

Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

Submissions Summary Report

July 2025

Contents

Introduction	2
Submission Summary and Response	3
Dale Tacono, Golden Grove	3
Anthony Humphries, Blanchetown	4
Neville Byrne, Mannum Waters	5
Neville Byrne, Mannum Waters	6
Anonymous, Coromandel Valley	6
Blanchetown District Hall Inc. & Community Committee, Blanchetown	7
Gary Frittum, Morgan	10
Appendix 1	12
Appendix 2	13

Introduction

On 21 May 2025 Council publicly notified the Draft River Structure Asset Management Plan was available for review and comment and invited submissions. This was advertised in the Murray Pioneer & Leader Newspaper on 21 May 2025 & the Murray Valley Standard on 22 May 2025 (See **Appendix 1** - Public Notice).

Public notification was also published on Council's Facebook on – 21 May, 28 May, 5 June & 10 June.

The Public Notice was emailed to the MMC Subscriber list (including all Associations) on 21 May 2025 and was published on the engagement page of Council's website from 21 May (with a tile on the front page of the website from 22 May)

In total seven (7) submissions were received at the close of the engagement period.

Council has prepared a Submissions Summary Report. Council's summary essentially lists the main points made by each submitter, and what outcome they seek from Council's decisions. All submissions are available in **Appendix 2**.

It should be noted that the Response and Action columns are draft recommendations presented to Council as part of the decision-making process. Consequently, Council may resolve to accept them with or without amendments in the final document.

Privacy

Please note that only the name and location of each submitter is detailed in the report. All personal details in the original submission contained in the appendices are redacted to maintain privacy.

Any commentary that is considered defamatory or inappropriate have been redacted.

Submission Summary and Response

Dale Tacono, Golden Grove

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought	Response	Action
1.1	NA	The plan does not address the needs of the Blanchetown McPhee boat ramp upgrades. Both the timing and the lack of commitment for funding is not committed and well beyond reasonable expectations which has been lobbied with Council since 2012. Council has acknowledged the poor condition of this asset.	Update McPhee Boat Ramp, Blanchetown	The AMP projects maintenance requirements for all existing assets and their current condition rating and service levels. The Capital investment table highlights proposed timing that Council can consider in its LTFP should it invest into upgrades of a Capital nature. The 2012 announcement regarding the boat ramp was a submission to SABFAC to seek funding. This was not forthcoming.	Recognition of boat ramp upgrades through the AMP as stated with Council seeking all funding options available for the upgrade to the Page Drive Boat Ramp and following on from the Swan Reach boat ramp concept design presently being undertaken.
1.2	NA	The plan lacks genuine commitment to realise the plan to action. To assume funding of 100% of cost for Blanchetown McPhee boat ramp from DEWS when council have not actively sought to remediate this asset or even determine extent of damage post flood		The AMP projects maintenance requirements for all existing assets and their current condition rating and service levels. The Capital investment table highlights proposed timing that Council can consider in its LTFP should it invest into	Recognition of boat ramp upgrades through the AMP as stated with Council seeking all funding options available for the upgrade to the Page Drive Boat Ramp and following on from the Swan Reach boat ramp concept design presently being undertaken.

		and refuse to apply for funding is not acceptable.		upgrades of a Capital nature. Government Flood funding through the Community Recreation and Remediation Program (CRARP) was announced in November 2024 and funding allocated in February 2025 for uninsured and open space flood damage to an “as alike condition pre flood” has now been allocated and works from CRARP is being scoped accordingly.	Government Flood funding through the Community Recreation and Remediation Program (CRARP) was announced in November 2024 and funding allocated in February 2025 for uninsured and open space flood damage to an “as alike condition pre flood” has now been allocated and works from CRARP is being scoped accordingly.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Anthony Humphries, Blanchetown

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought	Response	Action
2.1	NA	When will Blanchetown downstream boat ramp be upgraded? No mention in this Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan!	Would like upgrade to Blanchetown boat ramp included in Asset Management Plan	The AMP projects maintenance requirements for all existing assets and their current condition rating and service levels. The Capital investment table highlights proposed timing that Council can consider in its LTFP should it invest into upgrades of a Capital nature. The AMP considers a timeline for the stated ramp and is subject to	Recognition of boat ramp upgrades through the AMP as stated with Council seeking all funding options available for the upgrade to the Page Drive Boat Ramp and following on from the Swan Reach boat ramp concept design presently being undertaken.

--	--	--	--

Capital funding being received.	
---------------------------------	--

Neville Byrne, Mannum Waters

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought
3.1	NA	End of Life and High Risk Facilities	Would like to see the Morgan Wharf stabilised to eliminate risk and maintained as a visual tourist attraction rather than being demolished
3.2	NA	Service Levels River Facilities Classification	Suggestion to enhance the classification levels

Response	Action
An Engineering assessment has been undertaken on the Wharf structure and revetment (cliff face). The current estimates are based at approx. \$2.5M and subject to the sourcing of external funding	Council has lodged various submissions for flood remediation and have remained unsuccessful. The most recent submission has been forwarded under the CRARP Funding for consideration at \$2.5M being the funding externally of 75% only of this amount and valued at \$1,875,000 with Councils 25% of funding being \$625,000 should approval to fund is provided.
For consideration in version 2 of the AMP giving due regard to a reassessment of structure requirements within the current service levels.	To be undertaken as a review of the AMP in version 2 following the current implementation and monitoring of this current version 1 of the AMP. Increased service levels result in increase of capital investment and life cycle costs.

Neville Byrne, Mannum Waters

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought	Response	Action
4.1	NA	Omission of the Randell Dry Dock from the Asset Management Plan	Would like the Randell Dry Dock to be added to the AMP and for Council to incorporate the recommendations from the State Heritage Conservation Plan into the AMP.	The Dry Dock is an off-river structure and not publicly accessible for marine activities. The Dry Dock would be considered within the wholistic function of the Visitor Information Centre as the Dry Dock is not used and is currently a dormant structure.	To be considered as an infrastructure requirement for the historic purposes or preservation of, within the bounds of the Visitor Information Centre and Museum.

Anonymous, Coromandel Valley

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought	Response	Action
5.1	NA	Could we bring the Blanchetown Boat Ramp upgrade forward?	Would like the upgrade of the Blanchetown Boat Ramp brought forward	The Boat Ramp upgrade is included on a forward schedule within the AMP and is subject to funding. Council may consider accelerating this project should it be deemed possible through funding or subsequent external funding become available, or as a substitution of other business or works.	Seek 100% funding opportunities.

Blanchetown District Hall Inc. & Community Committee, Blanchetown

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought	Response	Action
6.1	NA	Riverbank remediation of land under care and control of Council is not included in the draft AMP	Request to know if these issues are to be addressed under the Constraints Project	Riverbanks are open space and not a structure that is considered within the AMP	N/A
6.2	NA	The McPhee Boat Ramp is too far away (2027/28)	Would like the upgrade of the McPhee Boat Ramp brought forward. Would also like input into a public consultation associated with its planning.	The Boat Ramp upgrade is included on a forward schedule within the AMP and is subject to funding. Council may consider accelerating this project should it be deemed possible through funding or subsequent external funding become available, or as a substitution of other business or works. The design would be an engineered solution and concept design would be within the adopted service levels specific to the site and in accordance with other provisions within the vicinity.	Seek 100% funding opportunities.
6.3	NA	The removal of the remnants of the Chuck Finn Wharf have not been included in the plan or budgeted for	Would like clarification as to why to has not been included	The Wharf has been condemned and was constructed as an activity for a film production. The wharf was not an engineered structure and was destined for removal	Consideration of budget requirements for removal of asset within CRARP allocation as varied.

				prior to the flood. Wharf was at end of life prior to the flood and the Blanchetown Community Committee had agreed on its removal and was subject to funding to remove.	
6.4	NA	The group do not know the details of what works the CRARP funding will cover	Would like communication of remediation works planned and an assurance that allowances are being considered for the upgraded boat ramp and access road bitumen works.	The CRARP Funding was for flood remediation to non-insured and unfunded areas to an "as alike condition pre-flood". No betterment or capital investment can be undertaken in line with the criteria of the funding.	Submissions lodged under the CRARP funding with eligible only projects approved and defined. No betterment or improvements are permitted through the CRARP funding criteria. All works are specific to before and after clarification and evidence to the funding body therefore standard works only apply as remediation and generally the extent is not for consultation. Works are being scoped and scheduled and notification of activities in some cases may occur.
6.5	NA	If the Swan Reach Boat Ramp is not funded by DEW then Blanchetown should be fast tracked in its place	Want assurance from DEW that funding will be forthcoming.	The commitment from DEW is for Swan Reach to proceed. DEW have recently announce a commitment to the basic design of the Blanchetown Boat ramp	Swan Reach Boat ramp project is planned to proceed with the priority of Blanchetown Boat Ramp to follow. Council will continue to apply for further

				as lodged by Council for the rounds of DEW Constraints funding.	supplement funding and other contributions/funding from key authorities ie SABFAC for all projects. In noting this, Mannum Waters Boat Ramp[funding was declined due to third party funding shortfalls, therefore opportunities for these priorities to be available for funding are opportunities and subject to Council approval.
6.6	NA	Bitumen works on the ramp access would potentially increase the rating from a C to a B or A.	Would like the bitumen works to be brought forward to 2026 to enable a lodgement for funding for the Blanchetown Boat Ramp sooner. Want to know if the access road is funded through DEW or LRCIP.	The boat ramp ratings are based on locality and user profile being local, township, regional etc. It is noted that Page Drive Boat Ramp services the down-stream (below Lock 1) access and that specific works would be specific to this site as there are provisions alike (above Lock 1) and proposed (DCLW applications) upstream at Paisley.	Consideration of service levels at the time of concept design.
6.7	NA	The issue of contractors being available to fulfil projects can be a source of delays	Could Council get more contractors on board to get projects completed quicker.	Council has a significant list of contractors based on conformance, availability and included on a Panel contract. Relevant contractors	Unfortunately, contractual services are difficult to engage due to their other ongoing commitments. The Panel Contract provides for various

				source work through Councils Procurement process.	flexibilities however in many cases some contractors have relevant expertise and licences to facilitate extraordinary type works. This remains an operational matter which involves contractor compliance to Council standards and unfortunately, not all contractors make themselves available for works at their compliance requirements.
--	--	--	--	---	---

Gary Frittum, Morgan

Submission#/Point #	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Decision Sought	Response	Action
7.1	NA	Concern raised regarding the proposed demolition of the Morgan Wharf	Would like to see the wharf restored rather than demolished	The Morgan Wharf is not scheduled for demolition. It is noted that the Wharf, based on condition would be at end of life however is being considered for the level of investment and subsidisation to retain. An Engineering assessment has been undertaken on the Wharf structure and revetment. The current estimates are based at \$2.5M and	Council has lodged various submissions for flood remediation and have remained unsuccessful. The most recent submission has been forwarded under the CRARP Funding for consideration at \$2.5M being the funding externally of 75% only of this amount and valued at \$1,875,000 with Councils

				subject to the sourcing of external funding	25% of funding being \$625,000.
--	--	--	--	---	---------------------------------

Appendix 1

Public Notice

Advertised in Murray Pioneer & Leader Newspaper 21 May 2025 & Murray Valley Standard 22 May 2025 (see ad below):

(SA)

erri
)

council
harm
is to
ive or
id are
ol and

erland
i.

highly
cated
ed in

people

1 and
copy
: (08)

erland
ri and
2.

25.



2025/26 Draft Annual Business Plan
& Budget, Draft Long Term Financial
Plan and Draft River Structures
Asset Management Plan

Mid Murray Council is inviting feedback from the community on the following documents:

- 2025/26 Draft Annual Business Plan & Budget
- Draft Long Term Financial Plan 2025/26 to 2034/35
- Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

The Public is welcome to view these documents from 12 noon Wednesday 21 May 2025 at Council Offices during normal office hours or on Council's website www.mid-murray.sa.gov.au

Written submissions are invited on the documents and will be received by the Chief Executive Officer, Mid Murray Council, PO Box 28, Mannum SA 5238 or via the feedback form on Council's website or email to; postbox@mid-murray.sa.gov.au until 12 noon Wednesday 11 June 2025.

Persons should indicate whether they wish to speak in support of their written submission prior to 12 noon Wednesday 11 June 2025.

Council will also provide the opportunity for the public to attend a meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 17 June 2025 in the Council Chambers, Adelaide Road, Mannum, between 9:30 and 10:30am for the purpose of asking related questions, making a verbal submission or speaking in support of their written submission.

Ben Scales
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

N

Pl
Gi
thi
en
pu

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.

As
By
du
m:
Be
be

Mi
wr
lan
thi
20

Ti
Cl

Tr
cc
ne
op
--

Appendix 2

Submissions Received

Tracy Bawden

From: Social Pinpoint <noreply@socialpinpoint.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 3 June 2025 5:05 PM
To: Tracy Bawden
Subject: IFOR10194-25 - 14/CON/SUR/1 - Feedback Form - Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan Form Submission

SynergySoft: IFOR10194-25 - 14/CON/SUR/1

Feedback Form - Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan Form Submission

There has been a submission of the form Feedback Form - Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan through your Mid Murray Your Say website.

Do you wish to remain anonymous?

No

First Name

Dale

Last Name

Tacono

Address

Golden Grove, SA, 5125

Phone

Email

Did you find the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan easy to understand

Yes

Any other Comments (limited to 300 characters)

The plan does not address the needs of the Blanchetown McPhee boat ramp upgrades. Both the timing and the lack of commitment for funding is not committed and well beyond reasonable expectations which has been lobbied with Council since 2012. Council has acknowledged the poor condition of this asset.

How Satisfied are you with the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

Unsatisfied

Any other general comments (Limited to 300 characters).

The plan lacks genuine commitment to realise the plan to action. To assume funding of 100% of cost for Blanchetown McPhee boat ramp from DEWS when council have not actively sought to remediate this asset or even determine extent of damage post flood and refuse to apply for funding is not acceptable.

Do you wish to make a representation in person by attending the meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 17 June 2025, between 9:30 and 10:30am?

Yes

Tracy Bawden

From: Social Pinpoint <noreply@socialpinpoint.com>
Sent: Saturday, 31 May 2025 9:30 PM
To: Tracy Bawden
Subject: IFOR10197-25 - 14/CON/SUR/1 - Feedback Form - Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan Form Submission

SynergySoft: IFOR10197-25 - 14/CON/SUR/1

Feedback Form - Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan Form Submission

There has been a submission of the form Feedback Form - Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan through your Mid Murray Your Say website.

Do you wish to remain anonymous?

No

First Name

Anthony

Last Name

Humphries

Address

Blanchetown

Phone

Email

Any other Comments (limited to 300 characters)

When will Blanchetown downstream boat ramp be up graded ?

No mention in this Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan!

How Satisfied are you with the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

Unsatisfied

Any other general comments (Limited to 300 characters).

About time it was upgraded.

Do you wish to make a representation in person by attending the meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 17 June 2025, between 9:30 and 10:30am?

No

This is not SPAM. You are receiving this message because you have submitted feedback or signed up to Mid Murray Your Say.

From: Neville Byrne [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 26 May 2025 5:08 PM
To: Post Box
Subject: IEM9614-25 - 18/CON/SUR/10 - Submission to Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

Please find my Comments on the Draft Asset Management Plan for MMC River Facilities.

If I can access any engineering or structural report on the Morgan Wharf, that might influence my suggestions for this facility.

Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

Comments Mid Murray Council Asset Management Plan River Facilities

Council is to be congratulated on developing this 15 year Asset Management Plan for its river facilities which are highly valued by residents, holiday makers and visitors.

COMMENTS

1. End of Life and High Risk Facilities

Not surprising, given the reliance of river facilities to a vibrant river recreation and tourism industry, there are few river facilities that will approach their End-of-Life in terms of the demand and structural integrity for these facilities.

The **Morgan Wharf** is a classic End-of-Life facility which can no longer serve its original function and has been allowed to deteriorate to a level that maintenance and repair is not a financially viable option for the Mid Murray Council with its relatively limited rate base.

The wharf certainly has heritage importance to the river communities of Mid Murray as it is one of the most iconic land-connected reminders of the river trade that spurred the existence of river towns in the Council area.

The wharf is a vital link with the developing paddle wheeler tourism product that is a Mid Murray tourism highlight. The potential for a heritage paddle wheeler tourism product from Goolwa to Renmark and beyond, is enhanced by having the Morgan Wharf remnant as a dynamic visual link with the river trade from the 1850s to 1930s.

Mid Murray is the heart of this potential tourism product with its maintenance and promotion of the P.S. Mayflower, P.S. Marion and P.S. Canally fleet, and the significant number of smaller and privately-owned paddle wheelers that use Mid Murray as a base.

While the Morgan Wharf will undoubtedly never serve as a tourism jump-off point for paddle wheeler tourism as the Echuca Wharf does, its retention and stabilisation as a heritage remnant is an important part of Morgan's heritage and the paddle wheeler industry.

Without access to any structural analysis, I would suggest the best approach is to attempt to stabilise the wharf structure (or a significant part of it), making it safe (and probably not publicly accessible). The sheer height of the Wharf to service the paddle wheeler trade in high river flow conditions, is a vital part of the paddle wheeler (and Morgan's) heritage.

An engineering solution to maintain the majority of the Wharf structure while minimising public and environmental risks would I think be the best solution in terms of recognising history as a key part of the Mid Murray mission.

I would prefer to see an engineering solution that effectively eliminates the perceived risks while maintaining this facility as one of the most important and impressive scenic historical features of the Mid Murray Council area.

2. Service Levels River Facilities Classification

It is noted the Council believes there are four classification levels for river facilities (Regional, District, Local and Informal). The

classification system appears only to apply to boat ramp access to the Murray River, rather than including other river facilities.

I think the classifications could be enhanced by greater reference to either their car parking/trailer capacity, and the relative importance of the facility to Regional to Local communities.

The Blanchetown boat ramp could arguably be better classified as a District facilities and it is difficult to imagine a 100 km catchment area for Regional boating facilities when most use is either by locals or by visitors staying on district shack communities.

From a tourism perspective, historical facilities such as the Morgan Wharf are possibly of greater Regional significance than any boat ramp facility.

However I am conscious that designating a few river facilities as Regional may enhance their capacity to attract higher levels of Grant funding. For example, the Mannum Waters Marina boat ramp facility could be rated Regional as it probably better able to cater for larger demand than the Mary Ann Reserve boat ramp, particularly from a parking capacity perspective. The reluctance of the developer to contribute significantly to the finalisation of the Mannum Waters Marina boat ramp facility indicates that this high capacity facility should be reclassified as a Regional facility to attract greater Grant funding.

3. Overall, I believe the draft River Facilities Asset Management Plan provides a good long-term view of the sustainability of these potentially expensive, high risk but community important facilities.

An alternative approach to the Morgan Wharf demolition is recommended.

Regards
Neville Byrne
Mannum Waters Marina

From: Neville Byrne [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 6 June 2025 12:55 PM
To: Post Box
Subject: IEM10384-25 - 14/CON/SUR/1 - Further submission to draft Asset Management Plan for MMC river facilities

In addition to my earlier submission, I wish to raise what appears to me to be a missing piece of Council's asset management plans (AMP).

While the historic Morgan Wharf has been identified as an "End-of-Life" asset in the River Facilities draft AMP, there is no evidence that the **Randell Dry Dock** has even been recognised as a Council asset.

While both the Morgan Wharf and Randall Dry Dock are both listed on the South Australian Heritage Register, the Randall Dry Dock does not rate a mention in the asset management plans for the River Facilities (draft May 2025) nor in Buildings, Land and Structures AMP, nor the Watercraft AMP (Mayflower/Marion/Canally/Workboats).

While the Dry Dock is managed as part of the Mannum Dry Dock Museum and Visitor Centre, its significance as a Council-owned heritage place warrants its separate consideration as a stand-alone asset, reflecting its separate listing on the State Heritage List, and separately needing Developmental approval to implement changes.

Like the Morgan Wharf, the Randall Dry Dock is at the End-of-Life stage in terms of meeting its original purpose.

But this does not detract from its importance as a heritage asset that needs ongoing care and protection. The recommended shelter to protect the Randall Dry Dock from further deterioration should be an asset management commitment in the Council's forward asset management program.

I would urge the Council to cite the Recommendations from the Conservation Plans for both river-based State Heritage places (Morgan Wharf and Randall Dry Dock) and to incorporate these

Recommendations in the River Facilities Asset Management Plan to provide a complete picture of the funding challenges facing protection of these assets in relation to their Conservation Plans.

Regards
Neville Byrne

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Neville Byrne.

Did you find the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan easy to understand

Yes

Any other Comments (limited to 300 characters)

Could we bring the Blanchetown Boat Ramp upgrade forward? with the caravan park out of action there is little tourism in the town to boost community businesses. A good quality boat ramp could provide a small boost to tourism via increased use of Blanchetown boat ramp by recreational boating.

How Satisfied are you with the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan

Satisfied

Any other general comments (Limited to 300 characters).

Be good to see the legal deadlock surrounding the Blanchetown caravan park resolved and the place reopened, there is little tourism in Blanchetown without it. Off topic but feel neglected in Blanchetown while other river towns thrive.

Do you wish to make a representation in person by attending the meeting of Council to be held on Tuesday 17 June 2025, between 9:30 and 10:30am?

No

To view all of this form's submissions, visit https://engagement.mid-murray.sa.gov.au/index.php/dashboard/reports/forms_new/data/7



ABN 79 470 838 670

Chairperson: Alan Reynolds

Secretary: Jan Badcock

Ben Scales
CEO
Mid Murray Council
49 Adelaide Road
MANNUM SA 5238

10th June 2025

Re: Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan - Public consultation submission

I am forwarding this submission on behalf of the Blanchetown District Hall Inc & Community Committee. Our committee also support the submission by Dale Tacono and his representation to the meeting on the 17th June to advocate and speak on behalf of the Blanchetown community. Our Chair & Treasurer, Alan & Ina Reynolds are interstate and I may not be able to attend.

For the reasons outlined in Dale Tacono's letter we urge Council to reconsider the order of works allocated in the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan, Appendix A: Renewals, new/upgrades 15 year rolling capital works program.

We agree with the Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan that includes the strengthening of Council infrastructure within the limitations mentioned and are pleased that Council is committed to enhancing Councils River Facility assets equitably across the region.

The draft does not include riverbank remediation of land under care and control of Council e.g. Section B access blocks noted on property owners leases as a right of way eg. the severe erosion between blocks 38 and 40 Page Drive since the flood has worsened and now prohibits the safe entry and egress to and from the river at this point. This block is meant to provide river access to the properties in the cul-de-sac on the opposite side of the road but it is now a hazard as it is dangerously eroded. Are these types of issues to be addressed under the Constraints Project?

Looking at the appendices, we believe the wait to 2027/28 is too far away for a town that has already waited 2.5 years for flood remediation works to start. The McPhee boat ramp area in Blanchetown is important and the only public, open green space and we look forward to the ramp and associated areas within the whole of the Community Land Management Plan for the Blanchetown Riverfront Reserve Allotment 118 being remediated (the riverbank area extends from opposite Dee Street to the northern boundary of 24 Page Drive) The allotment includes the McPhee boat ramp, associated car park, trailer

parking, designated fishing and swimming areas, shelters, extended lawned areas, natural riverbank areas, replacement of the deteriorated gabion wire baskets currently serving as bank protection and retainment. This is the Priority 1 Community Projects Action Plan lodged to Council in 2023 and also mentioned in letters to the Section 41 Blanchetown Community Services Committee, 2014.

There are a number of items that are not yet funded and the risk ratings high and extreme e.g. The Heritage listed Morgan Wharf requires funding of \$2m for the Risk Assessment Panel rating of "Extreme risk", and draw attention to the Table 6.2.0 p.403 Risks and Treatment Plan that has applied an Extreme Risk "Dismantle and remove from site whilst infrastructure is still obtainable. The \$2m loan application lodged and discussions regarding this Heritage Listed asset have been deferred. 7.4 Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan Discussion points, Council agenda p.1028.

"A cost estimate has been received in relation to remediation of the Morgan wharf and forwarded to the CRARP program for their consideration for funding". This is listed for Superstructure Design & Documentation in Year 3

There was a risk identified with our wharf in Blanchetown within the Riverfront Reserve Lot 118 CLMP. We were given the option to demolish or find a large sum to rebuild the Chuck Finn Wharf. It was built by the film crew for the Chuck Finn ABC Children's TV series which was part of a film set and not built to regulation standard. After Councils risk assessment and costings, it was decided with agreement of this committee that it could be demolished and was subsequently budgeted for. There was no region wide public consultation conducted for this structure. Our town would have benefited from the history and interest of the structure and area as it gives character and a point of interest to our river town. The flood came before anything was done and the deck of the wharf was taken in the flood leaving the base frame timbers remaining

This project is not listed in the rolling 15 year budget and we would like clarification as to why its not currently budgeted for removal.

We do not know what the details are of the \$127,304 allowed for the flood remediation of the McPhee boat ramp area funded by CRARP and subsidised by Council and would appreciate a communication of the remediation works planned to be done and assurance that allowances are being considered for the upgraded boat ramp listed here for 28/29 and bituminisation of the access road to ramp in 2027.

It is not clear when the plans of the McPhee boat ramp is to be done in the rolling budget but our community would benefit in the knowledge of knowing what is planned and importantly have some input into a public consultation associated its planning.

In the Area: *Blanchetown (McPhee) Year 5 2028/29 "Boat ramp upgrade 100% DEW funded \$1.3 m." Notes "Application in to fund design of Blanchetown Boat ramp, potential upgrade to be funded". Currently no funding allocated. If it is to proceed, funding will be required. Department of Environment and Water (Constraints Project)"*

If you are saying the application is now in to fund the design for the Blanchetown Boat ramp we would be absolutely delighted or are you saying the application will go in Year 5 2028/29 to fund the design process. This needs clarification. Year 5 is too far away. Ideally it needs to be done before the remediation of the space required for the updated boat ramp due for completion at the end of 2025.

In year 3, 2026/27 Swan Reach boat ramp is listed as currently lodged with DEW to 100% fund this project" yet not funded as at June 2025. *"If not funded by DEW, will need to wait until funding is available."* It may inevitably come through but if Swan Reach is not funded then Blanchetown should be fast tracked in its place. Can DEW give more assurance that funding will be forthcoming as there is a concern that the same thing that happened with the Flood disaster funding, it either never came or not all was provided and the wait is untenable.

Year 4, 2027/28 is designated to bitumise the access road to the McPhee boat ramp before the new ramp is scheduled for 2028/29. Bitumising the ramp access would potentially increase the current low rated C for the Blanchetown McPhee boat ramp which would give assurance that the funding will follow as the other criteria for a B or A rating could then be met.

I would like to suggest that the access road to the ramp be brought forward to 2026 to enable a lodgement for funding of the Blanchetown boat ramp at a higher classification than C soon after. Is the access road funded by DEW or by LRCIP

Council have said they are committed to the Blanchetown McPhee ramp to be next; however that is a long time of not knowing for certain and definitely not good for community wellbeing and for the reasons outlined in Dale Tacono's letter. We urge you reconsider the timelines proposed in this draft.

It would be good if they could start the process earlier to give assurance to our community. It would be expedient if the funding could be released earlier and more contractors put on to fulfil these plans earlier. There is so much waiting for years for projects to happen and its not just Blanchetown. Predicted dates of start up and completion of projects seem to be extended quite often e.g. on a positive note the Blanchetown Entrance statement is scheduled to happen this month. It's the last of the Blanchetown Revitalisation Projects funded by the Murray Darling Basin Economic Program for our community affected by the last drought after waiting many years (6/7yrs) (Covid & the Flood got in the way).

The Murraylands Road project has extended past the original completion date and relies on Council's diligence in applying for more grants to finish it.

The issue of contractors being available to fulfil projects can be a source of delays. Neo Infrastructure have been great with the work Council has tendered to them in and around Blanchetown and I wondered if Council had more contractors on board as the situation is only going to get worse with all the extra building and infrastructure projects predicted in SA under State Govt initiatives. Thinking an increase to the pool of contractors to draw from would get things underway across the whole MMC region quicker. Within the planned 15 years there should be an increase in the SA skills pool required for the various construction projects and trust our State Govt has this in hand.

The Federal Govt is responsible for disaster funding e.g. the financing of the River Murray Flood 2022/23 with administration handled by State Government and although many millions was distributed, not enough reached where it was most needed (Blanchetown) and not in a timely manner.

When the flood waters receded we and Council were enthusiastic to rebuild, mitigate future flooding and "build back better" was the motto at the time. Council worked out the costings to do this across a

massive riverfront area affected by the flood in a proper and timely manner, lodged a claim for Federal/ State Govt funding, only to be knocked back. Now we don't hear " build back better" anymore. Except for those property owners who rebuilt under the Plan SA revised Code and invested extra money to do so with the expectation that Council do the same and that the remediation and mitigation would be timely.

This Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan has given us hope but once again it is not timed for where it is needed most, when it is needed most and for whom e.g. here in Blanchetown a whole community and the transient communities that spend time here, use our services etc were affected directly and indirectly by the floods and still are. It relies on grants and the funding coming in a reliable and timely manner. It is great that you have worked out the Levels of service equitably and able to provide to all the listed river structures assets across the region and appreciate the fairness in your strategy.

There is a lot of essential upgrades in this draft document that depends on grants being fulfilled within a specific timeframe and this is where the concern lies, how can it be guaranteed that the DEW funding is still going to be available in 5, 6 or 7 years. There is a history of grant funds being expended quickly and closing with people missing out that shouldn't have, hence my urge to bring forward and get started on planning and implementing those upgrades requiring DEW funding now.

Yours sincerely

Jan Badcock

Secretary

on behalf of

Alan Reynolds, Chair

and the

Blanchetown District Hall Inc & Community Committee.

From: Cr Jen Davis
Sent: Friday, 13 June 2025 9:06 AM
To: Gary Mavrinac; David Hassett; Ben Scales
Cc: Simone Bailey; Post Box
Subject: IEM10829-25 - 14/CON/SUR/1 - Morgan Wharf

Hi All,

I have some very concerned residents of Morgan who are horrified at the recent Draft River Structures Asset Management Plan where it says that the Morgan Wharf will be demolished in the next 10 years.

Please see attached letter that one resident is sending to DEW.

There has been no discussion regarding this at MMHMC meetings. Can I please get some clarification on this proposal.

Thankyou

Cr. Jen Davis.

From: Gary Frittum [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 11 June 2025 3:42 PM
To: DEW.StateHeritageDA@sa.gov.au
Cc: Gary Frittum [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Morgan wharf demolition

Heritage Council of South Australia, Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure
Subject: Urgent Concern Regarding Proposed Demolition of Heritage Listed Wharf in Morgan, South Australia

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Gary Frittum, and I am writing to you as a concerned resident of Morgan, South Australia. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed demolition of the heritage listed wharf in Morgan. I have attached a brief outline of Morgan and its rich history for your information.

As you will see, Morgan was once the largest inland port in Australia, and potentially the Southern Hemisphere. The wharf stands as a significant reminder of this vital era in our town's history.

I am deeply concerned about the potential loss of this irreplaceable historical structure. Rather than demolition, I believe that the wharf should be restored and preserved for future generations.

The restoration of the wharf would not only protect our heritage but also significantly benefit the local economy. We have recently made significant progress in revitalising tourism in Morgan. The PS Canally paddle steamer is now operational, and we are welcoming other paddle steamers on their tourist routes. The wharf is a major draw card for tourists visiting Morgan, and its preservation is crucial for sustaining this growing tourism industry, which brings substantial economic benefits to the town.

Demolishing the wharf would be a devastating blow to Morgan's heritage and its economic future. I urge you to strongly consider the historical and economic importance of the wharf and to reject the proposed demolition in favour of a restoration project.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Gary Frittum

Attachment: Brief Outline of Morgan's History

<https://engagement.mid-murray.sa.gov.au/draft-river-structures-asset-management-plan>

page 25

5.12 Disposal Plan Disposal includes any activity associated with disposal of a decommissioned asset including sale, demolition, or relocation. There is one identified River Facilities asset for disposal within the 10-year planning period.

Asset ID Critical Assets Failure Mode Impact RF-MOWH001 Morgan (Wharf)

Asset already failed, affecting the structural integrity of wood construction.

Loss of serviceability and functionally poses as a safety hazard.

Possible significant cost implication (salvage/removal) due to the infrastructure slipping further towards or into the River Murray.

By identifying critical assets and failure modes an organisation can ensure that investigative activities, condition inspection programs, maintenance and capital expenditure plans are targeted at critical assets

Morgan (Timber Wharf) Location Asset ID Asset Name Unit Rate Condition Rating Description of Condition Morgan

(Wharf) RFMOWH001 Timber Super Structure \$1,650,000 6 (End of Life)

Asset is unserviceable and provides no service. Asset cannot be used.

Cr Jen Davis

Councillor

Mid Murray Council | PO Box 28, Mannum SA 5238

T: | M: 0402 317 444

Email: crjdavis@mid-murray.sa.gov.au

Web: www.mid-murray.sa.gov.au