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

Clearing Permit Decision Report

1. Application details

1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 6981/1
Permit type: Purpose Permit

1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Lake Austin Mining Pty Ltd**

1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 20/54
Local Government Area: Shire of Cue
Colloquial name: White Well Gold Project

1.4. Application

Clearing Area (ha)	No. Trees	Method of Clearing	For the purpose of:
110		Mechanical Removal	Mineral Production and associated activities

1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant
Decision Date: 12 May 2016

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:

18: Low woodland; mulga (*Acacia aneura*) (GIS Database). a

A flora and vegetation survey was conducted over the majority of the application area in March 2012. The following six vegetation communities were mapped within the survey area (Botanica Consulting, 2012):

1. Low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over low scrub of *Eremophila forrestii* subsp. *forrestii* over open low grass of *Monachather paradoxus*/*Aristida contorta*.

2. Low woodland of *Acacia caesaneura* over low scrub of *Eremophila jucunda* subsp. *jucunda* over open low grass of *Eriachne flaccida*/*Aristida contorta*.

3. Open low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over open low scrub of *Thryptomene decussata* over open low grass of *Aristida contorta*.

4. Low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over open dwarf scrub of *Ptilotus obovatus*/*Maireana triptera* on rehabilitated waste landform.

5. Low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over scrub of *Acacia ramulosa* over low open grass *Monachather paradoxus*.

6. Forest of *Acacia aneura* over low scrub of *Acacia ramulosa*/*Eremophila forrestii* subsp. *forrestii* over open low grass of *Monachather paradoxus*/*Eragrostis eriopoda* in creekline.

Clearing Description

White Well Gold Project.
Lake Austin Mining Pty Ltd (Lake Austin) proposes to clear up to 110 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 213 hectares, for the purpose of an open pit gold mine and mining related infrastructure. The project is located approximately 30 kilometres east of Cue, within the Shire of Cue.

Vegetation Condition

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

To

Degraded: Structure severely disturbed; regeneration to good condition requires intensive management (Keighery, 1994).

Comment

The vegetation condition was derived from a survey report produced by Botanica Consulting (2012). The majority of the survey area was considered to be in "good" condition. The eastern side of the application area was not covered by the vegetation survey.

The application area is located at the existing White Well minesite. Clearing is required for further development of the minesite. Clearing Permit CPS 5075/2, was granted to the previous minesite operator (Cobra Mining Ltd) on 27 June 2013. CPS 5075/2 authorised the clearing of up to 99 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 378 hectares, which included all of the current application area. The current (smaller) application area includes some areas of existing minesite disturbance.

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 Eastern Murchison subregion of the Murchison Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation of Australia (IBRA) bioregion (GIS Database). This subregion is characterised by its internal drainage and extensive areas of elevated red desert sandplains and minimal dune development (CALM, 2002). Vegetation is dominated by Mulga woodlands often rich in ephemerals; hummock grasslands, saltbush shrublands and *Halosarcia* shrublands (CALM, 2002).

A flora and vegetation survey over the majority of the clearing permit application area was undertaken by Botanica Consulting in March 2012. A total of 60 plant taxa, belonging to 29 genera from 16 families, were recorded from the survey area (Botanica Consulting, 2012). Botanica Consulting (2012) reported that the flora within the survey area was considered diverse but not restricted, and was widely represented in the region. The survey did not cover a narrow strip down the eastern side of the current clearing permit application area, however, landforms and vegetation types within this area are likely to be similar to those recorded within the survey area (GIS Database).

No Threatened Flora, Priority Flora, Threatened Ecological Communities or Priority Ecological Communities were recorded during the flora and vegetation survey, and none have been previously recorded within or in close proximity to the application area (Botanica Consulting, 2012; GIS Database).

One weed species, Prickly Paddy Melon (*Cucumis myriocarpus*) was recorded within the survey area (Botanica Consulting, 2012). Weeds have the potential to significantly change the dynamics of a natural ecosystem, outcompeting native species and potentially reducing 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.

A Level 1 fauna survey was conducted over the majority of the application area in March 2012 (Harewood, 2012). The fauna survey recorded a total of 36 native fauna species comprising of six reptile, 28 bird, and two mammal species (Harewood, 2012). Evidence of three introduced mammal species was also observed (Harewood, 2012). The fauna species and fauna habitat types recorded within the survey area were considered to be common and widespread within the subregion and faunal assemblages are unlikely to be different to those found in similar habitats located elsewhere in the region (Harewood, 2012). The proposed clearing is unlikely to have a significant impact on faunal diversity in a local or regional context.

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

Methodology

Botanica Consulting (2012)
CALM (2002)
Harewood (2012)

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 Level 1 fauna survey was conducted over the majority of the application area in March 2012 (Harewood, 2012). The survey consisted of a desktop study, a reconnaissance survey of fauna habitat types and opportunistic fauna sightings during the site visit (Harewood, 2012). A total of 36 fauna species were observed during the on-site survey or were identified by evidence such as scats, tracks and calls (Harewood, 2012).

Based on site observations and the vegetation survey by Botanica Consulting (2012), Harewood (2012) identified the following broad faunal habitat types within the survey area:

- Low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over scrub of *Acacia ramulosa* over low open grass *Monachather paradoxus*;
- Low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over low scrub of *Eremophila forrestii* subsp. *forrestii* over open low grass of *Monachather paradoxus*/*Arista contorta*;
- Low woodland of *Acacia caesaneura* over low scrub of *Eremophila jucunda* subsp. *jucunda* over open low grass of *Eriachne flaccida*/*Aristida contorta*;
- Low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over open dwarf scrub of *Ptilotus obovatus*/*Maireana triptera* on rehabilitated waste landform;
- Forest of *Acacia aneura* over low scrub of *Acacia ramulosa*/*Eremophila forrestii* over open low grass of *Monachather paradoxus*/*Eragrostis eriopoda* in creekline;
- Open low woodland of *Acacia aneura* over open low scrub of *Thryptomene decussata* over open low grass of *Aristida contorta*; and
- Decommissioned open cut mine - flooded with freshwater (Harewood, 2012).

The application area is unlikely to contain restricted habitats or faunal assemblages that are ecologically significant in the region (Harewood, 2012).

Based on known distributions, several conservation significant fauna species have the potential to occur within the application area, however, no conservation significant species were recorded during the fauna survey (Harewood, 2012). The majority of the potential species are wide-ranging and highly mobile and, with the exception of the malleefowl, none are expected to be specifically dependent on habitats occurring within the application area (Harewood, 2012). No evidence of malleefowl activity was recorded in the survey area, and Harewood (2012) considered that the malleefowl was unlikely to occur. However, not all of the current clearing permit application area was covered by the fauna survey, a targeted malleefowl survey was not undertaken, and there is potential malleefowl habitat in the area. The implementation of a fauna management condition may reduce potential impacts to malleefowl.

The landforms, vegetation associations and fauna habitat types found within the application area are well represented in the subregion (Botanica Consulting, 2012; Harewood, 2012; GIS Database). The proposed clearing is considered unlikely to have a significant impact on fauna habitat availability in a local or regional context.

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

Methodology Botanica Consulting (2012)
Harewood (2012)

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 majority of the application area did not record any species of Threatened flora (Botanica Consulting, 2012). The vegetation associations recorded within the application area are well represented in surrounding areas (Botanica Consulting, 2012; 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 Botanica Consulting (2012)

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 (Botanica Consulting, 2012).

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

Methodology Botanica Consulting (2012)

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 Murchison 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 18: Low woodland; mulga (*Acacia aneura*) (GIS Database). Approximately 99% of the pre-European extent of this vegetation association remains uncleared at both the state and bioregional 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 - Murchison	28,120,586	28,044,823	~ 99	Least Concern	~7.6
Beard vegetation association - State					
18	19,892,304	19,843,727	~ 99	Least Concern	~6.2
Beard vegetation association - Bioregion					
18	12,403,172	12,363,252	~ 99	Least Concern	~4.9

* 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 at variance to this Principle

There are no permanent watercourses or water bodies within the application area (Botanica Consulting, 2012; GIS Database). Two minor ephemeral drainage lines pass through the application area (GIS Database). These watercourses are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly following significant rainfall events.

Botanica Consulting (2012) identified one vegetation community within the application area as being associated with minor ephemeral watercourses:

Forest of *Acacia aneura* over low scrub of *Acacia ramulosa*/*Eremophila forrestii* subsp. *forrestii* over open low grass of *Monachather paradoxus*/*Eragrostis eriopoda* in creekline.

Based on the above, the proposed clearing is at variance to this Principle. However, vegetation associated with minor drainage lines is widespread in surrounding areas (GIS Database) and any impacts are likely to be minimal in a regional context. The proposed clearing is unlikely to result in any significant impact on any watercourse or wetland.

Methodology Botanica Consulting (2012)

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 may be at variance to this Principle

The application area is mapped as occurring within the Jundee and Wiluna land systems (GIS Database).

The Jundee land system is characterised by hardpan wash plains with variable dark gravelly mantling and weakly groved vegetation; minor sandy banks; and supports scattered mulga shrublands (Curry et al., 1994). The hardpan plains are not normally susceptible to erosion unless severely degraded, however, concentrated drainage zones are mildly susceptible to accelerated erosion when degraded (Curry et al., 1994).

The Wiluna Land System is characterised by low greenstone hills with occasional lateritic breakaways and broad stony slopes, lower saline stony plains and broad drainage tracts (Curry et al., 1994). It supports sparse mulga shrublands with patches of halophytic shrubs (Curry et al., 1994). Three of the land units within the Wiluna land system: the sandy surfaced gravelly plains; alluvial fans and plains; and drainage floors; are mildly to moderately susceptible to accelerated erosion when degraded (Curry et al., 1994). This land system shows some localised erosion as a result of mining activities (Curry et al., 1994).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing may be at variance to this Principle. Potential impacts from land degradation as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

Methodology

Curry et al. (1994)

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 or in close proximity to any conservation area (GIS Database). The nearest conservation area is the DPaW managed former Lakeside pastoral lease, located approximately 40 kilometres south-west of the application area, at its nearest point (GIS Database).

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).

Two minor seasonal watercourses pass through the application area (GIS Database). Minor ephemeral drainage lines are common in the surrounding area (GIS Database). These drainage tracts are dry for most of the year, only flowing or holding surface water briefly following significant rainfall events (Botanica Consulting, 2012). 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 proposed clearing is unlikely to result in any 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

Botanica Consulting (2012)

GIS Database:
- Groundwater Salinity, Statewide
- Hydrography, Lakes
- Hydrography, linear
- Public Drinking Water Source 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

There are no watercourses or waterbodies within the application area (GIS Database). Drainage lines in the area are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (Botanica Consulting, 2012). Temporary localised flooding may occur during heavy rainfall events.

The application area is within the Murchison River catchment area (GIS Database). Given the size of the area to be cleared (110 hectares) in relation to the size of the catchment area (approximately 10,376,751 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

Botanica Consulting (2012)

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 28 March 2016 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received in relation to this application.

There are two native title claims (WC1999/010 and WC1999/046) over the area under application (DAA, 2016). These claims have 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

Botanica Consulting (2012) Level 1 Flora and Vegetation Survey of White Well Mine. Report Prepared for Cobra Mining Ltd, by Botanica Consulting.

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

Curry, P.J., Payne, A.L., Leighton, K.A., Hennig, P. and Blood, D.A. (1994) An Inventory and Condition Survey of the Murchison River Catchment and Surrounds, Western Australia. Technical Bulletin No. 84. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.

DAA (2016) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Department of Aboriginal Affairs. http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/ (Accessed 10 May 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.

Harewood, G. (2012) Terrestrial Fauna Survey (Level 1) of the White Well Project. Report Prepared for Cobra Resources Limited, by G. Harewood, April 2012.

Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, 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	*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.