



Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6914/1

Permit type: Area Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 45/666

Local Government Area: Town of Port Hedland

Colloquial name: Turner River Quarry Project

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
12.62		Mechanical Removal	Camp facilities and overburden storage

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant

Decision Date: 10 March 2016

2. Site Information

2.1. Existing environment and information

2.1.1. Description of the native vegetation under application

Vegetation Description	<p>The clearing permit application area has been broadly mapped as the following Beard vegetation association:</p> <p>589: Mosaic: Short bunch grassland – savanna / grass plain (Pilbara) / Hummock grasslands, grass steppe; soft spinifex (Government of Western Australia, 2014; GIS Database).</p> <p>A flora and vegetation survey conducted by Animal Plant Mineral Pty Ltd (APM), identified the following two vegetation types within the application area (APM, 2009):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Isolated to very scattered <i>Corymbia</i> woodland and <i>Acacia</i> shrubland over <i>Triodia epactia</i> hummock grassland; and2. Isolated to very scattered <i>Corymbia</i> woodland and <i>Acacia</i> shrubland over <i>Triodia epactia</i> open hummock grassland. <p>There are also previously disturbed/cleared areas throughout the application area (APM, 2009).</p>
Clearing Description	<p>Turner River Quarry Project.</p> <p>Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd (Holcim) proposes to clear up to 12.62 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 12.62 hectares, for the purpose of camp facilities and overburden storage. The project is located approximately 39 kilometres southwest of Port Hedland, within the Town of Port Hedland.</p>
Vegetation Condition	<p>Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery, 1994).</p> <p>To</p> <p>Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery, 1994).</p>
Comment	<p>The vegetation condition was derived from a survey report produced by Animal Plant Mineral Pty Ltd (APM, 2009).</p> <p>This permit replaces previous Area Permit CPS 5614/1 which was granted by the Department of Mines and Petroleum on 20 June 2013 and expired on 31 July 2015. No clearing was undertaken under CPS 5614/1.</p> <p>The application area is located immediately adjacent to an operational hard rock quarry and associated mining infrastructure. The proposed clearing is for the upgrade of existing camp facilities and the creation of a new overburden storage area (Holcim, 2013).</p>

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 Roebourne subregion of the Pilbara Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion (GIS Database). This subregion is characterised by quaternary alluvial and older colluvial coastal and subcoastal plains with a grass savannah of mixed bunch and hummock grasses, and dwarf shrub steppe of *Acacia stellaticeps* or *A. pyrifolia* and *A. inaequilatera*. Uplands are dominated by *Triodia* hummock grasslands and ephemeral drainage lines support *Eucalyptus victrix* or *Corymbia hamersleyana* woodlands. Samphire, *Sporobolus* and mangal occur on marine alluvial flats and river deltas (CALM, 2002).

APM (2009) conducted a flora and vegetation survey over Mining Lease 45/666 (which includes the application area) from 18 to 21 October 2009. A total of 53 native vascular plant taxa from 21 families were recorded during the survey (APM, 2009). The application area does not support a high diversity of flora or vegetation units which may be important for the locality or the subregion (APM, 2009). APM (2009) identified two vegetation communities within the application area with the condition of the vegetation communities classified as 'Very Good' to 'Degraded' on the Keighery scale (Keighery, 1994).

Several species of Priority flora have the potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions, however no Priority flora were recorded during the flora survey of the application area and surrounding areas (APM, 2009).

There are no known Threatened flora species, Threatened Ecological Communities or Priority Ecological Communities recorded within or in close proximity to the application area (APM, 2009; GIS Database).

The application area falls wholly within the Boondarie Pastoral Lease (GIS Database), and the vegetation has suffered previous disturbance from grazing activities (Holcim, 2013). One weed species *Aerva javanica* (Kapok Bush) was recorded within the application area (APM, 2009). Weeds have the potential to significantly change the dynamics of a natural ecosystem and lower the biodiversity of an area. Potential impacts to biodiversity as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a weed management condition.

The fauna habitats within the application area are considered to be common and widespread within the subregion and faunal assemblages are unlikely to be different to that found in similar habitat located elsewhere in the region (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2009). The clearing of 12.62 hectares of native vegetation is unlikely to have a significant impact on faunal diversity in a regional or local context.

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

Methodology

APM (2009)
CALM (2002)
Holcim (2013)
Keighery (1994)
Terrestrial Ecosystems (2009)

GIS Database:

- IBRA Australia
- Pre-European Vegetation
- Threatened and Priority Flora
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TEC/PEC) - Boundaries
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TEC/PEC) - 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

Proposal is not likely to be at variance to this Principle

A fauna survey has not been conducted over the application area (Holcim, 2013). However, in October 2009, Terrestrial Ecosystems conducted a fauna survey over an area of similar terrain, immediately adjacent to the current clearing permit application area (Holcim, 2013).

Based on a flora and vegetation survey by APM (2009), two faunal habitat types were identified within the application area:

1. Isolated to very scattered *Corymbia* woodland and *Acacia* shrubland over *Triodia epactia* hummock grassland. (This habitat type represented the majority of the application area); and
2. Isolated to very scattered *Corymbia* woodland and *Acacia* Shrubland over *Triodia epactia* open hummock grassland.

APM (2009) considered the vegetation condition to be 'Degraded' to 'Very Good' on the Keighery scale (Keighery, 1994). The application area has suffered substantial disturbance over many years from pastoral

activities and adjacent mining activities, and substantial areas of better quality fauna habitat occur in surrounding areas (Holcim, 2013; Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2009). The application area does not contain restricted habitats or faunal assemblages that are ecologically significant in the region (Holcim, 2013; Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2009).

A large number of conservation significant fauna species have the potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions. However, the majority are wide-ranging and highly mobile and none are expected to be specifically dependent on habitats within the application area (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2009). The proposed clearing of 12.62 hectares of native vegetation immediately adjacent to existing disturbed areas is not likely to impact critical feeding or breeding habitat for any conservation significant fauna species.

The landforms, vegetation associations and fauna habitat types found within the application area are well represented in the Roebourne subregion (APM, 2009; Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2009; GIS Database). The proposed clearing is likely to have minimal impact on fauna habitat availability in a local or regional context (Terrestrial Ecosystems, 2009).

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

Methodology APM (2009)
Holcim (2013)
Keighery (1994)
Terrestrial Ecosystems (2009)

GIS Database:
- Pre-European Vegetation

(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 records of Threatened (rare) flora within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database).

A flora survey conducted over the application area did not record any species of Threatened flora (APM, 2009). The vegetation associations recorded within the application area are well represented in surrounding areas (APM, 2009; GIS Database), and the vegetation proposed to be cleared is unlikely to be necessary for the continued existence of any species of rare flora.

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

Methodology APM (2009)

GIS Database:
- Threatened and Priority Flora
- Pre-European Vegetation

(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**
There are no known Threatened Ecological Communities (TEC's) located within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database).

A survey of the application area did not identify any Threatened Ecological Communities (APM, 2009).

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

Methodology APM (2009)

GIS Database:
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TEC/PEC) - Boundaries
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TEC/PEC) - Buffered

(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 area applied to be cleared is located within the Pilbara IBRA bioregion (GIS Database). There is approximately 99% of pre-European vegetation remaining within the bioregion (Government of Western Australia, 2014).

The vegetation of the application area is broadly mapped as Beard vegetation association 589: Mosaic: Short bunch grassland – savanna /grass plain (Pilbara) /Hummock grasslands, grass steppe; soft spinifex (GIS Database). Approximately 99% of the pre-European extent of this vegetation association remains uncleared at both the state and bioregion level (Government of Western Australia, 2014). Hence, the vegetation proposed to be cleared does not represent a significant remnant of vegetation in an area that has been extensively cleared.

	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	Least Concern	~8.4
Beard vegetation association - State					
589	807,698	802,713	~ 99	Least Concern	~1.6
Beard vegetation association - Bioregion					
589	728,768	724,695	~ 99	Least Concern	~1.8

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

GIS Database:
- IBRA Australia
- 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 not likely to be at variance to this Principle

There are no watercourses or water bodies within the application area (Holcim, 2013; GIS Database). Minor ephemeral drainage lines are common in the surrounding area, and feed into the Turner River, a large ephemeral river which is located approximately 100 metres to the east of the application area, at its nearest point (GIS Database).

Local watercourses are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly following significant rainfall events. Holcim (2013) report that the application area is at an elevation approximately five metres above the level of the river bed of the Turner River and is not subject to inundation from the river. The vegetation of the application area is not considered to be riparian in nature or to be growing in association with any watercourse (APM, 2009).

The proposed clearing is not expected to have any significant impact on the Turner River or any other watercourse.

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

Methodology APM (2009)
Holcim (2013)

GIS Database:
- Hydrography, Lakes
- 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 is mapped as occurring within the Ruth land system (GIS Database). The Ruth land system is characterised by hills and ridges of volcanic and other rocks supporting hard spinifex (occasionally soft spinifex) grasslands. The system is prone to fairly regular burning but is not susceptible to erosion (Van Vreeswyk et al., 2004).

The Turner River Quarry is located on a low rocky north-south ridge, with gentle gradients sloping down to the east towards the Turner River (Holcim, 2013). The proposed clearing of 12.62 hectares of native vegetation is

not likely to result in appreciable land degradation.

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

Methodology Holcim (2013)
Van Vreeswyk et al. (2004)

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 conservation area (GIS Database). The nearest conservation area is the Mungaroona Range Nature Reserve, located approximately 85 kilometres south-west of the application area (GIS Database).

Given the distance of the application area from Mungaroona Range Nature Reserve and the abundance of uncleared land in the surrounding area, the area proposed to be cleared is not likely to provide a significant ecological linkage or fauna movement corridor for the reserve. The proposed clearing is unlikely to have any impacts on the environmental values of this or any other conservation area.

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

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

There are no watercourses or water bodies within the application area (GIS Database). Minor ephemeral drainage lines are common in the surrounding area, and feed into the Turner River, a large ephemeral river which is located approximately 100 metres to the east of the application area, at its nearest point (GIS Database). These drainage tracts are dry for most of the year, only flowing or holding surface water briefly following significant rainfall events (APM, 2009). While the proposed clearing may contribute to sediment loads in surface water flows, the impact to surface water quality is likely to be minimal.

The application area has a groundwater salinity that is saline (1,000 - 3,000 milligrams/Litre Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)) (GIS Database). The proposed clearing of up to 12.62 hectares of native vegetation is unlikely to result in any further deterioration in groundwater quality in the local area.

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

Methodology APM (2009)

GIS Database:
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide
- Hydrography, Lakes
- Hydrography, Linear
- Public Drinking Water Source Areas
- 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 climate of the region is semi-arid, with an average rainfall of approximately 300-350 millimetres per year (CALM, 2002). Drainage lines in the area are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (APM, 2009).

There are no watercourses or waterbodies within the application area (GIS Database). The Turner River is located to the east of the application area, with the edge of the river bed approximately 100 metres from the application area at its nearest point (APM, 2009; GIS Database). The Turner River is a broad, shallow river channel, however it is dry for most of the year, only flowing after significant rainfall events (APM, 2009). Temporary localised flooding may occur during heavy rainfall events, especially during the cyclone season,

however the application area is approximately five metres above the level of the river bed and is not subject to inundation from the river, even during peak flood events (APM, 2009).

The proposed clearing may result in increased run-off into the Turner River, however, given the size of the area to be cleared (12.62 hectares) compared to the size of the Turner River catchment area (approximately 480,186 hectares) (GIS Database), the proposed clearing is unlikely to increase the incidence or intensity of natural flooding events.

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

Methodology APM (2009)
CALM (2002)

GIS Database:
- Hydrography, linear
- Hydrographic Catchments - Catchments

Planning Instrument, Native Title, previous EPA decision or other relevant matter.

Comments

The clearing permit application was advertised on 1 February 2016 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received in relation to this application.

There is one native title claim (WC1999/003) over the area under application (DAA, 2016). This claim has been registered with the National Native Title Tribunal on behalf of the claimant groups. However, the mining tenement 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 located within the application area (DAA, 2016; GIS Database). 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.

Methodology DAA (2016)

GIS Database:
- Aboriginal Sites Register System

4. References

- APM (2009) Holcim Turner River: Botanical Assessment Survey. Report prepared for Holcim Australia Pty Ltd by Animal Plant Mineral Pty Ltd, 2009.
- CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographic Subregions in 2002. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia.
- DAA (2016) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Department of Aboriginal Affairs. <http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/> (Accessed 8 March 2016).
- 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.
- 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.
- Holcim (2013) Holcim Turner River Quarry. Application for clearing permit within Mining Lease M45/666. Holcim Australia Pty Ltd, May 2013.
- Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.
- Terrestrial Ecosystems (2009) Level 1 Fauna Risk Assessment for Holcim Turner River Quarry. Report prepared for Animal Plant Mineral Pty Ltd by Terrestrial Ecosystems, November 2009.
- Van Vreeswyk, A.M.E., Payne, A.L., Hennig, P., and Leighton, K.A. (2004) An Inventory and Condition Survey of the Pilbara Region, Western Australia. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.

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	<i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> , Western Australia
EPBC Act	<i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> (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	<i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> , 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 <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> , 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 <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> , 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 <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> , 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 <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> , 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 <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> , 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.