Department of Environment
Government of Western Australia

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 555/1
Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Water Corporation**

1.3. Property details

Property: LOT 13526 ON PLAN 219960 (MANJIMUP (S))
Local Government Area: Shire Of Manjimup
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
0.1		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
Beard Vegetation Association 23 - Low woodland; jarrah-banksia. Association 27 - Low woodland; paperbark (Melaleuca sp.) - (Hopkins et al. 2001; Shepherd et al. 2001)	The main area of clearing is located next to the Water Treatment Plant. Dwarf scrub D (Melaleuca thymoides and Sphaerolobium rostratum) over dense low sedges dominated by Desmocladus sp. (Mal Graham Environmental Services, 2004).	Excellent: Vegetation structure intact; disturbance affecting individual species, weeds non-aggressive (Keighery 1994)	A site inspection was carried out by DoE officers on 15th April 2005 (TRIM ref AD195). The vegetation in the area proposed to be cleared is in excellent condition. However some areas that have been disturbed by the construction of a track. The clearing for the pipe alignment will mostly be placed in areas that have been partially cleared for access tracks or fire breaks.

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 under application is within an Environmentally Sensitive Area (Register of the National Estate and Conservation Category Wetland) which has high biodiversity values. However, the area of clearing is very small (0.1ha) and it is proposed to rehabilitate the area after the pipe has been installed. No evidence has been presented or is readily available to suggest that the area that is proposed to be cleared contains a high level of biological diversity (Mal Graham Environmental Services, 2004 and CALM, 2005).

Methodology DoE Site inspection (TRIM ref AD195). Mal Graham Environmental Services (2004), CALM (2005)

(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

The survey effort described by Mal Graham Environmental Services (2004) revealed that much of the area that is proposed to be cleared has been subject to historical disturbance. There appears to be little suitable habitat for fauna of conservation significance remaining. Hence, it is unlikely that clearing of native vegetation in the proposed area will adversely impact on fauna known to occur in the local area (CALM, 2005). In addition, the area will not be permanently cleared as rehabilitation will ensure its values for fauna habitat are restored.

Methodology DoE site inspection (TRIM ref AD195), Mal Graham Environmental Services (2004), CALM (2005)

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

Comments

Proposal is not at variance to this Principle

Priority Flora (Sphaerolobium rostratum) has been identified at the site and the proponent has approval from the Environment Minister to take approximately 12 plants along the pipeline alignment (copy of approval TRIM ref IN20941). Due to this approval, the proposal is not at variance with this Clearing Principle

Methodology Approval to take Priority Flora (TRIM ref IN20941).

(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 at variance to this Principle

There are no recorded occurrences of Threatened Ecological Communities that are listed under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, within 10km of the proposed clearing. However there are 10 occurrences of a State-listed TEC Reedia Swamps Warren Region within this range (the closest occurrence being within 750 metres). Based on the documentation provided with specific reference to the level of degradation, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the State listed TEC, Reedia Swamps Warren Region, occurs at this site (CALM, 2005).

Methodology CALM (2005)

(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 Clearing Principle as the vegetation is relatively well represented.

	Pre-European area (ha)	Current extent (ha)	Remaining %*	Conservation % in reserves/CALM-status**	managed land
IBRA Bioregion - Warren	851,529	739,273	86.8	Least concern	
Shire - Manjimup	705,670	591,748	83.9	Least concern	
Beard veg type - 23	50,127	33,700	67.2	Least concern	54.7
Beard veg type - 27	161,222	106,631	66.1	Least concern	39.9
Mattiske veg type - KO	27,207	12859	47.3	Depleted	#
Mattiske veg type - Kb	283,460	231,926	81.8	Least concern	#

* (Shepherd et al. 2001)
** (Department of Natural Resources and Environment 2002)
# (Mattiske Consulting 1998)

Methodology Shepherd et al. (2001), Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002), Mattiske Consulting (1998)

(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 likely to be at variance to this Principle

The area under application is part of a marshy area, 25m south of a minor non perennial water course which runs into an indefinite watercourse (Walpole River) and is 150m upstream and east of the Walpole Weir (potable water supply for Walpole). Clearing of the native vegetation as proposed is not likely to be at variance with this Clearing principle as the Water Corporation has committed to managing impacts by minimising time spent with trench open, restoring ground levels and ensuring rehabilitation of the site (Paul Rogoysky, Water Corporation, pers. comm.).

Methodology GIS datasets:
Hydrography linear DoE 1/2/04
Paul Rogoysky, Water Corperation, pers. comm.

(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

The area under application is small and Water Corporation has committed to management practices for clearing the vegetation and subsequent works that are likely to reduce the risk of on or off site land degradation.

Methodology Paul Rogoysky, Water Corporation, pers.comm.

(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 following CALM managed areas are situated within a 10km radius of the proposed clearing:
- State Forest 48
- Crown Reserve 31362 (National Park)
- Nelson Location 13076; Crown Reserve 31501
- Crown Reserve 13045

The identified reserves and State Forest are a sufficient distance from the proposed clearing that their inherent environmental values are unlikely to be significantly impacted as a result of the proposed clearing being carried out (CALM, 2005).

Methodology CALM (2005)
GIS Database:
- CALM managed Lands and Water - CALM 01/08/04
- Clearing Regulations- Environmentally Sensitive Areas- DoE 30/05/05

(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

The area under application is part of Walpole Weir Catchment Public Drinking Water Supply Priority 1 Area. Priority 1 (P1) classification areas are defined to ensure that there is no degradation of the water source. Due to the small area involved, the management of the clearing and the rehabilitation proposed to be carried out, the proposal is not likely to be at variance with this Clearing Principle.

Methodology GIS Databases:
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSA) - 04/11/04

(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

The proposal is not likely to increase the risk of flooding due to the small area involved.

Methodology DoE site inspection (TRIM ref AD195)

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

Comments

The Shire of Manjimup supports the proposal. The application is not known to be at variance with any planning instrument or previous decision.

Methodology Submission-Shire of Manjimup (TRIM ref AD742)

4. Assessor's recommendations

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Building or Structure	Mechanical Removal	0.1	**Grant**	The proposal is to clear native vegetation to construct a pipleline in an Environmentally Sensitive Area. It is recommended that the permit be granted as the proposal is either not at variance or not likely to be at variance with the Clearing Principles. The Water Corporation has set in place management strategies to mitigate impacts in this Environmentally Sensitive Area. It is recommended that a condition to reinstate the topsoil along the alignment of the clearing be placed on the permit. This will ensure the rehabilitation of the vegetation in the medium to long term.

5. References

CALM (2005) Land clearing proposal advice. Advice to A/Director General, Department of Environment (DoE). Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia. DoE TRIM ref AI851.

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.

Hopkins, A.J.M., Beeston, G.R. and Harvey J.M. (2001) A database on the vegetation of Western Australia. Stage 1. CALMScience after J. S. Beard, late 1960's to early 1980's Vegetation Survey of Western Australia, UWA Press.

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

Mal Graham Environmental Services (2004) Environmental Impact Assessment. Walpole Water Supply- ADWG Program.

Unpublished report prepared for Water Corporation, Project Management Branch. TRIM ref IN20941.
Mattiske Consulting (1998) Mapping of vegetation complexes in the South West forest region of Western Australia, CALM.
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.

6. Glossary

Term	Meaning
CALM	Department of Conservation and Land Management
DAWA	Department of Agriculture
DEP	Department of Environmental Protection (now DoE)
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
WRC	Water and Rivers Commission (now DoE)