

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ECONOMY AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Wildlife Roadstrike in Victoria

Bendigo – Wednesday 6 August 2025

MEMBERS

Georgie Purcell – Chair

Richard Welch – Deputy Chair

John Berger

Katherine Copsey

Moirra Deeming

Bev McArthur

Tom McIntosh

Evan Mulholland

Sonja Terpstra

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Gaelle Broad

Georgie Crozier

David Davis

David Ettershank

Michael Galea

Renee Heath

Sarah Mansfield

Rachel Payne

WITNESSES

Rebecca Cook, Head, Prevention, and

Mhairi Roberts, Policy and Advocacy Manager, RSPCA Victoria.

The CHAIR: I declare open the Legislative Council Economy and Infrastructure Committee's public hearing for the Inquiry into Wildlife Roadstrike in Victoria. Please ensure that mobile phones have been switched to silent and that background noise is minimised.

I would like to begin this hearing by respectfully acknowledging the Aboriginal peoples, the traditional custodians of the various lands we are gathered on today, and I particularly welcome any elders or community members who are here today to impart their knowledge of this issue to the committee or who are watching the broadcast of these proceedings. I also welcome any other members of the public watching via the live broadcast.

To kick off, we will just have committee members introduce themselves. Do we still have Moira on the screen? No, we do not have Moira. We will go to Gaelle.

Gaelle BROAD: Hi. I am Gaelle Broad, Member for Northern Victoria.

Richard WELCH: I am Richard Welch, Member for North-East Metro.

The CHAIR: Georgie Purcell, Member for Northern Victoria.

John BERGER: John Berger, Southern Metro.

The CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you so much for appearing before us today. All evidence taken is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided by the *Constitution Act 1975* and further subject to the provisions of the Legislative Council standing orders. Therefore the information you provide during this hearing is protected by law. You are protected against any action for what you say during this hearing, but if you go elsewhere and repeat the same things, those comments may not be protected by this privilege. Any deliberately false evidence or misleading of the committee may be considered a contempt of Parliament.

All evidence is being recorded and you will be provided with a proof version of the transcript following this hearing, and then transcripts will ultimately be made public and posted on the committee's website.

For the Hansard record, could you both please state your full names and the organisation you are appearing on behalf of.

Mhairi ROBERTS: Sure. Mhairi Roberts, Policy and Advocacy Manager at RSPCA Victoria.

Rebecca COOK: Rebecca Cook, Head of Prevention, RSPCA Victoria.

The CHAIR: Wonderful. We now welcome your opening comments but ask they are kept around 10 to 15 minutes to ensure plenty of time for discussion.

Visual presentation.

Rebecca COOK: Sure. Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to appear today. We would like to start by acknowledging the hard work of the many dedicated Victorians who prioritise the welfare of wild animals hit by cars in their efforts to rescue and care for them. We were sitting behind the carers just now, so it was pretty obvious the work they put into it.

RSPCA Victoria is a non-government, community-based charity working to prevent cruelty to animals by actively promoting their care and protection. The RSPCA is Victoria's leading and most trusted animal welfare charity. We recognise wildlife road strike as a serious and significant animal welfare and public safety issue. We advocate for the implementation of strategies to avoid adverse animal welfare impacts caused by human activities. We believe humans have a moral responsibility to seek assistance wherever possible for individual wild animals who are suffering.

If you could move to the next slide, thank you. The scale of wildlife hit by cars in Victoria is significant and increasing. Estimates put the number of wild animals being killed and injured on Australian roads at more than 10 million per year and at least in the tens of thousands in Victoria. Sadly, this is likely an underestimation of the true scale of the problem. Colliding with a vehicle can cause an animal to experience significant fear, pain and distress and, in the majority of cases, death. For those animals who do not die immediately, they may suffer a painful and protracted period, slowly succumbing to their injuries, starvation or being predated on.

The majority of people who are on the ground rescuing and rehabilitating injured animals are everyday Victorian volunteers who care deeply about wildlife and want to prevent or alleviate their suffering. Other agencies also respond or assist with road strike cases, such as Victoria Police and local councils. Additionally, Victorian veterinarians often provide their services free of charge, both as a public service and due to their obligations to alleviate the suffering of any animal presented to them.

If we could move to the next slide. Road strike is a concern for public safety. We thank Victoria Police for providing us with the data for their traffic incident system for our submission, which shows 749 collisions with wildlife causing injury to a person in the last five years. This data does not capture the thousands of incidents where no person is harmed but an animal is. We highlight these figures to note the costs of wildlife collisions are being borne by the Victorian public through risks to their personal safety, healthcare costs, emergency response assistance, car insurance premiums and vehicle repairs, and in addition the significant business and personal contributions of wildlife organisations, volunteers and veterinarians.

Next slide, please. Our submission highlights 18 recommendations to begin to address this pressing issue. We have summarised these into three key takeaway priorities, focusing on prevention but also addressing key impacts. The first: due to the complexity involved with wildlife road strike requiring expertise and coordination to be effective with limited resources, we recommend a reference group with key stakeholders to be set up to guide urgent priority actions. Secondly, our current laws are outdated and lack provision for wildlife road strike. We recommend legislative amendments to improve protections for animals – for example, amending the *Road Safety Act* to require motorists to render assistance to animals regardless of the ownership status of the animal. Three, we call for financial support and standardised training across the sector and a centralised response system to enable the public to report incidents easily.

Next slide, please. A cross-sectoral reference group is needed to ensure urgent priorities are addressed in this complex space, particularly establishing a centralised database to inform our understanding of the scope of this problem, where mitigation is required and what tools will be best suited to a particular area and species.

Next slide, please. Effective mitigation strategies are urgently needed. This must include solutions we know work, along with those recommended from the reference group. This could include overpasses and underpasses in conjunction with fencing designed with the impacted species in mind. Further research into emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence animal detection systems linked to a variable message sign, is needed – such as recently reported on by the University of Sydney and Queensland University of Technology in Queensland for cassowaries, as you can see here. Another mitigation strategy is ensuring developments consider impacts on wildlife in the first instance, including at the landscape level. We know roads fragment habitats, and land clearing – aside from being a welfare problem in its own right – can result in roadside habitat often becoming one of the remaining sources of shelter and food for wildlife. Preventing this from happening in the first instance is by far the safest option for both animals and road users.

Next slide, please. Effective mitigation will also require public education around immediate risks and misconceptions, such as high-risk times of the day, along with awareness of any new resources they can use to report injured animals, such as an app and a single phone number for use across the state. Market research conducted by Verian on behalf of RSPCA Victoria found only one in five people self-report as definitely knowing what to do if they hit wildlife with their car. This research also found that 78 per cent of people would be supportive of an app to report incidents, with 75 per cent saying they would use it.

Final slide, thanks. Finally, bolstering the response to wildlife road strike is key to protecting wildlife welfare. This includes immediate funding to support those currently responding to the crisis on our roads but also funding for larger projects, such as the cross-sectoral reference group and the development of a fully centralised reporting and dispatch system to ensure a singular step for the public. Standardised training across the sector and for any agency involved in wildlife response is needed to promote positive welfare outcomes for wildlife.

RSPCA would also support the proposed \$2 levy on car registrations to help fund both the immediate and future financial requirements to address this complex issue. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you so much. We will go to questions. We will start with Ms Broad.

Gaelle BROAD: Thank you very much for appearing. I am just interested, with the size of Victoria – we heard about places like the Netherlands, which I think is a sixth of the land size or something like that. You have featured overpasses on the slides, and we have heard about other things like virtual fencing, but there are question marks over the data. With the size of Victoria and the amount of physical infrastructure that is required, given that it is road strike and we are talking about vehicles, is there any technology or anything you are seeing that could be put on a vehicle which might be more achievable than physical infrastructure everywhere? The ShuRoo, I know you said there are question marks over that. What are you aware of? We have heard about AI detection technology. What are you aware of that could be fitted to cars?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I am happy to talk to it. We do know that there is research that is considering whether there is the ability to have alerts in-car, but I think it is very much in the super early stages of being looked into. I think there really is a piece here around investing in further research, because there are novel technologies. That report that Bec spoke about on using the AI variable signage with the cassowaries up in Queensland was only reported on last week, so there definitely is research being undertaken in this space. Acknowledging that it is complex – there are a lot of roads around Victoria – obviously not one solution is going to be possible. It is going to take a lot of different solutions. That is why we think by having a reference group where people can come together and make sure that everyone knows what research is available and what research is needed we can find the most appropriate mitigations for particular areas. I think as well it really speaks to knowing where the hotspots are and having a really good database that has that information in it so that you can prioritise where you might put particular mitigations based on that, and so you can prioritise those really high-risk areas as well.

Rebecca COOK: We have also documented in here, in one of our tables in our submission on page 19, in addition to the in-vehicle warnings, there are trials with phone apps that would obviously work as well, regardless of where you are, that are based on GPS data and can monitor those hotspots.

Gaelle BROAD: You talked about development. We have heard previously about the need to consider wildlife in that, and you talked about preventing that happening. But what does that mean? What can be done when you are trying to balance those objectives practically?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I think it is considering planning at a landscape level rather than just at the development level, understanding what roads are already there and where the habitat is located and ensuring that you are not fragmenting that habitat further. It could also include, where it is possible, putting in place some of these things, like over and underpasses where there might be appropriate fencing and that type of thing, as part of the development. I think that is really important. Understanding what species might be in those areas will also factor into the type of mitigations that might be needed. I mean, we have seen this a lot with developments in the past where I guess they have not looked at the landscape level and you see instances of even just landlocking of kangaroos. I think it is really about taking a step back to look at what the impact is likely to be, how it can be developed in a way that is going to minimise the impact on animals and, where there has to be an impact, how you can mitigate some of those impacts.

Rebecca COOK: And I would just add that within our recommendations, recommendations 15 and 16 look at reviewing some existing guidelines – the *Fauna Sensitive Road Design Guidelines*, which I believe are quite old now, and also the *Living with Wildlife Action Plan*, and looking at how those might embed some planning information.

Gaelle BROAD: Yes. I am just interested, and I guess I have mentioned it earlier today too, but talking to residents that have been here for 70 years, they indicated that it was rare to see a kangaroo in the area. Now, with some of the population numbers we have seen – the government does surveys, and they indicate about 2.4 million kangaroos and about 500,000 in Loddon Mallee. Others have questioned whether or not that is accurate, but I am aware some people feel some of these tools to reduce wildlife road strike might be putting a bandaid on a bigger issue. What are your thoughts on the numbers in Victoria at the moment? I have spoken to some people who feel it has been set up to fail, like the system of managing wildlife. What are your thoughts or insights on how the government is managing wildlife in Victoria at the moment?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I suppose that is a very broad question. I mean, in terms of kangaroo numbers, I would say that the government does run population surveys, and our view would be that they need to be run frequently and in an ongoing manner so that we can continue to understand the population across the state as well. I would say that we do not actually do that for a lot of other species either, so there would be some species that are endangered that we would have a really good idea of how low the numbers are. But for other common species it is not something that is done regularly, so we would have to use proxy data to have an idea of population. I am thinking in terms of authority to control wildlife permits and other data as a proxy measure. I suppose it is a little bit hard to answer such a broad question. It is very species dependent. It depends on where animals are, whether they are in national or state parks; how they are managed; and what their status is – are they native or introduced species as well?

Gaelle BROAD: Can I –

The CHAIR: Yes, one more.

Gaelle BROAD: Well, I will just be very quick. What are you seeing or hearing, because I hear that deer are spreading across the state a bit, and there have been wombats increasing a lot too. Just across other species, what are you aware of, what changes?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I mean, deer are really problematic in terms of how they are managed in Victoria. On one hand, they are an introduced species that are protected under the *Wildlife Act*, and on the other hand, we have a deer management strategy that is trying to reduce their numbers. So I think deer are a really difficult species, because there is a conflict in terms of how we are managing them, in terms of having a sustainable population available for hunting, but then also trying to mitigate the damage that deer cause to habitat, which obviously then has an impact on other native species as well in terms of habitat destruction. So I think they are really problematic in terms of there not being a clear management outcome for that introduced species, and I think that makes it really difficult.

In terms of wombats, I think there is a system available for their control if it is demonstrated that they are causing damage, so there is an authority to control wildlife permit. In terms of numbers of wombats at a landscape level, it is not my area of expertise to comment on that.

Rebecca COOK: Nor mine.

Gaelle BROAD: That is fine. Thank you.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Ms Broad. Mr Welch.

Richard WELCH: Thank you. Chair. I would like to go back to the presentation. If you could just think about the second or third page in, you had a couple of really interesting stats I just want to ask you about regarding something like 94 per cent of deaths being within 100-kilometre zones and 80 per cent being in 80-kilometre zones. Where is that? I am presuming you are talking about animal deaths here, not human deaths.

Mhairi ROBERTS: No, I think that is Victoria Police data. So that relates to –

Richard WELCH: So that is human deaths, not animals?

Mhairi ROBERTS: Yes. So human fatalities and human injuries through speed.

Richard WELCH: Okay. I thought maybe that you had access to some special data about where these road strikes were happening. Okay. I will move on. One of your recommendations here is to develop a centralised reporting database to monitor wildlife road strike incidents and mitigation infrastructure and tools. I think there will be near universal agreement around that. I want to ask a quick question. At the moment the people who are at the centre of that are Wildlife Vic. How responsive and how effective do you feel they are in this role? Would you have any constructive input or observations where you think they could work better, especially with the rescue community?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I do not think we would provide any commentary on that. I would say, though, that they are the largest organisation that provides this service across the state. However, they are not the only organisation. Thinking of it from, I suppose, a road user perspective, it does make it really difficult. There is not

one point of call for people that might be involved in a collision with animals in terms of one number to call, one app to use. There is no government-facilitated avenue to help support that either. I think in an ideal world what we would really love to see is having one app where people can report that they have hit an animal. That app would also collect this data in terms of where all these incidents are happening, the hotspots, and we would hope that that would connect through to the appropriate wildlife service that could help then assist in that particular case. That is what we would hope would be a really great mechanism. And other organisations feeding into that app would be how we would see that ideally working. Obviously we do not think we should reinvent the wheel, but there needs to be one single source of truth where all that information can be pulled together. I do not know if you want to add anything to that.

Rebecca COOK: No, I think that is –

Richard WELCH: You are sort of semi-adjacent – you are a good observer of the phenomenon, those who are at the coalface. Do you have any observation as to why – you are right, we have got four or five groups and four or five databases and lots of different coordinators and things like that. What is your sense of why a sort of centralisation has not happened naturally? What are the obstacles?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I think it has just been a lack of agreement from all the stakeholders involved. I think that is why. I know there have been round tables in the past where everyone has been brought together, but I think just a lack of agreement from stakeholders has not seen that achieved. I think there is really a great role for government here to take the lead in this and to, I suppose, help facilitate that and potentially coordinate that to see that happen.

Rebecca COOK: I suppose that is why we have recommended this cross-sectoral working group, because we see that there are lots of different stakeholders in this area, which is also probably why organically things have grown.

Mhairi ROBERTS: I think when we are talking about that group, we are talking about having those that are responsible for development and planning in terms of road safety regulation and that type of thing. We are not just talking about having the people that are on the ground sit on that. It is really about having a really holistic view.

Richard WELCH: Do you think there is any risk, though? Look, I have got no quibble with it – yes, there are many factors, and there is no one silver bullet, and we should look at this holistically. But do you think there is any danger that that is biting off too much at once, it is too ambitious – that we should go, ‘Well, actually we can cut out a segment. We can fix the database. Let’s start there. Or we could fix this and start there.’ Is there a path of least resistance into the problem?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I think that is where I guess we were thinking that group could start to prioritise. There probably will be some low-hanging fruit, but I think it really needs those experts to come together and set those priorities so that we can be effective.

Richard WELCH: You said earlier that they have not been able to come to agreement. I am not expecting you to name names, but what is the nature of the things they are not agreeing on?

Mhairi ROBERTS: Oh, gosh. It has been a while since I have been to a round table. Yes, look, I am not sure what the specifics are. I just know that that is what I have also heard from other regulators in terms of just a lack of agreement to move forward.

Richard WELCH: If at any point before the inquiry is over, if you do find out what they are, could you let us know? Because we are here to find solutions, so it would be very helpful for us to know what the obstacles are, if we can decode them in some way.

Mhairi ROBERTS: Yes. I think, really, it is just hard not having one peak body representing. You have got a lot of individuals, because you have both the organisation level and then the carer level as well. I think there are just a lot of different views in terms of how things should be done, and I think that just makes it really difficult.

Richard WELCH: And the reason I am asking this is because what is going through my mind is: if we get a peak body in, will there be rebel organisations jumping out because of, you know, ‘You can’t tell us what to do’ sort of independent –

Rebecca COOK: I think that is why the education piece is important and starting with a base level of education: ‘Here’s the number to call’ – there is one central number, there is one app. Making it really simple for people and setting a ground level of awareness I think would probably be the way you would do it.

Mhairi ROBERTS: And being government-led with support from individuals and groups and having that coordinated function I think would help alleviate any differences of opinion in terms of then how things are managed on the ground as well.

Richard WELCH: That centre of gravity. Yes. Thank you, Chair. Thank you very much.

The CHAIR: Thanks, Mr Welch. I will pick up from there. Thank you so much for your great submission and presentation. I know RSPCA is really familiar with animal protection work across the board and there are a range of pieces that are ongoing and Bills that we are waiting for. But do you think that the government is somewhat complacent or almost expects this work from the volunteer community and perhaps does not realise what goes into it?

Rebecca COOK: I do not think we could really speak on behalf of the government.

Mhairi ROBERTS: No, but I think we would say that we know that wildlife carers and volunteers contribute a significant amount of their time and money into doing this work, and we have had many conversations in the past with vets who are darting animals that have been injured about the lack of resources and support to do that work. So we definitely acknowledge that it is a really under-resourced area and an area that could be better supported.

The CHAIR: Yes, of course. And that is not an attack on them; it is just the impression that I am getting. This of course comes from the ground that RSPCA is obviously more organisational-focused and that there might not be an understanding or a realisation because this has been the way that it has worked for so long and it is clearly falling apart and they are struggling with retention and funding and being able to attend cases, which of course has human impacts as well, and the trauma of that is significant. What can the government do to improve the sustainability of the people who are responding to this work?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I think providing those supports would really help. As you would have seen through our submission and our presentation as well, we are supportive of the proposal to have a levy on car registrations to provide that pool of funding that could help support them. And I suppose there is a piece here around having the mitigations in place to try and reduce the number of collisions with animals, because we know the number of collisions is increasing as we have urban spread and because of burnout the number of rehabilitators is also reducing. So I think we are reaching a critical point where there need to be some supports put in place and some intervention, but also not losing sight of mitigating the problem in the first place so that we are actually reducing the workload too. But we see, I suppose, things like burnout, which we know is an issue in our own shelters as well, and it is really important that there are mental health supports available as well as tackling the issues that they are facing in terms of resourcing.

Rebecca COOK: And I think training and ensuring that there is some consistent training around the issues that the carers who were before us were talking about, so that they have the expertise, they know what to do in certain situations and they have had the training, because obviously for us, animal welfare is the key outcome.

Mhairi ROBERTS: Similarly for VicPol – I would say they can play a role in this space, but I think that they also need support and training to be able to effectively euthanise animals. I think that probably varies across the force in terms of their ability to do that.

The CHAIR: Leaning into the mitigation strategies to reduce wildlife road strike, of course there are things that we can do in terms of infrastructure and technology and new signage. But is there anything that RSPCA identifies that could be added into legislation to even sooner pre-empt some of these situations that are occurring?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I think the immediate one that comes to mind would be a minor amendment to the *Road Safety Act* requiring people to render assistance to animals. The way it is currently written it only requires that where the animal is property, so we think that that is an amendment, and I think that would go hand in hand. I suppose the carrot-and-the-stick approach would be to also provide an easy way for people to report, so require them to stop and then have an easy app or one phone number so that they can report that. I think that is one avenue. We know as well that there is an animal care and protection Bill that is being drafted.

Under our current legislation, the *Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act*, there is quite an old code for wildlife rehabilitation, so we think that there is an opportunity under new legislation to have some regulations developed that could sit under that as well that would be more modern and provide some clearer guidelines for rehabilitation of animals. We do have concerns that if animals are found on the roadside, particularly orphaned animals, then finding appropriate places to return them to the wild is sometimes problematic because we do not want them put too close back to where they were found because they could become another statistic.

But also the *Wildlife Act* is another opportunity, we think, for changes. We do not think it really covers this issue particularly well. The *Wildlife Act* just had its 50th birthday, so it is getting pretty old now. That is something that we would love to see the government continue – the review that was started a few years ago – and have some transparency around that in terms of releasing the expert advisory panel’s report on that in terms of the issues that they found, because they did quite an extensive consultation where they spoke to a range of people in the sector about the concerns they had with the legislation, and then seeking the government’s response to that and what they think the areas are that they could progress and help to modernise that as well.

Rebecca COOK: There is also the ecosystem in decline –

The CHAIR: Oh, yes. That one is very late.

Rebecca COOK: We have not seen that report come out yet either, which might also provide some further advice.

The CHAIR: Yes, fantastic. On top of the *Road Safety Act*, one of the things that has been brought to my attention is that there is no real consideration for native animals in planning laws. Of course we have heard today that a lot of this road strike and road trauma is coming from habitat destruction and dispersal from that. Do you see an opportunity to incorporate animals in planning laws so that we can be proactive instead of reactive? Is that something the RSPCA has explored?

Mhairi ROBERTS: Yes. I cannot say I am particularly familiar with planning legislation, but I think any mechanism that can include consideration of animals where there is new development, particularly through the growth corridors where we know that is where the hotspots are through the north, I think would be really beneficial to make sure that, as we said before, some of those things in terms of habitat fragmentation, how close roads are being built to national parks and state forests and that type of thing are really vital.

The CHAIR: Just one final one from me. On the amendment to the *Road Safety Act* about stopping and rendering assistance, of course this would mean a range of different things to different people depending on what their qualifications are. But do you find that in most circumstances members of the public do want to help with this; they just do not have the education or awareness of knowing what the right thing to do is if they harm an animal or see a harmed animal?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I would say it is quite difficult. I have had conversations with other animal advocacy and wildlife groups, and even amongst that cohort it was not clear to us where people should go, what apps are already available and what information is available. I would say it is quite difficult now. You can go on the government’s website, and there is a tool where you can put in your location. But it spits out a list of numbers and organisations that you would then need to directly contact yourself. It is not even a one-step process, it is a multistep process that if you hit an animal you have to go through. It is just not easy for people to be able to find that information. And we know that static signage around the state, I think as you mentioned earlier, has multiple numbers. It varies depending on your location, so it does make it really difficult. I think we need to make it really easy for people to be able to report, to be able to get help, and I think we need to educate them. I think they need to go hand in hand.

Rebecca COOK: And I think while we do not know people's attitudes particularly – we have not surveyed them particularly on, 'Would you stop and help injured wildlife?' – we do know that 75 per cent of people in our survey said that they would use an app to report injured wildlife. So that is a good statistic, I think.

The CHAIR: Yes, fantastic. That is all from me. We have not had Mrs Deeming back on the screen, have we? Well, unless members have any follow-up questions –

Richard WELCH: I have one, very quick.

The CHAIR: Yes, of course.

Richard WELCH: I will be very quick.

The CHAIR: We have got the time to do it, and then Bec can go to *Mamma Mia!*

Richard WELCH: You can give it a short, sharp minute. A lot of the witnesses have brought up that we should incorporate it into planning. I am just wondering, has anyone done the other side of that same query – so what is the cost? Is there any consideration of – it is all very well to say that, but how much is that going to cost to developers, add to the price of housing et cetera?

Mhairi ROBERTS: I mean, I cannot speak to cost, but I think there is precedent in terms of the authority to control wildlife system where developers know they are going to impact – particularly kangaroos tend to be the common one – and that they need to develop a kangaroo management plan. I think there is already, particularly in the urban growth corridors, an understanding that there is a requirement to consider wildlife and having to have a management plan. I would say, though, the end result of that is often culling, because the development takes precedent in most cases. Sometimes mitigations are put in place. I think in that respect it is already considered, but not in terms of roads. I think it is probably an area that could be expanded upon. There are guidelines already in place for how to develop those plans.

Richard WELCH: So it is not adequately covered by environmental assessments or anything like that?

Mhairi ROBERTS: No, not to my knowledge.

Rebecca COOK: We could take it on notice and see what we can do.

Richard WELCH: Thank you.

The CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you so much. That is all from us. Thank you so much for coming along and joining us in Bendigo as well. We really appreciate it.

That concludes the public hearing, and we will have a quick break.

Witnesses withdrew.