APPENDIX D

Wildlife Hazard Management Plan

D1 Introduction

This Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (WHMP) has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of Appendix D.7 of the Phase 2 DCP. These requirements have been summarised in Table 15 below. A Wildlife Hazard Assessment (WHA) has been prepared as a separate document (ELA 2024d) to address the DCP requirements and is summarised in the following section.

Table 15: Appendix D.7 DCP requirements

Appendix D.16 DCP Requirement
Applications for the following uses within the 3 km and 8 km wildlife buffers must be accompanied with a Wildlife Hazard Assessment and Wildlife Management Plan that incorporates relevant mitigation and monitoring measures: • Agricultural produce industry • Agriculture • Aquaculture • Camping ground • Garden Centre • Intensive livestock agriculture • Intensive plant agriculture • Livestock processing industry • Plant nursery • Recreation facility (outdoor) • Recreation facility (major) • Recreational area • Sewage treatment plant • Waste or resource management facility • Waste or resource transfer station • Water storage facility.
Wildlife Hazard Assessment Reports must assess the wildlife attraction risk of the land use, the design of the building and ancillary works including proposed landscaping, water facilities (incl. stormwater infrastructure), waste management, and temporary risks associated construction activity.*
The Wildlife Management Plan must respond to the findings and recommendations of the wildlife hazard assessment.
Where monitoring is required to be undertaken in accordance with the Management Plan, copies of the report are to be submitted to the airport lessee company within 28 days of completion.
A waste management plan for the operation of the use must be submitted for the following uses within the 3 km, 8 km, and 13 km buffer: • Agriculture • Agricultural produce industry • Aquaculture • Camping Grounds • Eco-tourist facility • Food and Drink Premises • Garden Centre • Hotel • Intensive plant agriculture • Intensive livestock agriculture • Kiosk • Livestock processing industry • Plant Nursery • Recreation facility (outdoor) • Recreation facility (major)
Landscaping within the Enterprise Zone and Agribusiness Zone must comply with Appendix B: Western Sydney Aerotropolis Landscape Species List, except where the property is subject to biodiversity certification conditions or identified as one of the key government commitments.*

* ADDRESSED WITHIN THE WILDLIFE HAZARD ASSESSMENT (ELA 2024D).

D2 Background

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The study area is located immediately north of the Western Sydney International (Nancy-Bird Walton) Airport (WSI) and is within the 3 km wildlife buffer zone. In accordance with Section 4.19(2)(c) of the Western Parkland City SEPP, development consent must not be granted to relevant development within 13 km of the Airport unless the development will mitigate risk of wildlife to the operation of the Airport, for example by waste management, landscaping, grass, stormwater or removal of food. This WHMP has been prepared in conjunction with the WHA (ELA 2024d) which assessed the potential risk of wildlife attraction to the study area, identifying the highest risk species and providing an analysis of existing and proposed land use in relation to wildlife risk.

Bird and bat strike is a risk firstly for the safety of Airport operations, as well as a threat to biodiversity. There is a double incentive, and a statutory requirement, for all parties involved in development surrounding the WSI to minimise and manage the potential for wildlife hazards to occur. This report summarises the highest risk species, the types of wildlife habitat available or proposed in the subject land, and a plan for:

- Implementation and induction
- Management Actions (passive management, trigger responses and regular monitoring)
- Reporting requirements
- Review and adaptive management

A key challenge in managing wildlife risk is the inherent conflicts between Airport operations and other requirements of the Phase 2 DCP and Precinct Plan. This includes objectives to increase native vegetation under Connection to Country strategies, canopy targets, stormwater infrastructure and restoration of riparian corridors which, to some degree, can increase the attractiveness of wildlife habitat across a given site. It is not feasible to avoid wildlife habitat features altogether in the context of the site and its surrounding landscape. Landscaping, open waterbodies and vegetated riparian zones (VRZs) are essential in the context of this development for many reasons, not least of which include urban heat reduction, public amenity, stormwater management and supporting regional ecosystem health.

As such, while design measures across the Project have been implemented to reduce wildlife attractiveness, this WHMP provides additional support and assurance through a monitoring and reporting regime. This includes ongoing passive management actions, that will require collaboration between qualified ecologists, DPHI and NSW DCCEEW, and the WSI to effectively and humanely manage any real or anticipated wildlife risk for the life of the Project.

HIGHEST RISK SPECIES

Species risk rankings by guild or main functional group are presented in Table 16. A total of 30 high-risk species need to be considered for mitigation and monitoring. Mitigation and monitoring should be prioritised for the following high-risk groups and species:

- Flying foxes or Megabats (e.g. Grey-headed Flying-fox and Little Red Flying-fox)
- Waterbirds (e.g. Ibis and Masked Lapwing)

- Pigeons
- Large parrots (e.g. Galah, corellas, cockatoos)
- Waterfowl (e.g. Black Swan, grebes and duck species)
- Raptors (e.g. Wedge-tailed Eagle and Little Eagle)
- Owls (e.g. Masked Owel, Eastern Barn Owl)
- Australian Magpie
- Common Starling

The highest risk strike groups relevant to this development are the following with an extreme hazard ranking (ELA 2024d):

- **Megabats** (Grey-headed Flying-fox and Little Red Flying-fox)
- **Pigeons** (Rock Dove)
- **Ibis** (Australian White Ibis, Straw-necked Ibis)

Megabats (flying-foxes), are an extreme hazard species due to their large size and flocking behaviour and have several active camps in Western Sydney. These species are also the most recorded for strikes at the nearby Sydney Airport and Bankstown Airport. No flying-fox camps are currently known from or nearby the study area.

PROPOSED HABITAT TYPES

The study area contains existing habitat for birds in the form of native vegetation communities and farm dams. Additional habitat proposed under the Project that offers potential wildlife habitat includes:

- Cosgroves Creek riparian corridor (to be restored and managed under a VMP (ELA 2024c).
- Parkland Priority Areas, to be partially relegated and managed under a VMP (ELA 2024c).
- Street trees and on-lot landscaping (species selection and density in accordance with Appendix B of the DCP).
- Stormwater infrastructure in accordance with Sydney Water requirements. This includes stormwater basins, wetlands, bioretention basins and naturalised trunk drainage.
- Warehouse buildings and waste facilities, to be subject to a Waste Management Plan.

The locations of proposed wildlife habitat, in accordance with land use type, are presented in Figure 11.

Table 16: Summary of hazard rankings for common guilds/functional groups

Hazard Rank	No. of Species	Guilds/Functional Groups															
		Bush Birds	Corvids	Game fowl	Honeyeaters	Kingfishers	Megabats	Microbats	Owls	Parrots	Pigeons	Rails	Raptors	Swifts and Swallows	Waders	Waterbirds	Waterfowl
Extreme	**5**	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-
Very High	**3**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
High	**22**	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	2	-	-	6	7
Medium	**38**	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	4	7	3	2	4	2	-	6	2
Low	**35**	2	3	2	5	1	-	1	1	6	-	1	6	2	4	1	-
Negligible	**74**	45	1	-	12	2	-	8	1	-	1	-	-	3	1	-	-
Total	***177***	***51***	***10***	***2***	***17***	***3***	***2***	***9***	***8***	***16***	***7***	***3***	***12***	***7***	***5***	***15***	***10***

Table 17: Species examples per guild/function group

Guild/Functional Group	Examples
Bush birds	Fairy-wrens, Thornbills, Gerygones, Scrubwrens, Weebills, Treecreepers, Pipits, Whistlers, Robins, Starlings, Silvereyes, Pardalotes, Finches, Sparrows
Corvids	Australian Magpie, Ravens, Currawongs, Butcherbirds, Cuckoo-shrikes, White-winged Chough.
Game fowl	Australian Brush-turkey, Quails, Button-quails, Junglefowl
Gulls	Silver Gull
Honeyeaters	Wattlebirds, Spinebills, Noisy Miner, Noisy Friarbird, other Honeyeaters.
Kingfishers	Kookaburra, Sacred Kingfisher, other Kingfishers
Large flightless birds	Emu
Megabats	Grey-headed Flying-fox, Little Red Flying-fox
Microbats	Free-tailed Bats, Long-eared Bats, Wattled Bats, Little Forest Bat
Owls	Eastern Barn Owl, Southern Boobook, Tawny Frogmouth, other nightjars
Parrots	Cockatoos, Corellas, Galah, Cockatiel, Budgerigar, Lorikeets, Rosellas, other Parrots such as Swift Parrot
Pigeons	Rock Dove, Peaceful Dove, Bar-shouldered Dove, Wonga Pigeon, Crested Pigeon, Spotted Turtle-Dove, Common Bronzewing
Rails	Coots, Moorhens, Swamphens, Crakes, Rails.
Raptors	Wedge-tailed Eagle, other Eagles, Goshawks, Kites, Falcons, Kestrels, Hobbies.
Seabirds	Terns, Petrels
Swifts and Swallows	Welcome Swallow, Fairy Martin, Tree Martin, Fork-tailed Swift, Wood swallows, White-throated Needletail
Waders	Snipe, Stilts, Dotterel, Plovers, Sandpipers, Curlews
Waterbirds	Ibis, Herons, Egrets, Bitterns, Snipe, Darters, Pelicans, Cormorants, Spoonbills
Waterfowl	Ducks, Grebes, Swans

Figure 11: Proposed land use and habitat types (ELA 2024d)

D3 Implementation

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Proponent and/or nominated Project Manager is responsible for:

- Developing induction and training modules and records.
- Engaging a suitably qualified Ecologist(s) to complete monitoring works and reporting.
- Maintaining a record of monitoring and reporting.
- Notifying DPHI, WSI and/or the Ecologist of hazards and risks as they arise.

Site or building managers are responsible for:

- Implementing training and inducting all staff.
- Ensuring passive management actions are undertaken within their lot/building.
- Notifying the proponent, DPHI, WSI and/or the Ecologist of hazards and risks as they arise.

All staff, contractors and visitors are responsible for:

- Notifying the site/building manager of a management need or risk.
- Maintaining familiarity with the requirements of this Plan and the induction process.

INDUCTION AND TRAINING

All staff are to be aware of the potential wildlife hazards on site, and the contents of this WHMP. All contractors and building managers are to be aware of the level of wildlife risk on site, and must have completed an induction that includes:

- Roles and responsibilities.
- Passive, trigger and monitoring actions.
- An understanding of the risk ratings (Extreme, Very High, High, Medium, Low and Negligible). including what guilds and functional groups occur in each rating.
- Highest risk bird/bat species to consider on site.
- Lower risk but high strike species to consider.
- Reporting responsibilities.
- Injured or struck fauna procedures.

D4 Management Actions

The WHMP consists of the following management actions:

- **Passive management actions** (Table 18) – to modify habitats or other aspects of the environment to reduce the attractiveness of habitat for risk bird and bat species;
- **Trigger, response and action plan** (Table 19) – recommended actions triggered by wildlife presence or habitat use at any time during the Project life; and
- **Regular monitoring regime** (Table 20) – to monitor and record potential wildlife hazards on a regular recommended schedule.

Passive management is ongoing for the life of the Project and should be completed on a regular basis. The majority of management actions will depend on the severity of the wildlife risk, and would require input from an Ecologist, DPHI and WSI for appropriate future actions. Severe measures such as culling should only be considered as a last resort and it is expected that with a regular monitoring and trigger response cycle hazards can be identified early and culling can be avoided. Table 19 applies to triggers that may be observed during or outside of the scheduled monitoring activities.

Table 18: Passive management actions

Passive Management Type	Description	Recommended Schedule
Open space lawn management	Regular mowing/maintenance of open space lawns. Removal of clumping, fruiting or otherwise suitable foraging habitat in areas designated for open space lawn.	As required
Natural food supply management	Removal of fallen fruit from any fruiting native or exotic plants from public domain street tree, on-lot landscaping and native vegetation areas.	Twice monthly during peak fruiting/flowering season
Food waste management	Ensure all food waste generated by on-lot activities is managed appropriately, with closed bins emptied regularly to discourage scavengers (e.g. Ibis). All waste is to be taken off site.	Ongoing
Other waste management	Ensure waste is disposed of appropriately in accordance with the Waste Management Plan and bins and other waste storage facilities are maintained with closed lids or other suitable covering wherever practicable.	Ongoing

Table 19: Trigger, action and response plan (TARP)

Trigger	Justification / Notes	Immediate Action	Recommended Response
High-risk species More than 5 individuals of a high risk strike species (or guild) (Table 16) are observed using habitat on site. Excludes birds and bats flying over site.	Strike species or high risk birds and bats may occur on site and indicate a potential risk to Airport operations. This must be addressed early to avoid a potentially greater risk if left until the regular monitoring schedule.	• Consult with an Ecologist. Complete monitoring as per Table 20, if deemed necessary by qualified ecologist. • Monitoring to be tailored to species identified and its potential habitat usage.	Provide outcomes of monitoring in a report to WSI and DPHI as soon as practical. Consult with DPHI and qualified Ecologist to determine if further management or mitigation measures are required.
Megabat camp A Flying-fox camp (e.g. Grey-headed Flying-fox and/or Little Red Flying-fox) is established within the study area. This trigger also applies where fauna behaviours indicate a flying-fox camp may become established.	Grey-headed Flying-fox is a high risk species for wildlife hazard and is a threatened species under the BC Act and EPBC Act. Little Red Flying-fox is not a threatened species however is a high risk species.	• Record approximate numbers, behaviours and species (if possible). • Seek ecologist advice and liaise with DPHI.	Consult with Ecologist and DPHI. Following consultation, further mitigations may include: • Removal of food sources to deter camp establishment • Exclusion of individuals and translocation of camp
Megabat foraging Large numbers of Flying-fox individuals favour the study area for foraging habitat at night.	Flying-fox can forage over large distances (20 - 50 km in a night). If large numbers of Flying-fox are observed using the site, they may pose a risk to aircraft depending on the direction of their travel and number of individuals.	• Record approximate numbers, behaviours and species (if possible). • Seek ecologist advice and liaise with DPHI.	Following consultation with Ecologist and DPHI, additional measures such as removal of food sources may be required to deter Flying-fox foraging behaviours.
Breeding birds (colony-forming) Colony-forming birds establish a breeding cycle that relies on habitat in the study area.	Colony forming birds that are high-risk (e.g. Ibis) may require action to deter from site. Other lower-risk bird species may not require immediate action and ongoing monitoring may suffice. An Ecologist must assess the potential risk based on hazard rankings for individual species.	• Record approximate numbers, behaviours and species. • Seek ecologist advice and liaise with DPHI.	Following consultation with Ecologist, the following may be required: • Discouragement of colony using deterrents targeted to individual species. • Liaise with stakeholders to reduce availability of food supply such as and not limited to, in waste bins or landfill or by being hand fed.

Trigger	Justification / Notes	Immediate Action	Recommended Response
Breeding birds (waterfowl) Waterfowl are observed breeding in waterways or stormwater facilities (e.g. water retention basins) in the subject land.	The level of risk will be dependent on the size of the breeding flock, including mixed flocks (e.g. ducks, grebes and teals). For example, waterfowl may not require deterrence or relocation if few are observed and their behaviour is not likely to interfere with aircraft operations.	• Record species, habitat, breeding behaviour and numbers. • Seek ecologist advice.	If risk of breeding waterfowl is deemed high, the following may be required on advice from the Ecologist and/or DPHI: • Exclusion of waterfowl and protect ponds using Barriers such as bird balls or netting • Ongoing deterrence using a combination of methods such as light, noise and scare tactics such as predator kites.
Foraging resources (general) Suitable foraging resources for large or high-risk species may become present on site over time. Trigger where a significant increase in higher risk species presence is observed.	Landscaping and restoration across the study area will be undertaken progressively over a multi-year period. Colonisation of new flora and fauna may occur over this time, with changes to habitat and resources available to fauna. Foraging resources may include plant material such as fruits, or habitat on site may encourage small mammal, reptile or amphibian use which can offer a food resource for medium to large/carnivorous birds.	• Record species ID, location, habitat or resource (e.g. plant material, fruit or animal), observed behaviour and number of individuals • Consult with Ecologist regarding observations and carry out monitoring if necessary	Following consultation with Ecologist, the following may be required: • Removal of foraging resources • Revision of plant assemblage in landscaping or VMP works • Thinning of established vegetation Alternate measures may be deemed appropriate and necessary in accordance with adaptive management principles, based on the circumstance.
Foraging resources (waste) Human-produced waste onsite during construction or operation of the Project supports foraging behaviours of high risk and colony forming birds (e.g. Ibis).	Urban capable species, including but not limited to Ibis, are resourceful and may opportunistically forage waste receptacles for food. A Waste Management Plan is required to guide the management of waste on site for both the construction phase and operation of each warehouse.	• Record site or warehouse location, species, behaviour and numbers • Immediate removal of waste or securing of waste facilities • Ensure Waste Management Plan is in force and compliant	Consult with a qualified Ecologist in relation to incident, species and behaviours. Additional training for staff (construction and operation) or revision of the Waste Management Plan may be required.

MONITORING

The recommended monitoring regime includes surveys designed to establish baseline habitat usage and identify potential wildlife hazards and trends. All surveys should be conducted in survey seasons Autumn/Winter and Spring/Summer in the same month each survey event over consecutive years. The wildlife hazard monitoring plan is provided in Table 20. The following survey methods are recommended:

- **Diurnal (daytime) 2 ha, 20-minute point search bird survey** – morning and afternoon monitoring and data collection for a minimum of three consecutive days, in accordance with the timing in Table 20 for different habitat types.
- **Nocturnal (nighttime) bird surveys** – call back surveying and data collection for target bird species for a minimum of 2 hours over a minimum of two nights.
- **Diurnal Flying-fox** ground counts if deemed present (CSIRO 2011)
- **Deploy electronic recording devices** – Anabats, Songmeters and infrared motion detection cameras to record at target locations over a minimum of three nights.

Recommended survey points are to be developed by an Ecologist on site. In addition to the recommended monitoring schedule, targeted monitoring (and associated reporting) should be undertaken if and when strike species are identified on the site.

During monitoring, the Ecologist should make note of any general habitat type changes that may have occurred and potentially increased wildlife attraction. For example, a large storm event may cause the falling of branches and logs in wetland areas which provides new perching habitat for birds. Flooding events may result in long-term standing water in wetlands, which have been assumed to drain quickly, therefore changing the habitat type and availability. Findings are to be included in the monitoring reports. Consultation with DPHI and/or Western Sydney Airport would provide guidance on any additional approvals or actions required (e.g. removal or dispersal of changed habitat).

Table 20: Wildlife monitoring plan

Habitat Type	Monitoring Schedule	Data Collection	Objective
Street trees	Twice annual diurnal: • Bird survey • Flying-fox ground counts (if deemed present)	• Species • Number of individuals • Age for example chicks, juvenile or adult. Male or female • Habitat description (e.g. species, native, mature, flowering tree, establishment of any hollows, fissures, cracks or other habitat such as nests) • Behaviour (e.g. foraging, drinking, nesting, resting, flying, breeding behaviour, flock behaviour if flocking)	To establish and monitor usage of habitat. To establish and monitor increases or decreases in populations of higher risk species To use this data as part of an adaptive management approach to guide the modification of habitats and/or other mitigation measures. To determine if long-term monitoring and/or management of street trees is required or can be reduced, based on observations.

Habitat Type	Monitoring Schedule	Data Collection	Objective
On-lot landscaping	Twice annual diurnal: • Bird survey • Flying-fox ground counts (if deemed present)	• Species • Number of individuals • Age for example chicks, juvenile or adult. Male or female • Habitat description (e.g. species, native, mature, flowering tree, establishment of any hollows, fissures, cracks or other habitat such as nests) • Behaviour (e.g. foraging, drinking, nesting, resting, flying, breeding behaviour, flock behaviour if flocking)	To establish and monitor usage of habitat. To establish and monitor increases or decreases in populations of higher risk species To use this data as part of an adaptive management approach to guide the modification of habitats and/or other mitigation measures.
Warehouse (non-food) and offices	Twice annual: • Diurnal bird survey • Deploy anabats at targeted buildings	• Species • Number of individuals • Age for example chicks, juvenile or adult. Male or female • Habitat description (e.g. Building type, establishment of any building damage, creating access to habitat for resting or roosting, nests, bat maternity roost) • Behaviour (e.g. foraging, drinking, nesting, resting, flying, breeding behaviour, flock behaviour if flocking) • For Anabat data collection include call type (social or foraging)	To establish and monitor usage of habitat, focusing on waste storage areas and any evidence of roosting in buildings.
Stormwater basins	Diurnal bird survey: • Once prior to the commencement of pond construction. • Twice annually after construction of wetlands. Electronic surveys: • All electronic equipment deployed – 1 of each type at each waterbody. Survey locations to be at least one in each wetland.	• Species • Number of individuals • Age for example chicks, juvenile or adult. Male or female • Habitat description (e.g. species, native, mature, flowering tree, establishment of any hollows, fissures, cracks or other habitat such as nests) • Behaviour (e.g. foraging, drinking, nesting, resting, flying, breeding behaviour, flock behaviour if flocking)	To establish and monitor usage of ephemeral wetland habitat by birds and bats
Cosgroves Creek – waterway, vegetation riparian	Diurnal bird survey: • Once prior to the commencement of riparian restoration.	• Species • Number of individuals	To establish and monitor usage of more densely vegetated riparian habitat.

Habitat Type	Monitoring Schedule	Data Collection	Objective
corridor and/or VMP area	• Twice annually after commencement of riparian restoration. • Infrared motion detection camera – 1 in each corridor Survey locations to be at least one in each corridor.	• Age for example chicks, juvenile or adult. Male or female • Habitat description (e.g. species, native, mature, flowering tree, establishment of any hollows, fissures, cracks or other habitat such as nests) • Behaviour (e.g. foraging, drinking, nesting, resting, flying, breeding behaviour, flock behaviour if flocking)	To establish and monitor increases or decreases in populations of higher risk species To use this data as part of an adaptive management approach to guide the modification of habitats and/or other mitigation measures.
All native and fruiting exotic vegetation (including street trees and riparian zones)	Bat surveys: • Megabat diurnal ground counts if deemed present • Microbats – deploy Anabats within most optimal habitat Survey locations to be at least one in each corridor.	• Species • Number of individuals • Age for example juvenile or adult. Male or female • Habitat description (e.g., species, native, mature, flowering tree, establishment of any hollows, fissures, cracks or other habitat such as nests) • Behaviour (e.g., foraging, drinking, nesting, resting, flying, breeding behaviour, flock behaviour if flocking)	To establish and monitor flying-fox and microbat roosting and foraging behaviours. To use this data as part of an adaptive management approach to guide the modification of habitats and/or other mitigation measures.

D5 Reporting Requirements

ROUTINE REPORTING

Routine reporting ensures site managers are equipped with the information needed to adapt hazard management activities and the WHMP when required. The following reports are to be prepared:

- **Monitoring cycle reports** are to be provided to Western Sydney Airport within 28 days of each survey described in Table 20, in accordance with the DCP.
- **Annual report** describing all monitoring activities relating to wildlife hazard. This report must provide the details of monitoring activities completed in the current period and summarise all previously collected data from previous years so that trends can be identified.
- **Ad-hoc reporting** will be required where hazards are identified in accordance with the trigger, response and action plan. Reports must include the trigger for the action, who was notified (e.g., Western Sydney Airport, Ecologist and/or DPHI) and details of any follow-up actions within 2 weeks of the event.

An Ecologist may be required to provide input to the above reports. The proponent is responsible for engaging suitable staff to prepare the reports and must maintain a record of all reporting and activities.

Reporting of immediate wildlife hazard or strike is generally not expected to be required for wildlife observations within the subject land itself, being off-airport. The trigger response action plan should be implemented in this instance (Table 19).

INCIDENT REPORTING

If injured or struck fauna are observed in the subject land (regardless of cause), immediately notify the Project Ecologist and WIRES Wildlife Rescue. Even if deceased fauna is found on site, for example in the case of a Grey-headed Flying-fox, WIRES may still attend site to conduct a pup search (e.g. young may be alive nearby but unable to fly or still lactating).

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The successful implementation of this plan may not only be measured through the reported statistics or trends. In order to measure the effectiveness of this WHMP, key (primary) performance indicators to be adopted are:

- % of correctly filled wildlife management reports.
- % scheduled diurnal surveys completed.
- % staff training attendance or induction completion.
- % passive management actions completed on schedule.

If gaps in the performance indicators are identified, management measures and reporting requirements or templates should be reviewed as often as needed, at least on a 3-yearly review cycle (below) to ensure ongoing effectiveness.

D6 Review and Adaptation

To ensure this WHMP remains effective and is updated to fulfil future requirements, a review of the WHMP will be undertaken at a minimum every three years. If the results of regular monitoring justify a review prior to this due to the ineffectiveness of mitigation measures, the WHMP will be updated as required. Adaptive management measures will be implemented in consultation with a qualified Ecologist and necessary authorities (e.g. DPHI, WSI).

A major review is recommended be completed after 9-10 years and would involve complete revision and reissue of this document and the associated Wildlife Hazard Assessment (ELA 2024d). This includes reviewing the likelihood of bird species, updating risk assessments, strike statistics and adaptive management actions to address shortcomings or unsuccessful aspects of this WHMP. The review must also ensure compliance with all current legislation and strategic plans and adopt best-practice management actions and knowledge at the time of major review.

ecological AUSTRALIA
A TETRA TECH COMPANY

1300 646 131
www.ecoaus.com.au