



## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 566/1  
Permit type: Area Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd**  
Postal address: G.P.O. Box A42 Perth WA 6837  
Contacts: Phone: 9327 2351  
Fax: 9327 2008  
Email: peter.royce@riotinto.com

### 1.3. Property details

Property: AML70/4  
Colloquial name: AML 70/4 Brockman 2 Iron Ore Mine

### 1.4. Application

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

## 2. 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 vegetation of the site comprises low woodland species with some weed species present, such as *Cenchrus ciliaris* (Pilbara Iron, 2005). The area to be cleared is heavily disturbed from previous mining activities, such as access tracks to the ore stockpiles and to on-site buildings (Pilbara Iron, 2005). There are no environmentally sensitive areas present within or in close proximity to the application area, therefore it is unlikely to represent an area of outstanding biological diversity.

**Methodology** Pilbara Iron, 2005;  
GIS Database:  
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas - DOE 22/10/04

### (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

As the area to be cleared has been previously disturbed, it is unlikely that the vegetation represents significant habitat for fauna (Pilbara Iron, 2005). The type of vegetation in the application area is regionally abundant, so it is unlikely the fauna will be impacted upon by the clearing of 4 hectares (Pilbara Iron, 2005).

**Methodology** Pilbara Iron, 2005

### (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

A survey of the area proposed to be cleared was undertaken by Pilbara Iron. No Declared Rare and Priority Flora were located (Pilbara Iron, 2005).

**Methodology** Pilbara Iron, 2005;  
GIS Database: Declared Rare and Priority Flora Lists - CALM 13/08/03

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

There are no known occurrences of Threatened Ecological Communities within the area proposed for clearing.

**Methodology**    GIS Database: Threatened Ecological Communities - CALM 15/7/03

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

The vegetation to be cleared is Beards Vegetation Association #18 (Hopkins et al, 2001) of which there is ~99.9% of the pre-European extent still remaining (Shepherd et al, 2001).

**Methodology**    Hopkins et al, 2001;  
Shepherd et al, 2001;  
GIS Database: Pre-European Extent - DA 01/01

**(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 application area is contained within the Ashburton River catchment area, but is not associated with any major watercourses or wetlands.

**Methodology**    GIS Databases:  
-Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04  
-ANCA Wetlands - CALM 08/01  
-Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DOE 3/4/03

**(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 likely land degradation risks posed by the clearing of this vegetation are minimal as the area is already degraded (Pilbara Iron, 2005). Wherever feasible disturbance shall be minimised (Pilbara Iron, 2005).

**Methodology**    Pilbara Iron, 2005

**(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**

There are no conservation areas adjacent to the area proposed for clearing.

**Methodology**    GIS Database: CALM Managed Lands and Waters - 1/06/04

**(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 proposed clearing of 4 hectares is unlikely to have an impact on surface water quality and is unlikely to provide a major input to the recharge of groundwater.

**Methodology**    GIS Databases:  
-Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments - DOE 3/4/03  
-Hydrography, linear - DOE 1/2/04

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

The average annual rainfall of the area is ~500mm, which falls predominantly over the December to March period. It is unlikely that the clearing of 4 hectares of vegetation will have a significant influence on the run-off and flood regimes in the local area.

**Methodology**      GIS Database: Rainfall, Mean Annual - BOM 30/09/01

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

**Comments**      The vegetation to be cleared is within Mineral Lease AML 70/4 granted in accordance with the Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963 and the Mining Act 1908.

There is a Native Title Claim over the area under application by the Eastern Guruma peoples. However, the mining tenement has been granted so therefore the granting of a clearing permit is not a future act under the Native Title Act.

**Methodology**      GIS Database: Native Title Claims - DLI 19/12/04

**3. Assessor's recommendations**

Purpose	Method	Applied area (ha)/ trees	Decision	Comment / recommendation
Mining	Mechanical Removal	4	<b>Grant</b>	Assessable criteria have been addressed and no objections were raised. The Assessing Officer therefore recommends that the permit should be granted.

**4. References**

Hamersley Iron Pty Ltd (2003) Brockman Haul Road Access Rare Flora Survey. Unpublished Document. Department of Environment Reference: TRIM KNI727

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.

Pilbara Iron (2005) Botanical Survey Advice: Environment Department. Project Number 2005/15. Document Number 108597. Unpublished Report. Department of Environment Reference: TRIM KNI728

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.