Department of Environment
Government of Western Australia

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 176/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Mincor Operations Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: M15/91
Local Government Area: Shire of Coolgardie
Colloquial name: Coolgardie-Esperance Hwy, 18km from Widgiemooltha. Shire of Coolgardie.

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
6.5		Mechanical Removal	Mining

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
Beard Vegetation Association 936: Medium Woodland, Salmon gum	A total of 18 families, 26 Genera and 47 taxa were found within the survey area. Species representation was greatst amongst the Mimosaceiae, Myrtaceae and Myoporaceae families, and a composition typical of the Coolgardie Botanical District. The number of taxa would be increased substantially during more favourable sasonal conditions (Mattiske 2004).	Pristine: No obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery 1994)	Five vegetation communities were defined and mapped for the survey area. These included five eucalypt woodland communities on clays. These communities hold little regional significance as they are well represented within the Coolgardie Botanical District.

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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as the flora and vegetation survey indicated that the vegetation communities are typical of the area and do not display outstanding biodiversity (Mattiske 2004)

Methodology Mattiske Consulting (2004)

(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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as the vegetation to be removed is not going to significantly impact on habitat values or specially protected fauna (Mincor 2004)

Methodology Mincor (2004)

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

Comments **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not likely to be at variance with this principle as a June flora survey did not locate and declared rare or priority flora. While a spring survey was not undertaken, it is not likely that the proposal will impact on

declared rare flora (Mattiske Consulting 2004).

Methodology Mattiske Consulting (2004)

(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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as no signicant ecological communities have been identified for this site (Mattiske Consulting, 2004)

Methodology Mattiske Consulting (2004)

(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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as the vegetation proposed to be cleared is well represented.Mincor reserves/CALM-

	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation status**	% in managed land
IBRA Bioregion- Coolgardie	12,917,718	12,719,084	98.5	Least Concern	
Beard veg type-936	1,016210	906,826	89.2	Least Concern	2.3

* (Shepherd et al. 2001)
** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

Methodology (Shepherd et al. 2001), (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)

(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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as the vegetation is not related to a wetland or watercourse, and surface hydrology issues have been addressed through the NOI process (Mincor 2004)

Methodology Mincor (2004)

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

Comments **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as there are environmental management iniatives that will be put in place via the NOI process to mitigate any land degradation issues. In addition, the area proposed to be cleared has been highly disturbed (previous gravel pit) (DAWA, 2004)

Methodology DAWA (2004)

(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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as there are no nearby conservation reserves.

Methodology GIS database Department of Land Information Cadastre- Land Tenure 1/9/2004

(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 not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as conditions have been put in place via the NOI process to address surface water management (Mincor 2004, DOIR, 2004, DAWA, 2004)

Methodology Mincor (2004), DOIR (2004)NI825, DAWA (2004) NI842

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

Comments **Proposal is not at variance to this Principle**
The proposal is not at variance with this principle as the area is not prone to flooding. Also, surface water

management is addressed via the NOI conditions (DOIR 2004).

Methodology DOIR (2004)

(k) Planning instrument or other matter.

Comments

Not applicable.

Methodology

4. Assessor's recommendations

The recommendations of the Department of Environment to the CEO of the Department should be made consistent with the outcomes of the assessment by each of the agencies. Any conditions on the approval should also be outlined. These may be developed in consultation with such other agencies as required.

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Mining	Mechanical Removal	6.5	**Grant**	Recommend that proposal is granted as there are no issues that are at variance with the clearing principles. In addition, environmental management is being implemented via the Notice of Intent process (Department of Industry and Resources).

5. References

DAWA (2004) Land degradation assessment report. Land Clearing Officer, Department of Agriculture Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref NI842.

Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002) Biodiversity Action Planning. Action planning for native biodiversity at multiple scales ; catchment bioregional, landscape, local. Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Victoria.

DOIR (2004) Notice of intent- Conditions set. Department of Industry and Resources. DoE TRIM ref NI825.

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

Mattiske Consulting (2004) Flora and Vegetation Survey. Widgemooltha mine camp, access tracks and proposed haul road. Unpublished document prepared for Mincor Resources NL. DoE TRIM ref ND407

Mincor (2004) Notice of Intent Document- Widgemooltha mine camp, access tracks and proposed haul road. DoE TRIM ref

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