

**From:** Cr. Simon Richardson [ ]  
**Sent:** Friday, 5 May 2017 10:37  
**To:** Committee, EC (SEN)  
**Subject:** Re: Inquiry into shark mitigation and deterrent measures - Questions taken on notice and proof hansard

Hi Chrisitne. I have the read the Hansard record and support their accuracy other than one aspect which could be misconstrued.

My quote, "We used gyrocopters, which has not been talked about—that is another issue for us. For us, helicopters are a very expensive kind of silliness really, as far as what they can do and the impact they have on everybody else, so Council funded it ourselves—because it is unlawful to use gyrocopters as CASA do not consider themselves legitimate aircraft, although the rest of the world does." implies Council knowingly conducted themselves unlawfully. For the record, we hired a gyrocopter without the knowledge it was able to be used for surveillance. When we found out we desisted." WE certainly believe it should be made lawful, and this was the point I was attempting to make. They are cheaper and more effective, which was why Council wished to use them for surveillance purposes.

I hope this clarifies this statement.

Regards, Simon