Government of **Western Australia**
Department of **Mines and Petroleum**

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6864/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Mt Magnet Gold Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 58/222
Miscellaneous Licence 58/41
Local Government Area: Shire of Mount Magnet
Colloquial name:

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
100		Mechanical Removal	Mineral Production and Haul Road

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 4 February 2016

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 and are useful to look at vegetation in a regional context. The following two Beard vegetation associations are located within the application area (GIS Database):

18: Low woodland; mulga (*Acacia aneura*); and
313: Succulent steppe with open scrub; scattered *Acacia sclerosperma* & *A. victoriae* over bluebush.

A Level 1 flora and vegetation survey conducted by Botanica Consulting (2015) from 28 to 30 July 2015 identified 13 vegetation types within the application area:

Drainage Depression
DD-AFW1: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura* over scrub of *Acacia craspedocarpa/A. tetragonophylla* and low scrub of *Eremophila compacta* subsp. *compacta* in drainage depression;

DD-AFW2: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/ A. incurvaneura* over scrub of *A. craspedocarpa* and low scrub of *Eremophila forrestii* subsp. *forrestii /E. latrobei* subsp. *latrobei* in floodplain;

Quartz-Rocky Plain
QRP-AFW1: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/A. incurvaneura* over scrub of *Eremophila forrestii* subsp. *forrestii/ E. fraseri* and dwarf scrub of *Eremophila exilifolia/E. latrobei* subsp. *latrobei* on quartz-rocky plain;

QRP-AFW2: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/A. incurvaneura* over low scrub of *Eremophila fraseri* and dwarf scrub of *Eremophila compacta* subsp. *compacta /E. latrobei* subsp. *latrobei/ Ptilotus schwartzii* on quartz-rocky plain;

QRP-AFW3: Low forest of *Acacia craspedocarpa* over low scrub of *Eremophila fraseri* and open dwarf scrub of *Ptilotus schwartzii* on quartz-rocky plain;

QRP-AFW4: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/ A. incurvaneura* over scrub of *Acacia grasbyi/A. ramulosa* var. *ramulosa* and open low grass of *Eragrostis eriopoda* on quartz-rocky plain;

QRP-AFW5: Low woodland of *Acacia caesaneura/A. incurvaneura* over open scrub of *Acacia grasbyi/A. tetragonophylla* and dwarf scrub of *Eremophila serrulata/Ptilotus obovatus* on quartz-rocky plain;

QRP-AS1: Scrub of *Acacia burkittii/A. rhodophloia* over low scrub of *Eremophila fraseri* and dwarf scrub of *Eremophila exilifolia* on quartz-rocky plain;

Rocky Hillslope
RH-AFW1: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/A. mulganeura* over scrub of *Acacia grasbyi/A. tetragonophylla* and dwarf scrub of *Ptilotus obovatus/ Senna artemisioides* subsp. *filifolia* on laterite rise;

RH-AFW2: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/A. incurvaneura* over scrub of *Acacia grasbyi/A. ramulosa* var.

ramulosa and open dwarf scrub of *Eremophila exilifolia/Ptilotus obovatus* on laterite rise;

RH-AFW3: Low forest of *Acacia caesaneura/A. incurvaneura/A. mulganeura* over low scrub of *Eremophila fraseri* and dwarf scrub of *Eremophila exilifolia/Ptilotus obovatus* on Banded Ironstone ridge;

RH-AFW4: Low woodland of *Acacia caesaneura* over scrub of *Acacia burkittii* and low heath of *Eremophila platycalyx/ Senna artemisioides* subsp. *helmsii* on rocky hillslope; and

Breakaway
B-AFW1: Low forest of *Acacia incurvaneura* over scrub of *Acacia grasbyi/Thryptomene decussata* and dwarf scrub of *Eremophila exilifolia/Philotheca brucei* subsp. *brucei* on decaying low breakaway.

Clearing Description Mt Magnet Gold Pty Ltd proposes to clear up to 100 hectares of native vegetation within a total boundary of approximately 141.9 hectares for the purposes of mineral production and haul road. The project is located approximately 30 kilometres north of Mount Magnet, in the Shire of Mount Magnet.

Vegetation Condition Completely Degraded: No longer intact; completely/almost completely without native species (Keighery, 1994);

To:

Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery, 1994).

Comment Vegetation condition determined by Botanica Consulting (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 occurs within the East Murchison subregion of the Murchison Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion (GIS Database). This subregion is characterised by vegetation which is dominated by Mulga Woodlands often rich in ephemerals; hummock grasslands, saltbush shrublands and Halosarcia shrublands (CALM, 2002).

Botanica Consulting (2015) conducted a Level 1 flora and vegetation survey of the application area and identified 13 vegetation types within the application area, with 105 flora taxa representing 30 families and 55 genera. Species composition and vegetation types within the application area are typical of the local region and not considered to be unusually diverse, except for vegetation type RH-AFW3 (Botanica Consulting, 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).

The application area is located within the buffer zone of the Priority 1 Ecological Community 'Lake Austin Vegetation Complexes (Banded Ironstone Formation) (BIF)' (GIS Database). Botanica Consulting (2015) identified one vegetation type (RH-AFW3) associated with BIF within the application area. This BIF ridge had a minor elevation and was located on the western edge of the application area extending north-south. This vegetation type is unique and restricted to the BIF. The proponent has advised that approximately 1 hectare of this vegetation type will be impacted by the proposed clearing. Based on the small area of clearing in relation to the total area of the PEC and its buffer (35,590 hectares), it is unlikely the proposed clearing will have a significant impact on the PEC. Potential impacts to the Priority Ecological Community as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a condition that limits clearing within vegetation type RH-AFW3 to no more than 1 hectare.

A search of the Department of Parks and Wildlife's Threatened and Priority Flora databases revealed no records of Threatened Flora or Priority Flora species within a 5 kilometre radius of the application area (DPaW, 2016). Botanica Consulting (2015) identified three records the Priority 3 Flora species *Acacia burrowsiana* during the survey, with two individuals occurring within the application area. The proposed clearing of two individuals of *Acacia burrowsiana* is not likely to impact the conservation significance of this species. No Threatened Flora species or Threatened Ecological Communities were identified within the application area (Botanica Consulting, 2015).

Two weed species were identified within the application area; *Citrullus lanatus* (Pie melon) and *Cucumis myriocarpus* (Prickly Paddy Melon) (Botanica Consulting, 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.

There were four fauna habitat types recorded within the application area by Harewood (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).

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

Methodology Botanica Consulting (2015)

CALM (2002)
DPaW (2016)
Harewood (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.

Comments

Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

A Level 1 fauna survey was conducted over the application area between 29 and 30 July 2015 by Harewood (2015), which mapped four broad habitats within the application area:

1. Quartz-Rock Plain - Low Acacia Forests, and to a lesser extent Woodlands and Scrub over Scrub and/or Dwarf/Open Dwarf Scrub and/or Open Low Grass on Rocky Clay/Loam Soils;
2. Drainage Depressions/Floodplains - Low Acacia Forests over Scrub and Low Scrub on Clay/Loam Soils with outcropping Basement Rocks;
3. Rocky Hillslopes/Laterite Rises/ Subtle BIF Ridges - Low Acacia Forests and Woodlands over Scrub/Low Scrub and Dwarf Scrub/Open Dwarf Scrub or Low Heath on Rocky Clay/Loam Soils; and
4. Breakaways - Acacia Forests and Woodlands over Scrub/Dwarf Scrub on Massive to Rubbly Ferruginous Duricrust.

The landforms and habitat found within the application area are considered as being well represented in the local region (Harewood, 2015). 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 (Harewood, 2015).

The faunal survey did not identify any species of conservation significance within the application area (Harewood, 2015). Harewood (2015) identified two bird species of conservation significance which may be impacted by the proposed clearing; Rainbow Bee-eater (*Merops ornatus*) (Migratory species; JAMBA, CAMBA), and Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) (Schedule 7). These birds could potentially use the application area and adjoining areas for foraging, roosting and possibly breeding; however given the high mobility of these species, it is not likely that the proposed clearing will significantly impact the conservation significance of this species.

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

Methodology Harewood (2015)

(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 the flora and vegetation survey conducted by Botanica Consulting (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 Botanica Consulting (2015)
DPaW (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

According to available databases, there are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) within the application area (GIS Database). The nearest known TEC is approximately 216 kilometres east of the application area (GIS Database).

No TECs were recorded during the vegetation survey (Botanica Consulting, 2015).

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

Methodology Botanica Consulting (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 at variance to this Principle

The application areas fall within the Gascoyne Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia bioregion (GIS Database). The vegetation within the application areas is recorded as:

18: Low woodland; mulga (*Acacia aneura*); and
313: Succulent steppe with open scrub; scattered *Acacia sclerosperma* & *A. victoriae* over bluebush.

The above Beard vegetation associations retain approximately 99**%** or above of their pre-European extent at both the state and bioregion level (Government of Western Australia, 2014). The areas proposed to be cleared are not a significant remnant of native vegetation.

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

Methodology 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 the available databases, two non-perennial watercourses cross through the proposed haul road route (GIS Database). Based on vegetation mapping by Botanica Consulting (2015), the vegetation types DD-AFW1 and DD-AFW2 are identified as growing in association with these watercourses. As these watercourses are 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 Botanica Consulting (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 has been mapped as occurring on the Jundee, Violet, Wiluna, Challenge and Woodline land systems (GIS Database).

The Jundee land system is characterised by hardpan plains with ironstone gravel mantles supporting mulga shrublands (Payne *et al.*, 1998). Alterations to natural sheet flows can initiate soil erosion and cause water starvation and consequent loss of vigour in vegetation downslope (Payne *et al.*, 1998).

The Violet land system is characterised by undulating stony and gravelly plains and low rises supporting mulga shrublands. Abundant mantles provide effective protection against soil erosion over most of this land system, except where the soil surface has been disturbed, for example by the construction of tracks and gridlines where the soil becomes moderately susceptible to water erosion. Narrow drainage tracts are mildly susceptible to water erosion (Payne *et al.*, 1998).

The Wiluna land system is characterised by greenstone hills, breakaways and lower plains supporting mulga shrublands occasionally with understoreys of halophytic shrubs. Due to its stony nature much of this system is not generally susceptible to erosion; however disturbance of the stony mantle, especially on sloping areas can result in erosion. Two units within this land system are mildly to moderately susceptible to accelerated erosion when degraded (Payne *et al.*, 1998).

The Challenge land system is characterised by gently sloping gritty-surfaced plains, occasional granite hills, tors and low breakaways, with acacia shrubland (Payne *et al.*, 1998). Two units within this land system are slightly susceptible to erosion (Payne *et al.*, 1998).

The Woodline land system is characterised by hardpan wash plains supporting acacia shrublands and woodlands. The system is generally not prone to accelerated soil erosion, however, impedance to overland flow (e.g. by roads and tracks diverting run-off) can cause water starvation effects on vegetation downslope (Payne *et al.*, 1998).

Potential erosion impacts as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition and a watercourse management condition.

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

Methodology Payne *et al.* (1998)
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, Karroun Hill Nature Reserve, is located approximately 206 kilometres south of the application area (GIS Database).

Given the distance of the application area from Karroun Hill 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 East Murchison 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 Mount Magnet (BoM, 2016; 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 saline (1,000 to 7,000 milligrams/Litre Total Dissolved solids) (GIS Database). With high annual evaporation rates and low annual rainfall (BoM, 2016), 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 (2016)
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 238.2 millimetres and an average annual evaporation rate of between 2,400 and 2,800 millimetres there is likely to be little surface flow during normal seasonal rains (BoM, 2016; 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 BoM (2016)
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). 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 21 December 2015 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received in relation to the application.

Methodology Department of Aboriginal Affairs (2015)

4. References

Botanica Consulting (2015) Level 1 Flora & Vegetation Survey of the Blackmans Project. Prepared for Ramelius Resources Limited, September 2015.

BoM (2016) Climate Statistics for Australian Locations. A Search for Climate Statistics for Three Rivers Aero, Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology, http://reg.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_007057.shtml. (Accessed 28 January 2016).

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

Department of Aboriginal Affairs (2015) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Government of Western Australia, http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/. (Accessed 18 December 2015).

DPaW (2015) NatureMap Department of Parks and Wildlife, http://naturemap.dec.wa.gov.au. (Accessed 18 December 2015).

Harewood, G (2015) Fauna Assessment – Blackmans Project (V2). Prepared for Ramelius Resources Limited, September 2015.

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.

Payne, A.L., Mitchell, A.A. and Holman, W.F. (1988) An inventory and condition survey of rangelands in the Ashburton River catchment, Western Australia. Revised edition. Western Australian Department of Agriculture. Technical Bulletin No. 62.

5. 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
TEC	Threatened Ecological Community

Definitions:

{DPaW (2015) Conservation Codes for Western Australian Flora and Fauna. Department of Parks and Wildlife, Western Australia}:-

T **Threatened species:**
Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* listed under Schedules 1 to 4 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora (which may also be referred to as Declared Rare Flora).

Threatened fauna is that subset of 'Specially Protected Fauna' declared to be 'likely to become extinct' pursuant to section 14(4) of the Wildlife Conservation Act.

Threatened flora is flora that has been declared to be 'likely to become extinct or is rare, or otherwise in need of special protection', pursuant to section 23F(2) of the Wildlife Conservation Act.

The assessment of the conservation status of these species is based on their national extent and ranked according to their level of threat using IUCN Red List categories and criteria as detailed below.

CR **Critically endangered species**
Threatened species considered to be facing an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 1 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora.

EN **Endangered species**
Threatened species considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 2 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora.

VU **Vulnerable species**
Threatened species considered to be facing a high risk of extinction in the wild. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 3 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Threatened Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Threatened Flora.

EX **Presumed extinct species**
Species which have been adequately searched for and there is no reasonable doubt that the last individual has died. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 4 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice for Presumed Extinct Fauna and Wildlife Conservation (Rare Flora) Notice for Presumed Extinct Flora.

IA **Migratory birds protected under an international agreement**
Birds that are subject to an agreement between the government of Australia and the governments of Japan (JAMBA), China (CAMBA) and The Republic of Korea (ROKAMBA), and the Bonn Convention, relating to the protection of migratory birds. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.

CD **Conservation dependent fauna**
Fauna of special conservation need being species dependent on ongoing conservation intervention to prevent it becoming eligible for listing as threatened. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 6 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.

OS **Other specially protected fauna**
Fauna otherwise in need of special protection to ensure their conservation. Published as Specially Protected under the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950,* in Schedule 7 of the Wildlife Conservation (Specially Protected Fauna) Notice.

P **Priority species**
Species which are poorly known; or
Species that are adequately known, are rare but not threatened, and require regular monitoring. Assessment of Priority codes is based on the Western Australian distribution of the species, unless the distribution in WA is part of a contiguous population extending into adjacent States, as defined by the known spread of locations.

P1 **Priority One - Poorly-known species:**
Species that are known from one or a few locations (generally five or less) which are potentially at risk. All occurrences are either: very small; or on lands not managed for conservation, e.g. agricultural or pastoral lands, urban areas, road and rail reserves, gravel reserves and active mineral leases; or otherwise under threat of habitat destruction or degradation. Species may be included if they are

comparatively well known from one or more locations but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and appear to be under immediate threat from known threatening processes. Such species are in urgent need of further survey.

P2 **Priority Two - Poorly-known species:**
Species that are known from one or a few locations (generally five or less), some of which are on lands managed primarily for nature conservation, e.g. national parks, conservation parks, nature reserves and other lands with secure tenure being managed for conservation. Species may be included if they are comparatively well known from one or more locations but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and appear to be under threat from known threatening processes. Such species are in urgent need of further survey.

P3 **Priority Three - Poorly-known species:**
Species that are known from several locations, and the species does not appear to be under imminent threat, or from few but widespread locations 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 locations but do not meet adequacy of survey requirements and known threatening processes exist that could affect them. Such species are in need of further survey.

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 are close to qualifying for Vulnerable, but are not listed as Conservation Dependent.
(c) Species that have been removed from the list of threatened species during the past five years for reasons other than taxonomy.