



# Clearing Permit Decision Report

## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6803/1  
Permit type: Purpose Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Avoca Mining Pty Ltd

### 1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 63/647  
Miscellaneous Licence 63/73  
Local Government Area: Shire of Dundas  
Colloquial name: Musket Project

### 1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
739		Mechanical Removal	Mineral Exploration, Mineral Production, Haul Road and Associated Activities

### 1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant  
Decision Date: 3 December 2015

## 2. Site Information

### 2.1. Existing environment and information

#### 2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

**Vegetation Description** Beard vegetation associations have been mapped for the whole of Western Australia. Two Beard vegetation associations have been mapped within the application area:

**Beard vegetation association 8:** Medium woodland; salmon gum & gimlet; and  
**Beard vegetation association 10:** Medium woodland; red mallee group (GIS Database).

A Level 1 flora and vegetation survey conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015) during 26 and 27 August 2015 identified eight vegetation types within the application area:

#### **Acacia acuminata thicket over Granite outcropping**

Dominant species were *Acacia acuminata*, *Austrostipa nitida*, *Eremophila georgei*, *E. decipiens* subsp. *decipiens*, *Senna artemisioides* subsp. *filifolia*, *Santalum acuminatum* and *Solanum lasiophyllum*;

#### **Mixed Eucalyptus woodland over mixed sclerophyll shrubland**

Dominant species were numerous *Eucalyptus* species, *Atriplex vesicaria*, *Atriplex stipitata*, *Alectryon oleifolius*, *Santalum acuminatum* and *Eremophila interstans* subsp. *virgata*;

#### **Tecticornia shrubland**

Dominant species were *Tecticornia indica* subsp. *bidens*, *Frankenia pauciflora*, *Carpobrotus modestus* *Cratystylis conocephala* and *Gunniopsis quadrifida*;

#### **Eucalyptus salubris woodland over Chenopod shrubland**

Dominant species were *Eucalyptus salubris*, *Tecticornia disarticulata*, *Atriplex vesicaria*, *Ptilotus obovatus* and *Sclerolaena diacantha*;

#### **Mixed Eucalyptus woodland over Melaleuca sheathiana and Eremophila interstans**

Dominant species were *Eucalyptus lesouefii*, *Melaleuca sheathiana*, *Eremophila interstans* subsp. *virgata*, *Olearia muelleri* and *Westringia rigida*;

#### **Burnt Eucalyptus woodland thicket**

Dominant species were *Eucalyptus prolixa*, *E. urna*, *E. dundasii*, *Atriplex vesicaria*, *Olearia muelleri*, *Daviesia benthamii* subsp. *acanthoclona* and *Eremophila scoparia*;

#### **Eucalyptus mallee woodland**

Dominant species were *Eucalyptus griffithsii*, *Eucalyptus calycogona* subsp. *calycogona*, *E. cylindriflora*, *Exocarpos aphyllus*, *Alyxia buxifolia*, *Dodonaea stenozyga*, *Trymalium myrtillus* subsp. *myrtillus* and *Westringia rigida*; and

#### **Eucalyptus ravidia woodland**

Dominant species were numerous *Eucalyptus ravidia*, *Melaleuca sheathiana*, *Dodonaea stenozyga*, *Olearia muelleri*, *Eremophila ionantha*, *Exocarpos aphyllus* and *Eremophila interstans* subsp. *virgata*.

<b>Clearing Description</b>	Musket Project. Avoca Mining Pty Ltd applied to clear up to 739 hectares of native vegetation within a total boundary of approximately 1,036 hectares, for the purpose of mineral exploration, mineral production and associated activities. The project is located approximately 31 kilometres north-east of Norseman, in the Shire of Dundas.
<b>Vegetation Condition</b>	Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery, 1994);  To:  Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery, 1994).
<b>Comment</b>	

### 3. Assessment of application against clearing principles

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

<b>Comments</b>	<p><b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b></p> <p>The application area occurs within the Eastern Goldfields subregion of the Coolgardie Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion (GIS Database). This subregion is characterised the vegetation of Mallees, Acacia thickets and shrub-heaths on sandplains. Diverse <i>Eucalyptus</i> woodlands occur around salt lakes, on ranges, and in valleys. Salt lake support dwarf shrublands of samphire. Woodlands and <i>Dodonaea</i> shrubland occur on basic graninulites of the Fraser Range (CALM, 2002).</p> <p>Native Vegetation Solutions (2015) conducted a Level 1 flora and vegetation survey of the application area and identified eight vegetation types within the application area with 100 flora taxa representing 26 families and 48 genera. Species composition and vegetation types within the application area are typical of the local region and not considered to be unusually diverse (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2015). The area proposed to be cleared is not considered to be remnant vegetation and areas have been disturbed by historical exploration activities (GIS Database).</p> <p>A search of the Department of Parks and Wildlife's Threatened and Priority Flora databases revealed no records of Threatened Flora and one Priority Flora species within a 5 kilometre radius of the application area (DPaW, 2015). No Threatened or Priority Flora species, Threatened or Priority Ecological Communities were identified within the application area by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015).</p> <p>No weed species were identified by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015). Weeds have the potential to significantly change the dynamics of a natural ecosystem and lower the biodiversity of an area. Potential impacts to the biodiversity as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a weed management condition.</p> <p>There were five fauna habitat types recorded within the application area by Terrestrial Ecosystems (2015). All faunal habitats within the application area are considered to be common and widespread within the subregion and faunal assemblages are unlikely to be different to those found in similar habitat located elsewhere in the region (GIS Database).</p> <p>Based on the above, the proposed clearing is not likely to be at variance to this Principle.</p>
<b>Methodology</b>	CALM (2002) DPaW (2015) Native Vegetation Solutions (2015) Terrestrial Ecosystems (2015) GIS Database

#### (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.

<b>Comments</b>	<p><b>Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle</b></p> <p>A reconnaissance fauna survey was conducted over the application area on 26 August 2015 by Terrestrial Ecosystems (2015) which mapped five broad habitats within the application area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 - Eucalypt woodland over chenopod and other;</li> <li>2 - Eucalypt woodland with little understorey;</li> <li>3 - Acacia thicket;</li> <li>4 - Samphire flats; and</li> <li>5 - Eucalypt regrowth.</li> </ol> <p>The landforms and habitat found within the application area are considered as being well represented in the local region (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2015). The application area does not contain habitats or faunal assemblages that are ecologically significant, and the fauna assemblage of the study area is considered common and typical of the region and is not specifically dependent on the habitats within the application area</p>
-----------------	---

(Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2015).

Based on habitat type and previous fauna surveys in the local area, the following species of conservation significance listed as either threatened species under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* (EPBC) 1999 or protected under Western Australian legislation (*Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* (WC)) are likely to occur in the application area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2015):

- Malleefowl (*Leipoa ocellata*) (EPBC Act – Vulnerable; WC Act – Schedule 1);
- Australian Bustard (*Ardeotis australis*) (DPaW – Priority 4);
- Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus*) (EPBC Act – Migratory species; JAMBA, CAMBA); and
- Hooded Plover (*Thinornis rubricollis*) (EPBC Act – Migratory species).

Potential habitat exists for the Rainbow Bee-eater within the application area, which is seasonally widespread and common in southern Western Australia, and utilises both natural and degraded habitats (DotE, 2015). This bird could potentially use the application area and adjoining areas for foraging, roosting and possibly breeding; however given the high mobility of this species, it is not likely that the proposed clearing will significantly impact the conservation significance of this species.

The Australian Bustard is known to be highly mobile but may use the application area for foraging as part of a larger territory. Although the Australian Bustard may forage in the area, the application area is not likely to represent significant habitat.

The Hooded Plover may potentially utilise the salt lake which intersects the northern section of the application area. However, the majority of the salt lake exists outside the application area, therefore the proposed clearing is not likely to impact the conservation significance of this species.

Terrestrial Ecosystems (2015) also searched the application area for evidence of Malleefowl. Several of the vegetation types recorded by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015) may provide leaf litter suitable for Malleefowl and Malleefowl mound construction, however there were no Malleefowl mounds identified within the application area.

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

**Methodology** DotE (2015)  
Native Vegetation Solutions (2015)  
Terrestrial Ecosystems (2015)  
GIS Database

**(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**

According to available databases, there are no known records of Threatened Flora within the application area (GIS Database). A search of the Department of Parks and Wildlife's Threatened and Priority Flora databases identified no Threatened Flora species as occurring within a 5 kilometre radius of the application area (DPaW, 2015).

Based on flora and vegetation surveys conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015), no Threatened Flora species were recorded within the application area.

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

**Methodology** DPaW (2015)  
Native Vegetation Solutions (2015)  
GIS Database

**(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**

A search of the available databases showed that there are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC's) situated within 50 kilometres of the application area (GIS Database).

Based on flora and vegetation surveys conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015), no TEC's were recorded within the application area.

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

**Methodology** Native Vegetation Solutions (2015)  
GIS Database

**(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 application area falls within the Coolgardie IBRA bioregion (GIS Database). The vegetation within the application area is recorded as:

**Beard vegetation association 8:** Medium woodland; salmon gum & gimlet; and  
**Beard vegetation association 10:** Medium woodland; red mallee group (GIS Database).

Beard vegetation associations 8 and 10 retains approximately 49% and 98% of their pre-European extent which is more than the 30% threshold level recommended in the National Objectives Targets for Biodiversity Conservation below which, species loss appears to accelerate exponentially at an ecosystem level (Commonwealth of Australia, 2001). The local area has not been extensively cleared, and the area proposed to be cleared is not a significant remnant of native vegetation.

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in DPaw Managed Land (and post clearing %)
IBRA Bioregion - Coolgardie	339,875	328,891	~96.77	Least Concern	6.96 (7.15)
Beard vegetation associations - State					
8	694,638	346,569	~49.89	Depleted	6.84 (13.63)
10	145,676	144,162	~98.96	Least Concern	3.05 (3.08)
Beard vegetation associations - Bioregion					
8	280,248	275,589	~98.34	Least Concern	9.72 (9.88)
10	32,790	32,790	~100	Least Concern	-

\* Government of Western Australia (2014)

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

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

**Methodology** Commonwealth of Australia (2001)  
 Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)  
 Government of Western Australia (2014)  
 GIS Database

**(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 at variance to this Principle**

According to available databases, the north section of the application area is partially located within a small salt lake (GIS Database). Based on vegetation mapping by Native Vegetation Solutions (2015), the vegetation type 'Tecticornia shrubland' is identified to grow in association with the salt lake. As the salt lake located within the application area is only likely to inundate following significant rainfall or cyclonic events, the proposed clearing is unlikely to result in any significant impact to any watercourse or wetland provided natural surface water flow patterns are not disturbed. Potential impacts to riparian vegetation may be minimised through the implementation of a vegetation management condition.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** Native Vegetation Solutions (2015)  
 GIS Database

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

**Comments Proposal may be at variance to this Principle**

The application area is located within the Kambalda Soil-Landscape Zone (Tille, 2006). This zone is

characterised by flat to undulating plains (with hills, ranges and some salt lakes and stony plains) on greenstone and granitic rocks of the Yilgarn Craton (Tille, 2006). Soils comprise calcareous loamy earths and red loamy earths with salt lakes soils and some red/brown hardpan shallow loams and red sandy duplexes (Tille, 2006).

The proposal to clear 739 hectares of native vegetation is considered to be a relatively large area and may lead to land degradation through soil erosion. Although typical surface runoff would be minimal given the climate (BoM, 2015), high rainfall events may cause short-term erosion through the transportation of sediments in surface flows. Potential impacts from land degradation as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

The application area has an annual average evaporation rate of approximately eight times the annual average rainfall (BoM, 2015; GIS Database). Based on this information, surface flows during normal rainfall events are likely to be short lived and recharge to groundwater would be considered minimal. This would reduce the likelihood of salinity increasing as a result of the proposed clearing.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing may be at variance to this Principle.

**Methodology** BoM (2015)  
Tille (2006)  
GIS Database

**(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 application area is not located within any conservation area (GIS Database). The nearest conservation area Dundas Nature Reserve, located approximately 14 kilometres east of the application area (GIS Database).

Given the distance of the application area from Dundas Nature Reserve, the proposed clearing is not likely to provide a significant ecological linkage or fauna movement corridor and is not likely to impact the environmental values of the conservation area.

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

**Methodology** GIS Database

**(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 application area is not located within a Public Drinking Water Source Area (GIS Database). The application area is located within the proclaimed Goldfields groundwater area under the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914* (GIS Database). Any groundwater extraction and/or taking or diversion of surface water for the purposes other than domestic and/or stock watering is subject to licence by the Department of Water.

The annual evaporation rate exceeds the annual average rainfall for Norseman (BoM, 2015; GIS Database). Any surface water within the application area is likely to only remain for short periods following significant rainfall events. The proposed clearing is not likely to cause deterioration in the quality of any surface water within or outside of the application area.

The application area has a groundwater salinity that is hypersaline (14,000 to 35,000 milligrams/Litre Total Dissolved solids (TDS)) (GIS Database). With high annual evaporation rates and low annual rainfall, there is little recharge into regional groundwater. The proposed clearing is unlikely to further deteriorate the quality of underground water (GIS Database).

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

**Methodology** BoM (2015)  
GIS Database

**(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**

With an average annual rainfall of 303.9 millimetres and an average annual evaporation rate of between 1,600 and 1,800 millimetres there is likely to be little surface flow during normal seasonal rains (BoM, 2015; GIS Database). Whilst large rainfall events may result in flooding of the area, the proposed clearing is not likely to lead to an increase in incidence or intensity of flooding.

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

**Methodology** CALM (2002)  
GIS Database

### **Planning instrument, Native Title, RIWI Act Licence, EP Act Licence, Works Approval, Previous EPA decision or other matter.**

#### **Comments**

There is one Native Title claim over the area under application (Department of Aboriginal Affairs, 2015; GIS Database). However, the mining tenure has been granted in accordance with the future act regime of the *Native Title Act 1993* and the nature of the act (i.e. the proposed clearing activity) has been provided for in that process, therefore the granting of a clearing permit is not a future act under the *Native Title Act 1993*.

There are no registered Aboriginal Sites of Significance within the application area (Department of Aboriginal Affairs, 2015). It is the proponent's responsibility to comply with the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* and ensure that no Aboriginal Sites of Significance are damaged through the clearing process.

It is the proponent's responsibility to liaise with the Department of Environment Regulation, Department of Parks and Wildlife 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.

The clearing permit application was advertised on 26 October 2015 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. One submission was received requesting further information relating to the impacts to the proposed clearing. A response with further information was sent.

**Methodology** Department of Aboriginal Affairs (2015)

## **4. Assessor's recommendations**

#### **Comment / recommendation**

The application has been assessed against the clearing principles, planning instruments and other matters in accordance with s.51O of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*, and the proposed clearing is at variance to Principle (f), may be at variance to Principle (g), is not likely to be at variance to Principles (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (h), (i), and (j).

## **5. References**

- BoM (2015) Climate Statistics for Australian Locations. A Search for Climate Statistics for Norseman Aero, Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, viewed 4 November 2015, <[http://reg.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw\\_012009.shtml](http://reg.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_012009.shtml)>.
- CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographical Subregions. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2001) National objectives and targets for biodiversity conservation 2001-2005. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, ACT.
- Department of Aboriginal Affairs (2015) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Government of Western Australia, viewed 4 November 2015 <<http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/>>.
- Department of the Environment (DotE) (2015) *Merops ornatus* - Rainbow Bee-eater. Available online at [http://www.environment.gov.au/cgibin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon\\_id=670](http://www.environment.gov.au/cgibin/sprat/public/publicspecies.pl?taxon_id=670). Accessed 30 November 2015.
- 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.
- DPaW (2015) NatureMap Department of Parks and Wildlife, viewed 4 November 2015 <<http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au>>.
- Government of Western Australia (2014) 2014 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of June 2014. WA Department of Parks and Wildlife, Perth.
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Native Vegetation Solutions (2015) Level 1 Flora and Vegetation Survey of the Proposed Musket Project Tenement M63/647 and L63/73. Prepared for Metals X Limited, Avoca Resources Pty Ltd, Higginsville Gold Operation. September, 2015.
- Tille, P. (2006) Soil-landscapes of Western Australia's Rangelands and Arid Interior. Technical Report 313. Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia. ISSN 1039-7205.
- Terrestrial Ecosystems (2015) Level 1 Vertebrate Fauna Risk Assessment for the Musket Project. Prepared for Native Vegetation Solutions, October 2015.

## **6. Glossary**

### **Acronyms:**

<b>BoM</b>	Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government
<b>DAA</b>	Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Western Australia
<b>DAFWA</b>	Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia
<b>DEC</b>	Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia (now DPaW and DER)
<b>DER</b>	Department of Environment Regulation, Western Australia
<b>DMP</b>	Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia
<b>DRF</b>	Declared Rare Flora
<b>DotE</b>	Department of the Environment, Australian Government
<b>DoW</b>	Department of Water, Western Australia
<b>DPaW</b>	Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia
<b>DSEWPaC</b>	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (now DotE)
<b>EPA</b>	Environmental Protection Authority, Western Australia
<b>EP Act</b>	<i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> , Western Australia
<b>EPBC Act</b>	<i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (Federal Act)
<b>GIS</b>	Geographical Information System
<b>ha</b>	Hectare (10,000 square metres)
<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>PEC</b>	Priority Ecological Community, Western Australia
<b>RIWI Act</b>	<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> , Western Australia
<b>s.17</b>	Section 17 of <i>the Environment Protection Act 1986</i> , Western Australia
<b>TEC</b>	Threatened Ecological Community

### Definitions:

{DPaW (2013) Conservation Codes for Western Australian Flora and Fauna. Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia}:-

<b>T</b>	<p><b>Threatened species:</b> Specially protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i>, listed under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna or the Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora (which may also be referred to as Declared Rare Flora).</p> <p>Threatened Fauna and Flora are further recognised by DPaW according to their level of threat using IUCN Red List criteria. For example Carnaby's Cockatoo <i>Calyptorhynchus latirostris</i> is specially protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> as a threatened species with a ranking of Endangered.</p> <p><u>Rankings:</u> CR: Critically Endangered - considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild. EN: Endangered - considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild. VU: Vulnerable - considered to be facing a high risk of extinction in the wild.</p>
<b>X</b>	<p><b>Presumed Extinct species:</b> Specially protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i>, listed under Schedule 2 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Presumed Extinct Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Presumed Extinct Flora (which may also be referred to as Declared Rare Flora).</p>
<b>IA</b>	<p><b>Migratory birds protected under an international agreement:</b> Specially protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i>, listed under Schedule 3 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice. Birds that are subject to an agreement between governments of Australia and Japan, China and The Republic of Korea relating to the protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction.</p>
<b>S</b>	<p><b>Other specially protected fauna:</b> Specially protected under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i>, listed under Schedule 4 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.</p>
<b>P1</b>	<p><b>Priority One - Poorly-known species:</b> Species that are known from one or a few collections or sight records (generally less than five), all on lands not managed for conservation, e.g. agricultural or pastoral lands, urban areas, Shire, rail reserves and Main Roads WA road, gravel and soil reserves, and active mineral leases and under threat of habitat destruction or degradation. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from one or more localities but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and appear to be under immediate threat from known threatening processes.</p>
<b>P2</b>	<p><b>Priority Two - Poorly-known species:</b> Species that are known from one or a few collections or sight records, some of which are on lands not under imminent threat of habitat destruction or degradation, e.g. national parks, conservation parks, nature reserves, State forest, unallocated Crown land, water reserves, etc. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from one or more localities but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and appear to be under threat from known threatening processes.</p>
<b>P3</b>	<p><b>Priority Three - Poorly-known species:</b> Species that are known from collections or sight records from several localities not under imminent threat, or from few but widespread localities with either large population size or significant remaining areas of</p>

apparently suitable habitat, much of it not under imminent threat. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from several localities but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and known threatening processes exist that could affect them.

**P4**

**Priority Four - Rare, Near Threatened and other species in need of monitoring:**

- (a) Rare. Species that are considered to have been adequately surveyed, or for which sufficient knowledge is available, and that are considered not currently threatened or in need of special protection, but could be if present circumstances change. These species are usually represented on conservation lands.
- (b) Near Threatened. Species that are considered to have been adequately surveyed and that do not qualify for Conservation Dependent, but that are close to qualifying for Vulnerable.
- (c) Species that have been removed from the list of threatened species during the past five years for reasons other than taxonomy.

**P5**

**Priority Five - Conservation Dependent species:**

**Species that are not threatened but are subject to a specific conservation program, the cessation of which would result in the species becoming threatened within five years.**

**Principles for clearing native vegetation:**

- (a) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it comprises a high level of biological diversity.
- (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.
- (c) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it includes, or is necessary for the continued existence of, rare flora.
- (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.
- (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.
- (f) Native vegetation should not be cleared if it is growing in, or in association with, an environment associated with a watercourse or wetland.
- (g) Native vegetation should not be cleared if the clearing of the vegetation is likely to cause appreciable land degradation.
- (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.
- (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.
- (j) Native vegetation should not be cleared if clearing the vegetation is likely to cause, or exacerbate, the incidence or intensity of flooding.