Appendix I

Community Consultation

Includes the following:

- Community Update November/December 2010.
- Community Update December 2012.
- Aboriginal Focus Group Meeting Minutes.
- ISEPP Submissions.
Realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek

The Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) now has a preferred corridor for the proposed realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek, approximately 20km south of Narooma.

Background

The RTA is planning for a future upgrade of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek, approximately 20km south of Narooma. The proposed upgrade would improve road safety along this stretch of road which is steep and winding with a history of crashes.

The majority of these crashes involve vehicles leaving the road on curves. To assist in addressing these crashes, the RTA proposes to upgrade the road to a modern highway standard alignment, lowering the number and severity of curves in the road.

The RTA has conducted investigations into the area and selected a preferred corridor. Factors that have been considered include the existing road, the local topography, a range of environmental constraints and local land use and ownership.

The project

The RTA proposes to realign the Princes Highway from a point 1.5 kilometres north to 1.8 kilometres south of Dignams Creek Road. The key features of the project would be:

• Constructing approximately 3.1 kilometres of new highway built to modern road alignment standards.
• Constructing a new bridge over Dignams Creek – replacing the existing bridge.
• Constructing a new junction at the Princes Highway and Dignams Creek Road.
• Upgrade of an existing southbound overtaking lane.

The project would also result in sections of the existing Princes Highway south of Dignams Creek Road being removed and revegetated. Wildlife corridors between Gulaga and Kooraban National Parks would also be maintained through the installation of fauna crossing structures as part of the road upgrade.

Benefits

• Improved road safety.
• Improved road geometry and alignment, leading to improved travel efficiency.
• A reduction of vehicle carbon emissions due to improved alignment.
• Improved travel times for motorists on the Princes Highway.
• Catering for fauna movement through installation of fauna crossings.

What happens next

If you would like more information about this project you can contact the project development team:

Roads and Traffic Authority
PO Box 477
Wollongong NSW 2520

T (02) 4221 2418 (during business hours)

More information is also available at: www.rta.nsw.gov.au
Realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek

Have your say
The RTA has consulted with a number of directly affected land owners and both local councils.

To have your say on the preferred corridor, please contact the RTA’s Project Manager or provide comments in writing.

The preferred corridor is on display until 4 February 2011 at Cobargo Post Office, between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday.

Privacy: Your personal information in correspondence is collected for the sole purpose of assisting in the assessment of the proposal. All information received, including names and addresses of respondents, may be published in subsequent assessment documents unless a clear indication is given in the correspondence that such information is not to be published. Otherwise the RTA will only disclose your personal information, without your consent, if authorised by law. Your personal information will be held by the RTA at Level 6, 90 Crown St, Wollongong NSW 2500. You have the right to access and correct the information if you believe that it is incorrect.

This is a strategic design. Design shown is indicative only. Subject to change.

Date of aerial photography: January 2006. Imagery under licence to RTA by Department of Lands.
Dignams Creek
Princes Highway upgrade

Concept design
Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) is proposing to realign the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek. A concept design based on an alignment to the west of the existing Dignams Creek Bridge is on display for your comment until 11 January 2013.

Background:
In December 2010, RMS displayed a preferred road corridor for the proposed realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek. This realignment was primarily to the east of the existing Princes Highway and would have required large scale bridge and road works.

The upgrade announced in 2010 was initially estimated to cost $85 million and, as the design was refined, this cost estimate increased largely because of the need to increase the length of the bridge.

As part of the ongoing planning process, RMS is reviewing the proposed road corridor and is now investigating an alignment to the west of the existing Dignams Creek Bridge. This alignment would reduce the scale of earthworks compared with the alignment announced in December 2010. It would also have lower cuttings and embankments and a shorter bridge.

This would provide better value for money and assist obtaining early construction funding for the project. The estimated cost of this concept design is approximately half the cost of the 2010 alignment.

The project:
The proposed highway upgrade would now involve realigning the Princes Highway from 1.5 kilometres north to 600 metres south of Dignams Creek Road.

For a further 1.1 kilometres south, the existing highway would be upgraded by providing a widened northbound shoulder, a widened painted median and improved sight distance around curves to improve road safety.

The upgrade has been designed to allow the southern section to be realigned in the future as indicated in yellow on the concept design plan. This is a long term priority and construction would depend on the availability of funding.

The intersection of Dignams Creek Road with the Princes Highway in this concept design would be relocated approximately 40 metres to the south of its existing location. This is to accommodate a protected right turn bay for motorists turning into Dignams Creek Road, providing a safer environment for turning motorists and through traffic.

Have your say!
The concept design for the Princes Highway upgrade is now on display until Friday 11 January 2013.

Your comments and feedback are invited by:

- **Post:** Dignams Creek upgrade Project Manager, PO Box 477 Wollongong NSW 2520
- **Email:** DignamsCreekUpgrade@rms.nsw.gov.au
- **Telephone:** (02) 4221 2430

For more information or to make a comment please contact the project team by Friday 11 January 2013 by:
- **Post:** Dignams Creek upgrade Project Manager, PO Box 477 Wollongong NSW 2520
- **Email:** DignamsCreekUpgrade@rms.nsw.gov.au
- **Telephone:** (02) 4221 2430 (during business hours)

© Roads and Maritime Services
Privacy: Roads and Maritime Services (“RMS”) is subject to the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (“PPIPA Act”) which requires that we comply with the Information Privacy Principles set out in the PPIP Act. All information in correspondence is collected for the sole purpose of assisting in the assessment of this proposal. The information received, including names and addresses of respondents, may be published in subsequent documents unless a clear indication is given in the correspondence that all or part of that information is not to be published. Otherwise RMS will only disclose your personal information, without your consent, if authorised by the law. Your personal information will be held by RMS at 90 Crown Street, Wollongong NSW 2520. You have the right to access and correct the information if you believe that it is incorrect.

RMS 12.629

© Roads and Maritime Services
Privacy: Roads and Maritime Services (“RMS”) is subject to the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (“PPIPA Act”) which requires that we comply with the Information Privacy Principles set out in the PPIP Act. All information in correspondence is collected for the sole purpose of assisting in the assessment of this proposal. The information received, including names and addresses of respondents, may be published in subsequent documents unless a clear indication is given in the correspondence that all or part of that information is not to be published. Otherwise RMS will only disclose your personal information, without your consent, if authorised by the law. Your personal information will be held by RMS at 90 Crown Street, Wollongong NSW 2520. You have the right to access and correct the information if you believe that it is incorrect.

RMS 12.629
Features of the proposal:
- Construct a new highway built to current road design standards.
- Construct a new bridge over Dignams Creek replacing the existing bridge.
- Relocate the intersection of Dignams Creek Road with the Princes Highway for improved road safety.
- Upgrade the existing southbound overtaking lane.

Geotechnical investigations:
RMS has investigated geotechnical conditions to guide the road design and better understand the ground conditions on the proposed western alignment. We will publish the results from the geotechnical investigations in a finalised report in 2013.

Flora and fauna:
The proposed alignment would result in disused sections of the existing Princes Highway being removed and revegetated. Wildlife corridors between Gulaga and Kooraburn National parks would also be maintained with fauna crossings installed as part of the road upgrade.

Project benefits:
- Improved road safety with a better road alignment.
- Reduced vehicle carbon emissions due to improved grades and curves.
- Improved travel times for Princes Highway motorists.
- Safer crossings for local fauna.
Minutes of meeting

1. **Item: Dignams Creek Project Background**

The RTA is investigating options for the realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek. The existing section of existing highway has a poor alignment with tight horizontal curves and a narrow bridge crossing of Dignams Creek.

The RTA proposes to develop an improved road alignment that will meet current road design standards. The proposal includes the construction of a new bridge crossing of Dignams Creek. There is currently no funding commitment for construction.

As part of the development of the project, the RTA is consulting with the Aboriginal community to identify potential Aboriginal heritage impacts.

To date, a study area has been identified and a site walk over was undertaken with Merrimans Local Aboriginal Land Council. The Council was represented by Max Munroe.

The purpose of this meeting is to commence consultation with the registered stakeholders beyond the initial consultation undertaken with the relevant Local Aboriginal Land Council. At this meeting the project will be presented and the AFG will be given the opportunity to ask any questions it has about the project.

At this meeting, the “Preliminary Archaeological Investigation Assessment” report, undertaken by NSW Archaeology will also be presented. This report was sent to all registered members of the AFG with their invitation to this meeting. Additional copies are available at today’s meeting. The report will be later presented by Andrew Pearce of NSW Archaeology.

The next step of the archaeological assessment requires underground investigation. In order to do this, we require approval from DECC for the investigation methodology. This is called a Section 87 approval from DECC. A copy of the methodology was sent to all members of the AFG with their invitation to this meeting. Additional copies of the methodology are available here at today’s meeting. Andrew Pearce will present the investigation methodology for AFG comment.

DECC requires that the AFG is given 21 days to provide comment on the proposed methodology. After our presentation today, all registered AFG members will be provided with a copy of the methodology and given
the opportunity to comment. Any comments received will be considered and the methodology will be finalised for submission to DECC for approval.

Linh Truong, Project Development Manager, Roads and Traffic Authority

2. RTA Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation

The RTA has developed a procedure for consultation with the Aboriginal Community (The Procedure) to ensure that the RTA meets its obligations as prescribed by the Department of Environment and Climate Change (DECC).

A copy of The Procedure is available on request from Agnes Donovan, the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor, Southern Region.

Agnes Donovan – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor, Southern Region, Roads and Traffic Authority

3. Item: Archaeological Investigation

A site walk has been undertaken by Max Munro in conjunction with the RTA and a separate walk was undertaken by the archaeologists. No artefacts were found, however they could be concealed under the grass. Archaeologists have conducted an assessment and consider it unlikely that there will be artefacts on the mountainous areas. Archaeologists were able to see exposed ground in these mountainous areas and there were no artefacts identified. Max Monroe’s assessment agrees with the conclusion that artefacts are unlikely in the mountainous areas because of the steepness of the terrain.

Close to Dignams Creek it is considered more likely that there may be some trace artefacts. It is proposed that an archaeological investigation is carried out at these locations. If there are artefacts found on the site then there will be further analysis done on the objects to determine their origin.

These findings are covered in the “Preliminary Archaeological Investigation Assessment” report and is table here at today’s meeting.

In order to carry out the investigations a Section 87 approval is required from DECC.

Andy Pierce, Archaeologist, NSW Archaeology.

Issues:
People have been ploughing through the land and have been taking artefacts
Max Munroe, Community Elder.

Response:
Ploughing, though it disturbs the surface, has little effect on the archaeological significance of the artefacts. The artefacts still remain essentially in the same place.
Andy Pierce, Archaeologist, NSW Archaeology.

4. Item – Archaeological Process

The Archaeologist will be digging 6 pits along a 25m line at intervals of 5 metres. Each pit is 0.5m x 0.5m in area and the excavation work will be undertaken by hand. A total of 9 of these lines will be dug across the areas identified as being a potential archaeological deposit. These areas are shown on the map in the Preliminary Archaeological Assessment report as survey units 9, 11, 13, 14(north end), and 16.
This methodology is referred to as the “RTA Dignams Creek s87 permit application - Appendix 1” or the “Section 87 methodology” and is being tabled at this meeting to gain approval from the AFG. The AFG has 21 days to provide any further comments in writing.

After completion of the underground investigation, analysis will be done on any items recovered and a report will be provided to the RTA.

Andy Pierce, Archaeologist, NSW Archaeology.

Response:
The AFG is familiar with the investigation process and is happy with the process presented.

Members, Aboriginal Focus Group

5. Cultural heritage
The process of obtaining information about the cultural heritage of an area is covered by The Procedure and is undertaken as a separate process to the archaeological investigations. The process involves interviewing knowledge holders by a qualified consultant with experience in Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment. The consultant is engaged by the RTA.

As part of this process the AFG is asked to nominate knowledge holders who will add to the knowledge of the area. For examples, Elders who have knowledge of the history of the study area and can add value to the information gathered about the study area.

Agnes Donovan – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor, Southern Region, Roads and Traffic Authority

6. Nominations for knowledge holders
The following knowledge holders were nominated by the AFG:

a. Max Munro
b. Pam Flanders
c. Eddie Foster
d. Lorraine Naylor
e. Harold Harrison
f. Lionel Mongta
g. Mary Mongta

As part of the cultural heritage assessment process, these knowledge holders may be contacted by the heritage consultant and interviewed about their knowledge.

7. Item – Opportunities for Aboriginal Involvement
As part of the Section 87 investigations, there is opportunity for employment as either a “site officer” or “trainee site officer” to assist the archaeologist undertaking the investigation. The exact number of positions will be determined when the methodology is finalised.

A copy of the agreement to provide these services is available here at today’s meeting, for the information of Employers, and will available as requested by Employers. Candidates qualified to undertake the work are encouraged to apply for the positions and are encouraged to do so through their group or Council. The reason the applicant should apply through their employer, such as the Local Aboriginal Land Council, is that they are required to be covered for insurance purposes and require a green card.

Payments for the services are made directly to the Employer, such as the Local Aboriginal Land Council and not directly to the site officer. The Employer is responsible for the payment of the site officer as the rate is to
cover other overheads incurred by the Employer, such as insurance. Payment is made from time the site officer starts work on site to the time they finish each day. The site officer will be required to have signed time sheets for each day worked. No payment is made for travel to and from the site.

The RTA will assess all applicants for their suitability for the work and advise the successful candidates. As before, the number of available positions is yet to be finalised, but will be dependent on the requirements of the archaeologist.

Linh Truong, Project Development Manager, Roads and Traffic Authority

The RTA also works with industry to provide employment opportunities for Aboriginal people. Examples of employment types that have been made available in the past, during construction are:

- Traineeships
- Apprenticeships

Past projects that have employed Aboriginal people are:

- Oak Flats to Dunmore
- Nowra Upgrade
- Northern Distributor

Agnes Donovan, Aboriginal Cultural and Heritage Advisor, Roads and Traffic Authority.

8. Sum Up

Documents tabled:

- Preliminary Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment report
- RTA Dignams Creek s87 permit application - Appendix 1 (Section 87 Methodology)
- Agreement to provide services: Aboriginal Archaeological Investigations (available on request by Employers such as Land Councils or Groups.

Actions:

- 21 days for comments for Preliminary Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment report
- 21 days for RTA Dignams Creek s87 permit application - Appendix 1 (Section 87 Methodology)

NEXT MEETING: TBA.
Dignams Creek Aboriginal Focus Group Meeting

Welcome to the Country

Introductions and background - Linh Truong

- This meeting is being held to replace an Aboriginal Focus Group meeting held for Dignams Creek 4 March 2009 at the Wallaga Lake LALC. As we had only a small attendance at that meeting did not feel that we adequately consulted and took this opportunity to revisit the meeting.
- The RTA and NSW Archaeologists are here today to speak to you about work done to date on the Dignams Creek project.
- At this stage we do not have any fixed alignment for the Dignams Creek project. Some alignments, including those designed by the Department of Main Roads in the 1980’s, are being examined but we are still in the very early stages of developing the corridor.
- The RTA has defined a study area and are proceeding with investigations within this zone. (Picture of study area provided to the AFG).
- The goal is to engage the Aboriginal community early. Many of the people here responded to advertisements placed by the RTA inviting your involvement in the AFG’s for this project.
- Julie Dibden and her team at NSW Archaeology were engaged by the RTA to undertake the Aboriginal Archaeological investigations for the project.
- This is the first stage of the Dignams Creek Project, the RTA do not have plans for this new road as of yet we only have a study area, which is where we would like to construct the new road.

Purpose of today's meeting - Linh Truong

- The Archaeologists, the RTA and Uncle Max from Merrimans LALC have completed a site walk over. Julie will present the finding of this preliminary site walk today.
- The purpose of today’s meeting to:
- Introduce the AFG to the project;
- Present the findings from the preliminary investigation and gather any comments;
- Finalise the report;
- AFG agreement on section 87 methodology and proceed to applying for Section 87 approval from DECC;
- Discuss cultural heritage reporting and nominate knowledge holders if necessary.

Preliminary Aboriginal Archaeological Report – Julie Dibden
- A walk was undertaken by Linh Truong, Agnes Donovan, Max Munro and separately by Julie Dibden.
- There is a high chance that there will be Artefacts under the ground, the Archaeologists could not see anything when they did they site was over as the grass was too thick.
- It is considered that areas 9, 11, 13, 14 (north end) and 16, all near the creek, warrant further subsurface investigation. These areas are defined in the report agree with Max Munro’s observations.
- The report is tabled.
- There will be a 21 day period for the Aboriginal Focus Group to state any ideas, changes or comments that they would like to put forward.

Section 87 methodology – Julie Dibden
- It is proposed to excavate Test Squares in nine Test Transects in the five relevant Survey Units. Each Test Transect will measure 25 metres long. Six Test Squares will be excavated at five metre intervals in each Test Transect. Test Squares will measure 0.5 x 0.5 metres in area.
- After wet sieving the soil the Archaeologist will sort through the gravel by hand to get maximum results to find the artefacts.
- If there were remains such as bones found, we would have to stop working, leave them were they were found and we would have to follow the RTA procedures.
- Generally a hole might be 80cm where it is a flat surface and if we were to hit either rock or clay we would stop work and stop digging.
- Artefacts are usually found in the top 40cm of the earth’s surface, after the first 40 cm it starts to drop off and there are not as many artefacts found.
- There will be no excavation done further north due to erosion and the steepness of the land and low probability of finding any artefacts.
- The section 87 methodology is tabled.
- There will be a 21 day period for the Aboriginal Focus Group to state any ideas, changes or comments that they would like to put forward.

Cultural Heritage - Linh Truong and Agnes Donovan
- AFG would like cultural heritage report done if section 87 investigations finds any results.
- Information for cultural heritage report will be gather by interviewing knowledge holders nominated by the AFG.
- A draft report will be brought to the AFG for comment and any changes before finalising and making public.
- Knowledge holders will get paid for the time that they are being interviewed.
- Interviewees have a choice of how they will be interviewed. It can either be one on one with either Andy or Julie and you are able to choose to be interviewed at your home, LALC or on site.

Actions and Outcomes
- Meeting minutes to be forwarded to all registered AFG members.
- AFG has 21 days to comment on preliminary environmental report and section 87 methodology. Closing date for comments is 14 July 2009.
- AFG is supportive of section 87 investigations after any submissions are considered.

Next Meeting

- If comments from AFG during the submissions period result in major change to the report or methodology then another meeting will be held prior to submission to DECC for section 87 approval. Should this be required the next meeting will be held within 8 weeks.
- If no major changes result from comments then the RTA will proceed and make a submission for section 87 approval after the submission period ends. Should this happen then the AFG will be advised when of future meetings when they are required.
MEETING MINUTES

Name of Meeting: Dignams Creek Aboriginal Focus Group
Location of Meeting: Wallaga Lake, Community Centre
Date: 7 December 2010

Attendees:
Max Munro – Community Representative
Maria Walker – Community Representative
Lorraine Naylor – Community Representative
Katherine Holzner – RTA
Peter Hawkins – RTA
Eric Naylor – Community Representative
Agnes Donovan – RTA
Graham Roche – RTA
E. Foster – Community Representative
William Davis – Community Representative
Colin Edwards – Community Representative

Apologies:
Lional Mongta – Community Representative
Mary Mongta – Community Representative

Dignams Creek Aboriginal Focus Group Meeting

1. Welcome and Introduction
   Agnes Donovan – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor

2. Overview of the Project
   Peter Hawkins – Project Manager

   RTA Project team were introduced
   Current crash rate for this section of the Princes Highway is six times
   what is expected.
   Current project length is 3.4km long
   Options were identified to meet the project objectives
   Preferred option was selected in December 2010
   A plan of the preferred option was displayed and the impacts associated
   with the preferred option were discussed.
Review of previous Aboriginal cultural work for Dignams Creek
AGF held in March and June 2009 at these AGF’s the preliminary Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment was presented and adopted by the AGF, the proposed methodology for archaeological investigations as presented and adopted by the AGF.
A Site walk over was undertaken with the Merrimans Local Aboriginal Land Council.

Knowledge Holders identified and to be interviewed by the archaeologist:
Max Munro, Pam Flanders, Eddie Foster, Lorraine Naylor, Harrold Harrison, Lional Mongta and Mary Mongta.

Discussed future stages of the project and potential timeframes (assuming a funding commitment)

• Concept design (mid 2011)
• Environmental assessment including Aboriginal heritage impact assessment (late 2011)
• Property acquisition (mid 2013)
• Detailed design (early 2013)
• Construction commence (early 2014)

Discussed future Aboriginal heritage assessment work
• Undertake Archaeological Investigations (Feb 2011)
• Prepare an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (March 2011) and prepare an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (April 2011)
• Submit AHIP under section 90 to DECCW for approval (April 2011)
• Determine Review of Environmental Factors

3. NSW Archaeology – Andy Pierce
Talked about the methodology proposed for the current works and the process for DECCW approval. DECCW will be advised two weeks prior to archaeological works commencing.

Stated that the site archaeological work would be approximately three days long.

Advised that 4 site officers will be required to do the archaeological investigation works – 2 site officers and 2 trainee site officers (dependent on applications)
Site Officer Applications

- Applications were received from Max Munro, Eric Naylor and Lional Mongta. Further applications were handed out at the meeting
- All applications must have their OH&S card and site officers must have previous site work experience – please see attached job description for the Aboriginal Site Officer

Service Providers are required to complete the following documents – the documents will be provided by the RTA
- Agreement to provide services
- Standard agreement to provide aboriginal cultural heritage services
- Schedule 1 statutory declaration
- Aboriginal site officer application form

Service Providers must also provide copies of:
- Workers compensation insurance policy
- Third party motor vehicle insurance policy (green slip)
  - only required if driving to site
- Public liability insurance policy

The following documents should be provided when claiming payment:
- Claim for payment
- Schedule 1 statutory declaration
- Statement regarding workers compensation, pay-roll tax and remuneration
- A copy of timesheets

Questions
- What would we do if we found artefacts? Firstly DECCW would be notified and the site recorded and the artefacts would be reburied outside footprint adjacent to where they were found.
- What would we do if we found a burial site? Stop work, notify DECCW, the RTA Senior Environmental Officer, the AFG and the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Advisor
- Could we have signage recognising indigenous land? We will investigate the usage of signage, RTA have recently employed signage on other RTA projects.
• Naming of a bridge? The RTA will investigate the naming of the bridge.
### MEETING MINUTES

**Name of meeting:** Aboriginal Focus Group (AFG) for Dignams Creek  
**Location of meeting:** Wallaga Lake Hall  
**Meeting facilitator:** Peter Hawkins (RTA), Agnes Donovan (RTA)  
**Date:** 19/05/2011  
**Time:** 10am – 12pm  
**Attendees:** Peter Hawkins, Agnes Donovan, Graham Roach, Scott Morgan, Lyndall Thornhill, Miles Boak, Jakie Taylor, Julie Dibden, Andrew Pearce, Lionel Mongta, Max Munro, Lorraine Naylor.

All AFG members were provided a hard copy of the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report to review prior to the AFG.

**Meeting Commences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:00am    | · Introduction, Agnes Donovan  
· Review of Dignams Creek (Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Methodology)  
· Discussion of cultural impact  
· Slide show of project, overview including:  
  - Project footprint  
  - Existing road conditions  
  - Plan of proposed new realignment  
· Review of realignment with AFG members, Outlining where most artefacts where found.  
· All comments to the Cultural Heritage Assessment Report are to be reported no later than the 10th June 2011. | Peter Hawkins |

11:15am  
· Most artefacts that were found were flakes, (Chipped pieces of rock),  
· There was about 592 artefacts found and all were taken and hand sorted and bagged individually.  
· The artefacts found were similar in content and environmental contexts to many other sites in the local area and wider region. As such the artefact scatter is common and has low educational value.  
· It is recommended that no additional archaeological site work would be required for the project to proceed  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11:15am    | · Most artefacts that were found were flakes, (Chipped pieces of rock),  
· There was about 592 artefacts found and all were taken and hand sorted and bagged individually.  
· The artefacts found were similar in content and environmental contexts to many other sites in the local area and wider region. As such the artefact scatter is common and has low educational value.  
· It is recommended that no additional archaeological site work would be required for the project to proceed | Julie Dibden |
Julie Dibden (NSW Archaeological).
• Low potential for impact on archaeological sites within National Park areas adjacent to the proposal including in the Southern portion of Kooraban National Park.
• All members were happy with the oral history story regarding Dignams Creek & areas around it, Lionel had a minor change to his oral history.

| 11:45am/12:00pm | What to do with artefacts that were discovered during the test pit excavations?
|                | Artefacts are to be placed at a location outside the footprint of the construction. This will be undertaken when the design is finalised.
|                | The artefacts are to be located close to where they were taken from, and the site is to be recorded and the Office of the Environment Heritage are to be advised of the site location.
|                | The location of the artefacts are also to be provided to the Aboriginal Focus Group members.
|                | Section 90 Permit, AHIP will be prepared for submission with the Office of Environment and Heritage. |

Agnes Dovovan, Peter Hawkins

| Agnes Donovan, | The RTA would like to thank all AFG members, NSW Archaeological, OEH for their knowledge information and participation in the Aboriginal Focus Group for the Dignams Creek realignment. |

Closure of Meeting: 12:10pm
1. Welcome to Country
   Agnes Donovan (RMS Cultural Heritage Advisor)

2. Project background to date
   Peter Hawkins gave an overview of project development to date
   - Need for the project – poor alignment and crash history
   - Options investigated and previous option selected in 2010
   - Reasons for reinvestigating options – additional geotechnical information resulted in larger earthworks and longer bridge increasing costs. Need for a better value for money project to attract funding.

3. Findings of Archaeological Investigations and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR)
   Tim Webster discussed the new western alignment being investigated, previous Aboriginal cultural heritage investigations and advice from Archaeology NSW about potential for impacts of the new alignment.
   - Previous archaeological work included developing a methodology, holding AFG’s, undertaking site walk over’s and test excavations with members of the local Aboriginal community and finalisation of the CHAR which covered the above work and included oral history reports from local Aboriginals.
   - From the test excavations it was found that Aboriginal artefacts were found in moderate density in areas near the creek that were raised above the flood plain (Survey Unit 16) and areas lower in the floodplain had Aboriginal artefacts in low to negligible density (Survey Unit 11).
   - An Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) permit was issued by OEH for Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) sites in Survey units 11 and 16 as the previous alignment passed through these units.
   - The western alignment passes through a different survey unit (13) which was originally assessed to be PAD site. However after undertaking test excavations and extrapolating results from those excavations, survey unit 13 was assessed to be of low archaeological potential as it is a similar landform to survey unit 11. On this basis it is not considered necessary to undertake further test pitting in this area and the new alignment is not considered to have any significant additional impacts on Aboriginal heritage.
   - The question was then asked of the Aboriginal people present at the AFG if they had any additional knowledge of cultural heritage in the area that had not been assessed. It was also
stated that submissions or information could be provided by 23 October 2012. No additional issues were raised or submissions received.

4. Next Steps

- Questions regarding Aboriginal signage, naming of the bridge and placement of Aboriginal artefacts exhumed during test excavations were raised and these matters will be addressed in due course. There are guidelines for naming bridges which will be provided and the matter of artefacts will be discussed with the local Aboriginal community.

- It was stated that the next steps would be to complete the concept design and Review of Environmental Effects and put them on display, complete detailed design and then construction was dependant on funding.

Meeting was closed at 2pm
Dear Ms Vazey,

Re: Consultation regarding proposed realignment of Princes Highway Dignams Creek – assessment of environmental impacts.

I refer to your letter dated 19 April regarding the proposed works for the realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek and the assessment of environmental impacts. The area of Dignams Creek downstream from the area of works lies within a sanctuary zone of the Batemans Marine Park. The objects of the sanctuary zone are:

(a) to provide the highest level of protection for biological diversity, habitat, ecological processes, natural features and cultural features (both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) in the zone, and

(b) where consistent with paragraph (a), to provide opportunities for i) recreational, educational and other activities that do not involve harming any animal or plant or causing any damage to or interference with natural or cultural features or any habitat, ii) scientific research.

The works do not require a permit under Cl 1.11 (2) of the Marine Park (Zoning Plans) Regulations 1999 as they lie outside the boundary of the Batemans Marine Park however we would like to stress the importance on the need to minimise harm to the natural environment both at the work site, downstream and within the adjacent waters. We anticipate the implementation of Best Management Practise with respect to stormwater, erosion and sediment control and habitat management. This will include:

- Work scheduling (installation of protective measure before earthworks commence, suspension of works during rain, etc).
- Use of protective measures (silt curtains, use of bunds, site drainage, separation of ‘clean’ and ‘dirty’ water, sediment traps, etc)
- Actively manage and maintain of those measures (replacing damaged sediment control measures, modify sediment control and stormwater management systems if they are not working appropriately and removing accumulated sediment, ensuring the water quality of any run-off into the lake adheres to ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, etc)
- Rehabilitation of impacted environments such as riparian vegetation and stabilisation of creek banks upon completion of the works.

With respect to the management of stormwater within the area of works, the water quality should comply with the water quality benchmarks for estuaries of the catchments within the Batemans Marine Park (Clyde, Moruya and Tuross Rivers) as expressed in the NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) developed in accordance with the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines on water quality. (Further info is available on the DECC website at http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/jeo/). The section on objectives and indicators applicable to aquatic ecosystems, such as Dignams Creek, is attached. Any water discharged from the area of the works and delivered to waters of Dignams Creek should meet these water quality requirements.

Please ensure that workers on-site are aware of the significance and sensitivity of the receiving waters of Dignams Creek and in turn are aware of their obligations under the Protection of the Environment and Operations (POEO) Act with respect to pollution control at the site.

We request that we are forwarded a copy of the Environmental Impact Assessment for these works as soon as practicable. If you have any queries regarding the above please contact me on 02 4476 0804 or 0417 494 005.

Yours sincerely,

Shamaram Eichmann
A/Manager,
Batemans Marine Park
Meeting water quality levels suitable for local ecosystems is generally the basis for protecting the other environmental values, which are the uses people have for water.

**Aquatic ecosystems**

*Maintaining or improving the ecological condition of waterbodies and their riparian zones over the long term*

**Where the objective applies**

- This objective applies to all natural waterways.
- High level protection of aquatic ecosystems applies to waters in and immediately upstream of national parks, nature reserves, state forests, drinking water catchments and high-conservation-value areas. This reflects their largely unmodified aquatic ecosystems, value in providing natural sources of high-quality drinking water, and high levels of recreational use.
- Even in areas greatly affected by human use, continuing improvement is needed towards healthier, more diverse aquatic ecosystems.
- Water quality in artificial watercourses (e.g. drainage channels) should ideally be adequate to protect native species that may use them, as well as being adequate for the desired human uses. However, full protection of aquatic ecosystems may not be achievable in the short-term in some artificial watercourses.
- Artificial watercourses should meet the objectives (including protection of aquatic ecosystems) applying to natural waterways at any point where water from the artificial watercourse flows into a natural waterway.

**Examples of key indicators and their numerical criteria (default trigger values)**

The following table includes examples of some of the key water quality indicators and related numerical criteria (default trigger values) selected from the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, relevant to assessing and monitoring the health of aquatic ecosystems. To use and interpret these guidelines, see supporting information below and the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines. The booklet "Using the ANZECC Guidelines and Water Quality Objectives in NSW" explains key terminology and concepts used in the guidelines, in the context of NSW policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatic ecosystems</th>
<th>Numerical criteria (trigger values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total phosphorus    | • Upland rivers: 20 µg/L  
                      | • Lowland rivers: 25 µg/L for rivers flowing to the coast; 50 µg/L for rivers in the Murray-Darling Basin  
                      | • Lakes & reservoirs: 10 µg/L  
<pre><code>                  | • Estuaries: 30 µg/L |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Upland rivers</th>
<th>Lowland rivers</th>
<th>Lakes &amp; reservoirs</th>
<th>Estuaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total nitrogen</strong></td>
<td>250 µg/L</td>
<td>350 µg/L (near coast); 500 µg/L (Murray-Darling Basin)</td>
<td>350 µg/L</td>
<td>300 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chlorophyll-a</strong></td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
<td>4 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turbidity</strong></td>
<td>2–25 NTU (see supporting information)</td>
<td>6–50 NTU (see supporting information)</td>
<td>1–20 NTU</td>
<td>0.5–10 NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salinity (electrical conductivity)</strong></td>
<td>30–350 µS/cm</td>
<td>125–2200 µS/cm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissolved oxygen</strong></td>
<td>90–110%</td>
<td>85–110%</td>
<td>90–110%</td>
<td>80–110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pH</strong></td>
<td>6.5–8.0</td>
<td>6.5–8.5</td>
<td>6.5–8.0</td>
<td>7.0–8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes of more than 0.5 pH units from the natural seasonal maximum or minimum should be investigated.

*Note: Dissolved oxygen values were derived from daytime measurements. Dissolved oxygen concentrations may vary diurnally and with depth. Monitoring programs should assess this potential variability.*

Supporting information

- The ANZECC 2000 Guidelines advocate a risk-based approach to water quality assessment and management. That is, the intensity of assessment of current water quality status or impacts on water quality should reflect the risk of impacts on the achievement/protection of the water quality objective.
• Trigger values are the numeric criteria that if exceeded indicate potential for harmful environmental effects to occur. The default trigger values provided in ANZECC 2000 Guidelines are essentially conservative and precautionary. If they are not exceeded, a very low risk of environmental damage can be assumed. If they are exceeded, further investigation is "triggered" for the pollutant concerned. Assessing whether the exceedance means a risk of impact to the Water Quality Objective requires site-specific investigation, using decision trees provided in the Guidelines.

• For Protection of Aquatic Ecosystems in NSW, the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines provide default trigger values for major physico-chemical stressors in Tables 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 (pages 3.3-10 & 11) and for Toxicants in Table 3.4.1 (page 3.4-5).

• Note for turbidity trigger values: In general values in the lower part of the range will be found in rivers and streams during low flows and/or in more vegetated catchments. Waters of the Clyde River in particular tend to have turbidity values below 5 NTU and where these levels exist they should be maintained. Values in the higher part of the range will be found in rivers and streams in high flows and lower in the catchment (particularly inland catchments). For lakes and reservoirs, in general the higher values will be found in waterbodies that are shallow or in areas with dispersive soils.

• Note that pH varies naturally. Whilst 6.5-8.5 is the default trigger range, values outside this range should be investigated to assess whether they reflect natural variation. For example, some streams in sandstone areas have natural pH ranges as low as 4.5.

• The approach to protecting the aquatic ecosystem should consider the whole range of interacting factors - such as variability of water quality over time, sediment interactions, river flow, local geology, land use, the needs of sensitive habitats, and people's uses for water.

• Assessing ecosystem health also requires using a range of indicators and considering local modifying factors - such as basalt soils that result in naturally higher nutrient levels, or estuary opening patterns that affect water quality. However, information on a full range of indicators may not be available from regular monitoring.

• Although modified, many non-pristine environments contain important aquatic ecosystems. Well-functioning aquatic ecosystems also benefit people using these waters, such as by reducing blue-green algal blooms.

• Reducing diffuse pollutant loads during rainfall and runoff periods should be a key focus for improving water quality. It is also important in managing longer term impacts, such as sedimentation and polluted sediments.

• The choice of toxicant indicators for use in each management situation is related to known past or current activities. Impacts are detected by measuring water, sediment or biota. Natural sources should also be considered.

• Protecting aquatic ecosystems requires mimicking natural river flow patterns as closely as possible (see Section 5).
Dear Ms Vazey,

Re: Review of Environmental Factors (REF) Consultation - Proposed Realignment and New Bridge, HW1 Princes Highway, Dignams Creek, near Cobargo

I refer to your letter of 19 April 2011 seeking Department of Trade & Investment, Regional Infrastructure & Services (DTIRS – Fisheries) initial comments for the preparation of a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) for the proposed realignment and new bridge over Dignams Creek, Princes Highway, near Cobargo.

Issues Related to Fisheries

DTIRS (Fisheries) is responsible for ensuring that fish stocks are conserved and that there is “no net loss” of key fish habitats upon which they depend. To achieve this, the Department ensures that developments comply with the requirements of the Fisheries Management Act 1994 (namely the aquatic habitat protection and threatened species conservation provisions in Parts 7 and 7A of the Act respectively) and the associated Policy and Guidelines for Aquatic Habitat Management and Fish Conservation (1999).

Of particular concern to DTIRS (Fisheries) are the potential impacts that construction of the proposed new bridge may have on aquatic species and habitats and the water quality and hydrology of the waterways within the vicinity. To minimise these impacts an appropriate sediment and erosion control regime and water quality management provisions should be designed in accordance with current industry best management practices and implemented to safeguard the aquatic environment across the entire works area.

Environmental Assessment Requirements

The Department advises that the REF for the proposed development should include the following information:

- Location of works (including topographic map and photos).
- Name of adjacent waterway(s).
- Description of works to be undertaken, including design plans for the road and bridge.
- Method/s of construction and proposed waste disposal.
• Timing and duration of works.
• Volume and type of sediment to be excavated from the site, if appropriate.
• Aquatic and riparian habitat conditions at the site – particularly extent and condition of riparian and aquatic vegetation, water depth, and permanence of water flow and snags (large woody debris) in the vicinity of the proposed works.
• Analysis of any interactions of the proposed works with aquatic and riparian environments and predictions of any impacts upon aquatic and riparian environments including aquatic and riparian vegetation from the road and bridge construction works (both temporary and permanent).
• Safeguards to mitigate any impacts upon aquatic environments and riparian habitats.
• Potential impacts upon water quality of the proposed construction and operation of the new road and bridge.
• Safeguards to mitigate any impacts upon water quality in Dignams Creek. In particular, provide details on proposals for erosion and sediment control (to be incorporated into a Construction Environmental Management Plan - CEMP) and proposed stormwater and road drainage management measures for the new bridge (e.g. sediment basins).
• Potential impediments to fish passage as a result of the works (e.g. temporary coffer dams, bunds or work platforms) and possible mitigation measures to be employed to negate these impacts.
• Details of proposed revegetation of adjacent riparian areas.

DTIRS (Fisheries) Approvals

As a public authority, the RTA is required under section 199 of the Fisheries Management Act 1994 to consult with DTIRS (Fisheries) and take into account any issues raised prior to approving dredging and reclamation works in a waterway (e.g. bridge abutment and pier demolition and construction). I&I NSW should also be consulted regarding any works which may result in the temporary or permanent blockage of fish passage in a waterway.

Once the REF has been prepared for the proposal could you please forward a copy to this office for our review and further comment.

For further detailed advice on DTIRS (Fisheries) aquatic habitat requirements, please refer to the Department’s Policy and Guidelines Aquatic Habitat Management and Fish Conservation (1999) available on our website www.dpi.nsw.gov.au

If you require any further information, please contact me on 02) 4478 9103.

Yours faithfully

Trevor Daly
Fisheries Conservation Manager, South Coast Aquatic Habitat Protection

9 May 2011
ROADS & TRAFFIC AUTHORITY
ATTENTION: RACHEL VAZEY
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER/PROJECT MANAGER
P O BOX 2147
DANGAR NSW 2309

2 May 2011

ATTENTION: RACHEL VAZEY

Dear Rachel

ENQUIRY NO: TENO11-03215P2
LOT 506 DP 752155, LOT 246 DP752155, LOT 76 DP752154, LOT 93 DP752154, LOT 262 DP752154 PRINCES HWY DIGNAMS CREEK

Thankyou for your enquiry dated 19 April 2011.

This property is not within a proclaimed Mine Subsidence District and is not subject to any building restrictions imposed by the Mine Subsidence Board.

The provisions of the Mine Subsidence Compensation Act cover any improvement erected on this land.

Yours faithfully

Darren Bullock
District Manager
See attached, consultation from essential energy.

Hi Peter,

I can only see one potential issue that will need to be addressed. There is a powerline that crosses the proposed realignment of the highway just north of Digmans Creek. A level 3 ASP will needs to be consulted to make sure that the finished level of the road keeps the required clearances. If the clearances can not be maintained than the powerline will need to be moved and or raised. I have attached a drawing highlighting the powerline in question. Please give me a call if you gave any questions.

Phillip Smith
02 6492 9214

SEE ATTACHED FILE: RTA Digmans Ck.pdf
Hello Bob

Can you or Phil have a look at this one and respond accordingly.

Regards,
Kalina

Essential Energy (formally Country Energy)
Engineering Services
Network Planning South Eastern
planning.se@essentialenergy.com.au

Lynne Mowatt

21/04/2011 11:46 AM
Hi

Pls find attached your incoming scanned mail from records.

(See attached file: ROADS AND TRAFFIC AUTHORITY - RTA - CONSULTATION REGARDING PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF PRINCESS HIGHWAY DIGNAMS CREEK ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.pdf)

Thanks

Lynne

Lynne Mowatt
Executive Assistant to the Executive General Manager Engineering Services

(Embedded image moved to file: pic11389.gif)T: 02 6589 8718 | F: 02 6589 8680 | lynne.mowatt@essentialenergy.com.au

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

As of 1 March 2011 the Country Energy retail business transferred to Origin Energy. Our network operations continue under the 'Essential Energy' name. For more information about our network operations visit www.essentialenergy.com.au, or call general enquiries - 13 23 91. Customers within the Essential Energy network area can continue to contact us on 13 20 80 to report electricity network faults and emergencies. Water customers in Broken Hill and surrounding areas can also continue to report faults to their water service on 13 20 80. Our local field service teams will be ready to respond 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

This message is intended for the addressee named and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and notify the sender. Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of Essential Energy.

Before printing, please consider the environment.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachment to it are intended only to be read or used by the named addressee. It is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mistaken transmission to you. The RTA is not responsible for any unauthorised alterations to this e-mail or attachment to it. Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of the RTA. If you receive this e-mail in error, please immediately delete it from your system and notify the sender. You must not disclose, copy or use any part of this e-mail if you are not the intended recipient.
Dear Mr Ball,

Re: I SEPP consultation regarding changes to the proposed realignment of Princes Highway Dignams Creek.

I refer to your letter dated 14 September 2011 regarding the proposed works and changes to the realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek. The realignment will now be on the north western side of the current highway through Kooraban National Park. The realignment will cross a number of tributaries flowing into Narira and Dignams creek. As noted in our previous correspondence dated 12 May 2001 the area of Dignams Creek downstream from the area of works lies within a sanctuary zone of the Batemans Marine Park. The objects of the sanctuary zone are:

(a) to provide the highest level of protection for biological diversity, habitat, ecological processes, natural features and cultural features (both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) in the zone, and

(b) where consistent with paragraph (a), to provide opportunities for i) recreational, educational and other activities that do not involve harming any animal or plant or causing any damage to or interference with natural or cultural features or any habitat, ii) scientific research.

The works do not require a permit under Cl 1.11 (2) of the Marine Park (Zoning Plans) Regulations 1999 as they lie outside the boundary of the Batemans Marine Park however we would like to stress the importance of the need to minimise harm to the natural environment both at the work site, downstream and within the adjacent waters. We anticipate the implementation of Best Management Practise with respect to stormwater, erosion and sediment control and habitat management. This will include:

- Work scheduling (installation of protective measure before earthworks commence, suspension of works during rain, etc).
- Use of protective measures (silt curtains, use of bunds, site drainage, separation of ‘clean’ and ‘dirty’ water, sediment traps, etc)
- Actively manage and maintain of those measures (replacing damaged sediment control measures, modify sediment control and stormwater management systems if they are not working appropriately and removing accumulated sediment, ensuring the water quality of any run-off into the lake adheres to ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, etc)
- Rehabilitation of impacted environments such as riparian vegetation and stabilisation of creek banks upon completion of the works.

Please ensure that all erosion and sediment controls are in accordance with ‘Managing Urban Stormwater, Soils and Construction guidelines; 4th Edition Landcom 2004 (The Blue Book) and

www.mpa.nsw.gov.au

With respect to the management of stormwater within the area of works, the water quality should comply with the water quality benchmarks for estuaries of the catchments within the Batemans Marine Park (Clyde, Moruya and Tuross Rivers) as expressed in the NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) developed in accordance with the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines on water quality. (Further info is available on the DECC website at http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/ieo/). The section on objectives and indicators applicable to aquatic ecosystems, such as Dignams Creek, is attached. Any water discharged from the area of the works and delivered to waters of Dignams Creek should meet these water quality requirements.

Please ensure that workers on-site are aware of the significance and sensitivity of the receiving waters of Dignams Creek and in turn are aware of their obligations under the Protection of the Environment and Operations (POEO) Act with respect to pollution control at the site.

We request that we are forwarded a copy of the Environmental Impact Assessment for these works as soon as practicable. If you have any queries regarding the above please contact me on 02 4476 0804 or 0417 494 005.

Yours sincerely,

Shamaram Eichmann
Ranger,
Batemans Marine Park
[Clyde River catchment ] Water Quality Objectives

[excerpt from NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) developed in accordance with the ANZECC guidelines on water quality]

Meeting water quality levels suitable for local ecosystems is generally the basis for protecting the other environmental values, which are the uses people have for water.

**Aquatic ecosystems**

*Maintaining or improving the ecological condition of waterbodies and their riparian zones over the long term*

**Where the objective applies**

- This objective applies to all natural waterways.
- High level protection of aquatic ecosystems applies to waters in and immediately upstream of national parks, nature reserves, state forests, drinking water catchments and high-conservation-value areas. This reflects their largely unmodified aquatic ecosystems, value in providing natural sources of high-quality drinking water, and high levels of recreational use.
- Even in areas greatly affected by human use, continuing improvement is needed towards healthier, more diverse aquatic ecosystems.
- Water quality in artificial watercourses (e.g. drainage channels) should ideally be adequate to protect native species that may use them, as well as being adequate for the desired human uses. However, full protection of aquatic ecosystems may not be achievable in the short-term in some artificial watercourses.
- Artificial watercourses should meet the objectives (including protection of aquatic ecosystems) applying to natural waterways at any point where water from the artificial watercourse flows into a natural waterway.

**Examples of key indicators and their numerical criteria (default trigger values)**

The following table includes examples of some of the key water quality indicators and related numerical criteria (default trigger values) selected from the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, relevant to assessing and monitoring the health of aquatic ecosystems. To use and interpret these guidelines, see [supporting information](#) below and the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines. The booklet "Using the ANZECC Guidelines and Water Quality Objectives in NSW" explains key terminology and concepts used in the guidelines, in the context of NSW policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatic ecosystems</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Numerical criteria (trigger values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total phosphorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland rivers: 20 µg/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland rivers: 25 µg/L for rivers flowing to the coast; 50 µg/L for rivers in the Murray-Darling Basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakes &amp; reservoirs: 10 µg/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estuaries: 30 µg/L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Upland rivers</td>
<td>Lowland rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nitrogen</td>
<td>250 µg/L</td>
<td>350 µg/L for rivers flowing to the coast; 500 µg/L for rivers in the Murray-Darling Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophyll-a</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>2–25 NTU (see supporting information)</td>
<td>6–50 NTU (see supporting information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity (electrical conductivity)</td>
<td>30–350 µS/cm</td>
<td>125–2200 µS/cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved oxygen</td>
<td>90–110%</td>
<td>85–110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Dissolved oxygen values were derived from daytime measurements. Dissolved oxygen concentrations may vary diurnally and with depth. Monitoring programs should assess this potential variability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.5–8.0</td>
<td>6.5–8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes of more than 0.5 pH units from the natural seasonal maximum or minimum should be investigated. See supporting information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>See ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, table 3.3.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical contaminants or toxicants</td>
<td>See ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, chapter 3.4 and table 3.4.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological assessment indicators</td>
<td>This form of assessment directly evaluates whether management goals for ecosystem protection are being achieved (e.g. maintenance of a certain level of species diversity, control of nuisance algae below a certain level, protection of key species, etc). Many potential indicators exist and these may relate to single species, multiple species or whole communities. Recognised protocols using diatoms and algae, macrophytes, macroinvertebrates, and fish populations and/or communities may be used in NSW and interstate (e.g. AusRivAS).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting information**

- The ANZECC 2000 Guidelines advocate a risk-based approach to water quality assessment and management. That is, the intensity of assessment of current water quality status or impacts on water quality should reflect the risk of impacts on the achievement/protection of the water quality objective.
Trigger values are the numeric criteria that if exceeded indicate potential for harmful environmental effects to occur. The default trigger values provided in ANZECC 2000 Guidelines are essentially conservative and precautionary. If they are not exceeded, a very low risk of environmental damage can be assumed. If they are exceeded, further investigation is "triggered" for the pollutant concerned. Assessing whether the exceedance means a risk of impact to the Water Quality Objective requires site-specific investigation, using decision trees provided in the Guidelines.

For Protection of Aquatic Ecosystems in NSW, the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines provide default trigger values for major physico-chemical stressors in Tables 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 (pages 3.3-10 & 11) and for Toxicants in Table 3.4.1 (page 3.4-5).

Note for turbidity trigger values: In general values in the lower part of the range will be found in rivers and streams during low flows and/or in more vegetated catchments. Waters of the Clyde River in particular tend to have turbidity values below 5 NTU and where these levels exist they should be maintained. Values in the higher part of the range will be found in rivers and streams in high flows and lower in the catchment (particularly inland catchments). For lakes and reservoirs, in general the higher values will be found in waterbodies that are shallow or in areas with dispersive soils.

Note that pH varies naturally. Whilst 6.5-8.5 is the default trigger range, values outside this range should be investigated to assess whether they reflect natural variation. For example, some streams in sandstone areas have natural pH ranges as low as 4.5.

The approach to protecting the aquatic ecosystem should consider the whole range of interacting factors - such as variability of water quality over time, sediment interactions, river flow, local geology, land use, the needs of sensitive habitats, and people's uses for water.

Assessing ecosystem health also requires using a range of indicators and considering local modifying factors such as basalt soils that result in naturally higher nutrient levels, or estuary opening patterns that affect water quality. However, information on a full range of indicators may not be available from regular monitoring.

Although modified, many non-pristine environments contain important aquatic ecosystems. Well-functioning aquatic ecosystems also benefit people using these waters, such as by reducing blue-green algal blooms.

Reducing diffuse pollutant loads during rainfall and runoff periods should be a key focus for improving water quality. It is also important in managing longer term impacts, such as sedimentation and polluted sediments.

The choice of toxicant indicators for use in each management situation is related to known past or current activities. Impacts are detected by measuring water, sediment or biota. Natural sources should also be considered.

Protecting aquatic ecosystems requires mimicking natural river flow patterns as closely as possible (see Section 5).
28 September 2011

Jonas Ball
Environmental Planner/Project Director
Sinclair Knight Merz
PO Box 2147
DANGAR NSW 2309

Dear Jonas

REALIGNMENT OF PRINCES HIGHWAY AT DIGMANS CREEK

I refer to your recent correspondence regarding the proposed realignment of the Princes Highway at Digmans Creek.

Council fully supports the proposed realignment of this section of the Highway. This stretch of road has been a long standing safety concern and has been the site of many accidents over the years resulting in significant trauma in the Eurobodalla community.

The proposed realignment as shown in your correspondence appears to be adequate to improve safety along the Highway. The inclusion of additional overtaking lanes will also help improve traffic flow and reduce travel times.

It is unclear from your letter as to what the future plans are for the existing length of the Highway that will become redundant once the project is completed. Council would not be interested in taking on the responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of this length of redundant Highway. Should this length of road be required for the future access to properties a private road or right of carriageway should be created so that the future maintenance is the responsibility of the land owner and not ESC.

It is also unclear as to the future plans for the existing Digmans Creek Bridge. Again Council would not be interested in taking on the responsibility for the future maintenance of this bridge. We ask that this bridge be removed upon completion of the project as it will no longer be required.

If you require further information please contact me on (02) 4474-1251.

Yours faithfully

GEoff ARMSTRONG
TRAFFIC OFFICER
ROADS AND RECREATION
'The Eurobodalla Shire Council Supports Reconciliation'
See below for response from fisheries.

Peter Hawkins
Project Development Manager, Southern Region
Level 6, 90 Crown St, Wollongong, 2500
P - 4221 2582  I  F - 4221 2590  I  M - 0429504605

From: allan.lugg@industry.nsw.gov.au [mailto:allan.lugg@industry.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 28 September 2011 9:31 AM
To: HAWKINS Peter J
c C: trevor.daly@industry.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Proposed realignment of Princes Highway at Dignams Creek

Hi Peter,

Thank you for the letter dated 14 September 2011.

I can advise that we have no additional comments to make. The issues identified by Trevor Daly in his letter to Rachel Vazey dated 19 May 2011 remain relevant.

Regards Allan

Allan Lugg | Senior Conservation Manager
NSW Department of Primary Industries
4 Woollamia Road | PO Box 97 | HUSKISSON NSW 2540
T: 02 4428 3401 | F: 02 4441 8961 | M: 0409 912 686 | E: Allan.Lugg@industry.nsw.gov.au
W: www.industry.nsw.gov.au

Before printing, please consider the environment. IMPORTANT NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachment to it are intended only to be read or used by the named addressee. It is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mistaken transmission to you. The RTA is not responsible for any unauthorised alterations to this e-mail or attachment to it. Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of their organisation.

Click [here](mailto:here) to report this email as spam.
In reply please send to: Picton

Our reference: FN11-07294P2 PG:LE

Your reference: EN02937 ISEPP Consultation

Contact: Paul Gray  (02) 4677 1967

Roads & Traffic Authority
Attention: Jonas Ball
P O Box 2147
DANGAR NSW 2309

20 September 2011

Dear Jonas

ENQUIRY NO: TENQ11-03411P2
LOT 506  DP 752155, LOT 246 DP752155, LOT 93  DP752154, LOT 262 DP752154, LOT 78 DP752154 NO 9523 PRINCES HWY DIGNAMS CREEK

Thank you for your enquiry dated 14th September 2011 regarding changes to proposed alignment.

This property is not within a proclaimed Mine Subsidence District and is not subject to any building restrictions imposed by the Mine Subsidence Board.

The provisions of the Mine Subsidence Compensation Act cover any improvement erected on this land.

Yours faithfully

Paul Gray
Acting District Manager
Dear Mr Ball

Re: ISEPP consultation regarding proposed realignment of the Princes Highway Dignams Creek – assessment of environmental impacts.

Thank you for referring this matter to us for consideration and comment. The Marine Parks Authority has reviewed the outline of works in the project brief which was supplied to the Authority on the 11 Dec 2012. The Clyde River lies within the ‘Habitat Protection Zone’ of Batemans Bay under the Marine Parks (Zoning Plans) Regulation 1999.

I refer to your letter dated 18 December 2012 regarding further changes to the realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek. The realignment will now lie northwest of the current highway cross Dignams Creek Road and in turn be further upstream on Dignams creek. As noted in our previous correspondence dated 12 May 2001 and 31 Oct 2011 the area of Dignams Creek downstream from the area of works lies within a sanctuary zone of the Batemans Marine Park. The objects of the sanctuary zone are:

(a) to provide the highest level of protection for biological diversity, habitat, ecological processes, natural features and cultural features (both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal) in the zone, and

(b) where consistent with paragraph (a), to provide opportunities for i) recreational, educational and other activities that do not involve harming any animal or plant or causing any damage to or interference with natural or cultural features or any habitat, ii) scientific research.

The works do not require a permit under Cl 1.11 (2) of the Marine Park (Zoning Plans) Regulations 1999 as they lie outside the boundary of the Batemans Marine Park, however, in considering the potential effects of these works on Dignams Creek, the Marine Parks Authority (MPA) is principally concerned with ensuring that an activity does not adversely affect the marine biodiversity and ecological values of the marine park. These values are expressed and regulated through the Marine Parks Act 1997, the Marine Parks Regulation 2009, the Marine Parks (Zoning Plans) Regulation 1999 and the marine park Operational Plan.

To ensure potential impacts are mitigated we would like to stress the importance of the need to minimise harm to the natural environment both at the work site, downstream and within the adjacent waters. We anticipate the implementation of Best Management Practise with respect to stormwater, erosion and sediment control and habitat management. This will include:

• Work scheduling (installation of protective measure before earthworks commence, suspension of works during high rainfall events, etc).
• Use of protective measures (silt curtains, use of bunds, use of stormwater settlement ponds, site drainage, separation of ‘clean’ and ‘dirty’ water, sediment traps, etc)
• Active management and maintenance of those measures (replacing damaged sediment control measures, modify sediment control and stormwater management systems if they...
are not working appropriately and removing accumulated sediment, ensuring the water quality of any run-off into the lake adheres to ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, etc)

- Rehabilitation of impacted environments such as riparian vegetation and stabilisation of creek banks upon completion of the works.


With respect to the management of stormwater within the area of works, the water quality should comply with the water quality benchmarks for estuaries of the catchments within the Batemans Marine Park (Clyde, Moruya and Tuross Rivers) as expressed in the NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) developed in accordance with the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines on water quality. (Further info is available on the OEH website at http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/ieo/). The section on objectives and indicators applicable to aquatic ecosystems, such as Dignams Creek, is attached. Any water discharged from the area of the works and delivered to waters of Dignams Creek should meet these water quality requirements.

Please ensure that workers on-site are aware of the significance and sensitivity of the receiving waters of Dignams Creek and in turn are aware of their obligations under the Protection of the Environment and Operations (POEO) Act with respect to pollution control at the site. For further technical advice on the design and management of appropriate stormwater and sediment control systems for these works please contact the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) - Queanbeyan Office on 02 6229 7002. We request that we are forwarded a copy of the Environmental Impact Assessment once it has been prepared. If you have any queries regarding the above please contact our Ranger Shamaram Eichmann on 02 4476 0804 or 0417 494 005.

Yours sincerely

Matt Carr
Manager
Batemans Marine Park

18 January 2013
[Clyde River catchment] Water Quality Objectives

[excerpt from NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) developed in accordance with the ANZECC guidelines on water quality]

Water Quality Objectives

Meeting water quality levels suitable for local ecosystems is generally the basis for protecting the other environmental values, which are the uses people have for water.

Aquatic ecosystems

Maintaining or improving the ecological condition of waterbodies and their riparian zones over the long term

Where the objective applies

- This objective applies to all natural waterways.
- High level protection of aquatic ecosystems applies to waters in and immediately upstream of national parks, nature reserves, state forests, drinking water catchments and high-conservation-value areas. This reflects their largely unmodified aquatic ecosystems, value in providing natural sources of high-quality drinking water, and high levels of recreational use.
- Even in areas greatly affected by human use, continuing improvement is needed towards healthier, more diverse aquatic ecosystems.
- Water quality in artificial watercourses (e.g. drainage channels) should ideally be adequate to protect native species that may use them, as well as being adequate for the desired human uses. However, full protection of aquatic ecosystems may not be achievable in the short-term in some artificial watercourses.
- Artificial watercourses should meet the objectives (including protection of aquatic ecosystems) applying to natural waterways at any point where water from the artificial watercourse flows into a natural waterway.

Examples of key indicators and their numerical criteria (default trigger values)

The following table includes examples of some of the key water quality indicators and related numerical criteria (default trigger values) selected from the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines, relevant to assessing and monitoring the health of aquatic ecosystems. To use and interpret these guidelines, see supporting information below and the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines. The booklet "Using the ANZECC Guidelines and Water Quality Objectives in NSW" explains key terminology and concepts used in the guidelines, in the context of NSW policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatic ecosystems</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Numerical criteria (trigger values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total phosphorus</td>
<td>• Upland rivers: 20 µg/L&lt;br&gt;• Lowland rivers: 25 µg/L for rivers flowing to the coast; 50 µg/L for rivers in the Murray-Darling Basin&lt;br&gt;• Lakes &amp; reservoirs: 10 µg/L&lt;br&gt;• Estuaries: 30 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total nitrogen</td>
<td>• Upland rivers: 250 µg/L&lt;br&gt;• Lowland rivers: 350 µg/L for rivers flowing to the coast; 500 µg/L for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Upland rivers</td>
<td>Lowland rivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophyll-a</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>5 µg/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbidity</td>
<td>2–25 NTU</td>
<td>6–50 NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity (electrical conductivity)</td>
<td>30–350 µS/cm</td>
<td>125–2200 µS/cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved oxygen</td>
<td>90–110%</td>
<td>85–110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>6.5–8.0</td>
<td>6.5–8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dissolved oxygen values were derived from daytime measurements. Dissolved oxygen concentrations may vary diurnally and with depth. Monitoring programs should assess this potential variability.

Changes of more than 0.5 pH units from the natural seasonal maximum or minimum should be investigated.

Supporting information

- **The ANZECC 2000 Guidelines** advocate a risk-based approach to water quality assessment and management. That is, the intensity of assessment of current water quality status or impacts on water quality should reflect the risk of impacts on the achievement/protection of the water quality objective.
- **Trigger values** are the numeric criteria that if exceeded indicate potential for harmful environmental effects to occur. The default trigger values provided in ANZECC 2000 Guidelines are essentially conservative and precautionary. If they are not exceeded, a very low risk of environmental damage can be assumed. If they are exceeded, further investigation is "triggered" for the pollutant concerned. Assessing whether the exceedance...
means a risk of impact to the Water Quality Objective requires site-specific investigation, using decision trees provided in the Guidelines.

- For Protection of Aquatic Ecosystems in NSW, the ANZECC 2000 Guidelines provide default trigger values for major physico-chemical stressors in Tables 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 (pages 3.3-10 & 11) and for Toxicants in Table 3.4.1 (page 3.4-5).
- Note for turbidity trigger values: In general values in the lower part of the range will be found in rivers and streams during low flows and/or in more vegetated catchments. In particular, waters of the coastal lakes tend to have low turbidity values and where these levels exist they should be maintained. Values in the higher part of the range will be found in rivers and streams in high flows and lower in the catchment (particularly inland catchments). For lakes and reservoirs, in general the higher values will be found in waterbodies that are shallow or in areas with dispersive soils.
- Note that pH varies naturally. Whilst 6.5-8.5 is the default trigger range, values outside this range should be investigated to assess whether they reflect natural variation. For example, some streams in sandstone areas have natural pH ranges as low as 4.5.
- The approach to protecting the aquatic ecosystem should consider the whole range of interacting factors - such as variability of water quality over time, sediment interactions, river flow, local geology, land use, the needs of sensitive habitats, and people's uses for water.
- Assessing ecosystem health also requires using a range of indicators and considering local modifying factors such as basalt soils that result in naturally higher nutrient levels, or estuary opening patterns that affect water quality. However, information on a full range of indicators may not be available from regular monitoring.
- Although modified, many non-pristine environments contain important aquatic ecosystems. Well-functioning aquatic ecosystems also benefit people using these waters, such as by reducing blue-green algal blooms.
- Reducing diffuse pollutant loads during rainfall and runoff periods should be a key focus for improving water quality. It is also important in managing longer term impacts, such as sedimentation and polluted sediments.
- The choice of toxicant indicators for use in each management situation is related to known past or current activities. Impacts are detected by measuring water, sediment or biota. Natural sources should also be considered.
- Protecting aquatic ecosystems requires mimicking natural river flow patterns as closely as possible (see Section 5).
Dear Mr Ball

Re: Further comments on ISEPP consultation and request for site inspection regarding proposed realignment of the Princes Highway Dignams Creek – assessment of environmental impacts.

I refer to our letter dated 18 Jan 2013 regarding the proposed realignment of the Princes Highway at Dignams Creek and wish to clarify that the proposed realignment will now lie northwest of the current highway cross Dignams Creek Road and in turn be further upstream on Dignams creek within the Wallaga Lake catchment.

Further information regarding the proposal has been brought to our attention and we note that the proposed new route will include the construction of a narrower single carriageway bridge with a reduced span and the construction of steeper batters within the flood plain areas on the approaches to the bridge. It will also involve the construction of a steepened batter and bridge crossing over Blind Creek; a tributary of Dignams Creek. In terms of mitigating impacts of this proposal on the adjacent waterway we are more supportive of the previous route supplied to us and outlined in Attachment D of your correspondence dated 18 Dec 2012. This proposal involved one creek crossing with more gradual batters and a wider spanned bridge.

So we may better understand the proposed re-alignment and make an informed comment on the potential impacts of these design changes on the adjacent receiving waters of Dignams Creek, we request the opportunity to meet with you on site to discuss the works.

We request that we are forwarded a copy of the Environmental Impact Assessment once it has been prepared to further inform our future input. Please contact me at your convenience to organise a suitable time for the site inspection. I can be contacted on 02 4428 3001.

Yours sincerely

Matt Carr
A/ Manager
Batemans Marine Park
Mr Jonas Ball
Project Director
Roads and Maritime Services
PO Box 477
Wollongong NSW 2520

Dear Mr Ball,

Re: Consultation regarding proposed alignment of Princes Highway Upgrade at Dignams Creek

Thank you for your letter of 18 December 2012 seeking comments from the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) on the proposed alignment of the Upgrade of Princes Highway at Dignams Creek. Clause 16 of the State Environmental Planning Policy Infrastructure 2007 requires the Roads and Maritime Services to consult with the OEH due to the potential impacts on the Kooraban and Gulaga National Parks, which are adjacent to the existing road alignment, and SEPP 14 wetlands located downstream of the proposed works. The concept plan has been publically exhibited in this period as well.

It is noted that, as part of the ongoing planning process, consideration of additional options has led to the change of the preferred alignment. RMS is now investigating an alignment to the west of the existing Dignams Creek Bridge. It is understood that this alignment would reduce the scale of earthworks compared with the alignment announced in December 2010. It would also have lower cuttings and embankments and a shorter bridge.

New route

Overall, the exhibited concept plan with the westerly alignment is considered to have a greater environmental impact than the previously considered options. These comments are based on:-

- The route takes impacts closer to the sensitive catchment of Blind Creek and the area of the Endangered Ecological Community known as River Flat Eucalypt Forest on Coastal Flood Plains. The embankment from the concept plan is in close proximity to the creek and road construction would have number of direct and indirect impacts on this area.

- The Blind Creek catchment is potentially an important linkage to known koala populations in Kooraban National Park. The report Koala Survey Kooraban and Gulaga National Parks & Adjacent Lands 2010-2011 and ongoing survey by OEH has given a greater understanding of koalas distribution and abundance in this area. It found the important local population in the Sams Ridge area is persisting and the population appears to be stabilising in numbers. The Blind Creek catchment with its pockets of moist forest and
higher incidence of koala feed trees represents an important potential corridor for population dispersal. Detailed comments on the issues related to koala assessment are contained in Attachment 1.

- OEH previously has expressed support for the option bridging the Dignams Creek floodplain to minimise impacts on the sensitive wetlands and the coastal estuary downstream. This option also crossed the creek at a narrower point of the floodplain to make use of the higher terrain. The western option now proposes a crossing consisting of a shorter bridge and a long embankment across the floodplain. This approach would have a greater impact on hydrological processes in the immediate area and downstream on the coastal estuary.

**Impacts on OEH lands**

It is noted that the changes to alignment are outside of Kooraban National Park, that is, the route returns to the previously agreed alignment within the Park.

As stated in your letter the National Parks and Wildlife Amendment (Adjustment of Areas) Bill 2012 has been passed by the NSW Parliament which included the revocation of about 18.28 hectares of Kooraban National Park for the purposes of use as road reserve for the Dignams Creek project. Also that RMS and OEH are currently negotiating a land and biodiversity offset package for the revocation. OEH would agree with this but, as confirmed at the last meeting, any offset package would have to be ratified by the Gulaga National Park Board of Management.

The proposed upgrading treatments of the existing highway in the Stage 2 section adjacent to Gulaga National Park must be contained entirely in the road reserve. The design shows some cutting and filling in this area. No works can occur within the park boundary including any drainage treatments. OEH needs to be provided with much greater detailed information on the works to be undertaken than those provided in the concept plan.

**Aboriginal Cultural heritage**

The cultural heritage landscape of Gulaga is widely recognised as being one of the most significant areas on the south coast. OEH still considers that the Dignams Creek Realignment project should adequately address the proposed impacts on the Gulaga and Biamanga Aboriginal landscape in relation to important cultural values, in particular the loss of vegetation which will significantly alter the landscape and the visual impact and connectivity between the two mountains.

OEH issued AHIP # 1131201 on 20 January 2012 on the basis that it only authorised harm to Aboriginal objects located outside of the national park estate, so as to allow for geotechnical testing required as part of detailed design for the associated bridge upgrade at Dignams Creek. OEH has recently received an application to vary the AHIP as a result of the proposed realignment and is currently assessing this application.

Whilst the AHIP will, when completed, have covered off on the legislative requirements of impact to Aboriginal objects under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 the impact on the broader Aboriginal landscape in relation to important cultural values should be further considered in the environmental assessment to be undertaken.
OEH is happy to discuss these comments further. Please contact Miles Boak on (02) 6229 7095 if you have any queries in relation to this matter.

Yours sincerely

MICHAEL SAXON 15/2/2013
Regional Coordinator – Regional Operations South Branch
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

Enclosure:
Attachment One - Environmental assessment for koalas
ATTACHMENT ONE

Environmental assessment for koalas

OEH remains concerned about the impact of the proposal on Koalas and recommends implementation of the following survey and ameliorative actions:-

- For the new alignment RGBSAT surveys for koalas to be undertaken at 350m interval gridsites within 500m of zone of proposed impact, where this assessment has not previously been undertaken. The OEH methodology datasheet to be used is attached.

- Completed datasheets of initial koala surveys, and those undertaken in this study to be provided to OEH to be entered into OEH koala database.

- The fauna underpasses to be minimum 3m wide consist with the recommendations of the Investigation of the Impact of Roads on Koalas Prepared by Australian Museum Business Services for the NSW Roads and Traffic Authority Final Report December 2011.

- An additional fauna underpass should be constructed on the northern side of Dignams Creek.

- Measures need to incorporated in the design to ensure that fauna is funnelled towards underpasses: this could be appropriate fencing, dense plantings of rainforest understorey species in swales along batters, or vertical reinforced walling, or combinations of these measures

- The edge of the batter and the impact zone should be at least 50 metres from the riparian zone of Blind Creek.

- Plantings in riparian areas need to include a high proportion of endemic koala browse species

Analysis of the importance of Koala Habitat in the Blind Creek Catchment in accordance of the draft EPBC referral guidelines (Dec 2012 version).

Generally, koala habitat is considered critical to the survival of the species if it has some combination of the following characteristics:

- a history and/or currency of use by koalas
- habitat structure and composition
- extent
- dispersal value, and
- Recovery and persistence value.

*History and/or currency of use by koalas* concerns the use of the habitat patch by koalas over time.

*Score =1. Reason: anecdotal records from the 1970’s suggesting history of resident koalas in Dignam’s Hill area and likelihood that area is being used by dispersing young.*
Habitat structure and composition concerns the presence and proportion of important tree species in the vegetation community: locally preferred fodder species, other fodder species and/or shelter tree species.

Score = 1. Reason: Good species mix and structure in Dignams Hill section of the proposed realignment. E globoldea well represented to the east of Blind Creek. Both areas will be directly impacted. Blind Creek riparian area immediately adjacent to area of proposed impact has approximately >40% E botryoides overstorey. This is not listed as a koala feed tree species in NSW Recovery Plan but is listed us such by the Australian Koala Foundation. We have insufficient data to be confident about this species.

Extent is the area and shape of the habitat patch. For development sites, this means the total area of the suitable habitat within which the impact (direct and indirect) of your proposed action is likely to occur, not the area of the impact itself.

Score = 1. Reason: potentially important, but relatively small patch affected

Dispersal value is the degree to which the habitat does, or may, provide connectivity to enable koalas to safely move across the landscape and/or to enter or leave the area of habitat.

Score = 1. Reason: East-west link is critical. Increased speeds and proposed crash barrier will increase hazard unless fauna underpasses are effectively constructed and fauna effectively funneled to use them. However, the current highway, with no underpasses currently makes dispersal hazardous.

Recovery and persistence value is the additional benefit that the habitat is likely to have for the species’ long-term persistence and recovery, for example by:

- protecting the species from catastrophic events such as wildfires, droughts and periods of extreme heat
- maintaining the species’ range
- maintaining the species genetic diversity
- maintaining the species capacity to adapt to environmental changes in the future, or
- supporting an unusual occurrence of the koala.

Score = 2. Area immediately adjacent to small group of resident koalas. Offspring are likely to want to try to establish home ranges immediately adjacent to where other animals occur, ie in impact area. Additionally, Blind Creek likely to provide fire and drought refuge. Also arguably the rarity of the koala in this part of the region makes it an unusual occurrence.

To determine if an area is habitat critical to the survival of the species, each of the five characteristics are weighted equally and scored out of two points, making for a total possible score of 10 points. For the purposes of significant impact assessment, an area of habitat is considered to be habitat critical to the survival of the species if it scores six points or more.

This scoring system can also be used to score threatened species habitat quality for the purposes of the EPBC Act environmental offsets policy.
Hi Rachel,

See attached ISEPP response from Bega. I'm just getting through all my emails now so will be in touch later to follow up on what's been happening while I was away.

Cheers
Tim

From: Williams, Graeme [mailto:GWilliams@begavalley.nsw.gov.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 12 February 2013 11:36 AM
To: WEBSTER Timothy M
Cc: RVazey@globalskm.com
Subject: RE: ISEPP Consultation - Princes Hwy Upgrade Dignams Creek

Tim

Thanks for sending me copies of the Dignams Creek Rd intersection plans. I’ve attached a copy of the photos of the Armco culvert over Blind Ck that Council’s Mal Fraser sent to Peter Hawkins for your information.

Sorry about the late reply.

Council’s comments regarding the works are that

- There be no impact on the culvert over Blind Creek. Your drawing seem to show that the proposed works are clear of the culvert
- Dignams Creek Rd is a school bus route so the intersection has to accommodate bus turning with clear sight distances and linking to the climbing lane towards Cobargo
- Council will continue to maintain the Dignams Ck Rd from the bypass, but will not maintain any sections of the redundant highway as these will essentially be private driveways.

If need any further information, don’t hesitate to call me on 0428 260 994.

Graeme Williams
Road Asset Manager
Bega Valley Shire Council
02 6499 2168

Check out all the latest news and events at Council on www.begavalley.nsw.gov.au.

Hi Graeme,

I just tried to call in relation to a letter that was sent to Council on 18 December 2012 in relation to the Princes Hwy Upgrade at Dignams Creek. The ISEPP consultation period closed on 25 January 2013 and as yet I have not had a response from Council. Can you please advise if Council will be making a submission? We are keen to get Council’s comments on the proposal so this can be incorporated into the REF that is currently being prepared.

If you could reply to this email or give me a call on the number listed below that would be great.

Regards
See below, response from Eurobodalla. I think it was half written before and half after I discussed things with them because they answer some of their own questions.

Regarding the painted median I previously provided this response:

Regarding the painted median, this ranges from 1-3.5m and is part of road safety works which would also include widening the northbound shoulder and improving sight distance around corners by removing the cutting inside the curve. As the realignment (100km/hr design speed) is tying into the existing alignment which is substandard (albeit much better than the section which would be realigned in stage 1 to the north) the aim is to provide a cost effective safety benefit through minimal work to improve the transition between the realignment and existing alignment. This would be targeted to the crash types that are currently occurring on this section of road (predominantly off road on curve crashes). The median will provide greater separation from oncoming traffic and combined with a widened shoulder will provide greater road space for errant vehicles to correct themselves creating a more forgiving road environment. The 1.4km road safety treatment in stage 1 has been strategically estimated to cost $2.8M including a 64% contingency. These costs will be more accurately estimated in the coming months.

Re the Eurobodalla signage, RMS will liaise with Council to determine an appropriate location for the signage.

Regards

Tim Webster
Project Manager
RCS Southern Development | Southern Region
T 02 4221 2430 | www.rms.nsw.gov.au

Roads and Maritime Services
L6 90 Crown Street Wollongong
PO Box 477 Wollongong East NSW 2520

Hi Tim,

I apologise for the late reply – please accept the below as Council’s submission to the Dignams Creek project.

Council fully supports the proposed realignment of this section of the Highway. This stretch of road has been a long standing safety concern and has been the site of many accidents over the years resulting in significant trauma in the Eurobodalla community. The proposed realignment as shown in your correspondence appears to be adequate to improve safety along the Highway. The inclusion of additional overtaking lanes will also help improve traffic flow and reduce travel times.

It is unclear from your letter as to what the future plans are for the existing length of the Highway that will become redundant once the project is completed. Council would not be interested in taking on the responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of this length of redundant Highway. Should this length of road
be required for the future access to properties a private road or right of carriageway should be created so that the future maintenance is the responsibility of the land owner and not ESC. It is also unclear as to the future plans for the existing Digmans Creek Bridge. Again Council would not be interested in taking on the responsibility for the future maintenance of this bridge. We ask that this bridge be removed upon completion of the project as it will no longer be required.

I note that further advice provided by you (via emails on 17/1/13 & 18/1/13) has confirmed that none of the redundant lengths of Princes Highway will be converted to a Council asset upon the completion of the project. You further indicated that the existing Digmans Creek Bridge will also not become a Council asset.

Council believes that the width of the proposed painted median should be reviewed to determine if it is economically feasible. The additional funds to provide this facility may be better spent at other nearby locations within the state road network such as the Kings Highway which also has a high accident rate.

Council requests that the existing “Welcome to Eurobodalla Shire” signage be relocated to an appropriate location as part of the project.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I ask that you please keep Council informed of the progress of this project.

Cheers

Geoff Armstrong
Traffic Officer

t 02 4474 1251 | m 0458 266 174 | f 02 4474 1234

From: Warren Sharpe
Sent: Tuesday, 5 February 2013 11:27 AM
To: Geoff Armstrong
Subject: Fwd: ISEPP Consultation - Princes Hwy Upgrade Dignams Creek

Geoff,

See my email which indicates you will submit this. Timing.

WS

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: WEBSTER Timothy M <Timothy.WEBSTER@rms.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 5 February 2013 11:11:31 AM AEDT
To: Warren Sharpe <Warren.Sharpe@eurocoast.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: "Vazey, Rachel (SKM)" <RVazey@globalskm.com>
Subject: ISEPP Consultation - Princes Hwy Upgrade Dignams Creek
Hi Warren,

I just tried to call but you were in a meeting. We spoke a few weeks ago about your submission for the Princes Hwy upgrade at Dignams Creek. The consultation period closed on 25 January 2013 and I haven't received a response from Council yet. We are keen to get Council's comments on the proposal so this can be incorporated into the REF that is currently being produced.

If you could reply to this email or give me a call on the number listed below that would be great.

Regards

Tim Webster
Project Manager
RCS Southern Development | Southern Region
T 02 4221 2430 | www.rms.nsw.gov.au

Roads and Maritime Services
L6 90 Crown Street Wollongong
PO Box 477 Wollongong East NSW 2520
Hi Tim

Regarding the letter from Jonas Ball (dated 18 December 2012) on above proposed roadworks.

Fisheries NSW has no further comments on the proposed preferred alignment. The issues listed in our previous letter dated 19 May 2011 remain relevant (attached) and should be addressed in the final REF and design plans.

Thanks

Trevor
In reply please send to:
Picton
FN11-07294P2 DB:LE

Our reference:
EN02937 ISEPP

Your reference:

Contact:
Darren Bullock  (02) 4677 1967

Roads & Maritime Services
Attention: Jonas Ball  Environmental Planner/Project Director
P O Box 477
WOLLONGONG  NSW  2520

28 December 2012

Dear Sir or Madam

ENQUIRY NO: TENQ12-04095P2
CONSULTATION PROPOSED REALIGNMENT PRINCES HIGHWAY
DIGNAMS CREEK
LOT 506  DP752155, LOT 246  DP752155, LOT 93  DP752154, LOT 262
DP752154, LOT 78  DP752154, LOT 321  DP8734127, LOT 498
DP752155, LOT 497  DP752155, LOT 57  DP752155, LOT 321  DP873421,
LOT 11  DP836042 AND KOORABAN NATIONAL PARK

Thank you for your enquiry received 24th December 2012 regarding changes
to proposed alignment.

This property is not within a proclaimed Mine Subsidence District and is not
subject to any building restrictions imposed by the Mine Subsidence Board.

The provisions of the Mine Subsidence Compensation Act cover any
improvement erected on this land.

Yours faithfully

Lynette Evans
for Darren Bullock
District Manager
Hi Tim,

Thankyou for the chance to comment on the realignment of the Princes Hwy at Digmans Ck. Essential Energy's comments have not changed from the previous correspondence. The existing powerlines need to be maintained and the finished level of the highway needs to keep clearance from the powerlines. A level 3 Accredited Service Provider can be consulted to increase clearances over the highway or shift the powerlines to suit the repositioned highway needs.

Please give me a call if you have any questions.

Cheers Phil Smith
0428 485 346

Regards,

Essential Energy (formally Country Energy) Engineering Services Network Planning South Eastern planning.se@essentialenergy.com.au

----- Forwarded by Phillip Smith/People/ORG on 15/01/2013 08:39 AM -----
Customers within the Essential Energy network area can contact us on 13 20 80 to report electricity network faults and emergencies. Water customers in Broken Hill and surrounding areas can report faults to their water service on 13 20 80. Our local field service teams will be ready to respond 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

(See attached file: NSW GOVERNMENT - TRANSPORT - ROADS & MARITIME SERVICES - CONSULTATION REGARDING PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF PRINCES HIGHWAY DIGNAMS CREEK.pdf)

This message is intended for the addressee named and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and notify the sender. Views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, and are not necessarily the views of Essential Energy.
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