

Pro Forma: Advice for Native Vegetation Clearing Permit amendment pathway

Application to extend 'no clearing after' and expiry date (Administrative amendments)

Department of Mines, Industry Regulation and Safety (DMIRS) requires that amendments to clearing permits, including administrative amendments, be reviewed. The purpose of the review is to clarify whether there have been any substantial changes in conservation values and/or impacts within the application area since the original assessment. Such changes may result in supporting surveys no longer being adequate to support the revised assessment and/or change the outcomes when assessed against the 10 Clearing Principles listed under Schedule 5 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*.

The purpose of this pro forma is to provide DMIRS with information on:

- changes in conservation values since the original assessment.
- the significance of those changes; and
- the appropriate approval pathway for the area in question.

Where demonstrated through this pro forma, that previous survey information meets current regulator expectations and no substantial changes to known conservation values and/or clearing impacts exist, Rio Tinto Iron Ore (RTIO) would not pursue further survey work to support the administrative amendment.

Where previous supporting surveys are no longer adequate to meet current regulator expectations, or there have been significant changes to the known conservation values since assessment was made, supplementary supporting information will accompany an amendment to the NVCP or new clearing permit application. Rio Tinto will seek confirmation from DMIRS on the appropriate pathway.

Current		Proposed	
CPS#	3698/3	CPS#	3698/4
No clearing after date	30 June 2025	No clearing after date	30 June 2030
Expiry date	30 June 2030	Expiry date	30 June 2035
Clearing approved (ha)	170.7ha		
Clearing carried out to date (ha)	A total of 0.42ha has been cleared under this permit.		
Rehabilitation carried out to date (ha)	No rehabilitation has occurred under this permit.		
Justification of extension:	DSL requires access to material for the construction of cyclone protection levees, borrow pits, drainage channels and other associated operational activities.		

Bio Input/Desktop assessment	
Assessor:	
Date/s of field surveys:	Flora and vegetation surveys were conducted over the application area by Biota Environmental Sciences in October 2005 and July 2006.
Survey type/s:	Flora and vegetation surveys
Constraints / limitations:	Fungi and non-vascular flora (e.g. algae, mosses and liverworts) were not specifically sampled and some sections of the project area were not accessible by vehicle and could only be reached on foot. The vegetation units for this study were defined based on interpretation of aerial photography signatures combined with the site data and field mapping notes recorded during the field surveys and it was not possible to map the vegetation of areas outside the study area. Sampling of the flora present in the survey area was undertaken twice for some of the quadrats set up in the 2005 field survey, but only once for the quadrats set up in the 2006 field survey.
Have any additional field surveys been undertaken within the Permit area since the original application was submitted?	No
Presence of Threatened flora/fauna?	No Declared Rare Flora (DRF) was recorded during the survey (Biota Environmental Sciences, 2008a). There are no historic records of DRF occurring within the application area and none would be expected to occur (Biota Environmental Sciences, 2008a).
Presence of Priority flora/fauna?	Three Priority flora species (<i>Themeda sp. Hamersley Station</i> (Priority 3), <i>Gomphrena leptophylla</i> (Priority 3) and <i>Goodenia nuda</i> (Priority 4)) were recorded within or in close proximity to the application area (Biota Environmental Sciences, 2008a). A further four Priority flora species, <i>Gymnanthera cunninghamii</i> (Priority 3), <i>Terminalia supranitifolia</i> (Priority 3), <i>Acacia glaucoaesia</i> (Priority 3) and <i>Stackhousia clementii</i> (Priority 3), have been recorded within a 20 kilometres radius from the application area (GIS Database)
Presence of Threatened Ecological Communities?	No Threatened Ecological Communities were identified within the application area.
Presence of Priority Ecological Communities?	Two vegetation types are representations of Priority Ecological Communities (PEC's). These are the Priority 1 Roebourne Plains coastal grasslands with gilgai microrelief on deep cracking clays PEC (Roebourne Plains gilgai

	grasslands) and the Priority 3 Horseflat land system of the Roebourne Plains PEC.
Have there been any changes to the conservation rank of species or communities identified in previous surveys?	A search of DBCA's Florabase identified that <i>Goodenia nudal</i> and <i>Acacia glaucocaesia</i> are now listed as "Not Threatened". No changes have occurred to the classification of the Priority Ecological Communities identified.
Have any new species, communities or habitats of elevated environmental value been identified within the boundary of the clearing permit?	A search of the Protected Matters Search Tool (PMST) did not locate any flora species within the NVCP area. The DBCA-036 Threatened and Priority Flora did not displays any species within the NVCP area.
Other changes relevant to conservation of significant biological values in the context of the impact assessment (e.g., changes in known species distributions, new threats etc.)?	No new significant changes identified.
Is a field survey required to validate desktop assessment? Why / why not?	No proposed changes from the current permit and its application.
Is a new survey required? Why / why not?	No proposed changes from the current permit and its application.

Based on the above information the risk of significant impacts to ecological values (flora, fauna, and ecological communities) due to extending the 'no clearing' and expiry date, is low.

RTIO proposes an administrative amendment to extend the 'no clearing after' date and the expiry date. DMIRS Native Vegetation Branch to advise if this approach is considered appropriate.

☐

DMIRS Native Vegetation Branch approves an administrative amendment pathway

☐

DMIRS Native Vegetation Branch **does not** approve an administrative amendment pathway and will advise RTIO of the preferred approval pathway

Name: _____

Date: _____

