STATEMENT OF REASONS

Statement of reasons provided pursuant to section 33 of the Judicial Review Act 1991.

Applicant's name	Murweh Shire Council
Decision maker	Sally Egan, the delegate of the chief executive in accordance with the delegation given under section 141 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* (**the Act**)
Decision	Granted
Date of decision	05/06/2014

Introduction

On 30 May 2014, Murweh Council lodged an application for lethal take of eastern grey kangaroo, common wallaroo and red kangaroo on the Augathella Aerodrome.

On 05 June 2014, after consideration of the material before me, I, Sally Egan under section 186, granted a permit and signed a notice of decision to Murweh Shire Council confirming my decision.

Relevant legislation

The *Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) Regulation 2006* **(the Wildlife Management Regulation)** chapter 3, part 4, division 2 governs the grant of damage mitigation permits (DMP) for animals as follows:

Section 182 provides that I may grant a damage mitigation permit for a least concern animal.

Section 184 provides that I may grant a DMP only for one or both of the following purposes:
(a) to prevent damage or loss caused, or likely to be caused, by a protected animal;
(b) to prevent or minimise a threat, or potential treat, to human health and wellbeing caused by a protected animal.

Section 186 provides that a DMP may be granted for threat to human health and wellbeing caused by a protected animal only if I am satisfied–

(a) there is, or may be, a threat to a person's health and wellbeing resulting from harm caused by the animal to the person; and
(b) action under the permit will not detrimentally affect the survival of the animal in the wild; and
(c) the proposed way of taking the animal is humane and not likely to cause unnecessary suffering to the animal; and
(d) if the animal is a protected reptile –
    (i) the reptile will be released to the wild; or
    (ii) a conservation plan for the reptile authorises the holder of a damage mitigation permit to keep the reptile under the permit or otherwise.

Section 25 of the *Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation 2006* **(the Administration Regulation)** provides that in considering an application I must have regard to each of the following-

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

(a) The impact the activities that may be carried out under the DMP may have on the conservation of the cultural or natural resources of a protected area or native wildlife;
(b) The effect the grant of the authority will have on the fair and equitable access to nature, having regard to, in particular, the ecologically sustainable use of protected areas or wildlife;
(c) Any contribution the applicant proposes to make to the conservation of nature;
(d) Any relevant Australian or international code, instrument, protocol or standard or nay relevant intergovernmental agreement;
(e) The precautionary principle;
(f) Public health and safety
(g) The public interest
(h) Whether the applicant is a suitable person to hold the authority, having regard to the matters mentioned in schedule 2 of the Administration Regulation;
(i) Any recovery plan for wildlife to which the authority applies.

Pursuant to section 25(2) of the Administration Regulation I may have regard to anything else I consider appropriate to achieve the object of the Act.

Material on which the findings of fact were made

In arriving at my decision I had before me the following material for consideration:

- *Nature Conservation Act 1992,(*The Act), the Wildlife Management Regulation and the Administration Regulation 2006.
- Damage Mitigation Permit Application submitted 30 May 2014.
- Assessment completed by Luke Male (Senior Ranger - Wildlife).
- Historical information and local knowledge.

Findings of fact

I assessed the application against the requirements of the Nature Conservation legislation and made the following findings of fact: Conditions are included in the findings of fact.

Legislative requirement	Finding
Section 182 of the Wildlife Management Regulation	The species the applicant has requested to be listed on the permit are species of least concern by virtue of Schedule 6 of the *Nature Conservation (Wildlife) Regulation 2006*
Section 186 of the Wildlife Management Regulation	I am satisfied that the animals are a threat, or potential threat, to human health and wellbeing due to the risk of collision at the aerodrome.
Section 186(a)	I am satisfied that the species of macropod at the Augathella Aerodrome can pose a significant threat to a person's health and wellbeing due to the risk of collision with light aircraft. Similarly the birds listed in the application are also a risk.
Section 186(b)	I am satisfied that action under the permit will not adversely affect the survival of the species in the wild

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

	because the animals are least concern wildlife and the numbers potentially taken are moderate.
Section 186(c)	I am satisfied that the proposed way of taking the animal is humane and not likely to cause unnecessary suffering to the animal. Take of wildlife is by shooting only and will result in the instantaneous death of the target animal. Recommended Condition – Macropods must be taken by centre-fire rifle in a way specified in the National Code of Practice for the Humane Shooting of Kangaroos and Wallabies for Non-commercial Purposes, approved by the Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council.
Section 186(d)	The animal is not a protected reptile.

Additional matters I have taken into account

Section 25(1)(a) of the Administration Regulation	The activities that may be carried out under the DMP are the lethal take of eastern grey kangaroo, brown goshawk, brown falcon, red kangaroo and black kite. I consider that the issue of this permit will have no impact on the conservation of the cultural or natural resources of a protected area or native wildlife due to the common nature of the species and the low numbers to be affected by the activities in the permit.
Section 25(1)(b)	There will be no effect from the grant of the authority have on the fair and equitable access to nature, having regard to, in particular, the ecologically sustainable use of protected areas or wildlife;
Section 25(1)(c)	There is no contribution the applicant proposes to make to the conservation of nature;
Section 25(1)(d)	N/A
Section 25(1)(e)	The grant of the permit has taken into account the precautionary principle.
Section 25(1)(f)	I have had regard to public health and safety in ensuring that take is carried out by a person licenced to use firearms.
Section 25(1)(g)	I have had regard to the public interest.
Section 25(1)h)	I have established whether the applicant is a suitable person to hold the authority, having regard to the matters mentioned in schedule 2 of the Administration Regulation in that they are the landowner of the area to be permitted, have a weapons licence (or access to an agent who has access to a weapons licence) and have no previous conviction under the Nature Conservation Act that is relative to the grant of this permit. The applicant has upheld conditions of previous permits and has submitted returns of operations in a timely manner.

Reasons for making the decision

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

I am satisfied of all the matters set out in section 186 of the Wildlife Management Regulation have been met and accordingly I was able to grant a DMP.

sch4p4(6) Personal informatio

Sally Egan
Delegate
Department of Environment & Heritage Protection

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Statement of reasons provided pursuant to section 33 of the Judicial Review Act 1991.

Applicant's name	Murweh Shire Council
Decision maker	Sally Egan, the delegate of the chief executive in accordance with the delegation given under section 141 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* (**the Act**)
Decision	Granted
Date of decision	28/07/2014

Introduction

On 22 July 2014, Murweh Shire Council lodged an application for lethal take of eastern grey kangaroo, common wallaroo, red kangaroo black kite on the Charleville Airport.

On 28 July 2014, after consideration of the material before me, I, Sally Egan under section 186, granted a permit and signed a notice of decision to Murweh Shire Council confirming my decision.

Relevant legislation

The *Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) Regulation 2006* **(the Wildlife Management Regulation)** chapter 3, part 4, division 2 governs the grant of damage mitigation permits (DMP) for animals as follows:

Section 182 provides that I may grant a damage mitigation permit for a least concern animal.

Section 184 provides that I may grant a DMP only for one or both of the following purposes:
(a) to prevent damage or loss caused, or likely to be caused, by a protected animal;
(b) to prevent or minimise a threat, or potential treat, to human health and wellbeing caused by a protected animal.

Section 186 provides that a DMP may be granted for threat to human health and wellbeing caused by a protected animal only if I am satisfied–

(a) there is, or may be, a threat to a person's health and wellbeing resulting from harm caused by the animal to the person; and
(b) action under the permit will not detrimentally affect the survival of the animal in the wild; and
(c) the proposed way of taking the animal is humane and not likely to cause unnecessary suffering to the animal; and
(d) if the animal is a protected reptile –
    (i) the reptile will be released to the wild; or
    (ii) a conservation plan for the reptile authorises the holder of a damage mitigation permit to keep the reptile under the permit or otherwise.

Section 25 of the *Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation 2006* **(the Administration Regulation)** provides that in considering an application I must have

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

regard to each of the following-

(a) The impact the activities that may be carried out under the DMP may have on the conservation of the cultural or natural resources of a protected area or native wildlife;
(b) The effect the grant of the authority will have on the fair and equitable access to nature, having regard to, in particular, the ecologically sustainable use of protected areas or wildlife;
(c) Any contribution the applicant proposes to make to the conservation of nature;
(d) Any relevant Australian or international code, instrument, protocol or standard or nay relevant intergovernmental agreement;
(e) The precautionary principle;
(f) Public health and safety
(g) The public interest
(h) Whether the applicant is a suitable person to hold the authority, having regard to the matters mentioned in schedule 2 of the Administration Regulation;
(i) Any recovery plan for wildlife to which the authority applies.

Pursuant to section 25(2) of the Administration Regulation I may have regard to anything else I consider appropriate to achieve the object of the Act.

Material on which the findings of fact were made

In arriving at my decision I had before me the following material for consideration:

- *Nature Conservation Act 1992,(*The Act), the Wildlife Management Regulation and the Administration Regulation 2006.
- Damage Mitigation Permit Application submitted 22 July 2014.
- Assessment completed by Bob Lynch (Ranger - Wildlife).
- Historical information and local knowledge.

Findings of fact

I assessed the application against the requirements of the Nature Conservation legislation and made the following findings of fact: Conditions are included in the findings of fact.

Legislative requirement	**Finding**
Section 182 of the Wildlife Management Regulation	The species the applicant has requested to be listed on the permit are species of least concern by virtue of Schedule 6 of the *Nature Conservation (Wildlife) Regulation 2006*
Section 186 of the Wildlife Management Regulation	I am satisfied that the animals are a threat, or potential threat, to human health and wellbeing due to the risk of collision at the aerodrome.
Section 186(a)	I am satisfied that the species of macropod at the Chinchilla Aerodrome can pose a significant threat to a person's health and wellbeing due to the risk of collision with light aircraft. Similarly the birds listed in the application are also a risk.
Section 186(b)	I am satisfied that action under the permit will not

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

	adversely affect the survival of the species in the wild because the animals are least concern wildlife and the numbers potentially taken are moderate.
Section 186(c)	I am satisfied that the proposed way of taking the animal is humane and not likely to cause unnecessary suffering to the animal. Take of wildlife is by shooting only and will result in the instantaneous death of the target animal. Recommended Condition – Macropods must be taken by centre-fire rifle in a way specified in the National Code of Practice for the Humane Shooting of Kangaroos and Wallabies for Non-commercial Purposes, approved by the Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council.
Section 186(d)	The animal is not a protected reptile.

Additional matters I have taken into account

Section 25(1)(a) of the Administration Regulation	The activities that may be carried out under the DMP are the lethal take of eastern grey kangaroo, brown goshawk, brown falcon, red kangaroo and black kite. I consider that the issue of this permit will have no impact on the conservation of the cultural or natural resources of a protected area or native wildlife due to the common nature of the species and the low numbers to be affected by the activities in the permit.
Section 25(1)(b)	There will be no effect from the grant of the authority have on the fair and equitable access to nature, having regard to, in particular, the ecologically sustainable use of protected areas or wildlife;
Section 25(1)(c)	There is no contribution the applicant proposes to make to the conservation of nature;
Section 25(1)(d)	N/A
Section 25(1)(e)	The grant of the permit has taken into account the precautionary principle.
Section 25(1)(f)	I have had regard to public health and safety in ensuring that take is carried out by a person licenced to use firearms.
Section 25(1)(g)	I have had regard to the public interest.
Section 25(1)h)	I have established whether the applicant is a suitable person to hold the authority, having regard to the matters mentioned in schedule 2 of the Administration Regulation in that they are the landowner of the area to be permitted, have a weapons licence (or access to an agent who has access to a weapons licence) and have no previous conviction under the Nature Conservation Act that is relative to the grant of this permit. The applicant has upheld conditions of previous permits and has submitted returns of operations in a timely manner.

Reasons for making the decision

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

I am satisfied of all the matters set out in section 186 of the Wildlife Management Regulation have been met and accordingly I was able to grant a DMP.

sch4p4(6) Personal inform

Sally Egan
Delegate
Department of Environment & Heritage Protection

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

Queensland Government

Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

LETHAL DAMAGE MITIGATION PERMIT ASSESSMENT

Project Ref: 294004	**Permit Ref:** WIMP14850914
Assessing Officer: Bob Lynch	
Activity Location: Charleville Airport Charleville Qld 4470 Lot/Plan: Lot 53 on SP253460	
Applicant/s Name and Address: Mr Philip Pfingst Charleville Qld 4470	
LGA: Murweh Shire Council	
Phone: 07 46568355 **Mobile:** sch4p4(6) Personal	**Fax no:** 07 46568399 **Email:** philip_pfingst@murweh.qld.gov.au
Company name (if applicable):	
Representative spoken with: Mr Philip Pfingst	
Property Inspected: ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No - Desktop assessment** ***If yes*** **Date:** **By:**	
Type of crop: Airport	**Variety**: Human Health & safety
Total property area: 416 hectares	
Total area under cultivation: N/A	

1. What damage is being experienced? Damage to aircraft by eastern grey and red kangaroos, Common Wallaroo, Black Kite

2. Is the damage extensive and throughout the crop or pasture? Damage occurs time to time. There has been an increase in wildlife numbers at the airport resulting in an increased risk to aircraft.

3. What was the financial loss suffered by the landholder's from wildlife visiting the crop or pasture last season? Loss could exceed $100,000 depending on damage to aircraft.

4. How was this loss determined?

5. What methods have been used to deter the wildlife from the crops/pasture? Vehicle sirens, horns, airfield mowing, bird frite

6. If only lethal methods have been employed, explain why no other methods have been used? Non – lethal methods are not effective and are more costly

7. What species of wildlife causes, or is likely to cause damage to the crop/pasture? Client has identified species in estimated numbers: eastern grey kangaroo, red kangaroo, common wallaroos and black kite

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

8. Has the landholder sought information on non-lethal methods of control? :

Yes

9. Does the landholder intend to utilise non-lethal controls in the future?:

Yes, if more effective non- lethal methods can be found.

10. Do the landholder's current management practices influence the wildlife visiting their crops/pasture i.e allowing fruit to ripen on the tree etc? :

No

11. For what quantity of wildlife species does the applicant request approval? :

20 – red kangaroo*(macropus rufus)*
20 – eastern grey kangaroo*(macropus giganteus)*
20 – common wallaroo (*macropus robustus*)
50 – Black Kite (*Milvus Migrans*)

12. Will the landholder advise EHP of the numbers of each wildlife being taken and accurately report these figures? Evidence from previous Returns:

Yes through discussions applicant has stated that he will advise EHP on the numbers taken.

13. Is this permit being sought in anticipation of current or potential damage?

Current damage

14. Does the landholder consider destruction of wildlife an effective means of control as opposed to deterring or exclusion?:

yes

OFFICE USE ONLY: To be completed by assessing officer

Is the wildlife listed as least concern? ☒ **Yes** ☐ **No**

What evidence is available to suggest that this process will impact UNSUSTAINABLY upon this species? (references)

With Macropods:
Will we go over 1% of the estimated population of the harvested species? /No

Quota used as at 08/01/2014	Central	Usage to date	Quota allocated for Central
Eastern grey kangaroo	43.33%	61697	142396
Common wallaroo	26.14%	15707	60098
Red kangaroo	28.41%	20437	71924

(NB: Numbers to be changed with each new application, the region; and please change date to real time, e.g. as at assessment date, for current up to date running quota for the Delegate.)

What method is proposed to be used to take the wildlife?

Suitable firearm

Is this proposed method to be used to take the wildlife inhumane or likely to cause suffering to the animal?:

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

The proposed take will be under the provisions of the National Code of practice for shooting kangaroos and wallabies
A copy of the Code was emailed to applicant 25/07/2014

Is there evidence that wildlife has been taken prior to this inspection and in the absence of a permit? No

Is there potential for damage to crops or pasture at the time of inspection?

N/A as an inspection was not carried out

What type of crop/pasture requires protection?

Airport runway area

Firearm licence details supplied? Yes

ASSESSING OFFICER: Bob Lynch

LOCATION: Toowoomba **PHONE:** 07 4688 1529

DATE ASSESSED: 23/07/2014

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED: ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO**

FOR PERIOD OF: 23/07/2014 to 22/07/2015

SPECIES AND NUMBERS (if different to application):

Discussions held with applicant 23/07/2014 on new agreed species and numbers
20 – eastern grey kangaroo(*macropus giganteus*)
20 – Common wallaroo(*macropus robustus*)
20 – red kangaroo (*macropus rufus*)
50 – Black kite (*milvus migrans*)

SIGNATURE OF ASSESSING OFFICER: submitted electronically by email Bob Lynch 25/07/2014

MANAGER, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT: Sally Egan

APPROVED: ☑ **YES** ☐ **NO**

SIGNATURE: sch4p4(6) Personal i

DATE: 28/7/2014

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Statement of reasons provided pursuant to section 33 of the Judicial Review Act 1991.

Applicant's name	Murweh Shire Council / Mr Neil Polglase
Decision maker	Frank Mills, the delegate of the chief executive in accordance with the delegation given under section 141 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* **(the Act)**
Decision	Granted
Date of decision	05/01/2015

Introduction

On 12 December 2014, Murweh Shire Council lodged an application for lethal take of commercial species of kangaroo on the grounds that they have been in high numbers at the High School, Cemetery, Golf Club and Hospital which appear to be resident there and fears for resident's personal safety.

On 05/01/2015, after consideration of the material before me, I, Frank Mills under section 186, granted a permit and signed a notice of decision to Murweh Shire Council / Mr Neil Polglase confirming my decision.

Relevant legislation

The *Nature Conservation (Wildlife Management) Regulation 2006* **(the Wildlife Management Regulation)** chapter 3, part 4, division 2 governs the grant of damage mitigation permits (DMP) for animals as follows:

Section 182 *provides that I may grant a damage mitigation permit for a least concern animal. The numbers of the kangaroo species in the wild, is not endangered by this permit.*

I am confident that the species are correctly identified, as they are common species, and distinctive in appearance. The people identifying theme for this permit are known to have experience by the assessment team.

Section 184 *provides that I may grant a DMP only for one or both of the following purposes:*
(a) to prevent damage or loss caused, or likely to be caused, by a protected animal;
(b) to prevent or minimise a threat, or potential treat, to human health and wellbeing caused by a protected animal.

I am considering this permit application on the grounds of (b) human health and wellbeing.

I have considered the impact of the residents of the town, specifically those in proximity to the hospital and nursing home, where people are likely to be loss mobile and feel more threatened by large kangaroos. There is a history of the aggressive males fighting, defending territory and breeding females. There are additional threats associated with ticks in the schools oval, affecting students, is also a consideration.

I also recognise the emotional stress expressed through the concerns have been expressed from the following stakeholders, Qld Police, Charleville High school,

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

Charleville Golf Club, Charleville Public Hospital, Charleville nursing home and Murweh Shire council.

Section 186 *provides that a DMP may be granted for threat to human health and wellbeing caused by a protected animal only if I am satisfied–*

(a) there is, or may be, a threat to a person's health and wellbeing resulting from harm caused by the animal to the person; and
(b) action under the permit will not detrimentally affect the survival of the animal in the wild; and
(c) the proposed way of taking the animal is humane and not likely to cause unnecessary suffering to the animal; and
(d) if the animal is a protected reptile –
(i) the reptile will be released to the wild; or
(ii) a conservation plan for the reptile authorises the holder of a damage mitigation permit to keep the reptile under the permit or otherwise.

Section 25 of the *Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation 2006* **(the Administration Regulation)** provides that in considering an application I must have regard to each of the following-

(a) The impact the activities that may be carried out under the DMP may have on the conservation of the cultural or natural resources of a protected area or native wildlife;
(b) The effect the grant of the authority will have on the fair and equitable access to nature, having regard to, in particular, the ecologically sustainable use of protected areas or wildlife;
(c) Any contribution the applicant proposes to make to the conservation of nature;
(d) Any relevant Australian or international code, instrument, protocol or standard or nay relevant intergovernmental agreement;
(e) The precautionary principle;
(f) Public health and safety
(g) The public interest
(h) Whether the applicant is a suitable person to hold the authority, having regard to the matters mentioned in schedule 2 of the Administration Regulation;
(i) Any recovery plan for wildlife to which the authority applies.

Pursuant to **Section 25(2)** of the Administration Regulation I may have regard to anything else I consider appropriate to achieve the object of the Act.

Material on which the findings of fact were made

In arriving at my decision I had before me the following material for consideration:

- *Nature Conservation Act 1992,(*The Act), the Wildlife Management Regulation and the Administration Regulation 2006.
- Damage Mitigation Permit Application submitted 08 December 2015.
- Assessment completed by Rodney Manthey (Wildlife Range – Toowoomba).
    - The assessment officer in this application has been a long term resident of Charleville and is aware of the situation, and locations to a greater detail then can be described in this application. His knowledge of the applicant's ability to identify species and manage the conditions authorised by this permit.

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

- Historical information and my knowledge and local knowledge.
    - My 26 years of experience in Natural Resource Management. Including knowledge of ecology and managing human/ wildlife interactions.
- Assessment of DMP numbers for the species in accordance with the *Nature Conservation (Macropod) Conservation Plan 2006.*

Findings of fact

I assessed the application against the requirements of the Nature Conservation legislation and made the following findings of fact: Conditions are included in the findings of fact.

Legislative requirement	Finding
Section 182 of the Wildlife Management Regulation	The species the applicant has requested to be listed on the permit are species of least concern by virtue of Schedule 6 of the *Nature Conservation (Wildlife) Regulation 2006.* The quota for the commercial species of kangaroo has been established, the impact of this authority will be minimal. I am confident that the species are correctly identified, as they are common species, and distinctive in appearance. The people identifying the kangaroos for this permit are known to have experience by the assessment team. That the density of kangaroos in the town has been confirmed through two surveys. There have been issues in other urban areas of Queensland, which have resulted in serious injuries from human interactions with kangaroos at lower densities in urban areas
Section 186 of the Wildlife Management Regulation	I am satisfied that the animals are a threat, or potential threat, to human health and wellbeing due to the reports of abnormal behaviour and high population density. Specifically the aggressive nature of the some males and the fact that they have established breeding territories over some parts of town. That ticks are being shed in grass areas which can affect students at the school.
Section 186(a)	In relation to these matters I have determined that, the threats are and risk is significant, with the density of kangaroos in this area being significant. Specifically; the descriptions of the kangaroo behaviour, seems to be outside the normal range of behaviours for a wild animal. I am also aware of other incidents in Queensland, where individual animals, in urban situation have caused serious injury to people
Section 186(b)	The population of Kangaroos of these three species are not endangered, they are listed as least concern species and the official population densities for the 2015, indicate that these numbers are unlikely to have an effect nationally, regionally. Locally there is likely to be an effect, but this may only be short term, and is the effect the permit is being issued for.

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

Section 186(c)	I am satisfied that the proposed way of taking the animal is humane and not likely to cause unnecessary suffering to the animal. I have experience with other methods of relocation and consider them too stressful, time consuming and ineffective, and therefore impractical for this situation. Take of wildlife is by shooting only and will result in the instantaneous death of the target animal. The Council is using professional shooters and under police supervision. The applicant is aware of the code of practice, and under this level of supervision I am confident the activity will be compliant. **Recommended Condition** – Macropods must be taken by centre-fire rifle in a way specified in the National Code of Practice for the Humane Shooting of Kangaroos and Wallabies for Non-commercial Purposes, approved by the Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council. That Qld Police are present and manage public safety. That area's where animals are taken are limited to the High school, Cemetery, Golf club and Hospital grounds as specified.
Section 186(d)	The animal is not a protected reptile.

Additional matters I have taken into account

Section 25(1)(a) of the Administration Regulation	The activities that may be carried out under the DMP are the lethal take of Eastern Grey Kangaroo, Wallaroo and Red Kangaroo. I consider that the issue of this permit will have no impact on the conservation of the cultural or natural resources of a protected area or native wildlife due to the common nature of the species and the low numbers to be affected by the activities in the permit. Other species are unlikely to be adversely affected as removal of these herbivores will reduce the overall grazing pressure on plants species, thereby reducing overall impact. The area is an urban zone and wildlife in general, are not likely to preferentially inhabit urban areas.
Section 25(1)(b)	There will be no effect from the grant of the authority have on the fair and equitable access to nature, having regard to, in particular, the ecologically sustainable use of protected areas or wildlife. While removal of the kangaroos from within the town is likely to reduce the density of kangaroos in this area, it is unlikely to directly or indirectly, removal all kangaroos from the town area.
Section 25(1)(c)	There is no contribution the applicant proposes to make to the conservation of nature;
Section 25(1)(d)	N/A
Section 25(1)(e)	The grant of the permit has taken into account the precautionary principle.
Section 25(1)(f)	I have had regard to public health and safety in ensuring that take is carried out by a person licenced to use

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP

	firearms and under police supervision.
Section 25(1)(g)	I have had regard to the public interest.
Section 25(1)h)	I have established whether the applicant is a suitable person to hold the authority, having regard to the matters mentioned in schedule 2 of the Administration Regulation in that they are the landowner of the area to be permitted,. Engaging professional shooters, who have a weapons licence (this work will done under Police supervision) and have no previous conviction under the Nature Conservation Act that is relative to the grant of this permit. The applicant has upheld conditions of previous permits and has submitted returns of operations in a timely manner.

Reasons for making the decision

I am satisfied of all the matters set out in section 186 of the Wildlife Management Regulation have been met and accordingly I was able to grant a DMP.

sch4p4(6) Personal information

Frank Mills
Delegate
Department of Environment & Heritage Protection

Released under RTI Act 2009 - EHP