

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report West Belconnen Development Project, Yass NSW. Prepared for Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd Authors: Lyn O'Brien LGA: Yass Valley

16 April 2015



Biosis offices

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

Canberra Unit 16 / 2 Yallourn Street Fyshwick ACT 2609

Phone: (02) 6228 1599 Fax: (02) 6280 8752 Email: canberra@biosis.com.au

NEW SOUTH WALES

Sydney 18–20 Mandible Street Alexandria NSW 2015

Phone: (02) 9690 2777 Fax: (02) 9690 2577 Email: sydney@biosis.com.au

Wollongong

8 Tate Street Wollongong NSW 2500

Phone: (02) 4229 5222 Fax: (02) 4229 5500 Email: wollongong@biosis.com.au

QUEENSLAND

Brisbane

Suite 4 First Floor, 72 Wickham Street Fortitude Valley QLD 4006

Phone: (07) 3831 7400 Fax: (07) 3831 7411 Email: brisbane@biosis.com.au

VICTORIA

Ballarat

506 Macarthur Street Ballarat VIC 3350

Phone: (03) 5331 7000 Fax: (03) 5331 7033 Email: ballarat@biosis.com.au

Melbourne (Head Office)

38 Bertie Street Port Melbourne VIC 3207

Phone: (03) 9646 9499 Fax: (03) 9646 9242 Email: melbourne@biosis.com.au

Wangaratta

16a Templeton Street (PO Box 943) Wangaratta VIC 3677

Phone: (03) 5721 9453 Fax: (03) 5721 9454 Email: wangaratta@biosis.com.au

Document information

Report to:	Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd
Prepared by:	Lyn O'Brien (Senior Archaeologist) of the Canberra office.
Biosis matter no.:	16832

Document Control

LGA:

Alexander Beben
James Shepherd/Ashleigh Pritchard
West Belconnen – NSW- ACHA
16832
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment
West Belconnen Development Project NSW

Yass Valley

Revision	Prepared	Internal Review	External Review	Amended
DRFT01	LOB	AJB	DM	LOB
DRFT02	LOB	LOB	ТА	LOB
DRT03	LOB	MT	DM	LOB

Revision	lssued	Name	Signed
DRT01	12/1/2014	LOB	M. c.g.a.
DRT02	10/4/2014	LOB	Mr. 0. 8 am.
DRT03 © Biosis Pty	16/4/2015	LOB	M. c.p.a.

This document is and shall remain the property of Biosis Pty Ltd. The document may only be used for the purposes for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of the Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

Disclaimer:

Biosis Pty Ltd has completed this assessment in accordance with the relevant federal, state and local legislation and current industry best practice. The company accepts no liability for any damages or loss incurred as a result of reliance placed upon the report content or for any purpose other than that for which it was intended.



Acknowledgements

Biosis gratefully acknowledges the contributions of the following people and organisations n preparing this report:

Aboriginal Community Groups

- ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body
- United Ngunnawal Elders Council

Registered Aboriginal Parties

- Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Gunjeewong Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Corporation
- King Brown Tribal Group
- Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council
- Onerwal Aboriginal Land Council
- Ngarigu Currawong Clan
- Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation
- Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services
- Ingram Family

Government Departments

- NNTT (National Native Title Tribunal)
- Office of the Registrar Land Rights Act (1983)
- NSW OEH
- NTSCORP
- Office of Multicultural, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs, ACT Government
- ACT Heritage Unit



Abbreviations

ACHAR	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report
AGD	Australian Geodetic Datum
AHIMS	Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System
AHIP	Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit
AR	Archaeological Report
DA	Determining Authority
DP	Deposited Plan
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
LALC	Local Aboriginal Land Council
LGA	Local Government Area
MGA	Map Grid of Australia
NNTT	National Native Title Tribunal
NPWS	National Parks and Wildlife Service
NTSCORP	Native Title Services Corporation
OEH	NSW Office of Environment and Heritage
PAD	Potential Archaeological Deposit
RAP	Registered Aboriginal Party



Contents

Sumr	nary	vi
1	Introduction	. 1
1.1	Project Background	. 1
1.2	Planning Approvals	. 1
1.3	Restricted and Confidential Information	. 1
1.4	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	.4
	1.4.1 General Description	.4
	1.4.2 Tangible Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	.4
	1.4.3 Intangible Aboriginal Cultural Heritage	.4
	1.4.4 Statutory	.4
	1.4.5 Values	. 5
1.5	Geology	. 5
1.6	Soil Landscapes	. 5
1.7	Landscape Resources	. 6
1.8	Land Use History	. 6
2	Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Context	10
2.1	Ethnohistory	10
	2.1.1 Ethnohistory context	10
	2.1.2 Aboriginal Groups within the Project Area	10
	2.1.3 Customs and Lifestyle	11
	2.1.4 Early Contact with Europeans	12
2.2	Local and Regional Character of Aboriginal Land Use	13
2.3	Predictive Model	13
	2.3.1 Summary	15
2.4	Aboriginal Heritage Located in the Project Area	16
2.5	Interpretation of Past Aboriginal Land Use	18
2.6	Results of Archaeological Assessment	18
3	Aboriginal Community Consultation	20
3.1	Stage 1 Notification of Project Proposal and Registration of Interest	20
	3.1.1 Identification of Relevant Aboriginal Stakeholders	20
	3.1.2 Public Notice	21
	3.1.3 Registration of Aboriginal Parties	21
3.2	Stage 2 Presentation of Information about the Proposed Project	21
3.3	Stage 3 Gathering Information about Cultural Significance	21
	3.3.1 Archaeological Assessment Methodology Information Pack	21
	3.3.2 Field Work Program	22

📣 biosis.

	3.3.3 Stage 4 Review of Draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report	22
	3.3.4 Final Report	22
4	Aboriginal Cultural Significance Assessment	
4.1	Cultural Significance Values	23
4.2	Statement of Significance	24
4.3	Development Impacts	
4.4	Mitigation Strategy	
4.5	Sustainable Development Principles	
5	Recommendations	.9
	rences	
Арре	endices	3
Арре		3
Appe Appe	endices	3 . i
Appe Appe Appe Appe	endices	3 . i ii
Appe Appe Appe Appe	endices	3 . i ii
Appe Appe Appe Appe Appe	endices	3 . i ii iii

List of Figures

Figure 1. Location of Project Area in Regional Context	2
Figure 2. Project Area Boundary	3
Figure 3. Geology of the Project Area	8
Figure 4. Soil Landscapes of the Project Area	9
Figure 5: Aboriginal Sites Located in the vicinity of the Project Area	19

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Aboriginal Site Prediction Statements	14
Table 2.2. Location of AHIMS registered sites within 1km of Project Area	16
Table 2.3. Previously recorded sites missing from AHIMS search	17
Table 4.1: Significance Assessment Criteria.	24
Table 4.2: Summary of potential archaeological impact	26



Summary

This Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) details the findings of the assessment undertaken for the proposed West Belconnen Development Project, which is located to the east of the Murrumbidgee River, along the NSW/ACT border over Lots 1,2,3,4,5,7, DP771051 and Lots 61 & 62 DP801234 Parish of Weetangera, in the district of Walleroo, Yass NSW. This area is bounded by the Murrumbidgee River to the West and North, Ginninderra Creek to the East and the ACT/NSW border on the south. Master planning for the West Belconnen Development is being undertaken to guide future planning and management decisions. Biosis Pty Ltd has been commissioned by Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd (Riverview) to undertake an ACHAR and Archaeological Report (AR) to assist in the broad scale planning assessment.

This Project Area covers approximately 597.6ha and is divided into two main areas: the Development Area (371.6ha) which will be developed for residential purposes with associated infrastructure and the Conservation Corridor (226ha) which runs along the eastern band of the Murrumbidgee River and will not be subject to development. This Conservation Corridor will be placed into the management of a conservation trust which will be responsible for the ongoing management of the natural and Aboriginal heritage values of the Conservation Corridor.

Biosis has undertaken the following components for the ACHAR and AR:

- Review of previous work undertaken within the locality;
- Development of predictive model;
- Site inspections and field survey;
- Aboriginal Community Consultation; and
- Report preparation.

Biosis is assisting Riverview with the Aboriginal heritage assessment and consultation with the Aboriginal community. Consultation with the Aboriginal community followed the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (DECCW 2010) guidelines. The purpose of the community consultation was to assist and inform the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, and to assist the Director General of the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) in consideration and determination of any Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) applications that may be required.

Yass Valley Council is the Determining Authority (DA) and will assess the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report to help them determine if the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on Aboriginal cultural heritage.

An Archaeological Assessment of the Project Area was completed during 2013 and 2014. The overall effectiveness of the survey for examining the ground for Aboriginal sites was considered to be low due to low ground surface visibility predominantly due to vegetation cover and a low amount of exposures.

Ten (10) Aboriginal cultural heritage sites registered with AHIMS occur in the Project Area and 11 Aboriginal sites recorded but not listed on AHIMS currently are located in the vicinity. 42 Aboriginal cultural heritage sites are registered with the ACT Heritage Database within 1km of the Project Area within the ACT.

56 previously unrecorded Aboriginal Sites were recorded during the field surveys.

Details of the registered sites, the 56 newly located sites, the field program and the management recommendations are in the Biosis 2015 Archaeological Report attached at Appendix 7. Sub surface testing of areas of PAD and an application for an AHIP within the Development Area boundaries are recommended in the Archaeological Report as impacts cannot be avoided as the sites occur within the proposed residential development.



The Aboriginal community has been consulted about the heritage management of the project throughout its lifespan. Consultation has been undertaken with the Aboriginal community as per the process outlined in the OEH document, *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010.* Ten (10) Aboriginal organisations registered an interest in the project.

The outcome of the consultation process was that the registered Aboriginal parties (RAPs) considered the Project Area to hold a high level of cultural significance, due to its location to the Murrumbidgee River. The majority of the identified sites consist of small to medium artefact scatters or isolated finds and are held to have low cultural significance. Three large sites with potential sub surface deposits were also identified and are considered to hold high scientific and cultural values. These sites are located within the Conservation Corridor for the project and are not anticipated to be impacted by the project. The process and results of the Aboriginal consultation process are detailed in this document.

The recommendations that resulted from the consultation process are provided below.

Recommendation 1: Continued consultation with the registered Aboriginal parties

It is recommended that Riverview continue to inform these groups about the management of Aboriginal cultural heritage sites within the Project Area throughout the life of the project. This recommendation is in keeping with the *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010* (DECCW 2010).

Recommendation 2: Impacts will occur to the identified areas of PAD within the Development Area. Prior to any impacts occurring a program of sub surface investigation is required to determine the presence, extent and significance of any sub surface deposits. These investigations may be undertaken immediately or at a later date prior to development.

- A detailed methodology for the sub surface investigations should be developed for approval by the RAPs for the project prior to any testing commencing, and following discussions with NSW OEH as to the most appropriate methodology.
- This sub surface testing s may be in accordance with the Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW 2010) which would not require an AHIP to undertake the investigations.
- This sub surface testing if following a different methodology would require an AHIP from NSW OEH to allow impacts to the areas of known sites and areas of PAD.

Recommendation 3: Following the completion of sub surface testing an area based AHIP covering the Development area should be applied for from NSW OEH. This AHIP would apply to sites WB1-WB16, WB23-24, WB30-33, WB42-45, WB48-53. The AHIP application should cover the area as shown on Figure 8. AHIP application could be submitted following subsurface testing or at a later date prior to construction.

These sites should be collected, subjected to analysis and relocated to an agreed place within the Conservation Corridor of the Project Area to maintain their 'connection to country'. This location must be agreed upon by the RAPs, NSW OEH and Riverview Projects.

Recommendation 4: Sites and areas of PAD located within the Conservation Corridor are not subject to any proposed development impact. These sites are protected under legislation and in the event of any future action impacting on these known sites further assessment of the impacts and application for an AHIP may be required. This recommendation applies to the following sites: WB17 -WB22, WB25 – WB29, WB34-WB41,WB46-WB47, WB54-WB56, 57-1-0174, 57-1-0074, 57-1-0184, 57-1-0140 and PAD WB25, WB26 and 57-1-0140. Any works that may occur in the Conservation Corridor must avoid areas of heritage sites or application for an AHIP will be required.



Recommendation 5: The proposed West Belconnen Conservation Corridor is of high cultural significance to the Aboriginal Community. Ongoing liaison should be undertaken with the RAPs in regards to the management of sites within the Conservation Corridor and future planned developments that may impact cultural sites. This would involve meeting with the RAPs and discussing future developments. In the future the requirements of consultation may change and requirements should be checked with NSW OEH.

Recommendation 6: The area of the Ginninderra Creek has been assessed as holding high archaeological sensitivity. Any development that occurs within 100m should be subject to sub surface testing within the development footprint to avoid damage to the archaeological record. This sub surface testing should be in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (DECCW 2010).

Recommendation 7: Finding of low potential for unidentified cultural heritage sites or deposits across remainder of Development Area– proceed with caution.

The assessment of the Project Areas potential for cultural heritage sites and deposits is based on the field surveys and review of work completed in the immediate vicinity. This assessment has resulted in a finding of low potential across the Development Area except for the area of the Ginninderra Creekline. As a result the project can proceed with caution in areas with no known cultural heritage sites dependent on recommendations 9, 10 and 11.

Recommendation 8: Due to the nature of the archaeological record it is possible that additional cultural heritage sites exist within the Project Area which were not located during this planning field survey. As a result the RAPs have requested that a cultural heritage induction should be included in the induction package for all construction workers.

Recommendation 9: Discovery of Unanticipated Aboriginal Objects

All Aboriginal objects and Places are protected under the *NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act* 1974. It is an offence to knowingly disturb an Aboriginal site without a consent permit issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH). Should any Aboriginal objects be encountered during works associated with this proposal outside of the AHIP area, works must cease in the vicinity and the find should not be moved until assessed by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an Aboriginal object the archaeologist will provide further recommendations. These may include notifying the OEH and Aboriginal stakeholders.

Recommendation 10: Discovery of Aboriginal Ancestral Remains

Aboriginal ancestral remains may be found in a variety of landscapes in NSW, including middens and sandy or soft sedimentary soils. If any suspected human remains are discovered during any activity you must:

- Immediately cease all work at that location and not further move or disturb the remains
- Notify the NSW Police and OEH's Environmental Line on 131 555 as soon as practicable and provide details of the remains and their location
- Not recommence work at that location unless authorised in writing by OEH.

Recommendation 11: No further archaeological work required for the Development Area once AHIP obtained from OEH.

No further archaeological work is required for the Development Area should the AHIP be approved, except in the event that unexpected cultural finds are unearthed during any phase of the project (refer to Recommendation 9-10).



1 Introduction

1.1 Project Background

Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd (Riverview) propose to develop an area of land along the eastern side of the Murrumbidgee River for residential and related purposes. The land consists of undulating hills and has been historically used for pastoral purposes and is located to the north of the current Canberran suburbs of Holt and MacGregor. The Project Area is shown on Figures 1 and 2 and covers Lots 1,2,3,4,5,7 DP771051 and Lots ,61 & 62 DP 801234 Parish of Weetangera, in the district of Walleroo, Yass NSW. This area is bounded by the Murrumbidgee River to the West and North, Ginninderra Creek to the East and the ACT/NSW border on the south. Master planning for the West Belconnen Development is being undertaken to guide future planning and management decisions. Biosis has been commissioned by Riverview Projects (ACT) Pty Ltd (Riverview) to undertake an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) to assist in the broad scale planning assessment.

As a first step for the development to proceed the land parcel will require rezoning under the Yass Valley LEP 2013. As a requirement of this rezoning process the findings of the ACHAR with the AR appended will be provided as supporting documentation.

This Project Area covers approximately 597.6ha and is divided into two main areas: the Development Area (371.6ha) which will be developed for residential purposes with associated infrastructure and the Conservation Corridor (226ha) which runs along the eastern band of the Murrumbidgee River and will not be subject to development. The Conservation Corridor will be placed into the management of a conservation trust which will be responsible for the ongoing management of the natural and indigenous heritage values of the Conservation Corridor.

1.2 Planning Approvals

The proposed development will be assessed against Part 4 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* 1979 NSW. Other relevant legislation and planning instruments that will inform this assessment include:

- Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW)
- National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NSW)
- National Parks and Wildlife Amendment Act 2010 (NSW)
- Yass Valley Local Environmental Plan 2013.

1.3 Restricted and Confidential Information

Information in this report is restricted due to cultural sensitivities. Appendix 1 in the Archaeological Report contains AHIMS information which is confidential and not to be made public. This is clearly marked on the title page for the Appendix.

Any figures within the report which show the location of AHIMS sites is restricted and not to be made available to the general public.







1.4 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

1.4.1 General Description

According to Allen and O'Connell (2003), Aboriginal people have inhabited the Australian continent for the last 50,000 years, and the NSW area, according to Bowler *et al* (2003), for over 42,000 years. These dates are subject to continued revision as further evidence of Aboriginal cultural heritage is discovered and as more research of this evidence is conducted.

Without being part of the Aboriginal culture and the productions of this culture it is not possible for non-Aboriginal people to fully understand their meaning to Aboriginal people – only to move closer towards understanding this meaning with the help of the Aboriginal community. Similarly, definitions of Aboriginal culture and cultural heritage without this involvement constitute outsider interpretations.

With this preface Aboriginal cultural heritage broadly refers to things that relate to Aboriginal culture and hold cultural meaning and significance to Aboriginal people (DECCW 2010: 3). There is an understanding in Aboriginal culture that everything is interconnected. In essence Aboriginal cultural heritage can be viewed as potentially encompassing any part of the physical and/or mental landscape, that is, 'Country' (DECCW 2010: iii).

Aboriginal people's interpretation of cultural value is based on their "traditions, observance, lore, customs, beliefs and history" (DECCW 2010: 3). The things associated with Aboriginal cultural heritage are continually / actively being defined by Aboriginal people (also see DEC 2005: 1; DECCW 2010: 3). These things can be associated with traditional, historical or contemporary Aboriginal culture (also see DEC 2005: 1, 3; DECCW 2010: 3).

1.4.2 Tangible Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

Three categories of tangible Aboriginal cultural heritage may be defined:

- Things that have been observably modified by Aboriginal people
- Things that may have been modified by Aboriginal people but no discernible traces of that activity remain
- Things never physically modified by Aboriginal people (but associated with Dreamtime Ancestors who shaped those things)

1.4.3 Intangible Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

Examples of intangible Aboriginal cultural heritage would include memories of stories and 'ways of doing', which would include language and ceremonies (DECCW 2010: 3).

1.4.4 Statutory

Currently Aboriginal cultural heritage, as statutorily defined by the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*, consists of objects and places.

Aboriginal objects are defined as:

"any deposit, object or material evidence...relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises NSW, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains"

Aboriginal places are defined as a place that is or was of special Aboriginal cultural significance. Places are declared under section 84 of the *NPW Act 1974*.



1.4.5 Values

Aboriginal cultural heritage is broadly valued by Aboriginal people as it is used to define their identity as both individuals and as part of a group (also see DEC 2005: 1, 3; DECCW 2010: iii). More specifically it is used:

- To provide a:
 - "connection and sense of belonging to Country" (DECCW 2010: iii)
 - Link between the present and the past (DECCW 2010: iii)
- As a learning tool to teach Aboriginal culture to younger Aboriginal generations and the general public (DECCW 2010: 3)
- As further evidence of Aboriginal occupation prior to European settlement for people who do not understand the magnitude to which Aboriginal people occupied the continent (see also DECCW 2010: 3).

1.5 Geology

The current Project Area is made up of two separate geological groups. The northern most section of the Project Area extends into the Laidlaw Volcanics group, while the middle and southern sections of the Project Area lie within the Deakin Volcanics group. The geology of the landscape is mostly made up of Silurian volcanics, a rock type common in the Canberra area. In addition to the Silurian volcanics the geological landscape of the Project Area also includes various tuffs with some minor inclusions of siltstone, shale, sandstone and limestone. A common geological feature of the area is highly weathered bedrock (Jenkins 2000). The geology of the Project Area is shown on Figure 3.

1.6 Soil Landscapes

The soil landscape of the West Belconnen Project Area falls within three separate soil landscapes. A large amount of the Project Area is part of the Burra landscape, running closest to the Murrumbidgee, while a smaller section in the north east is part of the Williamsdale soil landscape with the Ginninderra Creek Group running along the length of the creekline. The location of the soil landscapes that makeup and surround the Project Area can be seen in Figure 4.

The Burra Group soils are moderately deep and well drained Kurosols and Chromosols and are a transferral landscape. Shallow earthy sands (Lithosols) exist on crest and upper slopes. Red and Brown Kandosols and Kurosols occupy mid slopes and most lower slopes. Brown Chromosols and Kurosols are along minor drainage lines and on some lower slopes (Jenkins 2000: 44)

The Williamsdale Group contains moderately deep well drained Yellow Chromosols on Red and Brown Kandosols on upper rises and fan elements. Moderately to very deep Sodosols on lower rises and fan elements (Jenkins 2000: 132). These soils are hard setting and erodible and also part of a transferral landscape. The topsoils are typically acidic.

Along the length of Ginninderra Creek lies the Ginninderra Creek Group, part of an alluvial landscape. This group consists of deep imperfectly drained sodic Brown Chromosols on the slope margins and deep alluvial soils on the floodplain. These soils are highly erodible with poor drainage and represent flood hazards as water logging can occur easily (Jenkins 2000:73)



1.7 Landscape Resources

Flora species present within the Project Area would have provided a range of resources for Aboriginal people. Food, tools, shelter and ceremonial items were derived from floral resources, with the locations of many campsites predicated on the seasonal availability of resources. The different types of eucalypts were useful in many respects (Percival and Stewart 1997). The oils from the leaves and gum were used medicinally and the wood was used to make implements, whilst bark strips were utilised in weaving..

These vegetation communities supported a range of faunal resources that would have been utilised by Aboriginal peoples. Terrestrial and avian resources were not only used for food, but also provided a significant contribution to the social and ceremonial aspects of Aboriginal life.

The fauna that may have been found within the area include larger species such as kangaroos, wombats, possums, koalas and avian species such as cockatoos. There are also a number of reptile species in the area, including lizards, skinks and snakes. The nearby water course, especially the Murrumbidgee River would have provided additional resources such as crayfish, fish and platypus.

1.8 Land Use History

The explorer Charles Sturt was granted the Project Area as a grant on returning from his expeditions along the Darling and Murray River Systems (1828-1830). A grant of 5000 acres was received and selected by Sturt in 1837. The 5000 acres covered an area of gently sloping land with sheltering ridges. The selection fronted onto the permanent water sources of the Murrumbidgee River and was bounded to the north by the Gininnderra Creek and by the Molonglo River on the south (EMA 2012:10).

It is not known if Sturt ever resided at the property which was purchased by Charles Campbell in 1838. The property was renamed 'Belconnen' and the land was cleared of native vegetation and opened up for sheep grazing. The Kilby family were assisted Scottish migrants who worked for the Campbell Family – the 1904 Parish Map of Ginninderra shows the land enclosed by the Ginninderra Creek and Murrumbidgee Rivers to be held by J.Kilby.

This northern portion of the Study Area (on the western side of Parkwood Road) was operated as the Ginninderra Falls Tourist Park from the late 1990s to 2004 when it was closed to the public. This involved the construction of two walking trails, carpark and picnic facilities at the upper gorge and a lower access road (graded) construction of toilets at a stretch along the Murrumbidgee River ideal for swimming and picnicking. A small sand mining quarry also operated along this stretch of the river briefly and the Red Gravel Quarry still operates on the western side of Parkwood Road. The majority of the Project Area has been minimally impacted being used currently for cattle grazing.





Plate 1. Ginninginderry (Ginninderra) Plains, New South Wales. Painting by Robert Hoddle between 1832-1835(NLA Vn3423118).



Plate 2. The Ginindarra (Ginninderra) Creek, looking to Murrumbidgee hills, County Murray, N.S. Wales, 30th Aug., 1875. Painting by Gordon Cummings. (NLA – an4441035v)







2 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Context

2.1 Ethnohistory

2.1.1 Ethnohistory context

Ethnography is the use of past sources to inform the lifeways of traditional peoples. Ethnography consists of three main sources:

- first hand explorer or settlers accounts of Indigenous people at the time of contact;
- first hand accounts of Indigenous life when the effects of European possession had started to impact on traditional practices; and
- anthropological studies of Indigenous traditional practices.

For the NSW region all of these sources are present with the most valuable being the accounts of early settlers and explorers through the region.

Knowledge of traditional Indigenous social organisation and language groups in the Canberra region is restricted to a small number of written and oral historical documents, as post-contact occupation and dispossession have resulted in the loss of much information (Gillespie 1984). Through dispossession of land and subsequent loss of many oral histories, many historians have only been able to piece together splintered accounts of Indigenous life, mainly through nineteenth century European ethnographic observations. We do know that prior to European occupation Indigenous people occupied south eastern Australia according to a system of land custodianship and had a complex kinship system.

2.1.2 Aboriginal Groups within the Project Area

It has been noted that there is a high correlation between drainage basins and tribal territories in the southern uplands (Flood 1980: 109). As the region features some of the strongest relief on the Australian continent this is not unexpected, as the various river systems provide both reliable sources of resources and easily recognisable territorial boundaries. Generally, custodial lands are based on water catchments of larger rivers. The creeks and rivers enable better communication. Groups within a catchment belong to a cultural group who share a common language and beliefs. The resources of the Canberra landscape could only sustain small groups who would move from tablelands to mountains depending on the season and resource availability. Seasonal movement is considered to have been a significant aspect of life for the Indigenous people throughout south-eastern Australia. Many resources are seasonal, and areas where summer camps were held could be depleted of resources. Movement to fresh resources was required. In addition, groups travelled to neighbouring areas to participate in ceremonial activities and large gatherings would have also depleted resources in those camps.

The Wiradyuri language occupies an immense region in New South Whales. Spanning from central to southern NSW, it is the language that is spoken over the greater extent of the territory than any other tongue (Matthews 1904:284). The tribes speaking the Ngunawal language span from Goulburn to Yass and Burrowa, also extending southerly to Lake George and Goodradigbee (Matthews 1904:294).

The Bogong moth that inhabits the mountain areas in great numbers was an important food source for the local Indigenous people, and it is believed the people travelled great distances during summer months to exploit this resource and participate in related ceremonial activity (Flood 1980: 111-112). At these times groups in the area are likely to have co-operated and participated in each others ceremonies, as utilisation of the resource would have meant that groups would have more than likely crossed boundaries in their travels. Groups were able to trade with neighbours, and obtain resources from other areas, including the coast (Avery 1994).



Much of the information on the Indigenous people of the region was written in the 1900s and is considered to be questionable (Avery 1994). As a result, the boundaries of custodial lands of cultural groups of the Southern Tablelands and Canberra region are unclear. Tindale (1974) places the Project Area within the boundary of the Ngunnawal people although close to the boundary with the Ngarigo to the south of the Molonglo and Murrumbidgee River junction. Horton's 1996 study of Indigenous boundaries also confirmed this division making the Project Area close to the junction for these groups.

It is currently recognised by the ACT Government that the Ngunnawal are the Traditional Owners of the Australian Capital Territory. Through the years, the Ngunnawal have been forced to disperse and have been unable to continue a traditional lifestyle, but the descendants still continue to live in the Canberra region today.

2.1.3 Customs and Lifestyle

Many hunting and gathering methods were employed by the Ngunawal. Govett described the practice of fire stick farming to herd the kangaroos for hunting – this also has the benefit of encouraging new growth and attracting kangaroos to specific areas (1973:23). These observations on Aboriginal life are consistent with the later remembering's of MacAlister (1907:88). Other methods, such as spearing emus and fish were also employed. When the vagaries of the weather became too unpredictable for hunting in once reliable sources, the Ngunawal people grew to depend on the Bogong moths in late spring each hear, making the annual trek to the mountains (Gillespie 1984: 45). Kangaroos, wallaroos, wallabies and wombats were preferred because of their great supply, though smaller game such as opossums, fish, birds, eggs, yams, berries, honey, grubs and seeds were also consumed regularly.

John Lhotsky recorded the dress consisting of '...a girdle with a small sort of apron formed of fringes before and behind...a few of the strong young men wore a sort of armlet upon their left arms, made of twisted hair of kangaroos, and which was a sort of distinction for brave warriors'. Lhotsky recorded some individuals with perforated nostrils adorned with reeds. He additionally observed the practice of fashioning nets and preparing opossum skins for cloaks, though cloaks appeared to be reserved for higher ranking members (1834:43).

All reports regarding habitations used by the Aboriginal inhabitants indicate simple, non-robust structures, comprised of green bushes with leaves sloping downwards against a low branch of a tree, supported by two poles. The interior of these structures contained a few skins for bedding, bark dishes and some stripped knobs from trees, used to hold water and foods (Gillespie 1984: 47).

Records indicate that the Yass Blacks occasionally had up to two wives, provided that the male remain responsible for his first wife. Evidence also suggests betrothal to be common, as well as the marriage of a younger woman to an older man. This act was justified as a method of protection against the advances of younger, less disciplined men (Gillespie 1984: 49).

One initiation ceremony, by the Ngunawal people, was conducted in what is now the Australian Capital Territory on Tidbinbilla Mountain. There young men aged 17-20 underwent the ceremony by having his front tooth knocked out. There is little recorded of this particular ceremony as it was conducted with great secrecy (Gillespie 1984:50).

Burial practices in the NSW area consisted of two main methods: the body was either placed in a hollow tree from above, or it was buried in a seated position in a pit dug into the ground, with the body tied up and knees drawn towards the abdomen. The grieving process consisted of great wailing by the relations, including the practice of cutting one's head with a tomahawk until blood flowed from the lacerations. Generally it was believed that the dead would come to life again for hunting, hence all personal affects were left with the individual. Very occasionally, a grave would be dug at the base of a carved tree. Names of the dead are very carefully avoided on the graves and the locations are intentionally avoided by tribal members, as they believe the spirit of the dead still haunts the location of the burial place (Gillespie 1984: 48).



Contact between Aboriginal groups was often violent with frequent fighting. Reverend Hurst, in 1842, mentions the inability of the different tribes to associate peacefully for any length of time (MacAlister 1907: 90). Thomas Franklin, a pioneer from the Yass district witnessed:

'a battle fought between about 1000 men, the Queanbeyan, Monaro and Upper Murray blacks being pitted against the Murrumbidgee and Lachlan blacks'.

Preparations for such battles took weeks to prepare, signals of which consisted of raising smoke during the day and fires at night from high peeks, visible from most areas (Gillespie 1984: 52). Despite this the dispersed clans of a 'tribe' and at times differing, Aboriginal groups amicably met periodically for ceremonial events.

Matthews recorded coastal and inland groups attending each others ceremonies including people from the Shoalhaven and Yass groups being present at Queanbeyan and Braidwood where an annual occurrence with member of the Wiradjuri, Ngunawal, Ngarigo and Walgalu tribes attending (Flood 1980). These interactions were governed by ceremonies of welcome and protocols for guests to follow while in country.

Music was an important part in the corroboree with clapping sticks being struck together to mark time and harmonies being sung in unison with the group (Lhotsky 1979:109, Govett 1977:29).

2.1.4 Early Contact with Europeans

The first contact between Indigenous people and Europeans would have occurred in the 1820's. Although Throsby, Smith, Vaughn and Wild explored the area in 1820, naming the region the Limestone Plains, they did not encounter any Indigenous groups, only spotting fires in the distance (Gillespie 1984). Groups near Yass and Lake George did interact with the incoming pastoralists and it often ended in violence. As the traditional hunting grounds were subsumed for stock grazing and land was cleared for pasture and agriculture, the ability of groups to subsist by traditional methods declined. Indigenous people adapted by either moving further away from settlements or utilising resources from the pastoralists. These resources were obtained by force, in exchange for work or given freely by pastoralists (Avery 1994).

The relationship between pastoralists and Indigenous groups was often brutal and violent. For example, a number of stockmen began to kidnap Indigenous girls and as a result there were retaliatory attacks on pastoral stations and stockmen (Gillespie 1984). The resentment and frustration suffered by the Indigenous groups at the loss of their way of life and the treatment by the settlers would have also caused threats and shows of aggression.

The relationships between pastoralists and Indigenous people were not all negative. Gillespie (1984) states that the Palmer, Davis and Wright pastoral families in the Ginninderra Area had very good relationships with their workers, as well as the Indigenous community. At the Ginninderra Station, located to the north of the Project Area, William Davis' cricket team had a large number of Indigenous players. Terence Murray at Yarralumla had good relations with the local Indigenous tribes who assisted him in the exploration of the Southern Alps allowing him to establish an outstation at "Coolamine'. Murray was fluent in several Indigenous languages (Wilson 1968).

Whilst many Indigenous people moved away from the settlements and continued a traditional lifestyle, many more stayed close. Some traditions continued, such as corroborees, fore example one took place at Reidsdale, north east of Hall, and another near Ginninderra Station in 1853, where 200 people attended (Gillespie 1984). The pastoral stations continued to be places where Indigenous people could find work and provisions. A 'fringe camp' is noted in the early 1900s near Lanyon (Kabaila 1997: 25) and first hand accounts from settlers in the district show the frequent visits from groups to either continue cultural practises or to ask for food and clothing. A blanket distribution centre was located at Janevale at Tuggeranong.



2.2 Local and Regional Character of Aboriginal Land Use

Floods regional assessment (Floods 1980) and ethnographic accounts for the Southern Tablelands region indicate that lowland areas were occupied all year round with seasonal travel routes and camps to exploit Bogong Moth resources and conduct ceremonies in more elevated areas. The regional distribution of Aboriginal cultural material suggests that occupation in lowland areas of the Southern tablelands was concentrated around water and sand bodies (Koettig 1983, Packard 1992), which would have provided important food and material resources to Aboriginal people (MacAlister 1907, Govett 1977). Stratified deposits with dates indicating Pleistocene occupation of the Southern Tablelands have been identified in rock shelters (Flood et al 1987, Navin Officer 2003) Ethnographic accounts indicate that Aboriginal people travelled widely throughout the area and would gather regularly for ceremonial purposes (MacAlister 1907, Wyatt 1972, Lhotsky 1979, Gillespie 1984).

Aboriginal site distribution modeling for the local Area completed by Kuskie and Boot in 1992, NOHC in 1992 and refined in 2009, supported the larger southern tablelands modelling, indicating that Aboriginal land use was focused around major watercourses and nearby landforms, such as lower slopes, with cultural material appearing less frequently on other landforms. Excavation programs by NOHC in 2009 to the east of the Project Area along Ginninderra Creek confirmed their predictions , with a wider regional study by AMBS (2010) also supporting its validity.

The ethnohistory and spatial distribution of Aboriginal sides in the Yass Valley and the surrounding area of the ACT suggests that higher artefact distributions will be centred around major waterways and nearby high points. These locations were the focus of repeated visits and most likely used as camping areas by Aboriginal people. Major waterways provided access to food and material resources, while elevated areas would have provided views of the surrounding landscape to monitor nearby bands while still being close to major waterways. The lower densities of sites and artefacts present on plains and hills away from watercourses is most likely a result of Aboriginal people moving through these areas for travel and food gathering, but not returning frequently or on a long term basis.

2.3 Predictive Model

A predictive model for site types most likely to be encountered during the survey across the present Project Area was also developed for the project based on the following information:

- Site distribution in relation to landscape descriptions within the Project Area
- Consideration of site type, raw material types and site densities likely to be present within the Project Area
- Findings of the ethnohistorical research on the potential for material traces to present within the Project Area
- Potential Aboriginal use of natural resources present or once present within the Project Area
- Consideration of the temporal and spatial relationships of sites within the Project Area and surrounding region

The site prediction model is detailed in Table 2.1. The definition of each site type is described firstly, followed by the predicted likelihood of this site type occurring within the Project Area.



Site Type	Site Description	Potential
Flaked Stone Artefact Scatters and Isolated Artefacts	Artefact scatter sites can range from high- density concentrations of flaked stone and ground stone artefacts to sparse, low- density 'background' scatters and isolated finds.	High: Stone artefact sites have been previously recorded in the region across a wide range of landforms, The topography of the area and the ease of access to the Murrumbidgee River and Creeks make the area valuable.
Shell Middens	Deposits of shells accumulated over either singular large resource gathering events or over longer periods of time.	Very Low: Shell middens are located in vicinity of permanent water sources which provide habitat for shellfish species. The upper reaches of the Murrumbidgee are not known for native shellfish though they occur in the lower reaches. No known sites are reported.
Quarries	Raw stone material procurement sites.	Low: Non known outcrops or source quarry occur in the vicinity. There is a low possibility of quarry sites being located.
Potential Archaeological Deposits (PADs)	Potential sub surface deposits of cultural material.	Moderate: PADs have been previously recorded in the region across a wide range of landforms. They have the potential to be present in undisturbed landforms.
Scarred Trees	Trees with cultural modifications	High: mature native trees have survived within the Project Area and may retain cultural scars.
Axe Grinding Grooves	Grooves created in stone platforms through ground stone tool manufacture.	Extremely low: The geology of the Project Area lacks suitable horizontal sandstone rock outcrops for axe-grinding grooves. Therefore there is low potential for axe grinding grooves to occur in the Project Area.
Burials	Indigenous burial sites.	Low: Indigenous burial sites are generally situated within deep, soft sediments, caves or hollow trees or on top of hilltops. The rolling hilltops of the Project Area may be suitable for burials

Table 2.1: Aboriginal Site Prediction Statements



Site Type	Site Description	Potential
Rock shelters with art and / or deposit	Rock shelter sites include rock overhangs, shelters or caves, and generally occur on, or next to, moderate to steeply sloping ground characterised by cliff lines and escarpments. These naturally formed features may contain rock art, stone artefacts or midden deposits and may also be associated with grinding grooves.	Moderate: The sites will only occur where suitable rock exposures or overhangs possessing sufficient sheltered space exist. One known rockshelter site with deposits occurs within the Project Area
Indigenous Ceremony and Dreaming Sites	Such sites are often intangible places and features and are identified through oral histories, ethnohistoric data, or Indigenous informants.	Low: There are currently no recorded mythological stories for the Project Area, however the Murrumbidgee is of importance to the ceremonial life of the Aboriginal community. Consultation with Stakeholders will be undertaken to determine the presence of Indigenous ceremonial sites.
Post-Contact Sites	These are sites relating to the shared history of Indigenous and non-Indigenous people of an area and may include places such as missions, massacre sites, post- contact camp sites and buildings associated with post-contact Indigenous use.	Very Low: There are no post-contact sites previously recorded in the Project Area and historical sources do not identify one.
Indigenous Places	Indigenous places may not contain any "archaeological" indicators of a site, but are nonetheless important to Indigenous people. They may be places of cultural, spiritual or historic significance. Often they are places tied to community history and may include natural features such as swimming and fishing holes	Moderate: The Murrumbidgee River is a major feature of the landscape and importance to the Aboriginal Community There are currently no recorded Indigenous associations for the Project Area. Consultation with Stakeholders will be undertaken to determine the presence of Indigenous associations.

2.3.1 Summary

Based on the predictive site models the following statements are applicable to the Project Area:

- Open campsites (artefact scatters) are likely to be the most common site types;
- Artefact scatters are most likely to occur on level, or gently sloping, well-drained ground in association with major waterlines or drainage features;
- Larger sites will occur near the major water courses of the Murrumbidgee River or Ginninderra Creek;
- Isolated finds are likely to occur anywhere in the landscape;
- Scarred trees are likely to occur in all topographies where old growth trees survive, likely as isolated trees;



- Rockshelter sites may occur wherever suitable rock outcrops exist; and
- Burial sites are likely to occur in landforms characterised by relatively deep profile of soft sediments such as sand and alluvium and on hilltops. The rolling high hilltops of the Project area may be suitable for burials.

The locations of the registered sites across the Project Area reflects the utilisation of the Riverine landscape with concentrations on the landscape features that would have provided shelter from wind, access to water and ease of travel through the landscape

2.4 Aboriginal Heritage Located in the Project Area

A search of the OEH Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) database (Client Service ID: 111587) undertaken on the 13/9/2013 identified five (5) Aboriginal archaeological sites within the Project area and a 1km buffer centred on the proposed Project Area. All of these registered sites are located *within* the Project Area (Figure 6). Table 2.2 provides details of the registered sites located within the Project Area. The mapping coordinates recorded for these sites were checked for consistency with their descriptions and location on maps from Aboriginal heritage reports where available.

It should be noted that the AHIMS database reflects Aboriginal sites that have been officially recorded and included on the list. Large areas of NSW have not been subject to systematic, archaeological survey; hence AHIMS listings may reflect previous survey patterns and should not be considered a complete list of Aboriginal sites within a given area.

Site Name	Recorded by	Site Type
57-1-0074	Canberra Archaeological Society 1988	Artefact Scatter
57-1-0139 - GFTP9	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2000	Artefact Scatter
57-1-0140 – GFTP8	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2000	Artefact Scatter
57-1-0144 - GFTP3	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2000	Artefact Scatter
57-1-0184 – GFTP7	Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2000	Artefact Scatter

Table 2.2. Location of AHIMS registered sites within 1km of Project Area

A comparison of the Aboriginal cultural heritage sites registered within the 1km buffer of the Project Area with the reports for the region indicates that a number of previously identified sites are missing from the database. Sites located by NOHC 2000 (GFTP1,2.4,5,6) are missing from the AHIMS search as are sites located by Boot in 1996 (artefact scatter and possible scarred tree) and Saunders 1997 (three artefact scatters and three isolated finds). AMBS 2012 also identified WR06 (IF), 07 (IF), 08 (IF) , 09(AS) and 10 (AS) within 1km of the project area at Gooromon Ponds. These sites along with their details and originally recorded locations are provided in Table 2.3.



AHIMS No	Site Name	Recorded By	Site Type	Grid Location (redacted)
57-1-0146	GFTP1	NOHC 2000	IF	
57-1-0145	GFTP2	NOHC 2000	AS	
57-1-0141	GFTP4	NOHC 2000	IF	
57-1-0142	GFTP5	NOHC 2000	AS	
57-1-0143	GFTP6	NOHC 2000	AS	
Unknown	GRQ – IF1	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	IF	
Unknown	GRQ – IF2	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	IF	
Unknown	GRQ- IF3	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	IF	
Unknown	GRQ1	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	AS	
Unknown	GRQ2	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	AS	
Unknown	GRQ3	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	AS	
Unknown	GRQ4	NOHC 1997 (Saunders)	AS	
Unknown	WR06	AMBS 2010	IF	
Unknown	WR07	AMBS2010	IF	
Unknown	WR08	AMBS2010	IF	
Unknown	WR09	AMBS2010	AS	
Unknown	WR10	AMBS2010	AS	

Table 2.3. Previously recorded sites missing from AHIMS search

A simple analysis of the Aboriginal cultural heritage sites provided to date which are located within the 1km buffer of the project area results in the following:

- The majority of the sites consist of small artefact scatters or isolated finds. Site data is displayed in Table 3.
- The majority of the sites are located on lower slopes or creek flats directly adjacent to permanent water.
- The majority of the sites consist of less than 5 artefacts.

The AHIMS dataset, now that additional sites have been added, is considered to represent accurately the located sites in the area and to provide a reliable and relatively robust model of occupation as results from several assessments appear consistent and predictable in their findings.



2.5 Interpretation of Past Aboriginal Land Use

The evidence for past Aboriginal land use of the Project Area is limited with only five sites being evidence of Aboriginal usage of the area.

The surrounding region is rich in sites mainly as a result of higher rates of survey for proposed residential developments and associated infrastructure. Saunders (1997) and NOHC (xxx) surveyed sections of the Project Area in relation to quarrying and tourist facilities. Both of these surveys located additional sites which were unknown prior to the work being completed. It is highly likely that additional sites will be identified during any further surveys over the Project Area.

The Project Area is located between two permanent water supplies the Murrumbidgee River and the Ginninderra Creek. The fact that both of these waterways retain their Aboriginal names is an indication of the importance of their resources and importance to the local Aboriginal Community. These water sources would have been a focus for activity providing year round resources and optimal camping locations. Large sites are known from along the edges of Ginninderra Creek further to the east and along the Murrumbidgee River (57-1-0074) identified by CAS in1988.

Away from the River edge and amidst the rolling undulating terrain of the pastoral lands utilisation would still have focused on the minor creeklines and routes that provided level travelling. Sites are predicted to be smaller and less visible the greater the distance from the main water resources.

2.6 Results of Archaeological Assessment

Field survey over the Development Area was conducted on the 3rd and 4th of December 2013, with follow up surveys within the Conservation Area occurring during February 2014. The overall effectiveness of the survey for examining the ground for Aboriginal sites was considered to be moderate due to varying levels of low ground surface visibility predominantly due to vegetation cover and a low frequency of exposures.

Twenty Nine previously unrecorded Aboriginal sites were identified during the field survey. Eighteen of these sites are located within the Development Area consisting of small, low density surface artefact scatters. These sites will potentially be impacted by the proposed residential development. Eleven sites were identified within the Conservation Corridor consisting of small surface scatters to large campsites. No impacts are planned to occur to any of these heritage sites.

Details of the survey, sites located and proposed impacts to sites are detailed in the AR attached as Appendix 6.

Figure 5 - Previously recorded indigenous sites - NSW lands - Redacted



3 Aboriginal Community Consultation

Consultation with the Aboriginal community has been undertaken in compliance with the *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010* (DECCW 2010) as detailed below. A consultation log of all communications with Registered Aboriginal parties (RAPs) is provided in Appendix 1.

3.1 Stage 1 Notification of Project Proposal and Registration of Interest

3.1.1 Identification of Relevant Aboriginal Stakeholders

In accordance with the consultation guidelines, Biosis notified the following bodies regarding the Proposal on the 25th September 2012:

- Yass Valley Council;
- NSW Office of Environment and Water (OEH);
- NSW Native Title Services Corporation Limited (NTSCORP Limited);
- Office of the Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983 of Aboriginal Owners;
- National Native Title Tribunal;
- Southern Rivers Catchment Management Authority; and the
- Onerwal Local Aboriginal Land Council.

Responses from these bodies are included in Appendix 2. A list of known Aboriginal stakeholders in the Yass Valley area was provided by OEH. The Aboriginal stakeholders consisted of:

- Nguannawal Elders Corporation Mr Arnold Williams
- Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation Mr Wally Bell
- Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation Mrs Dorothy Carroll
- Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services Mr Dean Bell
- King Brown Tribal Group Mr Carl and Mrs Tina Brown
- Gunjeewong Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation Ms Cherie Carroll turrise
- Onerwal Local Aboriginal Land Council
- Yass Valley Consultative Committee Kathy Campbell
- Alice Williams



3.1.2 Public Notice

In accordance with the consultation guidelines, a public notification was placed in the Canberra Times and the Yass Valley Tribune (25th September 2013 and 29th September 2013).

The advertisements invited Aboriginal people who hold cultural knowledge to register their interest in a process of community consultation to provide assistance in determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places in the vicinity of the Project Area. A copy of the public notice is provided in Appendix 3.

3.1.3 Registration of Aboriginal Parties

Aboriginal groups identified by OEH were sent a letter inviting them to register their interest in a process of community consultation to provide assistance in determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places in the vicinity of the project (15th October 2013). Of those groups invited to register, 10 replied to indicate they wished to be involved in the consultation process. In response to the public notice, 1 Aboriginal group registered for consultation, however they were also on the list from NSW OEH. Responses to registration from Aboriginal parties are provided in Appendix 4. A full list of Aboriginal parties who registered for consultation is provided below:

- Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council
- Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services
- Ngarigu Currawong Clan
- Onerwal LALC
- Gunjeewong Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Corporation
- King Brown Tribal Group
- Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation
- Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Rebecca Ingram

3.2 Stage 2 Presentation of Information about the Proposed Project

On 15th October 2013, Biosis provided RAPs with details about the proposed development works (Project Information Pack). A copy of the Project Information Pack is provided in Appendix 4.

3.3 Stage 3 Gathering Information about Cultural Significance

3.3.1 Archaeological Assessment Methodology Information Pack

On 18th October 2013, Biosis provided each RAP with a copy of the Project Methodology Pack outlining the proposed Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment process and methodology for this Project. RAPs were given 28 days to review and prepare feedback on the proposed methodology. A copy of the Project Methodology Pack is provided in Appendix 5.

No comments from RAPs were received at this stage of consultation.



3.3.2 Field Work Program

Between the dates of 25th September and 27th October 2013 Biosis contacted each of the RAPS and invited them to provide current insurance certificates to participate in the field work program. Nine of the RAPS responded and requested to be considered for fieldwork. These RAPs were:

- Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council
- Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Ngarigu Currawong Clan
- Onerwal LALC
- Gunjeewong Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Corporation
- King Brown Tribal Group
- Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation
- Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Rebecca Ingram

All of the above mentioned RAPS participated in the fieldwork program. This program consisted of field survey which was undertaken on the 2nd and 3rd of December 2013 over the Development Area and Conservation Corridor with follow up surveys of the Conservation Corridor on the 12th and 17th of February 2014. Lot 61 and Lot 62 DP 801234 were added to the project area in December 2014 with surveys being undertaken over these additional areas on the 1st, 8th and 9th of December 2014. RAPs who participated in these additional surveys were:

- Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation
- Ngarigu Currawong Clan
- Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation.

Fifty Six cultural heritage sites and ten areas of Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) were identified by the field programme. The results of the field work are provided in the AR attached at Appendix 6.

3.3.3 Stage 4 Review of Draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report

Following completion of the DRAFT Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report it was provided to RAPs on 11/4/2014 for review and comment. Verbal discussions held with the RAPS involved in the field programme at the completion of fieldwork supported the findings of the report. No responses were received to this draft of the report.

Following the completion of the additional surveys in January 2015 an updated draft report was supplied to each of the RAPs on the 18/2/2015. Follow up phone calls were then placed to each of the RAPs to document their views on the management recommendations for the Project Area. Responses from the RAPS are attached at Appendix 6.

3.3.4 Final Report

A copy of the final report was provided to RAPs following incorporation of all comments.



4 Aboriginal Cultural Significance Assessment

The two main values addressed when assessing the significance of Aboriginal sites are cultural values to the Aboriginal community and archaeological (scientific) values. This report will assess the cultural values of Aboriginal sites in the Project Area. Details of the scientific significance assessment of Aboriginal sites in the Project Area are provided in the Archaeological Assessment.

4.1 Cultural Significance Values

Cultural or social significance refers to the spiritual, traditional, historical and/or contemporary associations and values attached to a place or objects by Aboriginal people. Aboriginal cultural heritage is broadly valued by Aboriginal people as it is used to define their identity as both individuals and as part of a group (also see DECC 2005: 1, 3; DECCW 2010: iii). More specifically it provides a:

- "connection and sense of belonging to Country" (DECCW 2010: iii);
- Link between the present and the past (DEC 2005: 2-3; and DECCW 2010: 3);
- A learning tool to teach Aboriginal culture to younger Aboriginal generations and the general public (DECCW 2010: 3); and,
- Further evidence of Aboriginal occupation prior to European settlement for people who do not understand the magnitude to which Aboriginal people occupied the continent (also see DECCW 2010: 1; DECCW 2010: 3).

It is broadly acknowledged that Aboriginal people are the primary determiners of the cultural significance of Aboriginal cultural heritage. During consultation the following information was provided by RAPs in regards to the cultural values of the Project Area.

- West Belconnen Project Area is of high cultural value due to its location next to the Murrumbidgee (*Plenty Water*) and Ginninderra (*Sparkling or throwing little rays of light*) Creeks. Sites should be dense in the region which was heavily utilised by past Aboriginal people. Words in italics are meaning of Names in Ngunawal.
- The recorded Aboriginal Cultural Heritage sites located within its boundaries consisting of small artefact scatters or isolated finds possess low cultural value due to the small number of artefacts and common occurrence in the region.
- Large artefact scatters hold high importance as they are taken as indicators of camping sites and central to the community life of past generations. The location of these large sites (57-1-0140 and 57-1-0074) along the edges of the Murrumbidgee and at a swimming and camping place reflect the utilisation of the area by the past Aboriginal community and provide a linkage between past and present. These sites are important and should not be infringed upon.



4.2 Statement of Significance

Consultation with the Aboriginal Community (field based discussions) has resulted in the following statement of significance for the recorded sites.

The high density sites along the Murrumbidgee River are of high importance and provide a connection between the lifeways of the past generations and the present community of Aboriginal people who inhabit the region today. They represent their camping sites and show the usage of the region and the importance of the River to the community. Smaller sites throughout the region though important in demonstrating the past occupation of the area, do not provide any additional information as to how the past generations used the River and region and are not considered to be important. Ceremonial sites (Rockshelter and rock art sites) are close by to the south of the Project Area along the banks of the Murrumbidgee River. The land was all one and the use of the region is shown by all of these sites as a whole.

Table 4.1: Significance Assessment Criteria.

Site Name	Statement of Significance
WB1 & PAD 1	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB2 – WB24	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low.
WB25 & PAD	This site consists of a surface artefact scatter with potential sub surface deposits. The site probably extends further with additional artefacts not located due to low GSV on the day of field survey. This site contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area and the use of the River resources. Significance has been assessed as high.
WB26 & PAD	This site consists of a large surface artefact scatter with potential sub surface deposits. The site probably extends further with additional artefacts not located due to low GSV on the day of field survey. This site contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area and the use of the River resources. Significance has been assessed as high.
WB27 – WB31	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low.
WB32 & PAD	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB33 & PAD	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB34	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region.



Site Name	Statement of Significance
	Significance has been assessed as low
WB 35	This site consists of a possible scarred tree in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB36-WB39	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low
WB40& PAD	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB41-45	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low
WB46& PAD	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB47-WB49	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low
WB50 & PAD	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB51-WB52	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low
WB53 & PAD	This site consists of a low density open artefact scatter with potential subsurface deposits in fair condition. It contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area. Significance has been assessed as moderate.
WB54-WB56	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low
57-1-0139,57-1-0142 to 57-1-0146	These sites consist of isolated finds or low density artefact scatters. They do not hold any research potential and consist of common artefact types and materials for the region. Significance has been assessed as low.
57-1-0074, 57-1- 0184	These sites were originally recorded in 2000. No artefacts were present at their locations at the time of the field survey. Despite this lack of artefacts the sites are connected to 57-1-0140 and may have been surface expression of a single continuous site along the river flats. Significance has been assessed as low.
57-1-0140 & PAD2	This site was originally recorded as a small artefact scatter. Additional artefacts located during the field survey have extended the density and area of this site and classified the area as a PAD surrounding this site and extended to sites 57-1-0074 and 57-1-0184. This site



Site Name	Statement of Significance		
	contains the potential to provide further information on the occupation of the area and the use of the River resources. Significance has been assessed as moderate based on the high degree of disturbance to the site and surrounding region.		

4.3 Development Impacts

Within the Project Area in the boundary of the Development Area, there are thirty four (34) recorded Aboriginal sites that are potentially subject to harm as a result of the development. It is not possible considering the nature of the development to avoid impact to these sites. Within the Conservation Corridor twenty-two sites have been recorded. These sites will not impacted by the proposed development. The Conservation Corridor will be managed by a Conservation Trust who will be responsible for protecting and managing the heritage values of the identified sites. No indirect impacts to these sites are expected as a result of the development and the Trust will be responsible for ensuring that any future planning does not impact on their values.

A summary of the potential archaeological impact of the proposal on known Aboriginal sites within the Project Area is provided in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Summary of potential archaeological impact (redacted)



4.4 Mitigation Strategy

Ideally, heritage management involves conservation of sites through the preservation and conservation of fabric and context within a framework of *"doing as much as necessary, as little as possible"* (Marquis-Kyle and Walker 1994: 13). In cases where conservation is not practical, several options for management are available. For sites,


management often involves the salvage of features or artefacts, retrieval of information through excavation or collection (especially where impact cannot be avoided) and interpretation.

Avoidance of impact to archaeological and cultural heritage sites through design of the development is the primary mitigation and management strategy, and should be implemented where practicable.

Harm to the identified sites can not be avoided as the development footprint will extend across all of the Project Area boundaries. The small size of the surface areas of the sites does not make them suitable for exclusion from the area of impact in the form of a conservation area or nature park. The nature of the sites being common, consisting of common artefact types and materials and being low in significance does not warrant this class of treatment to ensure their preservation.

It is proposed that an AHIP be applied for these sixteen small surface sites, as their location impedes the development of the area. It is proposed that the sixteen sites be surface collected (salvaged) and relocated to an area within the Conservation Area agreed upon by the RAPs, the developers and NSW OEH. This will maintain their 'connection to country' in line with the wishes of the RAPs. An analysis of the recovered artefacts would need to be undertaken and a S90 Compliance report issued to OEH following completion of the project in line with AHIP conditions.

Sub surface testing should be undertaken to mitigate the loss of the areas of PAD if these are to be impacted. Salvage of the sub surface deposits will provide further information and context to the sites in the region and promote a greater understanding of Aboriginal occupation of the Ginninderra Creek catchment. This information can then be held by the Aboriginal community and used for educating members of their community and the wider public.

4.5 Sustainable Development Principles

Intergenerational equity is maintained by the continued dissemination of cultural knowledge and ability to visit cultural sites into the future. It is considered detrimental to future generations if cultural knowledge is lost by the current generation. Any destruction of cultural heritage sites runs the risk of negatively impacting in the future. This issue has been addressed by discussion of the significance of the sites and whether they would play any part in teaching the next generation about cultural traditions. Responses to this question were that the sites were common, that the use of the area was well known and this would continue to be passed on.

The small size of the sites renders them unable to be used as teaching aids. The impact of their destruction would be negligible, though the destruction of any site should be avoided where possible. No further mitigation or options could be suggested by the community apart from those contained in the recommendations in the following section.



5 Recommendations

The recommendation below responds specifically to the wishes of the registered Aboriginal parties. Recommendations regarding the archaeological value of the site and the subsequent management of Aboriginal cultural heritage is provided in the AR (Appendix 7).

Recommendation 1: Continued consultation with the registered Aboriginal parties

It is recommended that Riverview continue to inform these groups about the management of Aboriginal cultural heritage sites within the Project Area throughout the life of the project. This recommendation is in keeping with the *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010* (DECCW 2010).

Recommendation 2: Impacts will occur to the identified areas of PAD within the Development Area. Prior to any impacts occurring a program of sub surface investigation is required to determine the presence, extent and significance of any sub surface deposits. These investigations may be undertaken immediately or at a later date prior to development.

- A detailed methodology for the sub surface investigations should be developed for approval by the RAPs for the project prior to any testing commencing, and following discussions with NSW OEH as to the most appropriate methodology.
- This sub surface testing s may be in accordance with the Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW 2010) which would not require an AHIP to undertake the investigations.
- This sub surface testing if following a different methodology would require an AHIP from NSW OEH to allow impacts to the areas of known sites and areas of PAD.

Recommendation 3: Following the completion of sub surface testing an area based AHIP covering the Development area should be applied for from NSW OEH. This AHIP would apply to sites WB1-WB16, WB23-24, WB30-33, WB42-45, WB48-53. The AHIP application should cover the area as shown on Figure 8. AHIP application could be submitted following subsurface testing or at a later date prior to construction.

These sites should be collected, subjected to analysis and relocated to an agreed place within the Conservation Corridor of the Project Area to maintain their 'connection to country'. This location must be agreed upon by the RAPs, NSW OEH and Riverview Projects.

Recommendation 4: Sites and areas of PAD located within the Conservation Corridor are not subject to any proposed development impact. These sites are protected under legislation and in the event of any future action impacting on these known sites further assessment of the impacts and application for an AHIP may be required. This recommendation applies to the following sites: WB17 -WB22, WB25 – WB29, WB34-WB41,WB46-WB47, WB54-WB56, 57-1-0174, 57-1-0074, 57-1-0184, 57-1-0140 and PAD WB25, WB26 and 57-1-0140. Any works that may occur in the Conservation Corridor must avoid areas of heritage sites or application for an AHIP will be required.

Recommendation 5: The proposed West Belconnen Conservation Corridor is of high cultural significance to the Aboriginal Community. Ongoing liaison should be undertaken with the RAPs in regards to the management of sites within the Conservation Corridor and future planned developments that may impact cultural sites. This would involve meeting with the RAPs and discussing future developments. In the future the requirements of consultation may change and requirements should be checked with NSW OEH.



Recommendation 6: The area of the Ginninderra Creek has been assessed as holding high archaeological sensitivity. Any development that occurs within 100m should be subject to sub surface testing within the development footprint to avoid damage to the archaeological record. This sub surface testing should be in accordance with the *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (DECCW 2010).

Recommendation 7: Finding of low potential for unidentified cultural heritage sites or deposits across remainder of Development Area– proceed with caution.

The assessment of the Project Areas potential for cultural heritage sites and deposits is based on the field surveys and review of work completed in the immediate vicinity. This assessment has resulted in a finding of low potential across the Development Area except for the area of the Ginninderra Creekline. As a result the project can proceed with caution in areas with no known cultural heritage sites dependent on recommendations 9, 10 and 11.

Recommendation 8: Due to the nature of the archaeological record it is possible that additional cultural heritage sites exist within the Project Area which were not located during this planning field survey. As a result the RAPs have requested that a cultural heritage induction should be included in the induction package for all construction workers.

Recommendation 9: Discovery of Unanticipated Aboriginal Objects

All Aboriginal objects and Places are protected under the *NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act* 1974. It is an offence to knowingly disturb an Aboriginal site without a consent permit issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH). Should any Aboriginal objects be encountered during works associated with this proposal outside of the AHIP area, works must cease in the vicinity and the find should not be moved until assessed by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an Aboriginal object the archaeologist will provide further recommendations. These may include notifying the OEH and Aboriginal stakeholders.

Recommendation 10: Discovery of Aboriginal Ancestral Remains

Aboriginal ancestral remains may be found in a variety of landscapes in NSW, including middens and sandy or soft sedimentary soils. If any suspected human remains are discovered during any activity you must:

- Immediately cease all work at that location and not further move or disturb the remains
- Notify the NSW Police and OEH's Environmental Line on 131 555 as soon as practicable and provide details of the remains and their location
- Not recommence work at that location unless authorised in writing by OEH.

Recommendation 11: No further archaeological work required for the Development Area once AHIP obtained from OEH.

No further archaeological work is required for the Development Area should the AHIP be approved, except in the event that unexpected cultural finds are unearthed during any phase of the project (refer to Recommendation 9-10).



References

Allen, J. and J.F.O'Connell. 2003. The long and the short of it: Archaeological approaches to determining when humans first colonised Australia and New Guinea. *Australian Archaeology*: 57:5-19.

Australian Museum Business Services 2010. Indigenous Heritage Assessment Lot 22 DP 1101071 and Lot 71 DP 1085495 Wallaroo Road, Hall. Report to Parsons Brinckerhoff.

Avery, S. (1994). *Aboriginal and European Encounter in the Canberra Region: a question of change and the archaeological record*. Canberra ACT: Attorney Generals Dept.

Canberra Archaeological Society (1988). Site inventory. ACT Heritage.

Eric Martin & Associates. 2012. Belconnen Farm Conservation and Management Plan. Report for Reid and Stevens Pty Ltd.

Flood, J. (1980). *The Moth Hunters- Aboriginal Prehistory of the Australian alps*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

Gillespie, L. (1984). Aborigines of the Canberra Region. Lyall L. Gillespie, Campbell, ACT.

Govett, W. 1977. Sketches of NSW (1836 – 37) Gaston Renard.

Horton, D. 1996. Aboriginal Map of Australia. Canberra, AIATSIS.

Jenkins, J 2000. Soil Landscapes of the Canberra 1:100 000 Sheet. Queanbeyan Department of Land and Water Conservation..

Kabalia, P. (1997). *Belconnens Aboriginal Past: A glimpse into the Archaeology of the Australian Capital Territory.* Canberra: Black Mountain Projects.

Lhotsky, J. 1979 A Journey from Sydney to the Australian Alps undertaken in the months of January, February and March 1834. Blubber Head Press, Hobart.

MacAlister, C. 1907. Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South. C. Macalister Book Publishing Committee.

Navin Officer 1992. Preliminary Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Residential Development Areas WB-B-C1 and WB-C-C1 West Belconnen ACT. Report to the Department of Environment, Land and Planning. Report by Kuskie and Boot.

Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2003. Late Pleistocene Occupation at Wombeyan One, Wombeyan Cave Reserve, NSW. Report to NPWS.

OEH 2010. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010. NSW OEH.

Saunders, P. (1997). An Archaeological Survey of Ginninderra Red Gravel Quarry, Shire of Yarrowlumla, NSW. Consultancy report to David Hogg Pty. Ltd.

Speight, J.G. (1998) 'Landform' in McDonald, R.C. & R.F.Isbell (eds.) Australian Soil and Land Survey Field Handbook, p 9-57. Goanna Print, Canberra.

Navin Officer Heritage Consultants (2000). Ginninderra Falls Tourist Park (Stage 1) Parish of Weetangera, Yarralumla Shire, NSW. Consultancy report to David Hogg Pty Ltd for Ginninderra Falls Tourist Park.

Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2009.MacGregor West 1 Estate Off Site Works – Archaeological Salvage Program. Report to Village Building Co Limited.



Packard, P. 1992. An archaeological Assessment of Proposed Development in the Area of the lower Molonglo Water Quality Control Centre ACT. Report to Scott & Furphy Pty Ltd.

Percival, B. & Stewart, K. (1997). *Bush foods of NSW - a scientific record and an oral history*. Sydney: Royal Botanic Gardens Sydney.

South East Archaeology 1992. Preliminary Cultural Resource Survey of the Proposed Residential Development Areas WB-B-C1 and WB-B-B2 West Belconnen ACT. Report to Department of Environment, Land and Planning.

Tindale, N.B.1974. Aboriginal Tribes of Australia. Australian National University Press.

Wilson, G. (1968). *Murray of Yarralumla*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.



Appendices



Appendix 1 – Consultation Log

Aboriginal Group	Type of Consultation	Date/Time of Consultation	Response	
Consultation Notifications to regulators ascertain Aboriginal stakeholders – May 2010				
NNTT	Letter	25 September 2013	List of known Indigenous area at Yass.	
NTSCORP	Letter	25 September 2013	Response letter	
Murrumbidgee CMA	Letter	25 September 2013	No response	
Yass Valley Shire Council	letter	25 September 2013	Refer to LALC	
OEH Queanbeyan	Letter/Email	25 September 2013	List of Known indigenous stakeholders	
Onerwal LALC	Letter/Email	25 September 2013	Registered themselves	
Registrar Aboriginal Land Rights Act	Letter/Email	25 September 2013	No known stakeholders	
Placement of Notification – Local Pr	rint Media –			
Canberra Times	25/9 – paper		No registrations	
Yass Valley Tribune	25/9 – paper		No registration	
Additional Consultation under	taken by Riverview			
Meeting with United Ngunawal Elders		6 September 2011 – meeting	Rebecca Ingram would like to participate in project	
Meeting with ACT Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Elected Body		2 August 2011 - Meeting Phone call and emails	No issues but please keep informed	
Project Notifications to Identified Stakeholders by Regulators				
Yass Valley Indigenous Consultative Committee - Ms Cathy Campbell	60300565253098 – Express Post	14/10/2013 -	Not registering	
Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation – Ms Dorothy Carroll	60300565260096 – Express Post	14/10/2013	Registered for Project	
Ngunnawal Elders Corporation – Mr Arnold Williams	60300565259090 – Express Post	14/10/2013	No response	

Gunjeewong Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation – Ms Cherie Carroll-Turrise	60300565252091 – Express Post	14/10/13	Registered 11/11/2013 – two separate registrations
Ms Alice Williams -	60300565251094 – Express Post	14/10/13	No response
ACT Registered Stakeholders actively involved in project prior to commencement – Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council			
Ngarigu Currawong Clan King Brown Tribal Group			
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation			
Registrations	Name	Date	Contact details
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation	Mr Wally Bell	25/9/2013	PO BOX 6900 Charnwood ACT 2615
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council	Mr Joe House /Ms Michelle House	25/9/2013	8/2 Winchester Place Queanbeyan NSW 2620
Ngarigu Currawong Clan	Ms Ellen Mundy/Mr James Mundy/ Mr Tony Boye	25/9/2013	James Mundy 9B Suttor Street Ainslie ACT 2602
King Brown Tribal Group	Mr Carl Brown	25/9/2013	12 Pleasance Place Belconnen ACT 2617
Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation	Mr Glen Freeman	30/9/2013 – letter registration	0451790215 <u>KoomurriNAC@hotmail.com</u> PO BOX 356 DOONSIDE NSW 2767
Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services –	Mr Dean Bell	7/10/2013 – phone registration	0415 100189 yurwang_gundana@bigpond.com PO BOX 5628 South Windsor NSW 2756

Onerwal LALC	Mr Pat Loach	3/11/2013 – phone registration.	62265349 onerwal1@gmail.com PO BOX 644 YASS NSW 2582 Ngunnawallock24@gmail.com
Gunjeewong	Julie shroder	11/11/2013 – letter	0429341488 Julieshroder5@live.comm.au
Gunjeewong	Cherie Carroll Turrise	16/10/2013 – letter	0410744545 0415383489
Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corportion	Dorothy Carroll	5/11/2013 – letter	245 Ash Road Preston NSW 2170 0413 186 133 ngunawalhac@gmail.com
Ingram Family	Rebecca Ingram	15/10/2013 – called to discuss project – sent methodology pack and insurance request	<u>Ringram6033@gmail.com</u>
Provision of Project Information- St	tage 2 – 15 October 2013 – sent to all ider	ntified OEH stakeholders as	king for registration
RAP	Type of consultation	Date	Response
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Wally Bell	Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	No Response
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council –			
Mr Joe House	Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	No Response
	Project pack –hard copy – express post Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013 15/10/2013	No Response No Response
Mr Joe House Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen			
Mr Joe House Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy King Brown Tribal Group - Mr Carl	Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	No Response
Mr Joe House Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy King Brown Tribal Group - Mr Carl Brown Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal	Project pack –hard copy – express post Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013 15/10/2013	No Response No Response

-		
Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	Registered
Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	No Response
Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	Registered
Project pack –hard copy – express post	15/10/2013	No Response
October 2013		
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	18/10/2013	No Response
	Project pack –hard copy – express post Project pack –hard copy – express post Project pack –hard copy – express post October 2013 Methodology pack – hard copy – express post Methodology pack – hard copy – express post	Project pack -hard copy - express post15/10/2013Project pack -hard copy - express post15/10/2013Project pack -hard copy - express post15/10/2013October 2013Image: Comparison of the text of

Ingram Family	Methodology pack emailed	18/10/2013	No response
Notification to OEH and LALC – list of raps	15/11/2013 – letter and email		
Insurance details, fieldwork particip	pation		
BNAC	In letter	19/11/2014	Completed
Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation	Supplied wit registration letter	19/11/2014	Completed
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council – Mr Joe House	Letter/email	19/11/2013	3 Tennyson Avenue Queanbeyan NSW 2620
Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy	Letter/email	19/11/2013	6 Buckman Place Chapman ACT 2615
King Brown Tribal Group Mr Carl Brown	Letter/email	19/11/2013	Unit 2 65 Erin St Queanbeyan NSW 2620
Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Glen Freeman	Letter/email	19/11/2013	completed
Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services – Mr Dean Bell	Letter/email	19/11/2013	Will not participate as does not hold insurance
Onerwal LALC – Mr Pat Loach	Letter/email	19/11/2013	Covered by NSW Govt
Gunjeewong - Ms Julie Shroder	Letter/email	19/11/2013	0429341488 Julieshroder5@live.comm.au
Ingram Family	Phone call/email	19/11/2013	They do not hold insurances but will be subcontracting through employment agency (manpower) so covered by insurance.
Fieldwork Participation			
All RAPs except Yurwang Gundana – 3 & 4 th December 2013			

Buru Ngunawal, Ngarigu Currawong Clan, King Brown Tribal Group – 7 th and 14 th February 2014				
Provision of Draft Project Report				
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Wally Bell	email	8/5/2014	No response to date	
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council – Mr Joe House	Hard copy	8/5/2014	No response to date	
Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy	Hard copy	8/5/2014	No response to date	
King Brown Tribal Group - Mr Carl Brown	Hard copy	8/5/2014	No response to date	
Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Glen Freeman	email	12/5/2014	No response to date	
Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services – Mr Dean Bell	email	12/5/2014	No response to date	
Onerwal LALC – Mr Richard Bell	email	12/5/2014	No response to date	
Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation – Ms Dorothy Carroll	email	12/5/2014	No response to date	
Ingram Family	Email	12/5/2014	No response to date	
Gunjeewong Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation	Hard copy	8/5/2014	Agrees with report	
Provision of Final Report				
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Wally Bell	Hard Copy	18/8/2014		
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council – Mr Joe House	Hard Copy	18/8/2014		
Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy	Hard Copy	18/8/2014		

			,
King Brown Tribal Group - Mr Carl Brown		18/8/2014	
Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Glen Freeman		18/8/2014	
Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services – Mr Dean Bell		18/8/2014	
Onerwal LALC – Mr Richard Bell		18/8/2014	
Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation – Ms Dorothy Carroll		18/8/2014	
Ingram Family		18/8/2014	
Gunjeewong Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation		18/8/2014	
Notification of Methodology for addi	itional area of survey NSW Lands		
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Wally Bell	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council – Mr Joe House	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
King Brown Tribal Group - Mr Carl Brown	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Glen Freeman	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services – Mr Dean Bell	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Onerwal LALC – Mr Richard Bell	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation – Ms Dorothy Carroll	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date

Ingram Family	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	No response to date
Gunjeewong Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation	Hard Copy	13/10/2014	
Invitation for additional Field work			
Koomurri	Phone Call/email		Participated in feb 2015 surveys
BNAC	Phone call/Email		Participated in feb 2015 surveys
LGRTC	Phone Call		Participated in feb 2015 surveys
King Brown	Phone Call		Participated in feb 2015 surveys
			Participated in feb 2015 surveys
Provision of updated Draft report			
Buru Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Wally Bell	Email	16/4/2015	
Little Gudgenby River Tribal Council – Mr Joe House	Hard Copy	16/4/2015	
Ngarigu Currawong Clan – Ms Ellen Mundy	Hard Copy	16/4/2015	
King Brown Tribal Group - Mr Carl Brown	Hard Copy	16/4/2015	
Koomurri Ngunawal Aboriginal Corporation - Mr Glen Freeman	Email	16/4/2015	
Yurwang Gundana Consultancy Cultural Heritage Services – Mr Dean Bell	Email	16/4/2015	
Onerwal LALC – Mr Richard Bell	Email	16/4/2015	

Ngunawal Heritage Aboriginal Corporation – Ms Dorothy Carroll	Email	16/4/2015	
Ingram Family	Email	16/4/2015	
Gunjeewong Cultural Heritage Aboriginal Corporation	Email	16/4/2015	



Appendix 2 – Responses from Regulators



Appendix 3 – Public Notice



Appendix 4 - Project Information Pack



Appendix 5 – Project Methodology Packs



Appendix 6 - Responses from RAPS



Appendix 7 - Archaeological Report