an area that has natural values that are important and are currently protected through its conservation area status. It's also an area that has hydropower, mineral exploration licences; it's an area of mixed history and some degree of disturbance in some places. What I would say is that's currently protected under our legislation.

Mr RYAN - *If I could just add there, it comes across that that report was solely on the Tyndall Range, but that covered the whole western side of the World Heritage Area, and, I don't know the exact number, but there were 20 or 30 areas that were suggested to be extensions to the World Heritage Area. Some of those have been added in since 1990 and some haven't. Tyndall Range is one of those that hasn't been added.*

Does the Project Meet the Requirements of the Public Works Committee Act?

4.41 In assessing any proposed public work, the Committee seeks an assurance that each project meets the criteria detailed in Clause 15(2) of the Public Works Committee Act 1914. Broadly, and in simple terms, these relate to the purpose of the works, the need for and advisability of undertaking the works, and whether the works are a good use of public funds and provide value for money to the community. The Committee questioned the witnesses who provided the following confirmation:

CHAIR - *... Does the proposed works meet an identified need or needs, or solve a recognised problem?*

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - *Are the proposed works the best solution to meet identified needs or solve a recognised problem within the allocated budget?*

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - *Are the proposed works fit for purpose?*

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - *Do the proposed works provide value for money?*

WITNESSES - Yes.

CHAIR - *Are the proposed works a good use of public funds?*

WITNESSES - Yes.

5 DOCUMENTS TAKEN INTO EVIDENCE

5.1 The following documents were taken into evidence and considered by the Committee:

- *Next Iconic Walk*, submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, Parks and Wildlife Service, Department of Natural Resources and Environment Tasmania, 20 January 2026;
- *Submission regarding Next Iconic Walk*, Tassie Bound Adventures Tours, dated 25 January 2026;
- *Submission regarding Next Iconic Walk*, Tasmanian National Parks Association, dated 1 February 2026;
- *Submission regarding Next Iconic Walk*, Sue Abbott, dated 2 February 2026;
- *Submission regarding Next Iconic Walk*, Tasmanian Wilderness Guides Association, dated 2 February 2026;
- *Submission regarding Next Iconic Walk*, Wilderness Society, dated 2 February 2026,
- *Submission regarding Next Iconic Walk*, Hydro Tasmania, dated 2 February 2026; and
- Tasmanian Parks and Wildlife Service response to request for additional information, dated 27 February 2026.

6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 The Committee is satisfied that the need for the proposed works has been established. Once completed, the Next Iconic Walk will deliver a three-day, two-night hut-based walk that will provide economic benefits to the West Coast and Tasmania.
- 6.2 According to the proponent, the proposed works are feasible and iconic, with the Tyndall Range as the preferred location due to its outstanding natural environment and heritage values.
- 6.3 The Committee notes the views shared in the evidence received from public submissions, members of the public, and representatives of the Tasmanian National Parks Association, Tasmanian Wilderness Guides Association, and the Wilderness Society. Concerns with the proposed works included the site selection process and cost analysis, and operational, environmental, and biosecurity risks.
- 6.4 On the balance of evidence received, the Committee is satisfied that the proposed works will meet the identified need for overnight walking opportunities, attract visitors to the West Coast and encourage them to stay longer, and create employment and business opportunities. The Committee is of the view that the concerns raised in evidence have been adequately addressed by the proponent, and is satisfied that the proponent will mitigate the identified risks and impacts.
- 6.5 Accordingly, the Committee recommends the Next Iconic Walk, at an estimated cost of \$40 million, in accordance with the documentation submitted.



Parliament House
Hobart
21 April 2026

Ms Jen Butler MP
Chair

7 DIVISION

- 7.1 In accordance with section 8(2) of the Act, the following Divisions were recorded:
- 7.2 On the Question being proposed – That the Committee approves the Next Iconic Walk reference in accordance with the plans and specifications submitted.

The Committee divided.

AYES - 4
Ms Butler
Mr Harriss
Ms Rattray
Mr Shelton

NOES - 1
Ms Burnet

- 7.3 On the Question being proposed – That Chapter 6, ‘Conclusion and Recommendation,’ stand part of the Report;

The Committee divided.

AYES - 3
Ms Butler
Ms Rattray
Mr Shelton

NOES - 1
Ms Burnet

8 DISSENTING STATEMENTS

8.1 The honourable Member for Clark, Ms Burnet, voted against the inclusion of the 'Conclusion and Recommendation' in the Committee's report.

8.2 Ms Burnet provided the following Dissenting Statement:

Public Works Committee

Dissenting Statement – Next Iconic Walk

Helen Burnet MP

Is the \$40m price tag for the Next iconic Walk value for money, and is it delivering a good outcome for Tasmanians?

Based on the information provided, I believe that the project before the Public Works Committee for a 3-day multi-trip walk in the Tyndalls Ranges does not meet expectations for the best value for taxpayer money. Nor does it actually deliver on expectations for the best economic benefits for the region nor, in the longer term, for Tasmanians.

My dissenting report contests the economic, environmental and ecotourism benefits of this project. As outlined in some submissions to the Public Works Committee, if other proposals had been considered, there could be more widespread benefit, and more specifically west coast communities.

Of the 35 different proposals across Tasmania, the Tyndalls was deemed to best fit the government's criteria for investment as the Next Iconic Walk.

However, the proposal has, in my opinion, become overblown, with a price tag twice the originally proposed \$20m budget, catering for a predominantly non-Tasmanian, high-end market, being built in a National Park.

The concept would freeze out many Tasmanians from accessing the multi-day walk in their National Park because it is designed for the interstate and overseas market. The concept has a high price point, and targets high-end eco-tourism.

In s. 2.7 and 2.8 of the main report above, the following lists the proposed construction:

2.7 The proposed works will include the following:

- **Approximately 31 kilometres of track, built to a similar standard to the Overland Track (Class 3 Australian Standard or T1-T2 Parks and Wildlife Service track classification), ranging in width from 500 millimetres to 700 millimetres on average;**
- **Three day shelters along the track;**
- **Ancillary infrastructure including seating, lookouts, and markers along the track;**

- **A shelter with a toilet at the end of the track;**
- **Two service depots at either end of the track, which will include storage space and a helipad for use both during construction and once operational; and**
- **Two overnight accommodation nodes.**

2.8 The two accommodation nodes will have buildings and amenities to accommodate 44 walkers and up to three Parks and Wildlife Service staff or contractors, including:

- **Six stand-alone pods;**
- **Bunkrooms;**
- **Tent platforms;**
- **Lounge, dining, and kitchen facilities;**
- **A separate toilet building;**
- **A helipad;**
- **A host ranger housing and services building;**
- **Water tanks;**
- **A micro-hydro system; and**
- **Raised greywater absorption beds.**

As can be seen, the proposal itself has a significant environmental footprint in a sub-alpine, relatively remote region. According to the submission by Tasmanian Wilderness Guides Association (2/02/2026) the total footprint is 51ha. The “hut” nodes include significant infrastructure – ranger’s hut and services building, showers, water tanks micro-hydro system, amenity buildings, helipad and bushfire protection zone requirements will require clearing of vegetation surrounding buildings.

One of the overnight “hut” nodes consists of a pavilion approximately 60 m in length. This in itself suggests a significant footprint, however architecturally considerate it may be to its setting. Visual impact on the Tyndalls Range cannot be discounted.

The proposal sits within the West Coast Range, an area with high rainfall, and challenging environmental conditions. The proposed multi-day walk will be available for spring, summer and autumn months. During this time good weather cannot be guaranteed.

Whilst the walk will be open during seasons other than winter, west coast weather is fickle. This should flag concerns about the safety of inexperienced bushwalkers who may be under-prepared for Tasmanian and specifically west coast conditions.

Arguably, the remoteness of the Tyndalls Range makes it a less suitable location because of possible inclement weather, summer bushfire risks.

The business case suggests there is a maximum 44 walkers per day, equivalent to a maximum 12,000 visitors per year and a year-round capacity of 16,000 visitors (p. 6 Parks and Wildlife Service submission). The spread of *Phytophthora* is another

environmental risk, particularly with so many more visitors traversing a relatively isolated area of Tasmania.

The proposal's financial modelling presented an 80% uptake and that operating costs will be covered per season. This coverage of operating costs is clearly yet to be determined, but in assessing the proposal, the overall cost of establishing a walk in this remote part of Tasmania is what was before the committee and of greatest concern in my deliberations.

It is proposed that Parks rangers are on site when the walk season is open, hence the buildings associated with the rangers' requirements, that are separate to the main pavilion buildings.

The economic modelling comparing other walks in Tasmania is flawed, according to various submissions. The proponent's submission made comparisons to delivery and annual running costs of the Three Capes Walk, yet failed to concede that the Three Capes Walk is in a drier part of the state that is not sub-alpine and more remote. Whilst the proponent's submission did acknowledge that the Tyndalls proposal was at a lower altitude than the Overland Track, the comparison to the Overland Track is irrelevant in many ways: the former is an as-yet-built track through west coast terrain and the iconic Overland Track was built in the 1930's, almost 100 years ago.

Many of the submissions and deputations the Committee considered were from people and organisations concerned about the environmental impact. One consistent concern was that the area chosen is adjacent to the Tasmanian World Wilderness Heritage Area. The Tyndalls has been recognised as potential extension of the TWWHA. This was discounted by the proponent suggesting that at its closest point the proposed walk is 6 km away from the TWWHA. This seems a peculiar argument from the Parks and Wildlife Service who I would think may be more concerned with preservation than high-end tourism ventures.

Whilst the proponents (Parks and Wildlife Service) have to some extent mitigated risk to walkers by changing the route so that it is less exposed on the ridge at greater altitude, the development of a multi-day walk through the Tyndalls Range is still regarded by environmentalists as an insensitive approach.

It was disingenuous for the proponent in the deputations at the Committee hearing at Queenstown on 10 February to suggest that Bob Brown or the Bob Brown Foundation endorsed this proposal's route. Correspondence from Dr Brown received by myself and other committee members after the hearing made it clear that in no way did Dr Brown endorse the route nor proposal. They had instead proposed a trans-Tarkine / Takayna walk for consideration as the next iconic walk.

Summary

This proposal is already twice the original budget - now \$40m. With current economic circumstances and the war in the Persian Gulf impacting construction and the cost of materials, it is highly likely to be much more expensive to deliver.

Is the \$40m price tag value for money? Is it delivering a good outcome for Tasmania? I believe that it is not suitable in this location, with likely inclement weather, summer bushfire risks and being closed for 6 months of the season.

The proposal has been designed by Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service for the export market rather than for locals. I question whether the Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service's primary responsibility delivering this type of high-end experience in a remote, fragile ecosystem, or should their primary focus be managing our parks for greater benefit of Tasmanians?

Additionally, it would be of public interest to understand the significant resources already spent by Parks and the government on works associated with undertaking and promoting this project.

The delivery of jobs in construction for the longer term is beneficial. I firmly believe it is arguable that that a hub-and-spoke model of day walks, as suggested by the Tasmanian Wilderness Society's Mr Jimmy Cordwell and the Tasmanian National Parks Association's Mr Grant Dixon in his submission would be of greater direct economic benefit to those local towns.

That the Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service appears to prioritise this proposal on public land with ecological environmental and landscape values over other projects that would benefit Tasmanians and the upkeep of existing tracks and management of existing bushland is concerning.

It is an ongoing tension between government and environmental groups as to the suitability of this type of project in Tasmanian National Parks. There were many other proposals that are not presently in National Parks nor in TWWHA which were chosen not to be considered.

The TNPA in their submission dated January 31, 2026 noted :

“While 35 locations were assessed for the Next Iconic Walk in 2019, the selection process lacked transparency, with little to no information made public about the proposals submitted or the selection criteria used. Furthermore, while two multi-day walk options in the Tyndall Range were considered during the 2021 Feasibility Study, a third option of developing or upgrading a series of day walks accessible from Queenstown, could potentially offer greater benefits to the local area, cater for a wider demographic, cost considerably less, and have destructive impacts on wilderness and other values.”

I welcome the day where there is meaningful, constructive and valued consultation with environmental groups and those with specific experience and interest so that suitable projects with social and environmental licence can eventuate.

In formulating this dissenting statement, I would like to thank all who provided submissions and deputations, as well as Department staff appearing before the committee on behalf of the proponent.

I also thank Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service for organising the trip by helicopter to the Tyndalls to view the proposed development site.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H Burnet', written in a cursive style.

Helen Burnet MP

Member Public Works Committee

April 23, 2026