



1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 120/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Golden Mile Loopline Railway Society
Postal address: Po Box 2024 Boulder WA 6432

1.3. Property details

Property: Lot 488 on Plan 39619
Lot 489 on Plan 39620
Lot 4868 on Plan 39621
Colloquial name: Golden Mile Loopline

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
5		Mechanical Removal	Building or Structure

2. Site information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description	Clearing Description	Vegetation Condition	Comment
Rehabilitated native vegetation comprising Eucalyptus salmonophloia, E. woodwardii, E. transcontinentalis, Acacis sp, spinifex, Atriplex nummularia	As above through highly degraded, previously mined areas	Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery 1994)	Area to be cleared is subject to significant historical mining activity

3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

(a) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.

Comments Proposal is consistent with this Principle

CALM advise that no information was available to make an assessment against this Principle. However, land is formerly mine-rehabilitated area, surrounded by residential development and other mining activities. Therefore, there is unlikely to be a high level of biological diversity.

Methodology CALM advice, Desktop assessment, Site visit.

(b) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of, a significant habitat for fauna indigenous to Western Australia.

Comments Proposal is consistent with this Principle

CALM advise that there is likely to be minimal impact of clearing on fauna habitat, given degraded nature of site.

Methodology CALM Threatened and Priority Fauna Database

(c) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, significant flora.

Comments Proposal is consistent with this Principle

The Land Degradation Report (Department of Agriculture DAWA) indicates that 'the alignment traverses both disturbed mining areas and some areas of regeneration'. CALM Goldfields Region states 'Area has had

significant disturbance in the past'. The regeneration areas were established for dust suppression and there is a very low likelihood of Declared Rare and Priority Flora occurring within the notified areas. There appears to be a low probability of the proposed clearing to be in variance with Principle (c).

Methodology CALM Threatened Flora Data Management System (DEFL)
CALM herbarium Specimen Collection Database (WAHerb)

(d) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises the whole or a part of, or is necessary for the maintenance of a significant ecological community.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

CALM advise there are no know occurrences within 10km of the site. There appears to be a low probability of the proposed clearing to be in variance with Principle (d).

Methodology CALM Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) Database.

(e) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is significant as a remnant of native vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

Highly disturbed landscape that has been subject to mining activity. Much of the current vegetation has been purposely planted. The LGA has near 100% of its area currently vegetated. The Coolgardie Bioregion has approximately 98.5% of its native vegetation remaining and the Medium Woodland; salmon gum and Goldfields blackbutt vegetation association has near 100% of its pre-European distribution remaining.

Methodology Desktop Study using DoE GIS themes 'Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia EA Oct 2000' & 'Pre-European Vegetation DA Jan 2001'.

(f) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

Desktop study identifies no watercourses or wetlands in area of proposal

Methodology Desktop using Linear Hydrology Theme (Feb 2004)

(g) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

Clearing of the areas proposed for the railway line and associated access track would result in minimal land degradation and that the intended regeneration works post construction may result in enhancement of the area.

Methodology Site assessment

(h) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to have an impact on the environmental values of any adjacent or nearby conservation area.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

No CALM managed conservation areas in vicinity

Methodology Advice from CALM

(i) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

Surface water flow is on a low gradient toward the Boulder townsite where it is managed as stormwater by the City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Likely minimal effect on groundwater due to large expanse of native vegetation surrounding the city and also due to small 5ha area to be cleared.

Methodology Desktop study using DoE themes 'Hydrography, linear Feb 2004 DoE; Topographic Contours, Statewide DOLA Feb 2002 and five WIN Groundwater Sites'

(j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence of flooding.

Comments **Proposal is consistent with this Principle**

Minimal risk of flooding due to small size (5ha) of clearing proposal.

Methodology GIS data

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Building or Structure	Mechanical Removal	5	Grant	The proposal be approved and a permit issued

5. References

Keighery, BJ (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.

Shepherd, D.P., Beeston, G.R. and Hopkins, A.J.M. (2001) Native Vegetation in Western Australia, Extent, Type and Status. Resource Management Technical Report 249. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.