

# MRWA Vegetation Clearing Assessment Report

This guideline has been prepared to assist MRWA in addressing condition 7 "Assessment of Clearing Impacts" under Clearing Permit CPS 818/3.

For guidance on how to complete the form, refer to DEC completed reports (active permits) at [http://203.20.251.100/cps\\_reports/](http://203.20.251.100/cps_reports/).

## 1. AREA UNDER ASSESSMENT DETAILS

### Proponent details

Proponent's name:

MRWA

Contacts

Name: Gary Berg – Project Manager

:

Phone: 08 9892 0564

Fax:

Email:

### Property details

Property:

South Coast Highway

Colloquial name:

Ravensthorpe

### Area under assessment

| Clearing Area (ha) | No. Trees | Method of Clearing | For the purpose of: | Site Plan Attached                                       |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| 1.09ha             |           | Mechanical         | Road upgrade        | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

### Avoidance/Minimise clearing

How have the clearing impacts been minimised?

## 2. BACKGROUND

### Existing environment and information

Description of the native vegetation under application

(suggestion: To determine Vegetation Condition use - Keighery, B.J. (1994) Bushland Plant Survey: A Guide to Plant Community Survey for the Community. Wildflower Society of WA (Inc). Nedlands, Western Australia.)

|                       |   |                                      |  |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| Site Visit Undertaken | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Fauna / Flora Survey Undertaken      | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Site Report Attached  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Fauna / Flora Survey Report Attached | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Site Photos Attached  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No            | Other Relevant References Attached   | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

| Vegetation Complex                              | Clearing Description | Vegetation Condition | Comment |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------|
| 1096; medium woodland; yate and salmon gum      | Clearing area 0.22ha | 3                    |         |
| 925; Shrublands, mallee scrub and red mallee    | Clearing area 0.23ha | 4                    |         |
| 1111; medium woodland, yate                     | Clearing area 0.06ha | 5-6                  |         |
| 521; medium woodland, salmon gum and red mallee | Clearing area 0.58ha | 4                    |         |

## 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**

Due to the small area to be cleared and the high level of weed infestation present at most of the area, the proposal is not considered likely to be at variance to this principle.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

Due to the small area to be cleared and the significant fauna habitat present locally, it is not considered likely that the proposal is at variance to this principle.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

The botanical survey found populations of the Priority Three species *Acacia bifaria*. However, due to the small area under consideration as well as the results of the botanical survey and the proximity of large areas of vegetation it is considered unlikely that the proposal is at variance to this principle.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

The botanical survey found no threatened ecological communities in the vicinity.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

Vegetation types identified (1096, 925, 1111 and 521) are all above the 30% threshold specified by EPA position statement.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

No waterway within project site and no changes to existing drainage.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

Due to the small area of clearing required for proposal and nature of works, proposal is unlikely to be at variance to this proposal.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

Due to small nature and scale of proposal it is considered unlikely that this proposal will have any impact on conservation areas, there are two C Class reserves within the vicinity of the project which will not be impacted.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

Due to the small nature and scale of the project it is not likely that any deterioration in the quality of surface or groundwater will occur.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

**(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**

Due to the small nature and scale of the project it is considered unlikely that there will be any change to the incidences or intensity of any flood event.

**Methodology** Site visit 2005. EIA and EMP (GHD, 2005,) Botanical survey (Craig, 2005.)

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

**Comments**

**Methodology**

**4. SUBMISSIONS**

**If required have submissions been requested and addressed**

| Submission Requested from | Request Sent (Date) | Submission Received (Date) | Issues Raised / Comments Made |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|

**5. ASSESSOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

List of Principles seriously at variance, at variance or maybe at variance

**Recommendation (does this clearing require a Revegetation Management Plan / Offset Proposal / Environmental Management Plan / Management Strategy/New Application, under CPS 818/2)**

## 6. REFERENCES

### 6.1 OFFICER PREPARING REPORT

Melissa Piowczyk-Kruk

---

Position: G/Environment Officer  
Great Southern Regional Office  
MRWA  
08 9892 0567