



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 2520/1  
 Permit type: Purpose Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Woodside Energy Limited

### 1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 644 ON PLAN 28840 ( BURRUP 6714)  
 LOT 644 ON PLAN 28840 ( BURRUP 6714)  
 Local Government Area: Shire Of Roebourne  
 Colloquial name:

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.4		Mechanical Removal	Road construction or maintenance

## 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 Type 117: Hummock grasslands, grass steppe; soft spinifex.	The proponents additional information identifies the proposed clearing as being partly rock outcrop, partly Acacia colei Shrubland over Tussock/hummock grassland, partly Indigofera monophylla shrub heath over closed hummock grassland and partly Acacia inaequilatera scattered shrubs.	Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery 1994)	Condition of vegetation was taken from the proponents report and aerial photos of the proposed clearing.

## 3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

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

Comments: To be assessed.

Methodology

### (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: To be assessed.

Methodology

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

Comments: To be assessed.

Methodology

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

**Comments**

To be assessed.

**Methodology**

**(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**

To be assessed.

**Methodology**

**(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**

To be assessed.

**Methodology**

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

**Comments**

To be assessed.

**Methodology**

**(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**

To be assessed.

**Methodology**

**(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**

To be assessed.

**Methodology**

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

**Comments**

The proposal is to clear up to 0.4 hectares for the purpose of upgrading Burrup Road. There are no threatened ecological communities and declared rare flora in the vicinity. *Terminalia supranitifolia*, a priority three species has been recorded close to the application area. Given the small size of proposed clearing this Priority species is unlikely to be significantly impacted.

The clearing area contains vegetation association 117, which has 96.4% pre-European vegetation remaining (Shepherd, 2006). The vegetation within the proposed clearing area is classified as degraded (Keighery, 1994), and is better represented within the local area. Given this, the proposed clearing area is unlikely to be a significant remnant of vegetation.

The small (0.4ha) and linear nature of the clearing is unlikely to have a detrimental impact on native fauna habitat.

No watercourses or drainage lines pass through the application area.

Given the low topographical relief, brackish groundwater salinity level (1000-3000mg/L TDS) and the size of the application area (0.4 ha), land degradation and flooding are not likely to be an issue as a result of clearing.

Mattiske Consulting (1998)

Shepherd (2006)

Shepherd et al (2001)

GIS Layers:

- Annual Evaporation Contours (Isopleths) - WRC 29/09/98
- Average Annual Rainfall Isohyets - WRC 29/09/98
- CALM Managed Lands and Waters - CALM 01/06/05
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) - DEC 30/05/05
- Groundwater Salinity Statewide ? DoW 13/07/06
- Hydrographic catchments, catchments - DoW 01/06/07
- Hydrography, linear - DOW 13/7/06
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia - EA 18/10/00
- Mattiske Vegetation - CALM 23/3/98
- Pre European Vegetation - DA 01/01
- SAC Biodatasets - accessed 06 Jun 08
- Topographic contours statewide - DOLA and ARMY 12/09/02

#### Methodology

#### Planning instrument, Native Title, Previous EPA decision or other matter.

#### Comments

The land under application is owned by the Western Australian Land Authority, as it is a dedicated road the care, control and management falls to the Local Government under s.57 of the Land Administration Act 1997 (WA). Under this act responsibility is then given to Main Roads. The proponent has been given approval from Main Roads to clear within the Road.

There is one native title claim (Ngaluma / Injibandi) over the area under application. As the property is within road reserve, the granting of the clearing permit is a secondary approval and does not constitute a future act under the Native Title Act 1993.

#### Methodology

GIS database:

- Native Title Claims - LA 2/5/07

### 4. Assessor's comments

#### Comment

The proposal has been assessed against the ten clearing principles. All principles are unlikely to be at variance to the proposed clearing.

### 5. References

- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Shepherd, D.P. (2006). Adapted from: Shepherd, D.P., Beeston, G.R., and Hopkins, A.J.M. (2001), Native Vegetation in Western Australia. Technical Report 249. Department of Agriculture Western Australia, South Perth. Includes subsequent updates for 2006 from Vegetation Extent dataset ANZWA1050000124.

### 6. Glossary

Term	Meaning
BCS	Biodiversity Coordination Section of DEC
CALM	Department of Conservation and Land Management (now BCS)
DAFWA	Department of Agriculture and Food
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation
DEP	Department of Environmental Protection (now DEC)
DoE	Department of Environment
DoIR	Department of Industry and Resources
DRF	Declared Rare Flora
EPP	Environmental Protection Policy
GIS	Geographical Information System
ha	Hectare (10,000 square metres)
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community

