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INTRODUCTION

NSW Archaeology Pty Ltd has been engaged by the Roads and Maritime Services to prepare a Due Diligence Assessment in respect of the proposed construction of an additional westbound lane on Kosciuszko Road between Barry Way and Alpine Way on the western outskirts of Jindabyne, NSW.

This report has been prepared in accordance with the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage – OEH (formally NSW DECCW) *Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (NSW DECCW 2010).

For the purposes of this project, due diligence means ‘taking reasonable and practical steps to determine whether a person’s actions will harm an Aboriginal object and, if so, what measures can be taken to avoid that harm’ (NSW DECCW 2010: 18).

The *Due Diligence Code* outlines a number of steps to be adhered to in order to exercise due diligence when activities are undertaken that have the potential to cause harm to Aboriginal objects. The code stipulates that these steps should be followed in order to:

- identify whether or not Aboriginal objects are or are likely to be present in an area;
- ascertain whether or not the proposed activities are likely to harm Aboriginal objects (if present); and
- determine whether an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) application is required.

If Aboriginal objects are present or likely to be present and an activity will harm those objects, an AHIP is required.

As a result of the assessment, the following conclusions are made:

- There are no known previously recorded Aboriginal objects located in the subject area.
- No Aboriginal object sites were found during a field assessment of the proposed impact area. The landscape within the activity area is assessed to be of low archaeological sensitivity.

Acknowledgments

*Archaeological evidence confirms that Aboriginal people have had a long and continuous association with the region for thousands of years. We would in particular like to acknowledge and pay our respects to the traditional owners of the country which is encompassed by the proposal.*

1 Hereafter referred to as the *Due Diligence Code.*
1. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The activity area is located on the western outskirts of the township of Jindabyne, NSW. The subject area comprises approximately 1.6km of the current Kosciuszko Road corridor along the southern side of the westbound lane and some linear zones immediately adjacent (Figure 1).

In order to improve the local road efficiency, the NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) propose to construct an additional westbound lane along Kosciuszko Road between Barry Way and Alpine Way. It is foreseen that the added lane will ease bottlenecking of traffic at Barry Way and ease congestion of roads around Jindabyne during periods of peak traffic volume.

The proposed lane addition will involve rehabilitation of the existing road surface and impacting approximately 4.27 hectares of landscape along the road corridor through benching, scalping and blasting activity primarily associated with increasing road width, the provision of large cutting batters and rehabilitation of culverts. Impacts will include removal of vegetation, grubbing and clearance of landscape surfaces, removal of topsoil and boulders, large-scale excavation and cutting, and relocation/stockpiling of material.

The great majority of this construction activity will be restricted to the existing road corridor along the southern side of the westbound lane. Additionally, extension of earthworks into certain locations adjacent to the corridor will be required, particularly where the degree of road cutting must be increased in step with the height of subject elevated points in the landscape. Specific points of impact extension in this regard comprise the elevated granitic spur crests in the approximate centre of the study area where earthworks will require cutting approximately five metres into the adjacent landform surfaces outside the current road corridor.

A temporary compound and stockpile site will also be required for the construction activity. One potential location within the study area has been identified for this purpose, part of a low gradient hill crest feature at the western end of the proposal on the northern side of the road opposite the Essential Energy Depot. This subject area has been previously cleared and disturbed.

The first question to be addressed in a process of due diligence is, Will the activity disturb the ground surface or any culturally modified trees? (NSW DECCW 2010: 11). If the proposed activity will disturb the ground surface there is a higher likelihood that Aboriginal objects will be harmed.

When machinery is used to dig, grade, bulldoze, scrape, plough or drill the ground, the accompanying disturbance to the ground surface is often significant, and consequently, there is a high likelihood for any Aboriginal objects which may be present to be harmed.
1.1 Proposed Impacts

As outlined above, the proposed road works will involve considerable landscape alteration and drainage management within the road corridor, with some minor expansion into adjacent areas. Impacts will include large-scale removal and relocation of vegetation, earth and rock, temporary stockpiling of material and heavy vehicle movement.

1.2 Impact Assessment

Given the nature of the proposal, impacts will occur. However, the activity will mainly take place within an area already altered and utilised as road corridor and for other construction and stockpiling activities. Nevertheless, there is potential for Aboriginal objects, if present, to be disturbed.

No original vegetation is present and, therefore, no culturally modified trees would be harmed.
Figure 1 Location of the proposed activity.
2. AHIMS DATABASE SEARCH AND LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

2.1 AHIMS Site Search Results

A search of the NSW OEH Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) has been undertaken in respect of this study on 3 April 2017 (AHIMS Search ID #274905). The search covered an area of 20 square kilometres, encompassed by Eastings: 641000 – 646000 and Northings: 5967000 – 5971000, with a buffer of 50 metres (Appendix 1).

The previously recorded Aboriginal object sites (N = 48) listed on the AHIMS search are presented in Appendix 1. None are within the proposed activity area (see Figure 2).

It is worth noting, however, that the AHIMS register only includes sites which have been reported to the NSW OEH. Generally, sites are only recorded during targeted surveys in either development or research contexts, none of which are known to have taken place previously in the study area. Accordingly, this search cannot be considered to be an actual or exhaustive inventory of Aboriginal objects situated within the local area or indeed within the subject area itself.

It is also important to acknowledge that AHIMS data is often incorrect. Grid references and datums are not always accurate.

Searches have been conducted of the NSW State Heritage Inventory and the Australian Heritage Database. No Aboriginal heritage sites are listed on these as being in the subject area.

*It is noted that for the purposes of Due Diligence, the AHIMS search results may be relied on for 12 months.*
Figure 2 Location of the AHIMS sites in the immediate local area.
2.2 Assessment of the Archaeological Sensitivity of Landscape Features in the Proposed Impact Area

Regardless of the AHIMS search results and whether or not they indicate the presence of Aboriginal objects, it is a requirement to consider if Aboriginal objects are likely to be in the proposed activity area. The Due Diligence Code of Practice - Step 2b (NSW DECCW 2010) lists the following landscape features that indicate the likely existence of Aboriginal objects. Areas located:

- within 200 metres of waters (including the sea), or
- within a sand dune system, or
- on a ridge top, ridge line or headland, or
- within 200 metres below or above a cliff face, or
- within 20 metres of or in a cave, rock shelter, or a cave mouth; and
- on land that is not disturbed land (as defined on page 18 of the Due Diligence Code).

The Due Diligence Code of Practice does not, however, take into consideration other factors which could influence whether or not an area may contain Aboriginal objects, such as, for example, gradient (i.e. steep land is unlikely to contain Aboriginal objects), rockiness (i.e. very rocky land, irrespective of its location, may not be archaeologically sensitive) or stream order (i.e. land within 200m of a 1st order stream will have a different level of archaeological sensitivity compared to a 3rd or 4th order stream).

The area is situated on the Monaro and is part of the Eastern Uplands of southeastern Australia (Jennings and Mabbutt 1977). The Eastern Uplands consists of a wide plateau which extends from the coastal escarpment on the east, to the slopes of its western side. The landscape has low relative relief, lies generally below 600m altitude and slopes generally less that 5° with about 20% of the area containing steeper hills and ranges.

The Monaro is an area of high tablelands and mountains; it is bounded on the north by the Namadgi ranges, on the west by the alpine watershed, the east by the escarpment and the south by the Victorian border (Flood 1980). Four distinct natural environments have been defined by Costin (1954); the alpine, sub-alpine, montane and tableland. The proposal area is situated within a montane environment.

The area has a strongly seasonal thermal climate (Jennings and Mabbutt 1977). Flood (1980) draws attention to the phenomena of cold air drainage, frost and wind as affecting human occupation in the region. High winds and frost occur frequently; Flood (1980) argues that, in particular, the combination of cold temperature with wet winds was probably more significant in regard to human occupation than cold in itself.

The underlying geology in the study area is the Jindabyne Tonalite which is a part of the Lower-Middle Devonian Kosciusko Batholith. Granite outcrops in the study area in the form of boulders of low elevation (<1m) and mass.
The now submerged Jindabyne valley floor contains alluvial deposits, with some Tertiary gravels, sand, sandstone, clay and lignite present downstream from the junction of the Eucumbene and Snowy Rivers. Away from the valley, undifferentiated granite, granodiorite, tonalite, breccia, alpine and gneiss is present (NSW Geological Survey, Bega Map Sheet SJ 55-4). Quartz reefs and veins run through the region. Silcrete is available in the Dalgety-Berridale area, the Eucumbene valley and the Adaminaby Plateau (Avery 1997:3). Silcrete is available locally at Kara Creek on the Berridale Plateau and at Mt Gilead, south of Jindabyne. Soils in the region have a high gravel and sand content.

The study area is a part of a sloping to moderately dissected landscape system comprising the mid to upper valley sides flanking the southern Jindabyne (Snowy River) valley. Landscape units occurring within this setting include a series of slopes and spur crests separated by 1st order drainage depressions. In the west of the study area, Widows Creek drains northward into the river valley at Widows Inlet (now part of Lake Jindabyne) as a 3rd order stream.

The subject section of road corridor roughly parallels the 960m contour, crossing a series of moderately sloping spur sides, moderate to steep crests and simple slopes. In the rough centre of the alignment two steep-sided south-north trending spurs occur as locally elevated features exhibiting rocky outcrops and concentrations of granite boulders. At Widows creek a narrow basal slope/alluvial terrace interface is apparent within a constricted drainage corridor, approximately 200 upstream from the confluence with Lake Jindabyne. A broad hill crest occurs directly to the east of the crossing point at the creek. This feature rises approximately five metres above the level of Kosciuszko Road directly to the north of the Essential Energy Depot.

The activity area is generally highly disturbed, chiefly as a result of the construction of Kosciuszko Road. The existing road corridor has been cut into and through the underlying landscape surface with adjacent zones universally exhibiting ancillary excavation and grading associated with drainage, road verges and embankments. At Widows Creek, the road crossing and drainage modification engineering works have created wholesale disturbance of the creek bank topography within the current road corridor.

2.3 Conclusion

The proposed activity area contains a series of upper valley side landforms that are assessed to be generally of low archaeological sensitivity due primarily to high levels of previous disturbance.

Aboriginal land users may well have used local low gradient crest landforms for casual camping and shelter while in the area travelling through country, or hunting and gathering away from base camps. Such occupation, however, is predicted to have been sporadic and infrequent. The surfaces of the spurs subject to impacts adjacent to the existing road corridor are very rocky and moderate to steep gradient features that exhibit very low archaeological potential in this regard.
Focused Aboriginal occupation in the local area is expected to have occurred in much closer proximity to the major rivers and creeks. In this respect, the Widows Creek corridor may be expected to have attracted a locally higher degree of Aboriginal occupation, both as a semi-permanent source of water and also as a potential route of movement between the river valley and the more elevated terrain to the south.

Given the above, the majority of the proposed activity area is assessed to be unlikely to have been targeted by Aboriginal people for occupation which would result in significant levels of artefact discard. The majority of the activity area is predicted to be of low archaeological sensitivity and potential. That is, to contain low/negligible density artefacts only. Although the Widows Creek corridor may be expected to exhibit an elevated level of prehistoric Aboriginal occupation and a correspondingly potentially increased archaeological signature, the concentration of previous road construction activity confined to a narrow alluvial and ecotonal corridor at this landscape point has created significant localised impacts. It is therefore seen as highly unlikely that any remnant landscape units of elevated archaeological sensitivity will remain within the proposed development zone.
3. ASSESSMENT OF WHETHER OR NOT AVOIDANCE OF HARM TO AN OBJECT OR LANDSCAPE FEATURE IS POSSIBLE

3.1 Aboriginal Objects and Landscape Features

As noted in Section 2 above, there are no known Aboriginal object sites in the proposed activity area. Given the road corridor is located in an environmental context assessed to be of generally low archaeological potential and otherwise disturbed (see below), the impact area is not on landscape features which are assessed to be of significant archaeological sensitivity.

3.2 Disturbed Land

The proposed activity area is highly disturbed.

3.3 Avoidance of Harm

No AHIMS site are located in or near to the proposed activity area. The landform subject to impacts is not assessed to be archaeologically sensitive. The area is assessed to be disturbed. Given all of the above, a consideration of avoidance of harm is not relevant or necessary.
4. DESKTOP ASSESSMENT AND VISUAL INSPECTION

4.1 Desktop Assessment

Aboriginal people have lived in the Southern Uplands and its environs for at least 20,000 years. The oldest dated site in the region is the Birrígai Rock shelter which has yielded a radio carbon determination of 21,000±220 years BP (Flood et al 1987). Late Pleistocene occupation sites have also been identified in the coastal hinterland at Bulee Brook 2 (18810± 160) and Bobs Cave (10850± 300) west of Jervis Bay (Boot 1996). This is not an exhaustive listing.

During the Pleistocene, the environment of the region would have been a cold steppe grassland with vegetated shrubs and scattered groups of Eucalypts located in protected positions (Mulvaney and Kamminga 1999). Between 23,000 and 15,000 years ago, harsh conditions prevailed and the mountains peaks were glaciated above 1900 metres; periglacial conditions were present to at least 1000 metres above sea level. The alpine zone was a cold desert with scattered fields of perennial Plantago herb fields which may have provided some bulbs and tubers for human consumption (Mulvaney and Kamminga 1999).

Pleistocene occupation of the Snowy Mountains has been put forward as a theory by Kamminga (1992), however, this remains to be confirmed by further investigations. Flood et al. (1987) has argued that the Birrígai shelter in the ACT on the northern fringes of the Alps has provided evidence of Pleistocene occupation dating from about 21,000 years ago. The scarcity of artefacts in the Pleistocene levels has been interpreted by Flood (1995) as showing seasonal occupation of the site. Flood et al. (1987) have argued that an increase in occupation of the site in the Holocene from about 3,000 years is visible, and, it is considered that permanent exploitation of the alpine and sub-alpine regions of the Snowy Mountains began from about 5,000 years ago. Lourandos (1987) has argued that the evidence from the uplands of the Snowy Mountains represents ephemeral occupation during the Pleistocene with an increased establishment and occupation of sites following the late Holocene.

Aboriginal language groups including the Wolgal, Djilamatung and Ngarigo occupied the Snowy Mountains during the early period of European settlement (Tindale 1974). White settlers began to move into the Southern Uplands region during the early 1800s. European settlement ultimately resulted in the alienation of Aboriginal people from their traditional lands and changes in regard to cultural and economic relationships with country. It is generally understood that the Jindabyne area falls within the boundaries of the Ngarigo cultural and language group. The area occupied by these people extended from the eastern side of Kosciuszko Plateau to the western slopes of the coastal ranges (Tindale 1974).
The Ngarigo people maintained social relationships with neighbouring groups including Ngunnawal, Djilamatang, Jamathang and coastal groups including the Yuin (Howitt 1904).

Some information is recorded about the nature of Aboriginal occupation of the region during the early period of European occupation. The literature which does exist has presented a biased view of Aboriginal life within the mountains which is focused particularly on Bogong Moth exploitation. Indeed, the ethnohistoric literature has implied to some readers that seasonal exploitation of the moth was the major reason for Aboriginal usage of the Alpine region (cf. Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2000: 19). The significance of moth consumption has been re-evaluated (Navin Officer Heritage Consultants 2000: 19); Kamminga et al. (1989) have argued that the large inter tribal gatherings which were associated with moth exploitation acted to mediate and foster political and social linkages between the different language and tribal groups which came together during these occasions.

Flood (1973, 1980) was heavily influenced by the extant ethnohistoric literature which focused on moth exploitation in her seminal study of the region. She constructed a hypothesis of seasonal usage of the highlands based on the exploitation of the moth. The moth, she argued, was important as an economic food source and its exploitation may have been causal as the impetus for the initial usage of the highlands. Flood (1980) suggested that the Ngarigo people occupied low altitude valleys (< than 600m) in winter, moving into higher areas in summer primarily for the purpose of exploiting the bogong moth. She argued that the occupation pattern which resulted from the exploitation of moths is one in which a series of camps extended from the lowest valleys below 300m up to the alpine treeline zone at 1,830m.

A contrary viewpoint to Flood’s (1980) model has been provided by Chapman (1977) who argued that there was no evidence which pointed to the moth as being a staple food source; Chapman argued that the importance of the moth as a food resource has been over emphasized by early commentators. She argued that there is no evidence for the moth as being a reliable food source, that it lacked nutritional value to act as a staple and that the moth, in any case was primarily consumed by men. Chapman (1977) instead argued that the significance of moth exploitation was that it fostered social cohesion within the region.

Researchers such as Bowdler (1981), Cooke (1988), Gott (1982) and Kamminga et al. (1989) have drawn attention to a variety of vegetable products available locally which are likely to have been utilized as food resources. Bowdler (1981) has argued that the importance of the moth was more ideological than economic, and that the yam daisy would have provided a more reliable food source.

A model of seasonal usage of the alpine country continues to have currency within the literature. The seasonal migration to higher altitudes in summer months is accepted, however, the issue in regard to Flood’s emphasis on moth exploitation is questioned.
(Navin 1991). During winter small groups of Aboriginal people would have occupied the lower montane valleys and the adjacent tablelands (Mulvaney and Kamminga 1999: 298). The region would have opened up considerably however, in summer. It was during this time that people from other areas gathered to perform inter-tribal ceremonies (Mulvaney and Kamminga 1999: 299). Chapman (1977) has argued that the Jindabyne valley would have been occupied on a year round basis.

According to Avery (1994, cited in Avery 1997), Aboriginal people of the Jindabyne area continued until the late 1800’s to live in the area and exploit its local resources. The Jindabyne area now lies within the boundaries of the Bega Local Aboriginal Land Council.

**Archaeological Investigations**

Chapman (1976) investigated and excavated a hearth on the eastern bank of the Snowy River between Cobbin Creek and Mowamba River. The hearth was found in association with 123 artefacts on level ground on a small knoll about 60 metres from the river. Chapman interpreted the hearth to be probably of recent antiquity.

Gallard (1975) surveyed sections of the lake foreshore and recorded 26 sites. Ten of these were artefact scatters in the Tyrolean Estate area. Eight sites were recorded as hearths.

Chapman (1976) conducted an excavation of a hearth which was associated with artefacts 60m above the eastern bank of the former Snowy River, c. 2.5 km downstream from the Lake dam wall. A total of 123 artefacts were retrieved, and concluded that the hearth was most probably the remains of a burnt termite mound. She suggested that the other so called hearths in the area were most likely also termite mounds.

Chapman (1977) conducted a research project which examined the archaeological evidence that had come to surface as the result of the erosion which had taken place around the edge of Lake Jindabyne. Her study area extended between Wollondibby Creek and Colorado Point, from near the now submerged junction of the Eucumbene and Snowy Rivers to Kalkite Creek and around the northern shore to Clifford Point. She recorded 34 sites, 27 of which contained less than 50 artefacts. Three contained more than 100. The sites she found were all artefact scatters situated around the lake on slopes and near to creeks and the Snowy River. Sites were found to contain a large variety of artefactual material including pebble choppers, hatchet heads, geometric microliths, Bondi points, cores, scrapers, waste flakes and other artefact types. Quartz was the main material represented in the sites.

Chapman (1977: 54) noted that there was an abundance of pebbles that had been flaked, in particular, at sites on Colorado Point. Larger sites were found to be located relatively close to major water sources. However, she was unable to analyse the location of sites in relation to the Eucumbene and Snowy Rivers because of the disturbance to sites on the lake shoreline arising from wave action which had deposited artefacts in strand lines, thus destroying spatial relationships.
Gallard (1977) surveyed the site of the proposed Jindabyne sewerage works and found no Aboriginal sites.

Djekic (1982) recorded twelve sites while surveying the route for a proposed transmission line extending between Cooma and Jindabyne. Six of the sites were scarred trees, but only one of these was unequivocal, with four being identified as probable and one ambiguous. The other sites were comprised of four artefact scatters, two isolated finds and two open camp sites containing debitage and a few implements (Djekic 1982: 9). Four of these were located in the vicinity of the Snowy River; one situated on a 200 m wide spurline leading down to the river; one at the base of the spur on sandy river flats; an isolated find situated on the crest of a rise 200 m from the river, and another in the middle of a slight rise (Djekic 1982: 22-27).

Chapman (1982) conducted a survey at East Jindabyne between Rushes Creek and Tyrolean Village, and even though the area covered was rough terrain, six low density sites were recorded. All of these were artefact scatters located on breaks of slope or at the base of steep slopes near to substantial streams. Silcrete and river pebbles were commonly recorded.

Geering (1982) conducted a partial excavation during a salvage program of AHIMS #62-1-60 which was positioned in the path of the proposed 66kV electricity transmission line from Cooma to Jindabyne, and earlier identified as an open surface campsite. As only a small number of excavations had been carried out in the region, the results provided some more detail with regard to the range of tool technology and material types employed by the Ngarigo people. The surface site, located on the Snowy River, was a low density scatter with approximately 1 artefact per 100 sq metres. However, a total of 720 artefacts were collected over the course of the excavations which were sampled from eleven 30 m x 50 m zones. Of these, 188 were quartz, and the remainder of raw materials included volcanics, quartzite and river pebble, but predominantly silcrete. Artefact types included backed blades, pebble tools and hammerstones, as well as flakes and cores.

Walkington (1988) surveyed the proposed Mill Creek Estate subdivision south of Jindabyne, in an area characterized by minor drainage lines, low ridges, gentle slopes and marshland. No sites were recorded.

Koettig (1989) surveyed a proposed pipeline between Berridale and Lake Jindabyne for the Department of Public Works, finding six artefact scatters and six isolated finds. Sites were found on slopes, saddles, spurs and crests or knolls.

Packard (1990) conducted a preliminary survey for archaeologically sensitive areas for the East Jindabyne sewerage scheme. Two artefact scatters were recorded, one on a gently sloping area below a steep slope, and the other along a low ridge.
Navin (1990) surveyed the site of the Tyrolean Village Estate and recorded 11 artefact scatters and seven isolated finds. These sites were located on a number of ridges with finds distributed on shoulder, saddle, crest and knoll landform elements. The site density for this survey was estimated to be 1 site per 9.3 ha (Navin 1990: 22).

Navin (1991b) conducted a survey for the proposed Rushes resort complex locating 18 artefact scatters and two isolated finds, with an overall survey density of 1 site per 9.4 ha. Navin (1991b) noted that the results of her survey strongly correlated with the pattern of site distribution identified in other studies across the Jindabyne area, where sites were mainly situated on level ground on ridge crests, but also on ridge slopes and flats adjacent to drainage lines. Navin (1991b) suggested that sites with higher artefact densities were situated closer to the more permanent water sources, and noted that the Rushes Creek is the only major creek catchment joining the Snowy River on the eastern side of the Jindabyne Snowy River Plain. Navin re-recorded three of Chapman’s sites which are located in the current subject area: RC3, RC4 and RC5.

Williams Barber Archaeological Services (1993) surveyed an area measuring 183 hectares on the Barry Way, south of Jindabyne, at which time four artefact scatters were recorded. The sites were all small, low density sites. The raw material recorded was quartz, except for one silcrete piece. The majority of artefact types were amorphous flaked pieces with very few flakes and cores present.

Clegg and Caldwell (1994) prepared a report for the Bega Local Aboriginal Land Council in regard to a large artefact scatter site located at Curiosity Rocks, on the foreshore of Lake Jindabyne. This study found artefacts covering an area which measured 400 m x 150 m. Artefacts included hatchet heads, grinding stones, hammer stones, cores, blades, scrapers, flakes and debitage. Avery (1997) conducted a subsequent study of this site in order to provide the NSW NPWS with advice in regard to its protection and management. The site is located on a former low ridge crest and is interpreted to have been a component of a larger site complex which would have included a bunan (bora) ground and axe grinding groove site, both of which are now submerged under Lake Jindabyne.

Saunders (1997) carried out a survey for the Alpine Sands Estate recording four artefact scatters and three isolated finds. The scatters were of low to medium density and located on gentle to medium sloping spur crests and ridgeline side slopes near to gullies, while the isolated finds were found on upper slopes with one at the head of a major gully. The artefacts were made from silcrete, chert, volcanics, quartz and river pebbles.

Oakley (1998) conducted a survey at the proposed Alpine Air Service Complex on the foreshore of Lake Jindabyne at Widows Inlet. One artefact scatter was recorded consisting of up to 50 artefacts. The assemblage was dominated by quartz.

Oakley (1999) conducted an inspection of three of the sites previously recorded by Williams Barber Archaeological Services (1993) which had apparently suffered
disturbance due to grading of the farm track on which they were located. In addition, Oakley (1999) conducted further survey in areas of proposed access roads. No additional sites were found. The landform of this study area is a broad ridge/divide of low local relief situated between the Mowamba River to the east and Cobbin Creek to the west. The country is generally of flat to gentle gradient. First order drainage lines traverse the property. Oakley (1999) assessed the property to be of low potential to contain subsurface sites, mainly given the shallow soils encountered.

Oakley (2000) surveyed a 145 hectare area at “Mary’s Hill”, East Jindabyne, in response to a proposed residential subdivision. Six artefact scatters, three isolated finds and three areas of Potential Archaeological Deposit were recorded. The study area occupied the gently undulating terrain of a broad ridge. A water course on the western boundaries contains a spring and, accordingly, water was locally available.

Saunders (2003) conducted a survey of a 14 hectare parcel of land adjacent to Rushes Creek. Two sites were recorded, EJ1, an extensive artefact scatter, and EJ2, a small low density artefact scatter. The largest of the sites recorded by Saunders (2003: 17) consisted of over 100 stone artefacts which were described as distributed across a low gradient, north facing secondary spur crest above Rushes Creek and on the crest of a narrow ridge. The site dimensions are recorded as being 170 m by 100 m. The site area encompassed the three sites recorded previously by Chapman (1982) and Navin (1991): RC3, RC4 and RC5.

Saunders (2003) described the site EJ1 as comprised of stone artefacts, exposure by extensive surface erosion. She recorded c. 100 artefacts and calculated artefact density to be low. While Saunders (2003) indicated that more artefacts would be present, some in subsurface contexts, she argued that the site had been severely impacted by erosion and that the majority of artefacts were probably redeposited. Saunders says that while there may be some potential for subsurface deposits, they are unlikely to be in situ due to the high level of disturbance the site has undergone.

Biosis Research (2003) conducted an assessment of the proposal by Snowy Hydro to construct a spillway upgrade and outlet works at Jindabyne Dam situated to the south of the current study area. During this survey a previously recorded site (NPWS Site # 62-10007) and one new site (5-10 artefacts) were recorded. Additionally, an area situated adjacent to Cobbin Creek was also predicted to be archaeologically sensitive.

Barber (2003b) conducted an additional survey in respect of the Snowy Hydro proposal at Jindabyne Dam. Barber’s northern boundary abutted Lees Creek. Six sites and one area of potential archaeological deposit (PAD) were recorded to the south of Lees Creek. In addition, five sites and four areas of potential archaeological deposit were recorded on the eastern side of Kosciuszko Road, south of Lees Creek.

The sites recorded by Barber (2003b) were found to contain a range of artefact types and raw materials (quartz, silcrete, quartzite, volcanics and chert) comparable to other recorded sites in the local area. A site (CTC) situated immediately south of Lees Creek was
determined to be the main camping area due to the presence of the large number of artefacts recorded. The broader area in which this site is situated (ie immediately south of Lees Creek) was considered by Barber (2003b) to contain considerable archaeological material including PAD sites.

In the area situated to the east of Kosciuszko Road and south of Lees Creek (Barber 2003b) recorded two sites (CT L and CT K) on steep slopes which fall to Lees Creek. Barber (2003b) comments that such landforms are not usually considered to be archaeologically sensitive. However, the origin of the artefacts in both sites was questioned by Barber (2003b).

Dibden (2004a) undertook an Aboriginal archaeological assessment at Lot 10 DP 1044719 Leesville Industrial Estate, Jindabyne. The survey area measured 23.9 hectare in area and four Aboriginal sites were located. Two were low density artefact scatters and the others were isolated finds. The area is situated in a location away from sources of reliable water and concentrated resource zones. The results were therefore interpreted as representing the discard of artefacts during foraging and hunting forays conducted away from base camp locations.

Dibden (2004b) conducted a survey at Mill Ridge, south of Jindabyne, in response to a proposal to develop a rural tourist facility. A sparse artefact scatter and an isolated find were recorded. Given the location of the proposal area on a high ridge at considerable distance from a reliable water source, the sites were interpreted to be representative of transient rather than repeated habitation.

Dibden (2005) surveyed the proposed Highview Estate subdivision area situated immediately south of Jindabyne village. Six stone artefacts sites were recorded, most of which were situated within close proximity to Lees Creek.

Saunders (2006) conducted an assessment of a proposed 31 lot subdivision at East Jindabyne (the Ridge Estate). The area is situated on a broad spur at 960m AHD with an open to north-westerly aspect, overlooking the Snowy River valley. The spur crest is generally level with slopes of low to moderate gradient to the northeast and southwest. Two previously unrecorded Aboriginal archaeological sites, designated TREAS 1 and 2, and an associated area of potential archaeological deposit (PAD) were identified on the land during the archaeological survey. Further subsurface test excavation was undertaken at the site, which indicated that artefacts were present in very low density and a highly patchy distribution (Saunders 2007).

Dibden (2009) conducted a survey of a proposed substation for Country Energy at East Jindabyne. The area comprises a gently undulating simple slope with a north to northeasterly aspect; elevation of the land varies from approximately 1,150m AHD in the northeast to around 1,160m in the southwest. The actual location of the proposed substation encompassed a micro-topographical feature that is a slightly more level area of ground measuring approximately 35-40 metres across. The area comprised land that
would be generally favourable for human occupation, however, it is part of a broader landform that is somewhat amorphous and without a source of fresh water. The study area was predicted to have been utilised for hunting and gathering activities which would result in low levels of artefact discard. Two low density stone artefact locales were recorded and the results were found to be in keeping with the predictive model of site location relevant to the area.

To the north-west of Jindabyne, Paton (1985) surveyed a proposed upgrade of the Alpine Way between the Ranger Station and Dead Horse Gap. A small scatter of 10 artefacts was recorded on a gentle spur above No. 2 Creek and near to the Thredbo Rangers Station.

Crew (1988) surveyed the area of the proposed Wollondibby Resort, situated on the Wollondibby Creek. Crew (1988) recorded a number of sites including seven scarred trees, five artefact scatters and four isolated finds. Artefact scatters were generally located on level, elevated ground on ridges. One site contained 30 artefacts and was situated at 200-300 metres to the north of the creek at the base of a ridge slope. The other, containing 12 artefacts, was found almost on the bank of the river (Crew 1988: 12-13). A range of raw materials were recorded, including silcrete and volcanics.

Kamminga et al. (1989) investigated an area in the Thredbo Valley near its intersection with the Little Thredbo River. This locality is located at ca. 1140 m AHD. The results of this work indicated that the favoured camp location sites were wooded elevated flats situated at 15-20 m above the valley floor. Kamminga et al. (1989) argued that these locations provided protection from cold air drainage within the valley context. Moderately graded slopes and poorly drained wet ground, such as banks of water courses, were considered to be unfavourable camp site locations.

Barber (2001) surveyed a 12 kilometre section along the Alpine Way extending from the Ngarigo camping ground to east of Dead Horse Gap, for a series of 18 proposed road cutting upgrades. No evidence of Aboriginal occupation was found along the route which was situated on the southern lower slopes of the Thredbo River. This result was attributed to steepness of the gradient.

Barber (2003a) conducted a survey for a proposed Telstra cable line along the Alpine Way in the vicinity of the Little Thredbo River. Two isolated finds, one on a saddle and one downhill from a low knoll, and an artefact scatter situated on a wide spur crest containing 18 artefacts were recorded. However, the survey was restricted due to low visibility and several areas were determined to have moderate to high archaeological potential despite no archaeological material being observed.

Barber (2003b) conducted a survey of sections of the Lake Crackenback Resort on the Alpine Way in response to the proposed redevelopment of certain areas within that complex. Surveying an area of 3.6 hectares, with an effective coverage of 6%, seven archaeological locales were recorded, although one of these was clearly associated with
imported fill. Four sites were isolated finds and three were low density artefact scatters. Sites were generally located on elevated flats or minor slopes and were classified as being small, although the potential for additional sites to be present was noted.

Parkes and Barber (2003) conducted a survey of the Thredbo Valley Lodge. Parkes and Barber (2003: 17-21) and Barber (2003c) located three isolated finds and four low density artefact scatters in the surveys and subsurface testing conducted at the Thredbo Valley Lodge development area.

Parkes and Barber (2003) located these sites, all on spur crests and gentle slopes with northerly aspects, during their initial survey. Sites TVL1, TVL2 and TVL7 were interpreted to be indicative of short-term camp sites. TVL3 was interpreted as probably a larger base camp and TVL5 was predicted as potentially having the same function. TVL4 and TVL6 were believed to represent background scatter only. These assessments were based on an interpretation of a model of site location for the region, and in particular the spur crest landform element on which they are located and their proximity to Crackenback Swamp.

Barber (2003c) subsequently conducted subsurface investigation of a PAD and along a planned access road at the proposed development at the Thredbo Valley Lodge. One artefact was recovered from 15 test holes in the PAD area, located at the end of a saddle. A further 27 artefacts were recovered from 9 of 23 test holes along the proposed road subsurface test area. Most the artefacts were found in a section along a flat spur crest. Both sites were determined to have contained low artefact densities in comparison to other areas within the valley, despite the topographic features of the spur being deemed suitable for occupation as it was elevated flat ground affording protection from prevailing weather.

In summary, artefact scatters are typically recorded during field survey in the Jindabyne area. Artefact scatters will generally be found within the majority of survey contexts, indicating that stone artefacts are widely distributed across the landscape. However, site density varies significantly according to topography, gradient, elevation and proximity to various water sources. Artefact scatters which cover large areas and contain high artefact numbers are typically found on reasonably elevated contexts close to major streams (3rd or 4th order) such as the Wollondibby, Thredbo and Snowy Rivers. These sites are probably representative of long term, intensive and repeated Aboriginal occupation (Flood 1980: 190 – 192; Kamminga 1992: 107). Smaller scatters can be found elsewhere across a number of landform elements and terrain contexts. These sites are likely to be representative of smaller scale foraging and hunting activities.

4.2 Visual Inspection

The proposed activity is on largely disturbed land and does not contain known Aboriginal objects. Nevertheless, a visual inspection of the land was undertaken because it provided a greater level of surety in regard to the assessment process and was a component of the original scope of works.
The field inspection was conducted by Tom Knight, NSW Archaeology Pty Ltd, Ron Thomas (Bega LALC) and Shaun Foster (RMS Project Engineer) on 6 April 2017.

No Aboriginal sites were recorded in the study area and it was concluded that in all areas in which impacts would occur, there was not a high probability of undetected Aboriginal objects being present. In certain areas, ground exposure and potential archaeological visibility was relatively high. The absence of stone artefact in these areas reinforced the assessment that the archaeological sensitivity of the area was low.

On-the-ground assessment of previous impacts within and adjacent to the road corridor was undertaken with the following relevant observations compiled:

- The subject section of road corridor (i.e. the southern or upslope zone) has been heavily impacted by road construction including cutting through crest, slope and spur side features and adjacent drainage works and pad levelling within the current active road corridor (Photos 1 & 2).

Plate 1 Bank and culvert looking east.
Plate 2 Cutting looking west.

Plate 3 Spur side cutting with disturbed boulders looking west.
Plate 4 Scrapped spur top with disturbed boulders, looking west.

- Mechanical alteration of landscape surfaces, including modification of boulder fields on spur crests, has occurred within the corridor on points adjacent to the active road zone (Photo 3 & 4).

- Additional impacts are apparent in the zone paralleling the road corridor (i.e. following the boundary fence line upslope of the corridor) where a mechanically excavated dirt track has been cut into the landscape surface across crest and slope surfaces (Photo 5).
Plate 5 Corridor boundary track cutting looking east.

- Substantial levels of surface modification in the form of landscaping have taken place on low gradient crest features in the vicinity of the power substation and depot in the west of the study area (Photo 6).

- The subject section of landscape associated with Widows Creek has been heavily impacted by major road and culvert construction, drainage works and communications cable trenching (Photo 7 & 8).

- The subject section of hill crest identified as a potential stockpile zone to the north of the road corridor exhibits extensive evidence of surface grading and mechanical scalping activity (Photo 9). The impacts apparent at the location are consistent with previous landscape modification and use as a large stockpile and compound site, possibly associated with original road construction and/or the Snowy Scheme.
Plate 6 Landscaping near the power substation and depot in the west of the study area.

Plate 7 The eastern approach to Widows Creek looking west, note cutting, culvert and road batter intrusion.
Plate 8 The highly disturbed Widows Creek corridor on western side of creek, looking east.

Plate 9 The proposed stockpile site on hill crest to north of Kosciuszko Road, looking west. Note. Native grassland in non-disturbed non-subject surface to right of image.
A European feature, a stacked stone alignment or ‘wall’, was recorded in the approximate centre of the survey corridor, in association with the sloping crest of one of the elevated subject spurs. The wall comprises a rough dry stone construct oriented north-south (paralleling the spur crest orientation) and approximately 40m in length. GPS refs are 0643557. 5969101 (at north end) to 0643729. 5969676 (at south end). It has been constructed from local granitic large cobbles and small to moderate sized boulders (Photo 10). Wall height and width appears to be quite regular at +/-60cm; depending upon section-constituent stone size. The coursing runs at a maximum of around 4 large cobbles/small boulders (Photo 11). In relative terms, quite substantial boulders have been utilised with regularity as basal components and aligned accordingly. Some of these stones were estimated to weigh considerably more than 100kg (Photo 12).

The stone ‘wall’ falls partially within the impact zone. The proposed road widening will impact upon the stone alignment’s northern end, with approximately 6m of the feature being potentially removed as a result of the construction process.

This stone wall is identified as being European in origin. The following attributes were identified in this assessment.

- A substantial number of the constituent basal stones are of a size and mass that is in keeping with mechanical relocation and/or alignment;

- Some of the stones exhibit alteration (i.e. straight breakage) consistent with basic, rough dressing or facing (Photo 13);

- The northern end of the construct extends into and slightly across the adjacent mechanical cutting that parallels the road corridor (and is therefore seen to post-date that modern cultural feature) (Photos 14 & 15); and

- The north-south alignment of the ‘wall’ is in keeping with local portion or paddock boundaries, this impression being reinforced by the northern end’s direct alignment to (and to within 50cm of abutment with) a corner post in the road corridor fence line. This post marks a point of slight deviation in the fence and exhibits a prominent weathered nail and washer marker consistent with a survey mark (Photo 16).

The wall is, therefore, most likely a form of boundary/portion marker dating roughly to the mid twentieth century or later. The wall is not of heritage significance.
Plate 10 The stacked stone alignment, looking south.

Plate 11 The stacked stone alignment, looking west.
Plate 12 The stacked stone alignment. Note massive nature of boulders.

Plate 13 The stacked stone alignment. Note straight breakage on some boulders.
Plate 14 The wall extending across the mechanical cutting that parallels the road corridor.

Plate 15 The wall extending across the mechanical cutting that parallels the road corridor.
Plate 16 The fence post and a weathered nail and washer marker consistent with a survey mark.

Conclusion

No Aboriginal objects are known to be present in the subject area. Furthermore, the impacts areas are assessed to be generally highly disturbed and of low/negligible archaeological sensitivity and potential. Accordingly, an AHIP is not required for the proposed activity.

The Due Diligence Code of Practice (NSW DECCW 2010: 13) indicates that if the code has been followed and at any point it has been reasonably decided that an AHIP is not necessary, the proponent can proceed with caution.
5. LEGISLATION

The National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NPW Act) is the primary legislation for the protection of some aspects of Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW. One of the objectives of the NPW Act is:

… the conservation of objects, places or features (including biological diversity) of cultural value within the landscape, including but not limited to: (i) places, objects and features of significance to Aboriginal people … (s.2A(1)(b))

Part 6 of the NPW Act is administered by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (NSW OEH) and provides specific protection for Aboriginal objects and declared Aboriginal places by establishing offences of harm. Harm is defined to mean destroying, defacing or damaging an Aboriginal object or declared Aboriginal place, or moving an object from the land.

Section 86 of the NPW Act, *Harming or desecrating Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places*, sets out the penalties for harming an Aboriginal object. For an individual, the penalty for harming an object the person knows is an Aboriginal object, is imprisonment for up to 2 years and a significant fine (> $200,000).

Anyone proposing to carry out an activity that may harm an Aboriginal object or declared Aboriginal place must investigate, assess and report on harm that may be caused by the activity they propose. An Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) may be required if harm to Aboriginal objects and declared Aboriginal places is proposed. When this is the case, an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) is required to support the AHIP application. No Aboriginal objects are known to be present in the activity area and site is assessed to be of low archaeological sensitivity. Based on the current assessment it is concluded that an AHIP is not required.

Further archaeological investigations such as test excavations can be undertaken to provide a more informed assessment. Such work can be done within the provisions of the NSW DECCW (2010b) Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (the Code of Practice). Test Excavation undertaken in accordance with the Code of Practice allows harm to Aboriginal objects to occur (during excavation) without the need for an AHIP. Such work would normally only take place if the Due Diligence assessment concluded that further archaeological works were necessary. In this case, that conclusion has not been reached.

However, if the proponent did wish for great certainty in regard to the subsurface archaeological status of the property, test excavation could be undertaken in accordance with the Code of Practice.
6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Due Diligence Code of Practice (NSW DECCW 2010) - Step 4 of the Due Diligence Code of Practice (NSW DECCW 2010) indicates that where the assessment or visual inspection does not indicate that there are (or are likely to be) Aboriginal objects, the proponent can proceed with caution without an AHIP application. Section 5 provides further summary information of the legislative context relating to Aboriginal heritage in development contexts.

The assessment has concluded that based on environmental grounds and the extent of previous impacts, the activity area is not likely to be archaeologically sensitive. Accordingly, further archaeological assessment and an AHIP is not required.

However, if Aboriginal objects are found while undertaking the activity the proponent must stop work and notify the NSW OEH; an AHIP may need to be sought.

If human skeletal remains are found the proponent must stop work immediately, secure the area to prevent unauthorized access and contact the NSW Police and OEH.

The recommendations below are made on the basis of:

- A consideration of the relevant legislation (see Section 5 Statutory Information).
- The results of the investigation as documented in this report.
- Consideration of the nature of proposed impacts.

The following recommendations are made:

1. No further archaeological investigations are required in respect of the proposal. No areas were identified that could be characterised as places with a high probability of possessing subsurface Aboriginal objects with moderate or high potential conservation value. Accordingly, archaeological test excavation has not been undertaken in respect of the proposal as it could not be justified (cf. NSW DECCW 2010: 24).

2. No Aboriginal objects or places have been recorded in the subject area or identified during the field survey. An Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit is not required for the proposed works.

3. There are no Aboriginal cultural heritage constraints to the proposed works.

4. A European stone wall extends partially into the subject area. This feature is not of heritage significance and poses no constraint to the proposed works.
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### APPENDIX 1: AHIMS DATABASE SEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelf</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>SiteStatus</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteType</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01356</td>
<td>Willoby 1</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643235</td>
<td>5971312</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: -</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>0450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01351</td>
<td>Willoby inlet boat ramp</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643502</td>
<td>596550</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: -</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01352</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks South</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643572</td>
<td>5964755</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: -</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01327</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 21</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643539</td>
<td>5964962</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 2</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01328</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 20</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643680</td>
<td>5964969</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 1</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01329</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 19</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643710</td>
<td>5964959</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 7</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01313</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 1</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643716</td>
<td>5964920</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 5</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01330</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 18</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643724</td>
<td>5964917</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 2</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01314</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 2</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643752</td>
<td>5964917</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 5</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01351</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 17</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643746</td>
<td>5964957</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 5</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01315</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 3</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643752</td>
<td>5964921</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 5</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01316</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 4</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643755</td>
<td>5964923</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 3</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01302</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 16</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643763</td>
<td>5964995</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 1</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01317</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 5</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643766</td>
<td>5964922</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 6</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01318</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 6</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643775</td>
<td>5964927</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 13</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01333</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 15</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643784</td>
<td>5964990</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 1</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 - 01326</td>
<td>Curiosity Rocks 14</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>643804</td>
<td>5964994</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact: 1</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 02/04/2017 for Julia乙烯 for the following area at Datum: GDA, Zone: 55, Eastings: 641000 - 646000, Northings: 5947000 - 5947100 with a buffer of 50 meters. Additional Info / archaeological assessment: Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 45. This information is not guaranteed to be free from error or omission. Office of Environment and Heritage (NSW) and its employees disclaim liability for any act done or omission made on the information and consequences of such acts or omissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shell</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>Site Features</th>
<th>Site Types</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0325</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 13</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640094</td>
<td>596996</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0319</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 7</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640081</td>
<td>596992</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0320</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 9</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640094</td>
<td>596992</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 4</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0328</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 12</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640089</td>
<td>596990</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0321</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 9</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640070</td>
<td>596992</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 3</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0323</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 10</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640097</td>
<td>596993</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0323</td>
<td>Curiosity rocks 11</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640080</td>
<td>596994</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 3</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0150</td>
<td>Restriction applied. Please contact <a href="mailto:ahims@environment.nsw.gov.au">ahims@environment.nsw.gov.au</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4048950599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0013</td>
<td>Jindabyne</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640260</td>
<td>596770</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Ceremonial Ring (Stone or Earth): Axe Grinding, Grinding Groove: Axe, Groove, Bone, Carvings</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0175</td>
<td>WIPS</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>640260</td>
<td>596492</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0209</td>
<td>Highview Site 1</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>644461</td>
<td>596604</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 2</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0209</td>
<td>Highview Site 2</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>644460</td>
<td>596799</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 12</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0290</td>
<td>Highview Site 3</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>644760</td>
<td>596759</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 5</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0173</td>
<td>Berridale</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>645000</td>
<td>596800</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Burial Site</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0223</td>
<td>Jindabyne</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>645000</td>
<td>596800</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Carved or Scared)</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0213</td>
<td>CT9</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>645000</td>
<td>596100</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact 2</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 03/04/2017 for Julie Didden for the following area at Datum: GDA, Zone: SS, Eastings: 441000 – 464600, Northings: 5967000 – 5971000 with a Buffer of 50 meters. Additional Info: Archaeological Assessment, Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 40.

*This information is not guaranteed to be free from error or omission. Office of Environment and Heritage (NSW) and its employees disclaim liability for any action or omission made on the information and consequences of such action or omission.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recorders</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>True Easting</th>
<th>True Northing</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>Site Features</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0293</td>
<td>Highview Site 6</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640125</td>
<td>5987465</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0291</td>
<td>Highview Site 4</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640163</td>
<td>5987214</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 8</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0292</td>
<td>Highview Site 5</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640187</td>
<td>5987199</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 17</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0212</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640200</td>
<td>5987000</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 100</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0174</td>
<td>Thredbo Terrace 1</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640250</td>
<td>5988550</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0211</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640400</td>
<td>5984000</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 10</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0214</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640400</td>
<td>5987050</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 10</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0059</td>
<td>Jindabyne Timburr Off</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640500</td>
<td>5986800</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0216</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640500</td>
<td>5986900</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0220</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640525</td>
<td>5987315</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 2</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0221</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640600</td>
<td>5987275</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0002</td>
<td>Lake Jindabyne/JW10</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640600</td>
<td>5987600</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 10</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0215</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640625</td>
<td>5987050</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 6</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0217</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640500</td>
<td>5987150</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 4</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-1-0218</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>M. Matthew Barer</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>640500</td>
<td>5987460</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artifact: 20</td>
<td>Permits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 01/04/2017 for M. Matthew Barer for the following site: RMS Kosciuszko Road, Jindabyne. RMS Jindabyne. Rock House, Jindabyne.

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error or omission. Office of Environment and Heritage (NSW) and its employees disclaim liability for any act done or omission made on the information and consequences of such act or omission.
RMS DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST BOUND LANE BETWEEN BARRY WAY AND ALPINE WAY, JINDABYNE NSW

ABORIGINAL STAKEHOLDER CULTURAL HERITAGE SURVEY REPORT

JUNE 2017
Aboriginal stakeholder cultural heritage survey report

1. Purpose of this assessment

This assessment forms part of the Stage 2 assessment of the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) Procedure for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation and Investigation. Its purpose is to determine whether any features of Aboriginal cultural significance occur within the study area for this project, and whether they would be affected by the project. This assessment will be used to assist the RMS in determining whether further assessment and consultation is required for this project.

2. Project details: (provide the following information)

   a) Project title: RMS Development of the West Bound Lane Between Barry Way and Alpine Way, Jindabyne NSW

   b) Location of study area: The study area is approximately 1.6km of the Kosciuszko Road corridor located on the western edge of Jindabyne, NSW. The study area is on the southern side of the road.

   c) Name of Aboriginal site officer(s) completing this assessment: Ron Thomas with Glenn Willcox (Bega LALC CEO)

   d) Name of Aboriginal organisation(s) represented by this survey: Bega Local Aboriginal Land Council

   e) Name of site officer(s) who undertook site survey: Ron Thomas

   f) Date of survey: 6th of April 2017
3. Methodology:

a) Approximately how much of the total project area was surveyed (e.g. 10%-100%) and why? (E.g. Certain areas were heavily disturbed, properties were inaccessible, ground visibility was poor, difficult weather conditions, etc.)

The entire length of the corridor was surveyed with a particular focus on areas where exposed sub soils were present. Generally, the ground visibility was poor due to high grass cover.

b) How was the survey undertaken? (E.g. On foot, by car, individually, in groups, other? If other people were involved in the survey, please provide their names and name of their organisation, if relevant)

The survey was undertaken by a team of 3 people: Ron Thomas (Bega LALC), Tom Knight (NSW Archaeology) and Shaun Foster (RMS). The team walked the length of the study area corridor and focussed on less disturbed land forms and areas where ground exposure might have exposed artefacts etc.

4. Results:

a) Please provide a description of the area surveyed. Include a description of the total area covered, landforms, built areas, etc. Where appropriate, survey areas should be identified on a map/plan.

The survey area is described in the Due Diligence report that was compiled by the archaeologist undertaking the heritage assessment. The Bega LALC has nothing to add to what has been described in this report.
b) Were any of the following features identified during the survey? (Please tick as required)

- [ ] stone tools or flakes
- [ ] hearths
- [ ] shell middens
- [ ] scarred trees
- [ ] shelters
- [ ] art sites
- [ ] bora circles
- [ ] significant spiritual or social areas
- [ ] totems
- [ ] significant cultural landscape features
- [ ] other – please state:

If any of the above items were ticked, please provide a description including the location, quantity, size, condition and significance of the feature, if known. Where considered appropriate, this information should be identified on a map/plan).

No cultural features were identified during the survey field work.
c) Is it likely that any of the above features may be present in the study area, despite not being positively identified during the survey?  
No.  Yes.  (If yes, where are they considered likely to occur?)

No. Approximately 2 years' prior Ron Thomas, worked on a survey closer to the lake shore to the north of the current study area. Based on the findings of this previous survey undertaken Ron thought is possible but perhaps not likely that cultural material, namely substantial numbers of stone artefacts, could be present in the 600-700 meters of corridor to the immediate west of the township. It should be noted that the surrounding region has numerous highly significant cultural features, some now submerged under the waters of Lake Jindabyne.

d) If known, please provide a description of the natural resources used by Aboriginal people that are, or would have been, available within the study area. Please describe the significance of these resources to past and present Aboriginal communities.

Creeks and drainage lines would be the features that intersect with the study area that would have provided resources to Aboriginal people. Other creeks and rock outcrops in the broader region would have also provided substantial resources for Aboriginal people.
Please provide a description of past disturbances to the study area, if known, and how this may have affected Aboriginal cultural heritage features.

The section of the study area where a higher density of artefacts may have been present, namely in the vicinity of Widows Creek, has been heavily disturbed by previous land disturbance/road works. Collection of rocks for building the stone wall, particularly if done mechanically, may have disturbed cultural material.
5. **Conclusion:**

Is the project likely to affect any significant known or potential Aboriginal cultural heritage features as identified by the survey?

- Yes. (If yes, please describe the features and how they would be affected).
- No.
This assessment has been completed by:

Name: Ron Thomas and Glenn Willcox

Position title: Bega LALC Senior Sites Officer and Bega LALC CEO

Organisation name: Bega Local Aboriginal Land Council

On the following date: 1 June 2017
June 13, 2017

Shaun Foster
Roads and Maritime Services
Southern Region

Dear Shaun,

Stage 2 site assessment results for Kosciuszko Road, Barry Way to Alpine Way Upgrade, Jindabyne based on Stage 2 of the Procedure for Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation and investigation (the procedure).

The project, as indicated in the image attached was assessed as being unlikely to have an impact on Aboriginal cultural heritage.

The assessment is based on the following Stage 2 site assessment considerations:

- The project works are within the existing road corridor (disturbed zone).
- The project is unlikely to harm known Aboriginal objects or places (AHIMS sites).
- The AHIMS search did not indicate moderate to high concentrations of Aboriginal objects or places in the study area.
- The study area does contain landscape features that indicate the presence of Aboriginal objects, based on the Office of Environment and Heritage’s Due diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal objects in NSW and the Roads and Maritime Services’ procedure, however, the cultural heritage potential of the study area appears to be reduced due to past disturbances in the form of the construction of Barry Way (road corridor).
- There is an absence of sandstone rock outcrops likely to contain Aboriginal art.
- No items of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance were identified during the Stage 2 site survey conducted by New South Wales Archaeology and Bega Local Aboriginal Land Council on Thursday 6th April, 2017.

Your project may proceed in accordance with the environmental impact assessment process, as relevant, and all other relevant approvals.

If the scope of your project changes, you must contact me and your regional environmental staff to reassess any potential impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage.
RMS staff and/or contractors should be aware of the potential of Aboriginal objects (including skeletal remains) being discovered during the course of the project, if this occurs all works in the vicinity of the find must cease. Follow the steps outlined in the Roads and Maritime Services' *Unexpected Archaeological Finds Procedure*.

For further assistance in this matter and do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Lee Davison  
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Officer  
Southern Region