



# Clearing Permit Decision Report

## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 3296/1  
Permit type: Purpose Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd**

### 1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Leases 59/421 and 59/458  
Local Government Area: Shire of Yalgoo  
Colloquial name: Eastern Creek Mining Project

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
34.1		Mechanical Removal	Mineral Production

## 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
<p>Beard Vegetation Associations have been mapped at a 1:250,000 scale for the whole of Western Australia and are useful to look at vegetation extent in a regional context. One Beard Vegetation Association is located within the proposed clearing area (GIS Database):</p> <p><b>1. Beard Vegetation Association 202 -</b> Shrublands; Mulga &amp; <i>Acacia quadrimarginea</i> scrub.</p> <p>Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) undertook a flora and vegetation survey of the Eastern Creek project area (including the proposed clearing area). The following six vegetation communities were described from the proposed clearing area:</p> <p><b>Acacia Shrublands</b></p> <p><b>A1 -</b> Tall Open Scrub of <i>Acacia ramulosa</i> var. <i>ramulosa</i> with <i>Acacia sabina</i> over <i>Eremophila forrestii</i> and mixed low shrubs over <i>Cheilanthes adiantoides</i> and annuals on orange sandy loams on lower slopes and flats;</p> <p><b>A2 -</b> Tall Shrubland of <i>Acacia ramulosa</i> var. <i>ramulosa</i> with <i>Acacia ayersiana</i> and <i>Acacia sabina</i> over <i>Eremophila forrestii</i> and <i>Philothea deserti</i> subsp. <i>deserti</i> with <i>Aluta aspera</i> subsp. <i>hesperia</i> over <i>Cheilanthes adiantoides</i>, <i>Monachather paradoxus</i>, low shrubs and annuals on orange brown sandy loam on flats;</p> <p><b>A3 -</b> Tall Shrubland of <i>Acacia ramulosa</i> var. <i>ramulosa</i> with <i>Hakea recurva</i> subsp. <i>recurva</i>, <i>Acacia sabina</i>, <i>Acacia ayersiana</i> and <i>Acacia tetragonophylla</i> over mixed low shrubs and annuals on orange brown sandy loam on flats;</p> <p><b>A4 -</b> Tall Open Shrubland of <i>Acacia ayersiana</i> with <i>Acacia ramulosa</i> var. <i>ramulosa</i> and <i>Acacia aneura</i></p>	<p>Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd have recently acquired the Minjar Gold Project (located 50 kilometres south of Yalgoo) from Monarch Gold Pty Ltd and are looking to re-establish open pit mining and gold processing in the area. One particular area (colloquially named Eastern Creek) has been selected as the chosen start-up mining location.</p> <p>Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd have applied to clear up to 34.1 hectares of native vegetation at the Eastern Creek project area to expand an existing waste rock dump, establish an open cut pit, ore transfer station, access roads and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed clearing is located directly south of the Silverstone project area (a previously mined area consisting of a 1.6 kilometre chain of three open pits and associated waste rock dumps).</p> <p>Native vegetation and topsoil removed during clearing operations will be stockpiled separately for use in future rehabilitation works.</p>	<p>Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery, 1994);</p> <p>to</p> <p>Excellent: Vegetation structure intact; disturbance affecting individual species, weeds non-aggressive (Keighery, 1994).</p>	<p>The vegetation condition rating is derived from information provided by Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009), Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) and analysis of aerial photography and imagery.</p>

over *Acacia sabina* and *Eremophila forrestii* over low shrubs and annuals on orange sandy loam on flats;

**A5** - Tall Shrubland of *Acacia ramulosa* var. *ramulosa* over *Aluta aspera* subsp. *hesperia* with *Baeckea ?benthamii* (ms) and *Hibbertia stenophylla* over annuals on orange brown sandy loam on flats;

#### Shrublands

**S1** - Low Open Shrubland of *Stachystemon intricatus* and *Mirbelia rhagodioides* with *Aluta aspera* subsp. *hesperia* with emergent *Acacia ayersiana*, *Acacia burkittii*, *Acacia ramulosa* var. *ramulosa*, *Eremophila forrestii* and *Acacia sabina* on orange brown sandy loam on flats.

### 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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The area applied to clear is within the Yalgoo Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) bioregion (GIS Database). The Yalgoo bioregion is an interzone between the South-western and Murchison bioregions, and whilst it is rich and diverse in flora and fauna, most species are wide ranging and typically occur in one or more adjoining bioregions (CALM, 2002). Pastoralism is the dominant land use in the Yalgoo bioregion, comprising approximately 76% of the total land area (CALM, 2002). However, mining also has an increasing interest in the bioregion (CALM, 2002).

Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) recorded 27 families, 44 genera and 65 flora species within the Eastern Creek project area, including one weed species, *Monoculus monstrosus*, which could not be positively identified as it was a juvenile form. Species representation was greatest amongst the Mimosaceae (9 taxa), Myrtaceae (7 taxa) and Myoporaceae (6 taxa) families (all of which are typical of the Eremaean Botanical Province). Eight vegetation communities were recorded during the survey, six of which occur in the proposed clearing area. None of the vegetation communities present are Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC's), Priority Ecological Communities (PEC's) or ecosystems at risk (GIS Database; CALM, 2002). Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) noted that communities A1, A2 and S1 may be considered locally significant as they support Priority Flora.

In summary, the proposed clearing area consists of *Acacia* shrublands on relatively flat topography on the de-stocked Badja Pastoral Lease. Previous mining disturbances are clearly evident upon examination of aerial photography. The floristic diversity of the proposed clearing area is not likely to be higher than other areas of native vegetation elsewhere in the bioregion.

From a faunal perspective, the greater Yalgoo bioregion is known to support a rich and diverse array of fauna, some of which are habitat specific. A desktop study revealed that the proposed clearing area may support up to 128 bird species, 36 mammal species (including 11 introduced species), 69 reptile species and 6 amphibian species (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009). Fauna habitats within the proposed clearing area are not unique and are likely to be represented elsewhere. In addition, previous mining and pastoral-related disturbances are likely to have diminished the habitat values of the area to some extent. On this basis, the proposed clearing area is unlikely to support a high level of faunal diversity.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** CALM (2002).  
Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009).  
GIS Database:  
- Threatened Ecological Communities.

#### (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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) contracted Aquila Wildlife Fieldwork to undertake a Level 1 fauna survey of the Eastern Creek project area in accordance with EPA Guidance Statement No. 56 and EPA Position Statement No. 3. The survey found that the Eastern Creek project area does not contain unique fauna habitats, and most habitats are likely to be represented elsewhere in the bioregion (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009).

Of significance, the Malleefowl (*Leipoa ocellata*) listed as 'Vulnerable' under the *Environment Protection and*

*Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999* and Schedule 1 'Fauna that is rare or is likely to become extinct', *Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice 2008* is known from the local area.

Consequently, a targeted search for the Malleefowl was conducted in the Eastern Creek project area. One suitably qualified zoologist spent two days in July 2009 searching the area. Two old and dis-used Malleefowl mounds were found approximately 30 - 40 metres west of the proposed clearing area in the A3 vegetation community (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009). No Malleefowl sightings were made, and no other evidence of the Malleefowl was recorded in the Eastern Creek project area (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009).

An active Malleefowl mound was recorded during a separate search in the Monaco project area, located approximately 5 kilometres south of the proposed clearing area (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009). It has been suggested that the Malleefowl is likely to have vacated the Eastern Creek area during previous mining activities between 2002 and 2004, moving southwards (Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd, 2009). The finding of an active mound in the Monaco area supports this claim. On this basis, it is considered unlikely that the proposed clearing will result in the destruction of Malleefowl mounds or mortality of individuals. A small amount of suitable habitat will be lost, however this is unlikely to be representative of significant habitat given the extent of Acacia shrublands in the local area.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009).  
Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009).

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

**Comments** **Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**

Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) undertook a flora and vegetation survey of the Eastern Creek project area (including the proposed clearing area) between 6 and 10 July 2009. The survey timing was consistent with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) recommendations that flora and vegetation surveys in the Eremaean Botanical Province be conducted following seasonal winter rains (EPA, 2004). More than 100 millimetres of rainfall was recorded at Yalgoo in the months preceding the survey (Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd, 2009).

A desktop assessment revealed that there are 11 species of Declared Rare Flora (DRF) known to occur in the Yalgoo bioregion. However, Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) did not record any DRF during the July 2009 field survey.

Based on Rare and Priority Flora database searches, 19 Priority Flora species may occur within the Yalgoo bioregion. Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) recorded one of these species, *Grevillea globosa* (P3), from 12 locations during the flora and vegetation survey. Eight of the 12 locations were within the proposed clearing area, with population sizes ranging from 1 to 10 plants (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009). The assessing officer notes that the nature of the clearing proposal is not likely to allow Priority Flora within the proposed clearing area to be avoided. Similarly, no suggestion has been made by the applicant that Priority Flora will be avoided during clearing operations.

According to the Western Australian Herbarium (2009) *Grevillea globosa* is known to occur in the Yalgoo bioregion of the Eremaean Botanical Province and the Avon Wheatbelt bioregion of the South-Western Botanical Province. Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) notes that there are 23 records of this species in the Western Australian Herbarium collection.

In a local sense, *Grevillea globosa* is known from multiple collections at the Golden Grove mine site (located approximately 13 kilometres north), including one collection of more than 4,000 plants in 1999 (Ecotec Pty Ltd, 2006). Collection records from Golden Grove in 2000 indicate that the species was recorded over an extensive area (approximately 20 square kilometres) scattered and in pockets amongst mining drill lines (Ecotec Pty Ltd, 2006). It was suggested at this time that the species may be a disturbance opportunist, although no further information is available to substantiate this claim. Healthy populations of *Grevillea globosa* were also recorded in 2004 and 2005 near the Blue Hills Range (located approximately 60 kilometres south of Yalgoo) (Ecotec Pty Ltd, 2006).

Whilst the proposed clearing is likely to result in a loss of *Grevillea globosa* plants in the project area, the proposal is unlikely to threaten the overall conservation status of the species.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Ecotec Pty Ltd (2006).  
EPA (2004).  
Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009).  
Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009).  
Western Australian Herbarium (2009).

**(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 Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**

There are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC's) within the proposed clearing area (GIS Database).

A number of flora surveys have been undertaken in the Minjar Gold Project area since 2000, including Hart, Simpson and Associates Pty Ltd (2000), Woodman Environmental Consulting Pty Ltd (2003), Ecotec Pty Ltd (2006) and most recently, Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009). No TEC's have been recorded during any of these surveys.

One Priority Ecological Community (PEC) is known from the Minjar area - 'Minjar/Gnows Nest vegetation complex (banded ironstone formation)' (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009). Given that the proposed clearing area is located on flat plains and not a banded ironstone formation, it is unlikely that this PEC would be impacted (Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd, 2009).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Ecotec Pty Ltd (2006).  
Hart, Simpson and Associates Pty Ltd (2000).  
Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009).  
Woodman Environmental Consulting Pty Ltd (2003).  
GIS Database:  
- Threatened Ecological Communities.

**(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 area applied to clear is within the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) Yalgoo bioregion (GIS Database). According to Shepherd (2007) there is approximately 98.9% of the pre-European vegetation remaining in the Yalgoo bioregion (see table below). The vegetation of the proposed clearing area is classified as Beard Vegetation Association 202: Shrublands; Mulga & *Acacia quadrimarginea* scrub (GIS Database). There is approximately 100% of the pre-European vegetation remaining of Beard Vegetation Association 202 in the Yalgoo bioregion (Shepherd, 2007).

The area proposed to clear does not represent a significant remnant of native vegetation in the wider regional area. The proposed clearing will not reduce the extent of Beard Vegetation Association 202 below the current recognised threshold level of 30% of the pre-clearing extent of the vegetation type (below which species loss accelerates exponentially at an ecosystem level) (EPA, 2000).

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in IUCN Class I-IV Reserves
IBRA Bioregion - Yalgoo	5,057,316	5,001,943	~98.9	Least concern	9.85
Beard vegetation associations - State					
202	448,529	448,529	~100	Least concern	0.4
Beard vegetation associations - Bioregion					
202	45,096	45,096	~100	Least concern	No data available

\* Shepherd (2007)

\*\* Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002).  
EPA (2000).  
Shepherd (2007).  
GIS Databases:  
- Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia.  
- Pre-European Vegetation.

**(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**

There are no watercourses or wetlands in the proposed clearing area (GIS Database; Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd, 2009). Hart, Simpson and Associates Pty Ltd (2000) noted that there are almost no developed drainage lines in the Minjar area, with sheet flow across the land being the typical drainage form. No distinct vegetation in the area is related to drainage lines or water ponding (Hart, Simpson and Associates Pty Ltd, 2000).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009).  
Hart, Simpson and Associates Pty Ltd (2000).  
GIS Database:  
- Hydrography, linear.

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

**Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**

Land system mapping by the Department of Agriculture Western Australia has mapped a variety of land systems for the Yalgoo bioregion. Land systems are mapped based on biophysical features such as soil and landform type, geology, geomorphology and vegetation type (Payne, et. al., 1998). The proposed clearing area includes three land systems (GIS Database). A broad description of each is given below:

**Tealtoo Land System** - This land system is characterised by level to gently undulating loamy plains with fine ironstone lag gravel supporting dense Acacia shrublands. The Tealtoo Land System is not generally prone to soil erosion (Payne et. al., 1998). Approximately 32.15 hectares of the proposed clearing area is within this land system.

**Illaara Land System** - This land system is characterised by gravelly plains supporting Mulga-Casuarina shrublands. The Illaara Land System is generally not susceptible to erosion (Payne, et. al., 1998). Approximately 1.2 hectares of the proposed clearing area is within this land system (GIS Database).

**Watson Land System** - This land system is characterised by hills, rises and gravelly plains supporting Bowgada shrublands with non-halophytic undershrubs. Whilst stone and gravel surface mantles provide effective protection against erosion, their removal may initiate erosion (Payne, et. al., 1998). Approximately 0.75 hectares of the proposed clearing area is within this land system (GIS Database).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Payne et. al. (1998).  
GIS Database:  
- Rangeland land system mapping.

**(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

The proposed clearing area is not located within a conservation reserve (GIS Database).

Several pastoral leases (Warriedar, Lochada, Thundelarra and Karara) located proximate to the Badja pastoral lease on which clearing is proposed have been purchased by the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) and may potentially be added to Western Australia's conservation estate in the future (Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd, 2009). At its nearest point, the proposed clearing area is 1.2 kilometres east of Warriedar Station (GIS Database).

The proposed clearing area cannot be considered as a linkage to, or a buffer for the DEC purchased pastoral stations. It is therefore unlikely that the proposed clearing will impact upon the conservation values of these areas.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009).  
GIS Database:  
- DEC Tenure.

**(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle**

There are no watercourses or wetlands in the proposed clearing area (GIS Database). Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009) state that the transport of sediment in surface water run-off over cleared areas will be controlled by the use of channels to divert surface water into silt traps before dispersing into the surrounding shrubland.

The proposed clearing is not located within a Public Drinking Water Source Area (GIS Database). The proposed native vegetation clearing is unlikely to significantly affect groundwater levels or quality.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009).  
GIS Database:  
- Hydrography, linear.  
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas.

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

**Comments Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle**

There are no watercourses or wetlands in the proposed clearing area (GIS Database; Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd, 2009).

Native vegetation clearing is likely to increase surface water run-off, however there is not likely to be an increase in the incidence or intensity of natural flood events in the local or regional area.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009).  
GIS Database:  
- Hydrography, linear.

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

**Comments**

There are no Native Title Claims over the area under application (GIS Database).

According to available GIS databases there is one known registered Aboriginal Site of Significance over the proposed clearing area (GIS Database). The registered site (Mougooderra Hills - ID 4498) covers an area of approximately 10,000 hectares (GIS Database). Given that the proposed clearing area does not include any hills, it is unlikely that this particular site will be impacted. It is the proponent's responsibility to comply with the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* and ensure that no Sites of Aboriginal Significance are damaged through the clearing process.

It is the proponent's responsibility to liaise with the Department of Environment and Conservation and the Department of Water to determine whether a Works Approval, Water Licence, Bed and Banks Permit, or any other licences or approvals are required for the proposed works.

No submissions were received from direct interest parties or members of the public when the clearing permit application was advertised for comment.

**Methodology** GIS Database:  
- Aboriginal Sites of Significance.  
- Native Title Claims.

**4. Assessor's comments**

**Comment**

The proposal has been assessed against the Clearing Principles, and the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to Principles (a), (b), (c), (d), (g), (h), (i) or (j) and is not at variance to Principles (e) and (f).

Should a clearing permit be granted, it is recommended that conditions be imposed on the permit for the purposes of retaining topsoil and vegetation, weed management, record keeping and permit reporting.

## 5. References

- CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographical Subregions. Yalgoo (Yal).  
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.
- Ecotec Pty Ltd (2006) Desktop Survey of Priority Flora and Fauna: Minjar Project. Prepared for Monarch Gold Mining Company Limited. August 2006.
- EPA (2000) Environmental protection of native vegetation in Western Australia. Clearing of native vegetation, with particular reference to the agricultural area. Position Statement No. 2. December 2000. Environmental Protection Authority, Western Australia.
- EPA (2004) Guidance for the Assessment of Environmental Factors - Terrestrial Flora and Vegetation Surveys for Environmental Impact Assessment in Western Australia. Guidance Statement No 51. Environmental Protection Authority, Western Australia.
- Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd (2009) Eastern Creek Project - Application for a Purpose Clearing Permit. August 2009.
- Hart, Simpson and Associates Pty Ltd (2000) Gindalbie Gold NL: Minjar North Project. Ecological Survey. September 2000.
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Mattiske Consulting Pty Ltd (2009) Flora and Vegetation Survey of the Eastern Creek Tenement, Minjar Project Area. Prepared for Golden Stallion Resources Pty Ltd. August 2009.
- Payne, A.L., Van Vreeswyk, A.M.E., Pringle, H.J.R., Leighton, K.A, Hennig, P (1998) Technical Bulletin No. 90: An inventory and condition survey of the Sandstone-Yalgoo-Paynes Find area, Western Australia. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia, South Perth.
- Shepherd, D.P. (2007). 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.
- Western Australian Herbarium (2009). Florabase - The Western Australian Flora. Department of Environment and Conservation. <http://florabase.dec.wa.gov.au/>
- Woodman Environmental Consulting Pty Ltd (2003) Gindalbie Gold NL: Further investigations into Priority Flora populations. Minjar Project. November 2003.

## 6. Glossary

### Acronyms:

<b>BoM</b>	Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government.
<b>CALM</b>	Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia.
<b>DAFWA</b>	Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia.
<b>DA</b>	Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.
<b>DEC</b>	Department of Environment and Conservation
<b>DEH</b>	Department of Environment and Heritage (federal based in Canberra) previously Environment Australia
<b>DEP</b>	Department of Environment Protection (now DoE), Western Australia.
<b>DIA</b>	Department of Indigenous Affairs
<b>DLI</b>	Department of Land Information, Western Australia.
<b>DMP</b>	Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia.
<b>DoE</b>	Department of Environment, Western Australia.
<b>DoIR</b>	Department of Industry and Resources, Western Australia.
<b>DOLA</b>	Department of Land Administration, Western Australia.
<b>DoW</b>	Department of Water
<b>EP Act</b>	Environment Protection Act 1986, Western Australia.
<b>EPBC Act</b>	Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Federal Act)
<b>GIS</b>	Geographical Information System.
<b>IBRA</b>	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia.
<b>IUCN</b>	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources – commonly known as the World Conservation Union
<b>RIWI</b>	Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914, Western Australia.
<b>s.17</b>	Section 17 of the Environment Protection Act 1986, Western Australia.
<b>TECs</b>	Threatened Ecological Communities.

### Definitions:

{Atkins, K (2005). *Declared rare and priority flora list for Western Australia, 22 February 2005*. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Como, Western Australia} :-

- P1** **Priority One - Poorly Known taxa:** taxa which are known from one or a few (generally <5) populations which are under threat, either due to small population size, or being on lands under immediate threat, e.g. road verges, urban areas, farmland, active mineral leases, etc., or the plants are under threat, e.g. from disease, grazing by feral animals, etc. May include taxa with threatened populations on protected lands. Such taxa are under consideration for declaration as 'rare flora', but are in urgent need of further survey.
- P2** **Priority Two - Poorly Known taxa:** taxa which are known from one or a few (generally <5) populations, at least some of which are not believed to be under immediate threat (i.e. not currently endangered). Such taxa

are under consideration for declaration as 'rare flora', but are in urgent need of further survey.

- P3 Priority Three - Poorly Known taxa:** taxa which are known from several populations, at least some of which are not believed to be under immediate threat (i.e. not currently endangered). Such taxa are under consideration for declaration as 'rare flora', but are in need of further survey.
- P4 Priority Four – Rare taxa:** taxa which are considered to have been adequately surveyed and which, whilst being rare (in Australia), are not currently threatened by any identifiable factors. These taxa require monitoring every 5–10 years.
- R Declared Rare Flora – Extant taxa (= Threatened Flora = Endangered + Vulnerable):** taxa which have been adequately searched for, and are deemed to be in the wild either rare, in danger of extinction, or otherwise in need of special protection, and have been gazetted as such, following approval by the Minister for the Environment, after recommendation by the State's Endangered Flora Consultative Committee.
- X Declared Rare Flora - Presumed Extinct taxa:** taxa which have not been collected, or otherwise verified, over the past 50 years despite thorough searching, or of which all known wild populations have been destroyed more recently, and have been gazetted as such, following approval by the Minister for the Environment, after recommendation by the State's Endangered Flora Consultative Committee.

{Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice 2005} [Wildlife Conservation Act 1950] :-

- Schedule 1 Schedule 1 – Fauna that is rare or likely to become extinct:** being fauna that is rare or likely to become extinct, are declared to be fauna that is need of special protection.
- Schedule 2 Schedule 2 – Fauna that is presumed to be extinct:** being fauna that is presumed to be extinct, are declared to be fauna that is need of special protection.
- Schedule 3 Schedule 3 – Birds protected under an international agreement:** being birds that are subject to an agreement between the governments of Australia and Japan relating to the protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction, are declared to be fauna that is need of special protection.
- Schedule 4 Schedule 4 – Other specially protected fauna:** being fauna that is declared to be fauna that is in need of special protection, otherwise than for the reasons mentioned in Schedules 1, 2 or 3.

{CALM (2005). *Priority Codes for Fauna*. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Como, Western Australia} :-

- P1 Priority One: Taxa with few, poorly known populations on threatened lands:** Taxa which are known from few specimens or sight records from one or a few localities on lands not managed for conservation, e.g. agricultural or pastoral lands, urban areas, active mineral leases. The taxon needs urgent survey and evaluation of conservation status before consideration can be given to declaration as threatened fauna.
- P2 Priority Two: Taxa with few, poorly known populations on conservation lands:** Taxa which are known from few specimens or sight records from one or a few localities on lands not under immediate threat of habitat destruction or degradation, e.g. national parks, conservation parks, nature reserves, State forest, vacant Crown land, water reserves, etc. The taxon needs urgent survey and evaluation of conservation status before consideration can be given to declaration as threatened fauna.
- P3 Priority Three: Taxa with several, poorly known populations, some on conservation lands:** Taxa which are known from few specimens or sight records from several localities, some of which are on lands not under immediate threat of habitat destruction or degradation. The taxon needs urgent survey and evaluation of conservation status before consideration can be given to declaration as threatened fauna.
- P4 Priority Four: Taxa in need of monitoring:** Taxa which are considered to have been adequately surveyed, or for which sufficient knowledge is available, and which are considered not currently threatened or in need of special protection, but could be if present circumstances change. These taxa are usually represented on conservation lands.
- P5 Priority Five: Taxa in need of monitoring:** Taxa which are not considered threatened but are subject to a specific conservation program, the cessation of which would result in the species becoming threatened within five years.

**Categories of threatened species (*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*)**

- EX Extinct:** A native species for which there is no reasonable doubt that the last member of the species has died.
- EX(W) Extinct in the wild:** A native species which:  
(a) is known only to survive in cultivation, in captivity or as a naturalised population well outside its past range; or  
(b) has not been recorded in its known and/or expected habitat, at appropriate seasons, anywhere in its past range, despite exhaustive surveys over a time frame appropriate to its life cycle and form.
- CR Critically Endangered:** A native species which is facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild in the immediate future, as determined in accordance with the prescribed criteria.
- EN Endangered:** A native species which:  
(a) is not critically endangered; and  
(b) is facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild in the near future, as determined in accordance with the prescribed criteria.
- VU Vulnerable:** A native species which:



- (a) is not critically endangered or endangered; and
- (b) is facing a high risk of extinction in the wild in the medium-term future, as determined in accordance with the prescribed criteria.

**CD**

**Conservation Dependent:** A native species which is the focus of a specific conservation program, the cessation of which would result in the species becoming vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered within a period of 5 years.