Government of Western Australia
Department of Mines and Petroleum

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6818/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Fortescue Metals Group Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: *Iron Ore (Hamersley Range) Agreement Act 1963*, Mineral Lease 4SA (AML 70/4)
Local Government Area: Shire of Ashburton
Colloquial name: Eliwana Prospect

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
2		Mechanical Removal	Widening an existing road

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 10 December 2015

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description

The clearing permit application area has been broadly mapped as the following Beard vegetation association (GIS Database; Government of Western Australia, 2014):

82: Hummock grasslands, low tree steppe; snappy gum over *Triodia wiseana.*

A vegetation survey was undertaken by Ecoscape within the application boundary (23.7 hectares). A total of seven vegetation types were identified (FMG, 2015):

1) *Acacia bivenosa* mid sparse shrubland over *Triodia epactia* mid open hummock grassland;
2) *Acacia exigua*, *A. bivenosa* and *A. marramamba* mid sparse shrubland over *Triodia wiseana* low open hummock grassland;
3) *Eucalyptus leucophloia* subsp. *leucophloia* low open woodland over *Acacia atkinsiana* and *A. exigua* tall open shrubland over *Triodia wiseana* low open hummock grassland;
4) *Eucalyptus leucophloia* subsp. *leucophloia* low open woodland over *Acacia maitlandi*, *A. marramamba* and *Senna glutinosa* subsp. *glutinosa* mid-tall sparse shrubland over *Triodia wiseana* mid hummock grassland; and
5) *Eucalyptus victrix* low-mid open woodland over *Acacia citrinoviridis* and *Melaleuca glomerata* tall open shrubland over **Cenchrus ciliaris*, *Pluchea dentax* and *Eriachne tenuiculmis* and *Eulaia aurea* mid open tussock grassland/low sparse herbs.

*Identified weed species

Clearing Description

Eliwana Prospect.
Fortescue Metals Group Ltd (FMG) proposes to clear up to 2 hectares of native vegetation within a total boundary of approximately 23.68 hectares for the purpose of widening an existing road. The project is located approximately 70 kilometres east north-east of Tom Price, in the Shire of Ashburton.

Vegetation Condition

Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Kieghery, 1994).

Comment

The vegetation condition was assessed by Fortescue Metals Group (FMG, 2015).

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 application area is located within the Hamersley subregion of the Pilbara Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) bioregion (GIS Database). The Hamersley subregion is generally described as Mulga low woodland over bunch grasses on fine textured soils in valley floors, and *Eucalyptus leucophloia* over *Triodia brizoides* on skeletal soils of the ranges (CALM, 2002).

Flora and vegetation surveys have been undertaken over the Eliwana Prospect inclusive of the application area. Seven vegetation communities were identified, as listed under the vegetation description above (FMG, 2015). None of these communities are considered to be representative of a Threatened Ecological Community or Priority Ecological Community (FMG, 2015; GIS Database).

No Threatened or Priority flora species have been identified within the application area (FMG, 2015; DPaW, 2015). However, a number of Priority species have been identified within a 20 kilometre radius of the application area (FMG, 2015):

1) *Eremophila magnifica* subsp. *velutina*
2) *Indigofera* sp. Bungaroo Creek (S. van Leeuwen)
3) *Nicotiana umbratica*
4) *Ptilotus rotundifolius*
5) *Sida* sp. Barlee Range *(S. Van Leeuwen)*
6) *Acacia bromilowiana*
7) *Eremophila magnifica* subsp. *magnifica*
8) *Goodenia nuda*
9) *Ptilotus mollis*
10) *Ptilotus subspinescens*

The species listed above are not geographically restricted, most occurring over multiple IBRA sub-bioregions (FMG, 2015; DPaW, 2015). Given the small size of the application area (two hectares) it is unlikely that the proposed clearing will have a significant impact.

The proposed clearing will result in the removal of vegetation on footslopes and plains habitat as well as major creek line habitat (Ecologia Environment, 2015). Within the Eliwana prospect alone a total of 40,759 hectares of footslope and plains habitat was identified during vegetation surveys (Ecologia Environment, 2015). This habitat has not been identified as being of conservation significance, however it may provide foraging habitat for some conservation significant fauna species (FMG, 2015).

A total of 1,139 hectares of major creek line habitat was identified during vegetation surveys (Ecologia Environment, 2015). Major creek line habitat associated with gorges, escarpments and waterholes, is considered significant habitat for the Pilbara Olive Python (FMG, 2015). However, the major creek line within the application area exists in a gently undulating area away from rocky gorges and is therefore not considered significant for the Pilbara Olive Python (FMG, 2015).

The major Creek Line habitat may provide foraging opportunities for the Northern Quoll (*Dasyurus hallucatus*) and Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat (*Rhinonicteris aurantius*) (FMG, 2015). However, the proposed disturbance would not remove more than 0.76 hectares of this habitat (FMG, 2015). Fortescue Metals Group Ltd (FMG) advises that clearing of this habitat is likely to be restricted to one to two metres either side of the track for a distance of 220 metres. Therefore clearing is likely to be approximately no more than 0.44 hectares (FMG, 2015). There is considerable creek line foraging habitat surrounding the application area, and therefore this relatively small scale of clearing is unlikely to cause a significant impact to fauna species (FMG, 2015).

Based on available databases within a 20 kilometre radius, one Endangered, two Vulnerable, one Migratory and seven Priority 4 fauna species are likely to occur within the application area (DPaW, 2015; FMG, 2015). Given the small scale of the proposed clearing, impacts on fauna of conservation significance are likely to be minimal.

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

Methodology

CALM (2002)
DPaW (2015)
Ecologia Environment (2015)
FMG (2015)
GIS Database:
- IBRA WA (Regions – Sub Regions)
- Pre-European vegetation
-Threatened Ecological Sites Buffered

(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

Fauna habitats have been mapped throughout the Eliwana Prospect inclusive of the application area (Ecologia Environment, 2015). Two habitats were identified within the boundaries of the application area (Ecologia Environment, 2015):

- Footslopes and plains habitat
- Major creek line habitat

As mentioned previously a total of 40,759ha of footslopes and plains habitat and 1,139 ha of major creek line habitat was mapped throughout the Eliwana Prospect (Ecologia Environment, 2015). The habitats are widespread in the area relative to the size of the proposed clearing (two hectares) (Ecologia Environment, 2015). There are cliffs and ridges present throughout the Eliwana Prospect which may provide suitable habitats for several fauna species, however the application area is located within less undulating terrain and is therefore not likely to act as significant habitat (Ecologia Environment, 2015). Vegetation within the application area is in good condition and may provide foraging or shelter opportunities for fauna (FMG, 2015). However there is also suitable foraging habitat surrounding the Eliwana Prospect (Ecologia Environment, 2015). Given the small amount of clearing, absence of cliffs and rocky terrain, and the abundance of suitable habitat in the surrounding area, the proposed clearing is unlikely to have a significant impact on fauna.

Based upon available databases the following conservation species are likely to occur within a 20 kilometre radius of the application area (DPaW 2015; FMG 2015):

- Ghost Bat (*Macroderma gigas*) – Vulnerable under *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* (WC Act) ;
- Rainbow Bee-Eater (*Merops ornatus)* - Migratory under the Japan and Australia Migratory Bird Agreement (JAMBA)
- Striated Grasswren (*Amytornis striatus* subsp. *striatus*) – Priority 4 under WC Act;
- Long-tailed Dunnart (*Sminthopsis longicaudata*) – Priority 4 under WC Act;
- Western Pebble-mound Mouse *(Pseudomys chapmani)* – Priority 4 under WC Act
- Northern Quoll (*Dasyurus hallucatus*) – *Endangered under Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) and WC Act;
- Pilbara Leaf-nosed Bat (*Rhinonicteris Aurania*) – Vulnerable under EPBC Act and WC Act
- Pilbara Olive Python (*Liasis olivaceus barroni*) – Vulnerable under EPBC Act and WC Act

Based on the preferred habitat of the species above, the following species are considered most likely to occur within the application area (FMG, 2015; DPaW, 2015):

- Pilbara Olive Python (*Liasis olivaceus barroni*)
- Western Pebble-mound mouse *(Pseudomys chapmani)*
- Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus)*

The Pilbara Olive Python is usually found in rocky areas and gorges, in particular those associated with water courses (DPaW, 2015; FMG, 2015). The creek line within the permit envelope may represent suitable habitat for the python, however it is not considered to be critical habitat due to a lack of permanent water, rocky gorges and gullies (FMG, 2015). There is more suitable habitat surrounding the application area (FMG, 2015).

The Western Pebble-mound mouse is found on sloping hills or rocky ranges with the presence of spinifex, eucalyptus and scattered shrubs (Ecologia Environment, 2012). FMG advises that this habitat is represented within the application area (FMG, 2015). Given the wide distribution of the species and its occurrence in a number of protected areas, it is unlikely that the two hectares of clearing proposed in this application will have a significant impact on the species.

The Rainbow Bee-eater is a widespread species and common migrant to many parts of Australia, including the Pilbara bioregion (Department of Environment, 2015). Its habitat includes open woodlands, shrublands and semi cleared areas (Department of Environment, 2015). FMG advises that the Rainbow Bee-eater may utilise the area for foraging, however there are vast areas of foraging habitat available to the Bee-eater in the local area and the region (FMG, 2015). Given the wide distribution and migratory nature of the Rainbow Bee-eater the proposed clearing is unlikely to have a significant impact.

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

Methodology

Department of Environment (2015)
DPaW (2015)
Ecologia Environment (2012)
Ecologia Environment (2015)
FMG (2015)

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

Comments

Proposal not likely to be at variance to this Principle

According to available datasets, there are no known records of Threatened flora within the application area (GIS Database).

FMG (2015) have not recorded any threatened flora species within the application area.

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

Methodology

FMG (2015)
GIS Datatbase:
- Threatened and Priority Flora List

(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

According to available databases, there are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) within the application area (GIS Database). The nearest known TEC is located approximately 25 kilometres North of the application area (GIS Database).

No TECs were identified by FMG (2015).

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

Methodology

GIS Database (2015)
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities Buffers
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities Boundaries

(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 application area occurs within the Pilbara Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion, in which approximately 99.6% of the pre-European vegetation remains (see table below) (GIS Database; Government of Western Australia, 2014)

The vegetation within the application area has been mapped as Beard vegetation association 82 (GIS Database). Given the amount of vegetation remaining in the local area and bioregion, the vegetation proposed to be cleared is not considered to represent remnant vegetation.

	Pre-European area (ha)*	Current extent (ha)*	Remaining %*	Conservation Status**	Pre-European % in DPaW Managed Lands
IBRA Bioregion - Pilbara	17,808,657	17,733,583	~99.6	Least Concern	8.40
Beard vegetation associations - State					
82	2,565,901	2,553,217	~99.5	Least Concern	10.52
Beard vegetation associations - Bioregion					
82	2,169,996	2,157,852	~99.4	Least Concern	12.44

*Government of Western Australia (2014)
** Department of Natural Resources and Environment (2002)

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

Methodology

Government of Western Australia (2014)
GIS Database:
- IBRA WA (regions - subregions)
- 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 at variance to this Principle

The application area is intersected by several minor drainage lines (FMG, 2015; GIS Database)

The proposed clearing is for widening an existing road. FMG (2015) predicts approximately 0.44 hectares of riparian vegetation will be cleared in order to widen the road. FMG (2015) notes that no evidence of water starvation has been observed downstream of the area with relation to the pre-existing road. Given the small amount of clearing (two hectares) and the abundance of minor and major drainage lines containing riparian vegetation within the surrounding area, it is unlikely clearing will result in any significant impact.

Potential impacts to riparian vegetation may be minimised through the implementation of a watercourse management condition.

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

Methodology FMG (2015)
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**
The application area intersects with three different land systems, Boolgeeda, Newman and Platform (GIS Database).

The Platform Land System consists of dissected slopes and raised plains of hard spinifex grasslands. This system is not susceptible to erosion (Payne et al., 1998).

The Newman Land System consists of plateaux, ridges and mountains supporting hard spinifex grasslands. This system is not prone to erosion (Payne et al., 1998).

The Boolgeeda Land System consists of stony lower slopes, plains and hills systems supporting hard and soft spinifex grasslands and mulga shrublands. The system is not susceptible to erosion (Payne et al., 1998).

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 application area is not located within any Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW) managed reserves or other conservation areas (GIS Database).

The nearest conservation area is Karinjini National Park located approximately 70 kilometres east of the application area (GIS Database). The proposed clearing is not likely to significantly impact on this reserve.

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

Methodology GIS Database:
- DPaW 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 Public Drinking Water Source Areas within or in close proximity to the clearing permit application area. There are no permanent watercourses or wetlands within the application area (GIS Database).

The existing road crosses a number of minor drainage lines and one large creek line. Some minor disturbance is required within the larger creek line to widen the road (FMG, 2015). Given there is a pre-existing road, the proposed widening of the road by one to two metres is unlikely to significantly alter surface water flows.

FMG Advises that sediment loads are expected to be naturally high during surface water flow events within the Eliwana Prospect (FMG, 2015). The proposed clearing will expose a larger area of bare surface. However, given the small size (two hectares) of the proposed clearing it is unlikely to significantly increase erosion and sediment loads. Therefore, an impact on surface water quality is unlikely.

Groundwater in the application area is generally contained in fractured rock aquifers. As such, depth to the groundwater table can be highly variable (FMG, 2015). Depth to groundwater at the closest bore is

approximately 40 metres (FMG, 2015). Given the relatively small scale of clearing (two hectares) and the depth to the water table, the proposed clearing is unlikely to have any significant impact on groundwater quality.

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

Methodology FMG (2015)
GIS Database:
- Hydrography, linear
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas (PDWSAs)
- RIWI Act, Groundwater 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**
The application area experiences an arid tropical climate with highly variable rainfall, falling mainly in summer (CALM, 2002). The average annual rainfall at Paraburdoo is 315 millimetres (FMG, 2015). Cyclonic activity is significant, with several systems affecting the coast and hinterland annually (CALM, 2002). Evaporation rates greatly exceed mean annual rainfall at a rate of 3200 millimetres (FMG, 2015). Drainage lines occur within the area, however the small scale of clearing combined with high evaporation and variable rainfall means that there is unlikely to be an increased intensity of flooding.

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

Methodology CALM (2002)
FMG (2015)

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

Comments There are no Native Title Claims over the area under application (DAA 2015). 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 that intersect with the application area (DAA, 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, the Department of Water, and the Department of Parks and Wildlife, 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 9 November 2015 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received.

Methodology DAA (2015)

4. Assessors Comments

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 may be at variance to Principle (f), is not likely to be at variance to Principles (a), (b), (c), (d), (g), (h), (i) and (j), and is not at variance to Principle (e).

5. References

CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographical Subregions. Department of Conservation and Land Management.

DAA (2015) Aboriginal Heritage Inquiry System, Government of Western Australia, Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Perth, http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/

Department of Environment (2015) Species Profile and Threats Database, Department of the Environment, Canberra, <http://www.environment.gov.au/cgi-bin/sprat/public/sprat.pl>

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: Mapping Western Australia's Biodiversity. Department of Environment and Conservation. http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au/

Ecologia Environment (2012) North Star Project Level 2 Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Assessment.

Ecologia Environment (2015) *Western Hub Project* – Eliwana and Flying Fish Terrestrial Vertebrate Fauna Assessment.

FMG (2015) Supporting Documentation – Native Vegetation Clearing Permit

Government of Western Australia (2014) 2014 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of June 2014. 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.Northcote et al (1960-68).

Payne, A.L, Mitchell, A.A, and Holman, W.F. (1998) Technical Bulletin No. 62 – An inventory and condition survey of rangelands in the Ashburton River Catchment, Western Australia

6. Glossary

Acronyms:

BoM	Bureau of Meteorology, Australian Government
DAA	Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Western Australia
DAFWA	Department of Agriculture and Food, Western Australia
DEC	Department of Environment and Conservation, Western Australia (now DPaW and DER)
DER	Department of Environment Regulation, Western Australia
DMP	Department of Mines and Petroleum, Western Australia
DRF	Declared Rare Flora
DotE	Department of the Environment, Australian Government
DoW	Department of Water, Western Australia
DPaW	Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia
DSEWPaC	Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (now DotE)
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority, Western Australia
EP Act	*Environmental Protection Act 1986*, Western Australia
EPBC Act	*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Federal Act)
GIS	Geographical Information System
ha	Hectare (10,000 square metres)
IBRA	Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources – commonly known as the World Conservation Union
PEC	Priority Ecological Community, Western Australia
RIWI Act	*Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914*, Western Australia
s.17	Section 17 of *the Environment Protection Act 1986*, Western Australia
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community

Definitions:

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

T **Threatened species:**
Specially protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* 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).

Threatened Fauna and Flora are further recognised by the Department according to their level of threat using IUCN Red List criteria. For example Carnaby's Cockatoo *Calyptorynchus latirostris* is specially protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* as a threatened species with a ranking of Endangered.

Rankings:
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.

X **Presumed Extinct species:**
Specially protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950, 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).

IA **Migratory birds protected under an international agreement:**
Specially protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950, 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**.**

S **Other specially protected fauna:**
Specially protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950, listed under Schedule 4 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.

P1 **Priority One - Poorly-known species:**
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.

P2 **Priority Two - Poorly-known species:**
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.

P3 **Priority Three - Poorly-known species:**
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 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.