



# Clearing Permit Decision Report

## 1. Application details

### 1.1. Permit application details

Permit application No.: 7240/1  
Permit type: Purpose Permit

### 1.2. Proponent details

Proponent's name: **Gascoyne Resources Limited**

### 1.3. Property details

Property: Mining Lease 59/749  
Local Government Area: Shire of Mount Magnet  
Colloquial name: Dalgara Gold Project

### 1.4. Application

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

### 1.5. Decision on application

Decision on Permit Application: Grant  
Decision Date: 17 November 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 associations: 18: Low woodland; mulga (*Acacia aneura*); and 395: Hummock grasslands, mixed sandplain; bowgada, mallee, heath and spinifex (GIS Database).

A Level 1 flora and vegetation survey was conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions during May and June 2016 over an area of approximately 2,051 hectares, which included the current clearing permit application area (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

The following seven vegetation communities were recorded within the application area (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016):

Open mulga woodland;

Mulga over *Acacia ramulosa* and *Eremophila forrestii* shrubland;

Mulga over *Thryptomene costata* and *Eremophila glutinosa* shrubland;

Open mulga shrubland over stony plains;

*Acacia aneura* and *Acacia craspedocarpa* over *Eremophila jucunda* open shrubland with herbaceous understorey;

Mulga over Chenopod shrubland; and

Mulga woodland over *Acacia grasbyi* and *Acacia rhodophloia*.

**Clearing Description** Dalgara Gold Project. Gascoyne Resources Limited (Gascoyne Resources) proposes to clear up to 227 hectares of native vegetation within a boundary of approximately 943 hectares, for the purposes of mineral production and mining related infrastructure. The project is located approximately 65 kilometres northwest of Mount Magnet, within the Shire of Mount Magnet.

**Vegetation Condition** Good: Structure significantly altered by multiple disturbance; retains basic structure/ability to regenerate (Keighery, 1994);  
to  
Very Good: Vegetation structure altered; obvious signs of disturbance (Keighery, 1994).

**Comment** The vegetation condition was derived from a vegetation survey conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

The Dalgara project proposes to recommence and further develop mining operations at the former Golden

Wings and Gilbeys minesites which ceased operations in 2001. The application area includes existing mine pits and mining related infrastructure. Clearing will be required for the upgrade of the existing minesite infrastructure and development of additional infrastructure (Clark Lindbeck, 2016).

### 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 Western Murchison subregion of the Murchison Bioregion of the Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) (GIS Database). The Western Murchison subregion is characterised by mulga low woodlands, often rich in ephemerals, on outcrop and extensive hardpan wash-plains that dominate the subregion. The dominant land-use of the subregion is grazing (CALM, 2002).

A Level 1 flora and vegetation survey was conducted by Native Vegetation Solutions over the application area and surrounding areas from 30 May to 2 June 2016 (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016). A total of 130 flora species, from 27 families and 49 genera were recorded within the survey area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

No Threatened Flora have been recorded within or in close proximity to the application area, and none were found during the survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016; GIS Database). Database searches revealed 28 species of Priority flora with the potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions, however, none were recorded during the flora survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

No Threatened or Priority Ecological Communities have been recorded within or in close proximity to the application area, and none were found during the survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016; GIS Database).

The vegetation condition within the survey area was described as Good to Very Good on the Keighery scale, with parts of the application area previously disturbed by vehicle tracks and historical mining activities (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

The application area falls within the Murrum pastoral lease (GIS Database), and previous vegetation disturbance has occurred from pastoral activities, including weed invasion in some areas (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016). Two weed species, *Rumex vesicarius* (Ruby Dock) and *Carrichtera annua* (Ward's Weed) were recorded during the survey (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016). Weeds have the potential to out-compete native flora and reduce 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 application area and surrounding areas during October 2013 (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). The fauna survey recorded a total of 123 fauna species, including 22 reptiles, 11 mammals, and 88 bird species with the potential to occur within the project area (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). The survey results were considered representative of the expected fauna assemblage for the region (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). One extinct Malleefowl mound and potential Malleefowl breeding habitat was recorded within the survey area (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). A targeted survey of suitable Malleefowl habitat was conducted during May-June 2016, however no further signs of Malleefowl were recorded and it was considered most likely that Malleefowl no longer utilise the application area (MBC, 2016).

The flora and fauna species, vegetation communities and fauna habitats found within the application area are well represented within the region, and the application area is unlikely to represent an area of higher biodiversity than surrounding areas, in either a local or regional context.

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

##### Methodology

CALM (2002)  
Clark Lindbeck (2016)  
MBC (2016)  
Native Vegetation Solutions (2016)

GIS Database:  
- IBRA Australia  
- Pre-European Vegetation  
- Threatened and Priority Flora  
- Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities - boundaries

#### (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**

Level 1 fauna surveys were conducted over the former Golden Wings minesite area and surrounding areas on 16 October 2013, and over the remainder of the current clearing permit application area on 31 May – 1 June 2016 (Clark Lindbeck, 2016).

The fauna and fauna habitats occurring within the application area were considered to be typical of the region, and well represented in surrounding areas (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; MBC, 2016).

Desktop surveys of available databases recorded ten fauna species of conservation significance with the potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; MBC, 2016). The majority of these species are birds, which tend to be wide ranging and are unlikely to be dependent on the vegetation and habitats proposed to be cleared (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; MBC, 2016). Other species, such as the Black-flanked Rock Wallaby (*Petrogale lateralis lateralis*) were considered unlikely to occur due to a lack of specific habitat (MBC, 2016).

The following two fauna species of conservation significance were considered to have the greatest potential to occur within the application area, based on known distributions and available habitats (MBC, 2016):

*Merops ornatus* (Rainbow Bee-eater) (Migratory); and  
*Falco peregrinus* (Peregrine Falcon) (Specially protected fauna).

The Rainbow Bee-Eater is a migratory species which ranges over most of mainland Australia. The Rainbow Bee-eater occurs mainly in open forests and woodlands, shrublands, and in a variety of cleared to semi-cleared habitats, often occurring in close proximity to water (DEE, 2016). No evidence of nesting has been recorded within the application area, and it is considered most likely that the Rainbow Bee-Eater is a transitory visitor to the area during normal migratory patterns, and is not dependent on the application area for either foraging or breeding habitat (Clark Lindbeck, 2016).

The Peregrine Falcon is wide ranging and while it may fly over the area it is unlikely to be dependent on the vegetation and habitats proposed to be cleared (Clark Lindbeck, 2016).

Approximately 11 hectares of potential Malleefowl breeding habitat (*Leipoa ocellata*) and one extinct Malleefowl mound was identified within the survey area during the fauna survey (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). A targeted Level 2 survey of suitable Malleefowl habitat was conducted during May-June 2016 (MBC, 2016). No other Malleefowl mounds or any other signs of Malleefowl were detected and it was considered that the application area was unlikely to represent preferred breeding habitat for Malleefowl due to a scarcity of dense vegetation coverage and leaf litter (MBC, 2016).

The landforms, vegetation associations and fauna habitat types found within the application area are well represented within the region (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; GIS Database), and the vegetation proposed to be cleared is unlikely to represent significant habitat for fauna in a regional context (MBC, 2016).

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

**Methodology** Clark Lindbeck (2016)  
DEE (2016)  
MBC (2016)

GIS Database:  
- Aerial imagery  
- 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**  
There are no records of Threatened flora within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database), and a flora survey of the application area did not record any species of Threatened flora (Clark Lindbeck, 2016; Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

The vegetation associations recorded within the application areas are well represented in surrounding areas (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016; GIS Database), and the vegetation proposed to be cleared is unlikely to be necessary for the continued existence of any species of Threatened (rare) flora.

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

**Methodology** Clark Lindbeck (2016)  
Native Vegetation Solutions (2016)

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 (TECs) located within or in close proximity of the application area (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016; GIS Database).

Surveys of the application area did not identify any TECs (Native Vegetation Solutions, 2016).

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

**Methodology** Clark Lindbeck (2016)  
 Native Vegetation Solutions (2016)

GIS Database:  
 - Threatened and Priority Ecological Communities (TECPEC) - 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 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, 2015).

The application area is broadly mapped as Beard vegetation associations 18: Low woodland; mulga (*Acacia aneura*); and 395: Hummock grasslands, mixed sandplain; bowgada, mallee, heath and spinifex (GIS Database). Approximately 99% and 100% of the pre-European extent of these vegetation associations, respectively, remains uncleared at both the state and bioregional level (Government of Western Australia, 2015). 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	7.78
Beard vegetation association - State					
18	19,892,304	19,843,727	~ 99	Least Concern	6.62
395	102,487	102,487	~ 100	Least Concern	20.44
Beard vegetation association - Bioregion					
18	12,403,172	12,363,252	~ 99	Least Concern	4.96
395	102,166	102,166	~ 100	Least Concern	20.47

\* Government of Western Australia (2015)  
 \*\* 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 (2015)

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 at variance to this Principle**  
 There are no watercourses or wetlands within or in close proximity to the application area, and the vegetation proposed to be cleared does not grow in association with any watercourse or wetland (GIS Database).

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

**Methodology** Clark Lindbeck (2016)

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 broadly mapped as the Jundee, Violet, and Yanganoo land systems (GIS Database). These land systems have been mapped and described in technical bulletins produced by the former Department of Agriculture (now the Department of Agriculture and Food).

The Jundee land system is described as hardpan wash plains with minor sandy banks, supporting scattered mulga shrublands (Curry et al., 1994). This land system is generally not susceptible to erosion (Curry et al., 1994).

The Violet land system is described as gently undulating gravelly plains, with low stony rises and minor saline plains, supporting mulga and bowgada-dominated shrublands, with dense mulga groves and patchy halophytic shrublands (Curry et al., 1994). The land surfaces are largely protected by stony mantles, however some land units may be susceptible to erosion if the soil surface is disturbed or vegetation cover is removed (Curry et al., 1994).

The Yanganoo land system consists of broad flat hardpan wash plains, supporting extensive mulga shrublands and minor grassy shrublands (Curry et al., 1994). This land system may be locally susceptible to erosion if disturbed (Curry et al., 1994).

Based on the above, the proposed clearing may be at variance to this Principle. Management practices will be implemented to minimise the risk of erosion and potential land degradation (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). Potential land degradation as a result of the proposed clearing may be minimised by the implementation of a staged clearing condition.

**Methodology** Clark Lindbeck (2016)  
Curry et al. (1994)

GIS Database:  
- Land Systems

**(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**

There are no conservation areas within the application area. The nearest conservation areas are the former Dalgarranga pastoral lease, which is located approximately 700 metres north of the application area and the former Noongal pastoral lease approximately 250 metres west of the application area, at their nearest points. These former pastoral leases are now managed by the Department of Parks and Wildlife (GIS Database). The proposed clearing is unlikely to have any impacts on the environmental values of these 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**

There are no Public Drinking Water Source Areas within or in close proximity to the clearing permit application area (GIS Database). There are no watercourses or wetlands within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database). Drainage lines in the region are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). Management practices will be implemented to minimise the risk of erosion and potential impacts to surface water quality (Clark Lindbeck, 2016).

The proposed clearing is unlikely to result in increased sedimentation of any watercourse, or cause deterioration in the quality of surface or underground water.

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

**Methodology** Clark Lindbeck (2016)

GIS Database:

- 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**

The climate of the Western Murchison subregion is arid, with a variable bimodal rainfall that usually falls in winter (CALM, 2002). Records from the nearest weather station to the application area (Mount Magnet airport, approximately 70 kilometres to the southeast), indicate a mean annual rainfall of approximately 257 millimetres (Clark Lindbeck, 2016). Drainage lines in the area are dry for most of the year, only flowing briefly immediately following significant rainfall (Clark Lindbeck, 2016).

There are no watercourses or waterbodies within or in close proximity to the application area (GIS Database). During heavy rainfall events, sheet flows and temporary localised flooding may occur over the broad hardpan plains which are typical of the region. However, 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** CALM (2002)  
Clark Lindbeck (2016)

GIS Database:

- Hydrography, linear

**Planning instrument, Native Title, Previous EPA decision or other matter.**

**Comments**

The clearing permit application was advertised on 5 September 2016 by the Department of Mines and Petroleum inviting submissions from the public. No submissions were received in relation to this application.

There are no registered native title claims over the area under application (DAA, 2016). 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 (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 of Significance

**4. References**

- CALM (2002) A Biodiversity Audit of Western Australia's 53 Biogeographic Subregions in 2002. Department of Conservation and Land Management, Western Australia.
- Clark Lindbeck (2016) Dalgaranga Gold Project Supporting Document for Clearing Permit Application. Report prepared for Gascoyne Resources Ltd, by Clark Lindbeck and Associates Pty Ltd, August 2016.
- DAA (2016) Aboriginal Heritage Enquiry System. Department of Aboriginal Affairs. <http://maps.dia.wa.gov.au/AHIS2/> (Accessed 15 November 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.
- DEE (2016) Species Profile and Threats Database. *Merops ornatus* – Rainbow Bee-eater. Australian Government, Department of the Environment and Energy. <https://www.environment.gov.au/>

- Government of Western Australia (2015) 2015 Statewide Vegetation Statistics incorporating the CAR Reserve Analysis (Full Report). Current as of June 2015. 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.
- MBC (2016) Level 1 Fauna Assessment and Level 2 Targeted Malleefowl Survey Dalgara. Report prepared for Gascoyne Resources Ltd, by MBContracting Environmental, June 2016.
- Native Vegetation Solutions (2016) Level 1 Flora and Vegetation Survey Gascoyne Resources Dalgara Tenements. Report prepared for Clark Lindbeck and Associates Pty Ltd, by Native Vegetation Solutions, June 2016.
- 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. Department of Agriculture, Western Australia. Technical Bulletin 84.

## 5. Glossary

### Acronyms:

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

### Definitions:

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

<b>T</b>	<p><b>Threatened species:</b> 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).</p> <p><b>Threatened fauna</b> is that subset of 'Specially Protected Fauna' declared to be 'likely to become extinct' pursuant to section 14(4) of the Wildlife Conservation Act.</p> <p><b>Threatened flora</b> 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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>CR</b>	<p><b>Critically endangered species</b> 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.</p>
<b>EN</b>	<p><b>Endangered species</b> 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.</p>

- 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.