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Executive Summary

This assessment presents the results of an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) which has been prepared to support an Environmental Assessment for the proposed Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification) at the Moolarben Coal Complex (MCC), near Ulan in New South Wales. Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine coal production.

A total of ten (10) Aboriginal heritage sites were identified and/or inspected during the field survey for the ACHA, including one previously recorded Aboriginal site S1MC140 (AHIMS ID #36-3-0949). The new Aboriginal heritage sites identified during the survey include five (5) artefact scatters, three (3) isolated finds and one (1) rock shelter with Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD). The previously recorded Aboriginal heritage site which was reinspected during the surveys was an artefact scatter. Nine (9) of the recorded sites were assessed as having low scientific significance and one (1) site was assessed as having moderate scientific significance. Notwithstanding, consultation undertaken to date with the Aboriginal community indicates that all Aboriginal heritage sites at the MCC, known or otherwise, have high cultural significance.

Of the ten (10) sites, only two (2) are assessed as being potentially subject to impacts associated with the Modification, as the proposed disturbance area has been refined during the assessment process. This refinement has resulted in avoidance of disturbance to several sites identified during the field surveys, including the rock shelter with PAD.

The existing Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016) anticipates the type of impact described in this assessment, and as such provides a robust management framework within which to manage both the impacts and avoidance of impact to Aboriginal heritage sites and values.
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### Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal cultural heritage</td>
<td>The tangible (objects) and intangible (dreaming stories, legends and places) cultural practices and traditions associated with past and present day Aboriginal communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHA</td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHCRs</td>
<td>Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water [DECCW], 2010a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHIP</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHIMS</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHMP</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal object(s)</td>
<td>The legal definition for material for Aboriginal cultural heritage under the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>The scientific study of material traces of human history, particularly the relics and cultural remains of past human activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological deposit</td>
<td>A layer of soil material containing archaeological objects and/or human remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>An area that contains surface or sub-surface material evidence of past human activity in which material evidence (artefacts) of past activity is preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefact</td>
<td>An object made by human agency (e.g. stone artefacts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblage</td>
<td>A group of artefacts found in close association with one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any group of items designated for analysis that exist in spatial and/or vertical context – without any assumptions of chronological or spatial relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>A management strategy which protects Aboriginal sites within an impact area by avoiding them totally in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Before Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchment</td>
<td>The area from which a surface watercourse or a groundwater system derives its water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cm</td>
<td>centimetre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative impacts</td>
<td>Combination of individual effects of the same kind due to multiple actions from various sources over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>Commonwealth Heritage List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP1</td>
<td>Coal Handling Processing Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>Department of Environment and Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECCW</td>
<td>The Department of Conservation, Climate Change and Water, now the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>The processes involved in preparing the Study Area for the proposed activities that will have direct and/or indirect physical impact(s) in the one or more forms such as construction, excavation, demolition, clearing etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>Natural or artificial means for the interception and removal of surface or subsurface water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Ecologically sustainable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP&amp;A Act</td>
<td>NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flake</td>
<td>A piece of stone detached from a core by human activity, displaying a number of attributes such as bulb of percussion, striking platform, termination etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSV</td>
<td>Ground Surface Visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm</td>
<td>As defined in the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Influence or effect exerted by a development or other activity on the natural, built and community environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact area</td>
<td>An area that will be the subject to the particular impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In situ</td>
<td>Latin words meaning ‘on the spot, undisturbed’ - In archaeological terminology it is used for objects found in their original location of discard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated artefact / find</td>
<td>A single artefact found in an isolated context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km</td>
<td>kilometre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>km²</td>
<td>square kilometres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape unit</td>
<td>An area of common landform, and frequently with common geology, soils and vegetation types, occurring repeatedly at similar points in the landscape over a defined region - It is a constituent part of a land system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landform</td>
<td>Any one of the various features that make up the surface of the earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Mines Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCO</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>The procedures used to undertake an activity, e.g. archaeological investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m²</td>
<td>square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>To address the problem of conflict between land use and site conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Mining Lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLALC</td>
<td>Mudgee Local Aboriginal Land Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGATSIC</td>
<td>Murong Gialinga Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtpa</td>
<td>Million tonnes per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWCO</td>
<td>North-East Wiradjuri Company Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHL</td>
<td>National Heritage List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPW Act</td>
<td>NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPW Regulation</td>
<td>NSW National Parks and Wildlife Regulation 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC1</td>
<td>Open Cut Area 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC2</td>
<td>Open Cut Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC3</td>
<td>Open Cut Area 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC4</td>
<td>Open Cut Area 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>NSW Office of Environment and Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>Potential archaeological deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A location considered to have a potential for subsurface archaeological material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of a local Aboriginal land council, registered holders of Native Title, Aboriginal groups or other Aboriginal people who may have an interest in the Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNE</td>
<td>Register of the National Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>Run-of-mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHI</td>
<td>State Heritage Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHR</td>
<td>State Heritage Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>See ‘Archaeological site’ above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area</td>
<td>A given area that is the subject to the investigation (i.e. the Modification area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey coverage</td>
<td>A graphic and statistical representation of how much of a particular area was actually surveyed and therefore assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG1</td>
<td>Underground 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG2</td>
<td>Underground 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG4</td>
<td>Underground 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNTCAC</td>
<td>Warrabinga Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVVAC</td>
<td>Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Scope

The Moolarben Coal Complex (MCC) is located approximately 40 kilometres (km) north of Mudgee, in the Western Coalfields of New South Wales (NSW) (Figure 1). The MCC is situated within the Mid-Western Regional Council Local Government Area.

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) is the operator of the MCC on behalf of the Moolarben Joint Venture (Moolarben Coal Mines Pty Ltd [MCM], Sojitz Moolarben Resources Pty Ltd and a consortium of Korean power companies). MCO and MCM are wholly owned subsidiaries of Yancoal Australia Limited.

Mine operations at the MCC are currently approved until 31 December 2038 and would continue to be carried out in accordance with NSW Project Approval (05_0117) (Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1) as modified and NSW Project Approval (08_0135) (Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2) as modified.

Stage 1 at the MCC has been operating for several years and at full development will comprise three open cut mines (OC1, OC2 and OC3), a longwall underground mine (UG4), and mining related infrastructure (including coal processing and transport facilities). Stage 2 at the MCC has commenced and at full development will comprise one open cut mine (OC4), two longwall mines (UG1 and UG2) and mining related infrastructure (Figure 2).

The management of Aboriginal heritage at the MCC is undertaken in accordance with the currently approved Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016).

MCO has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. The Open Cut Optimisation Modification (herein referred to as the Modification) would require a modification to both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Moolarben Coal Project Approvals (05_0117 and 08_0135) under section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (EP&A Act). Details and proposed activities under the Modification are provided in Section 3 below.

Niche Environment and Heritage (Niche) has been commissioned by MCO to undertake an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) and archaeological assessment report to inform the Environmental Assessment being prepared for the Modification. The ACHA for the Modification will specifically assess those areas within the mining tenements of the MCC that have not been covered by previous Aboriginal cultural heritage assessments. The ACHA, in particular, will assess the components of the Modification that fall within Mining Leases (ML) 1606, 1628, 1691 and 1715 (Figures 3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3).

The objective of the ACHA is to provide an assessment of the potential for the Modification to impact Aboriginal objects and values and outline recommended management measures (where required), in accordance with current best practice and informed by the Aboriginal community.
Figure 1
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The ACHA has been prepared in accordance with (but not limited to) the following regulations and guidelines:

- *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (ACHCRs)* (NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water [DECCW], 2010a);

- *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (DECCW, 2010b);

- *Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales* (DECCW, 2010c);

- *NSW Minerals Industry Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Projection of Aboriginal Objects* (NSW Minerals Council, 2010);

- *Guide to Investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW* (NSW Office of Environment and Heritage [OEH], 2011);

- *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance* (Australia ICOMOS, 2013); and

- *NSW National Parks and Wildlife Regulation, 2009* (NPW Regulation).
2. Description of the Study Area

The Study Area is situated within the Central Tablelands region of NSW, south-east of Ulan, and comprises 10 separate study areas that altogether cover approximately 105 hectares (ha) (Figure 1 and Figure 2). Details of the separate areas are provided in Table 1 below and shown in Figure 3.

Table 1: Details of separate areas within the overall Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area ID</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>22.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>49.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>16.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area H</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area J</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>104.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major disturbance works associated with the Modification would be limited to the extent of the Study Area.

The Study Area stretches across various landscapes including flat-topped rocky ridges, steep upper slopes and more gently-sloping mid and lower slopes and alluvial flats and undulating country. The slopes are covered by re-growth forest vegetation, while the flats and undulating country has been cleared for pasture and heavily impacted by various agricultural activities (Figure 3). Portions of the Study Area have been previously subject to systematic Aboriginal heritage survey during previous assessments and management activities. A detailed description of this previous work is provided in Section 9. Of relevance, the proposed internal haul road between OC2 and OC4 had been entirely covered by previous surveys and consequently was not the subject of the field survey component.

The area subject to survey for this assessment was larger than the current Study Area. Detailed mine planning and refinement of the final proposed disturbance area has resulted in the avoidance of direct impact to some identified heritage sites.
3. Description of the Development Proposal

As described in Section 1.1, MCO has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase ROM coal production. The Modification would require modifications to both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Moolarben Coal Project Approvals (05_0117 and 08_0135) under section 75W of the EP&A Act. The main changes to the operations of the approved MCC associated with the Modification include:

- Increased disturbance limits around OC2 and OC3.
- Increased combined Stage 1 and Stage 2 open cut ROM limit from 13 million tonnes per annum (Mtpa) to 16 Mtpa.
- Increased Stage 1 open cut ROM coal production from 8 Mtpa to 10 Mtpa.
- Increased Stage 2 (OC4) ROM coal production from 12 Mtpa to 16 Mtpa.
- Increased Coal Handling Processing Plant (CHPP) washing limit from 13\(^1\) Mtpa to 16 Mtpa.
- Increased total production limit from 18 Mtpa to 22 Mtpa.
- Increased number of laden product trains:
  - 8 per day on average (from 7 per day); and
  - 11 per day at peak (from 9 per day).
- Minor changes to alignment of haul road from OC2 to OC3 and location of OC3 Mine Infrastructure Area, with associated change in disturbance.
- Additional internal road from OC2 to OC4 via Carrs Gap, with associated changes in disturbance.
- Additional rail loading infrastructure (e.g. second load out bin) for increased product coal rate.
- Additional coal bypass conveyor infrastructure, with associated disturbance.
- Change to controlled water release:
  - On-site water treatment facility to allow treatment of water.
  - Increase rate of controlled release.
- Ancillary infrastructure (e.g. access tracks, power, services, communications, explosives reload and pipelines).

The development of the Modification would occur as soon as practicable following all necessary approvals.

\(^1\) The MCC is approved to wash 13 Mtpa ROM coal, except in 2017 when up to 13.5 Mtpa ROM coal can be washed.
4. Investigators and Contributors

This investigation was conducted by Balazs Hansel (MA Arch), Senior Heritage Consultant at Niche who has 17 years of experience as a professional archaeologist and 8 years as a heritage consultant in NSW and overseen by Jamie Reeves, Director at Niche. In addition to the individuals listed in Section 6.2, fieldwork was conducted by Balazs Hansel (MA Arch) and Caitlin Marsh (BA Hons), Archaeologist at Niche who has 2 years’ experience as a professional archaeologist and heritage consultant. All GIS, mapping and cartography for the ACHA was undertaken by Dr. Ross Jenkins who has more than 25 years’ experience in GIS, remote sensing and the geosciences.

Consultation with the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) for the ACHA is being managed by MCO. All of the RAPs are invited to provide advice on Aboriginal cultural heritage values during this assessment, regardless of participation in the archaeological survey work.
5. Statutory Framework and Other Approvals

The NSW National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974 (NPW Act), administered by the OEH, provides statutory protection for Aboriginal objects and the management of Aboriginal Heritage in NSW. The NPW Act defines Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places:

*Aboriginal object means any deposit, object or material evidence (not being a handicraft made for sale) relating to the Aboriginal habitation of the area that comprises New South Wales, being habitation before or concurrent with (or both) the occupation of that area by persons of non-Aboriginal extraction, and includes Aboriginal remains.*

*Aboriginal place means any place declared to be an Aboriginal place under section 84.*

The OEH is responsible for the implementation of the Aboriginal heritage provisions of the NPW Act. The rationale behind the NPW Act is to prevent the unnecessary or unwanted destruction of Aboriginal objects and to protect and conserve objects where such action is considered not warranted (Kuskie 2013b). Where Approval or Development Consent is granted for a project or modification, section 89J of the EP&A Act provides that an AHIP under the NPW Act may not be required. In these circumstances, Aboriginal heritage would be managed in accordance with the Conditions of Consent stipulated by the modified Project Approval or Development Consent.
6. Consultation with the Aboriginal Community

In administering its statutory functions under Part 6 of the NPW Act, the OEH requires that proponents consult with Aboriginal people about the Aboriginal cultural heritage values (cultural significance) of Aboriginal objects and/or places within any given development area in accordance with clause 80C of the NPW Regulation.

The OEH maintains that the objective of consultation with Aboriginal communities about the cultural heritage values of Aboriginal objects and places is to ensure that Aboriginal people have the opportunity to improve ACHA outcomes by (DECCW 2010a):

- providing relevant information about the cultural significance and values of Aboriginal objects and/or places;
- influencing the design of the method to assess cultural and scientific significance of Aboriginal objects and/or places;
- actively contributing to the development of cultural heritage management options and recommendations for any Aboriginal objects and/or places within the proposed subject area; and
- commenting on draft assessment reports before they are submitted by the proponent to the OEH.

Consultation in the form outlined in the ACHCRs is a formal requirement where a proponent is aware that the development activity has the potential to impact Aboriginal objects or places. The OEH also recommends that these requirements be used when the certainty of impact is not yet established but a proponent has, through some formal development mechanism, been required to undertake a cultural heritage assessment to establish the potential impact their proposal may have on Aboriginal objects and places.

Consultation for the Modification has been undertaken generally in accordance with the ACHCRs as these meet the fundamental tenants of the 2004 policy Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants (NSW Department of Environment and Conservation [DEC] 2004), while meeting current industry standards for community consultation.

The ACHCRs outline a four stage consultation process that includes detailed step-wise guidance as to the aim of the stage, how it is to proceed and what actions are necessary for it to be successfully completed. The four stages are:

- Stage 1 – Notification of project proposal and registration of interest.
- Stage 2 – Presentation of information about the proposed project.
- Stage 3 – Gathering information about the cultural significance.
- Stage 4 – Review of draft cultural heritage assessment report.

The ACHCRs also outlines the roles and responsibilities of the OEH, Aboriginal parties including Local and State Aboriginal Land Councils, and proponents throughout the consultation process.

To meet the requirements of consultation it is expected that proponents will (DECCW 2010a):

- bring the RAPs or their nominated representatives together and be responsible for ensuring appropriate administration and management of the consultation process;
• consider the cultural perspectives, views, knowledge and advice of the RAPs involved in the consultation process in assessing cultural significance and developing any heritage management outcomes for Aboriginal objects(s) and/or places(s);

• provide evidence to the OEH of consultation by including information relevant to the cultural perspectives, views, knowledge and advice provided by the RAPs;

• accurately record and clearly articulate all consultation findings in the final cultural heritage assessment report; and

• provide copies of their cultural heritage assessment report to the RAPs who have been consulted.

The consultation process undertaken to seek active involvement from relevant Indigenous people followed the current NSW statutory guideline, namely, the ACHCRs. Section 1.3 of the ACHCRs describes the guiding principles of the document. The principles have been derived directly from the Principles section of the Australian Heritage Commission’s *Ask First: A guide to respecting Indigenous heritage places and values* (Australian Heritage Commission 2002). Both documents share the aim of creating a system where free prior informed advice can be sought from the Aboriginal community. The following sections outline the process and results of the consultation conducted during this assessment to ascertain and reflect the Aboriginal cultural heritage values of the Study Area.

6.1 Stage 1 – Project Notifications

This stage of the consultation process is used to identify any Aboriginal people or groups who may have a cultural interest in and/or possess cultural knowledge in relation to the Study Area. Aboriginal stakeholder groups with an interest in the MCC have previously been identified (in compliance with the ACHCRs) and MCO has maintained ongoing consultation and engagement with these groups since the time of their initial registration.

For the Modification, the existing Aboriginal stakeholder groups at the MCC were contacted and consulted with. These parties are considered to be the RAPs for the Modification and include the following:

• Aleisha Lonsdale;

• Craig McConnell;

• Mudgee Local Aboriginal Land Council (MLALC);

• Murong Gialinga Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Corporation (MGATSIC);

• North-East Wiradjuri Company Ltd (NEWCO);

• Warrabinga Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation (WNTCAC);

• Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation (WVVAC); and

• Warranha Ngumbaay.

A consultation log detailing all Aboriginal community consultation undertaken for the Modification is provided in Appendix 1. The Proposed Methodology for the assessment and a copy of relevant written correspondence sent to and received from the RAPs are provided in Appendix 4, Appendix 2 and Appendix 3, respectively.
6.2 Stages 2 and 3 – Presentation of Project Information and Gathering Information about cultural significance

Proposed Methodology

On 4 January 2017 all of the RAPs were provided with a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the ACHA for their review and comment in accordance with the ACHCRs (DECCW 2010a), with a minimum of 28 days allowed for RAPs to:

- suggest any protocols to be adopted into the information gathering process and assessment methodology; and
- highlight any other matters such as issues or areas of cultural significance that might affect, inform or refine the methodology.

In addition, all RAPs were invited to provide advice on Aboriginal cultural heritage values at all stages during the preparation of the assessment.

Comments on the Proposed Methodology were received from MGATSIC on 2 February 2017 and from Warrabinga NTCAC on 8 February 2017. A copy of the submissions are included in this report in Appendix 3. Responses to the submissions are provided in Table 2 below.

Proposed Methodology Addendum

During the review of the Proposed Methodology, and as a result of future detailed mining planning, an addendum to the Proposed Methodology was prepared to describe an additional portion of the Study Area. This addendum was distributed to all RAPs on 10 March 2017. A copy of this Proposed Methodology Addendum is provided in Appendix 4.
### Table 2: Responses to Comments Received on Proposed Methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, Registered Aboriginal Party</th>
<th>Comment on the Proposed Methodology</th>
<th>MCO Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 February 2017, MGATSIC</td>
<td>...we would like all areas to be throughly [sic] surveyed not just some areas.</td>
<td>As outlined in Section 11 of this report, the survey methodology undertaken for this ACHA allowed for all previously unsurveyed areas to be surveyed in their entirety. All areas subject to previous systematic survey were not re-inspected, however were originally subject to survey with representatives of the RAPs. The survey coverage and results achieved a robust understanding of the Study Area, and the results were consistent with expectations and the findings of previous assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 February 2017, MGATSIC</td>
<td>The Archaeologist &amp; Environment staff to listen to the Aboriginal Groups concerns and -connecting to country also their Cultural knowledge.</td>
<td>MCO acknowledges that Aboriginal heritage is of primary interest to the Aboriginal community, and that Aboriginal people have the right to be consulted and involved in relation to the management of their heritage. MCO recognises that the Aboriginal community has a paramount role in identifying cultural significance and cultural heritage values. As outlined in the Proposed Methodology, in the event that a RAP has sensitive or restricted public access information, MCO would manage this information (if provided by the Aboriginal community) in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Warrabinga has registered and been determined for upwards of 10 claims within the extent of our country. There is no reason to suggest that a determination on our whole of country claim will not be made in the near future.</td>
<td>Noted. As described in Section 6.1 of the ACHA, Warrabinga NTCAC has been consulted as a Registered Aboriginal Party for the Modification. As described in the approved Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan, MCO is committed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organization/Commentaire</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td><strong>Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd has provided no details in regards to who the Archaeologist will be for the project. Please provide details.</strong></td>
<td>MCO has engaged Niche to undertake the ACHA for the Modification. The specific investigators and contributors are described in detail in Section 4, including relevant qualifications and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td><strong>Warrabinga has experienced how Aboriginal archaeological consultants will treat our heritage differently. We would like to ensure that the Aboriginal archaeological consultant for the project will both consider our heritage appropriately, and will consider our concerns and comments appropriately.”</strong></td>
<td>MCO acknowledges that Aboriginal heritage is of primary interest to the Aboriginal community, and that Aboriginal people have the right to be consulted and involved in relation to the management of their heritage. MCO recognises that the Aboriginal community has a paramount role in identifying cultural significance and cultural heritage values. As outlined in the Proposed Methodology, in the event that a RAP has sensitive or restricted public access information, MCO would manage this information (if provided by the Aboriginal community) in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td><strong>“In point two on page 1 of the proposed methodology, it is stated that “minor increase in disturbance limits at OC2”; please clarify what you mean by minor increase. That is an arbitrary statement, and everyone has a different idea as to what constitutes at minor increase.”</strong></td>
<td>As described in Sections 2 and 3 of the ACHA, the Modification would include increased disturbance in the order of approximately 105 ha. This includes areas of disturbance associated with the increased limits around OC2 and OC3. Area calculations for each component of the Study Area are provided in Table 1 of the ACHA, and presented on Figures 3, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC  |  As a result of this “minor increase in disturbance limits at OC2” will the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be updated to reflect this increase?  |  Section 15 of the ACHA includes a recommendation that the HMP would be updated to include the extent of the Modification and the management of Aboriginal heritage values within it.  

8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC  |  In point three on page 1 of the proposed methodology, it is stated that “changes to alignment of the haul road from OC2 to OC3 and the location of the OC3 Mine Infrastructure Area”; please provide a map which addresses this point.  |  Figure 2 in the ACHA includes a map showing the general arrangement for the Modification. This map indicates the location of the proposed alignments of the haul road from OC2 to OC3, the location of the OC3 mine infrastructure area, the location of the extensions to the OC3 pit limits and associated out of pit waste dump, proposed OC2 to OC4 haul road, new site access to OC3 via Moolarben Road (excluded from the modification), and the indicative location of the coal handing infrastructure refinements. It is also noted that the indicative Study Area (including the above-described components) was presented on Figure 2 in the Proposed Methodology which was provided to the RAPs for review and comment. However, for clarity the labelling on this figure has been updated in the draft ACHA to more specifically identify the individual modification components.  

8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC  |  It is always appropriate when discussing changes to any infrastructure, haul roads, Aboriginal heritage, etc., to include a map of the specific area, especially when the Registered Aboriginal Parties are being requested to provide comment on the proposed methodology.  |  Noted. The Proposed Methodology included two separate figures, one providing the regional location/context for the Modification, and the other providing the indicative Study Area (along with the location of known Aboriginal heritage sites).  

8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC  |  In point seven on page 1 of the proposed methodology, “other minor ancillary infrastructure”; please provide a map which addresses this point.  |  As described in Section 3 of the draft ACHA, the Modification may also include the development of other minor ancillary infrastructure. Ancillary infrastructure includes, for example, the construction of...
and/or maintenance of access tracks (e.g. for the installation and/or maintenance of surface infrastructure), internal power infrastructure, minor water infrastructure such as pipelines and other associated minor infrastructure, plant, equipment and activities.

The location of the ancillary infrastructure would be determined as required over the life of the Modification, and hence this cannot be shown on figures or maps. Notwithstanding, the location and design of ancillary infrastructure would be flexible and would be located in an attempt to avoid known Aboriginal heritage sites and areas of cultural sensitivity as far as practicable.

In this regard, it is noted that Section 15 of the draft ACHA includes a recommendation for salvage in relation to any Aboriginal heritage sites that may be subject to impacts from ancillary infrastructure over the life of the Modification.

8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

At this point Warrabinga is of the opinion that an insufficient degree of information has been provided in order for us to make any comment on the proposed methodology; a high level map with an “indicative Study Area” is not appropriate. If you have a proposed location for specific infrastructure, you need to supply Warrabinga with this information.

Warrabinga requires that the maps as requested above, and that an amended proposed methodology for the project be issued.

Noted. Please refer to the responses above in relation to the provision of relevant mapping and figures in the ACHA.
If the provided proposed methodology has been prepared to comply with the Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents (DECCW, 2010), then the document needs to include the following details in order to be in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents (DECCW, 2010):

- Environmental context;
- Archaeological context;
- Indentify and list which Aboriginal sites will be potentially impacted by the proposed works; and,
- Previous disturbance to Aboriginal sites within the Study area.

The information above is all necessary in order for Warrabinga to provide a comment in regards to the proposed methodology being put forward by Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd.

Please do not point Warrabinga to review the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan in order to gather this information. It is the responsibility of the party who prepared the document to address Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents (DECCW, 2010) to provide this information in a single document in order for us to provide a response; it is not the responsibility of the Registered Aboriginal Parties to gather this information.

As described in Section 1 of the ACHA, the proposed methodology has been prepared in accordance with (but not limited to) the following regulations and guidelines:

- the ACHCRs (DECCW, 2010a);
- Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW, 2010b);
- Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW, 2010c);
- NSW Minerals Industry Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Projection of Aboriginal Objects (NSW Minerals Council, 2010);
- Guide to Investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW (NSW Office of Environment and Heritage [OEH], 2011);
- The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Australia ICOMOS, 2013); and
- the NPW Regulation.

Sections 4.2 and 4.3 outline key requirements in relation to the presentation of project information and community consultation in relation to cultural significance. These requirements are in relation to project-specific detail and proposed assessment methodology, and it is noted that these sections do not
require the requested information to be provided in the Proposed Methodology.

MCO notes that the requested information is provided in the ACHA in Section 8 (landscape/environmental context), Section 9 (Aboriginal archaeological context), Section 12 (survey results and discussions), and Section 14 (impact assessment).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comment and Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 February 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>It should be noted that this may not be Warrabinga’s last response in regards to the documentation provided to-date by Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd; Warrabinga will provide additional responses until such time as we feel that our concerns have been satisfactorily addressed. Warrabinga would like to remind Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd that the project should not proceed any further until all comments and concerns raised by the RAPs have been addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field Surveys

The field surveys for the Modification were undertaken in two campaigns. The first campaign was from 21 February to 24 February 2017, with the second campaign on 14 March and 15 March 2017. Table 3 provides a list of the representatives from the RAPs that attended the field survey for the assessment. Engagement for the field surveys was undertaken consistent with the requirements of the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016).

Table 3: List of representatives from the RAPs that participated in the field component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal Stakeholder</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Day(s) of attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEWCO</td>
<td>Kelli Menzies</td>
<td>21-24.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaen Morgan</td>
<td>14-15.3.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLALC</td>
<td>Debbie Foley</td>
<td>24.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Foley</td>
<td>23.2.2017, 14-15.3.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tammy Peterson</td>
<td>21-22.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGATSIC</td>
<td>Steven Flick</td>
<td>21-22.2.2017, 14-15.3.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Foley</td>
<td>23.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shannon Foley</td>
<td>24.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNTCAC</td>
<td>Shaen Morgan</td>
<td>21-24.2.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coral Williams</td>
<td>15.3.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVVAC</td>
<td>Invited, but not in attendance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the Aboriginal heritage survey the following comments were made by the RAPs attending the surveys:

- The entire Study Area needs to be surveyed not just sections of the recent Modification proposal.
- The Study Area is important and culturally significant to the local Aboriginal people.

The above comments are acknowledged by MCO, and have been addressed in the above responses to the comments received on the Proposed Methodology.

6.3 Stage 4 – Review of Draft Report

In accordance with the ACHCRs, a draft of this ACHA was provided to all RAPs listed in Section 6.1 for review and comment on 15 May 2017. A minimum of 28 days were provided to each of the RAPs, with feedback requested by 13 June 2017. A copy of the final ACHA report will be made available to all RAPs during the public exhibition period for the Environmental Assessment. During this exhibition period all RAPs will have the opportunity to review and provide additional comment on the final ACHA report.

As at 16 June 2017, written submissions on the draft ACHA had been received from the following RAPs in accordance with the ACHCRs:

- Warrabinga NTCAC – 13 June 2017.
- MGATSIC – 14 June 2017.
Copies of the submissions are included in this report in Appendix 3. Responses to each submission are provided in Table 4 below.
### Table 4: Responses to Comments Received on Draft ACHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, Registered Aboriginal Party</th>
<th>Comment on the Draft ACHA</th>
<th>MCO Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td><em>First off, we would like to make it clear that Niche should not finalise the DRAFT Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification, May 2017 until they have received confirmation from Warrabinga that we are of the opinion that all out concerns have been addressed. We would also like to clarify that all our concerns must be addressed in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report.</em></td>
<td>The comments provided by Warrabinga NTCAC have been included in full in Appendix 3 and considered in detail in this table. Detailed consideration of the comments provided by all RAPs has been undertaken, including updates and/or clarification in the report where required. A copy of the final ACHA report will be made available to all RAPs during the public exhibition period for the Environmental Assessment. During this exhibition period all RAPs will have the opportunity to review and provide additional comment on the final ACHA report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td><em>Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Warrabinga notes that the comments we provided on the 7th February 2017 for the Proposed Methodology are not included in the ACHAR. The comments issued by Warrabinga to Moolarben (as directed) were within the 28 day comment period, and as such must be addressed within the DRAFT ACHAR. Can Moolarben please confirm that they are in receipt of the comments issued by Warrabinga?</em>&lt;br&gt;Attached to this letter is a copy of the comments issued by Warrabinga on the 7th February 2017. Warrabinga expects that our comments and/or queries raised in response to the Proposed Methodology are addressed in an amended DRAFT ACHAR.</td>
<td>Comments received during the review period for the Proposed Methodology are considered and documented in Section 6.2 of the ACHA. Note that a copy of the submissions are also provided in Appendix 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td><em>Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Warrabinga notes that not all the extents of the Study Areas are visible in Figure 3 has been updated to include contour lines and zoomed-in copies are provided as Figure 3.1, Figure 3.2</em></td>
<td>Figure 3 has been updated to include contour lines and zoomed-in copies are provided as Figure 3.1, Figure 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 (i.e. K, I, E, C, D and B). Please provide “zoomed-in” maps of Study Areas K, I, E, C, D and B for Figure 3. Please ensure that the “zoomed-in” maps are replicated for all the other maps in the DRAFT ACHAR. This is not an unreasonable request, especially when Warrabinga and the other Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) for the project do not have access to the spatial data for the project, and we are being asked to provide commentary on the cultural significance within the Study Area.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

On page ii of the Executive Summary, it is stated that a total of 10 Aboriginal sites have been identified; however upon review of Figure 6, Warrabinga noted that the colour used to demarcate “Isolated Finds” blended in with the colour used to identify the “Current Survey Coverage”. Please clarify why the exact same colour was chosen to demarcate to item that where overlaid on each other.

Updated, zoomed-in copies of Figure 6 (AHIMS sites) are provided as Figure 6.1, Figure 6.2 and Figure 6.3.

Updated, zoomed-in copies of Figure 7 (Survey Results) are provided as Figure 7.1, Figure 7.2 and Figure 7.3

Given the intent of the remaining figures (1 and 4), similar insets have not been applied. This is on the basis that these figures were prepared to be viewed at an appropriate scale to determine the relationships between the Study Area, the boarder location and the hydrology and soils of the Study Area.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

Upon review of Figure 6, Warrabinga noted that the current survey coverage is larger than the Study Area. Please explain why this is the case. Please clarify whether the entire current survey coverage area is discussed and assessed within this ACHAR, or whether the ACHAR is limited to the current Study Area.

As described in Section 14.1 of the ACHA, the Study Area was larger than the final proposed disturbance area (particularly in the north [i.e. in the areas associated with the coal handling infrastructure requirements]). Detailed mine planning and refinement of the final proposed disturbance area has resulted in the avoidance of direct impact to some identified heritage sites.
The survey coverage has been shown on Figure 7 for completeness, to show an accurate representation of survey coverage at the MCC to date. However, we note that the assessment provided in this ACHA report considers only those portions of the Study Area (i.e. those portions bounded by the red polygons on Figure 7).

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

Please clarify whether the nine (9) newly identified Aboriginal sites have been registered with AHIMS. Please provide copies of the AHIMS numbers and site cards for each of the identified Aboriginal sites in the ACHAR.

All newly recorded Aboriginal sites have been registered with AHIMS and relevant AHIMS numbers have been updated in the report.

Copies of site cards are available via the AHIMS register website, to which Warrabinga NTCAC (and all RAPs) has access.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

In Table 11 and 12, Niche provides an estimated extent of each Aboriginal site; however, no map is provided detailing the extent of the Aboriginal sites. Please provide a map detailing the estimated extent of each of the Aboriginal sites. If Niche is unable to provide a map of each of the estimated extents, please provide details on the estimated extent (i.e. square, circle, rectangle buffer).

Table 13 provides details of the identified Aboriginal heritage sites within the Modification area, including an estimate of the extent of each site (e.g. 5 m by 10 m etc). Updated, zoomed-in copies of Figure 7 (Survey Results) are provided as Figure 7.1, Figure 7.2 and Figure 7.3 to show the mapped extents of the sites identified within the Study Area.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Niche does not include a map that details the location of the construction footprint in relation to the identified Aboriginal sites. This is necessary in order for Warrabinga to understand how the proposed construction works will impact identified Aboriginal sites. Please provide a map that details the estimated extent of each of the sites, overlaid with the proposed construction footprint. Please ensure that close-up

As described in Section 2, the Study Area for the Modification is comprised of 10 separate areas comprising approximately 105 ha. As detailed in Section 14.1, for the purposes of this assessment, the two (2) Aboriginal heritage sites that occur within the proposed disturbance area are considered to have the potential to be directly impacted by the proposed mining activities, which will involve the excavation of soil profiles and will result in the complete removal of
Maps focused on the identified Aboriginal sites are included in the DRAFT ACHAR. Other sites have the potential to be impacted by indirect impact due to their proximal location to the disturbance boundary.

For clarity, text has been added to Section 2 of the ACHA as follows: "Major disturbance works associated with the Modification would be limited to the extent of the Study Area”.

Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Niche provides no comment on whether areas of Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) (that are not identified in relation to recorded Aboriginal sites) are within the current Study Area. Please clarify whether areas of PAD are present within the current Study Area, and if so, whether the PAD will be impacted by the proposed construction works.

No areas of PAD (not associated with recorded Aboriginal heritage sites) were identified within the Study Area.

As described in Section 15, should any previously unrecorded Aboriginal heritage sites be identified during the Modification they should be managed consistent with the requirements of the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan.

In Section 12.3, the nine (9) newly identified Aboriginal sites have been identified or assessed as having ‘low scientific significance’; what is Niche is using as the definition of scientific significance? Please clarify how scientific significance differs to archaeological significance. It is best to keep language and phraseology consistent and fluid throughout a document to save any confusion or misunderstanding.

A detailed description of the significance assessment is provided in Section 13.1, including a detailed discussion in Section 13.1.2 of the differentiation between low, moderate and high significance. In this assessment, archaeological and scientific significance represent the same characterisation and hence the term ‘scientific significance’ has been used throughout the report.

There is a similar confusion on page 40, paragraph two (2) which states that a recorded site was assessed as having low significance. Please clarify if this significance refers to the cultural heritage significance, the archaeological significance, or the overall significance of

The text in Section 9.4 has been updated to clarify that this statement is referring to ‘scientific’ significance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to point 1 on page 16, it is stated that “increased disturbance limits around OC2 and OC3”; please clarify what you mean by increased disturbance limits. Niche has provided no details about what this statement refers to.</td>
<td>As described in Sections 2 and 3 of the ACHA, the Modification would include increased disturbance in the order of approximately 105 ha. This includes areas of disturbance associated with the increased limits around OC2 and OC3. Area calculations for each component of the Study Area are provided in Table 1 of the ACHA, and presented on Figure 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Please clarify whether the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be updated to reflect the increased disturbance limits around OC2 and OC3.</td>
<td>Section 15 includes a recommendation that the HMP would be updated to include the extent of the additional disturbance for the Modification and the management of Aboriginal heritage values within it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to point 2 on page 16, it is stated that “OC2 final landforms to retain highwalls/lowwalls and additional dams in the final landform”; please clarify what Niche means by this.</td>
<td>MCO is no longer seeking approval for this change as part of the Modification. This description has been removed from Section 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to point 9 on page 16, it is stated that “minor changes to alignment of haul road from OC2 to OC3 and location of OC3 Mine Infrastructure Area, with associated change in disturbance”; please provide a map which addresses this point. Please provide a map to show how the changes to the alignment of the haul road will differ from the original alignment of the haul road. Please clarify whether the minor changes to the alignment of haul road was surveyed as part of the current assessment.</td>
<td>Figure 2 in the draft ACHA includes a map showing the general arrangement for the Modification. This map indicates the location of the proposed alignments of the haul road from OC2 to OC3 and the location of the OC3 mine infrastructure area. The location of the approved haul road from OC2 to OC3 is also shown on Figure 2. The new alignment is proposed to be constructed within the extent of the study area. The study area has been subject to systematic survey and assessment, which is described in detail in Sections 11 and 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is always appropriate when discussing changes to any infrastructure, haul roads, Aboriginal heritage, etc., to include a map of the specific area, especially when the RAPs are being requested to provide comment on the proposed methodology.</td>
<td>Noted. The ACHA includes six separate figures including one providing the regional location/context for the Modification, and others providing the indicative Study Area (along with the location of known Aboriginal heritage sites, survey coverage, AHIMS sites, landforms etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regards to point 10 on page 16, it is stated that “additional internal road from OC2 to OC4 via Carrs Gap”; please provide a map which addresses this point. Please clarify whether the proposed alignment for the additional internal road was surveyed as part of the current assessment.</td>
<td>The location of the OC2 to OC4 haul road is labelled and presented on Figure 2. This area, and forms area “I” of the Study Area. The Study Area has been subject to systematic survey and assessment, which is described in detail in Sections 9, 11 and 12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regards to point 11 on page 16, it is stated that “additional rail loading infrastructure (e.g. second load out bin) for increased product coal rate”</td>
<td>Noted. Any additional rail loading infrastructure will be located within previously disturbed or approval disturbance areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the proposed methodology issued in January 2017, it was stated in point 6 on page 1 that “new site access to OC3 via Moolarben Road, and associated widening of the existing Moolarben Road”; please clarify whether this new site access will still be constructed.</td>
<td>MCO is no longer seeking approval for this change as part of the Modification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response by Niche to Murong Gialinga Aboriginal &amp; Torres Strait Islander Corporation under section 6.2, page 21, needs more information. The statement is as follows “… the level of survey undertaken was considered sufficient to achieve the goals of the assessment”, please address who considered it sufficient, and by what means? It should not be necessary for Warrabinga to point out to Niche that predictive models are ever evolving, and</td>
<td>As described in Section 9.4, approximately 10% of the Study Area had been subject to previous systematic survey prior to commencement of the surveys for this assessment. Due to the relatively small and accessible size of the Study Area, and due to the fact that some areas had been subject to previous survey, a detailed landscape or landform sampling methodology was not applied. Rather, as discussed in Section 11.1, the approach taken was to use a high intensity transect survey across the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that just because the predictive model indicates that an area does not need additional survey, does not mean that additional survey isn’t required.

It should also be noted, that unless Niche has surveyed 100% of the entire Study Area, then it is always appropriate to resurvey an area, especially when there have been long periods (i.e. 6 to 12 months) between surveys; because Aboriginal sites that were previously unidentified may have become exposed and in suitable environs to be identified.

Study Area including all landforms. This allows for an inspection of ridge slopes and tops for closed sites such as rock shelters and overhangs, as well as a broad inspection for open sites. On this basis, the survey undertaken is considered by Niche to be sufficient for the purposes of this assessment.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

In regards to paragraph 2 of Section 7.2.2, Warrabinga acknowledges that according to the Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan, 2012 that there are no Aboriginal heritage items located “specifically within the study area”; however, Warrabinga requires clarity as to whether the LEP identifies Aboriginal sites outside the Study Area, but within close proximity to the Study Area. Please provide articulated information in regards to this.

As described in Section 7.2.2, a search of the Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan, 2012 was undertaken for this assessment. No Aboriginal heritage items listed in the Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan, 2012 were located within the Study Area or immediate surrounds. For clarity, the text in Section 7.2.2 has been updated to state this.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

In regards to Section 8.2, Niche makes general high-level references to topography and landforms within the Study Area; however, no maps are provided in order to support Niche’s statements; if Niche intends to discuss the topography and landforms of the Study Area then it is appropriate that a map be included in order for the RAPs to understand Please include a map of the topography and landforms.

Topography within the Study Area and surrounds is presented on Figures 6 and 7, while aerial bases have been presented on 3, 4, 6 and 7 to allow differentiation between cleared and vegetated land. Soils and hydrology mapping has also been presented on Figure 4.

For clarity, Figure 3 has been updated to also include contours. In addition, all new copies of Figure 3, 6 and 7 include contour lines.

13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC

In regards to Section 8.3, Niche does not provide any references for the geology. Please provide references.

Reference has been provided in Section 8.3 in relation to geological information of the Study Area. Geology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Warrabinga NTCAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</strong></td>
<td>Niche does not provide a geology map for the Study Area; if Niche intends to discuss the geology of the Study Area then it is appropriate that a map be included in order for the RAPs to understand. Please include a map of the geology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In regards to Section 8.6, Niche is extremely scant on providing information about the ecology/resource exploitation of the Study Area; Warrabinga would expect that based on the number of assessments (both archaeological and ecological) that have been undertaken within the extent of Moolarben Coal, that more information would be available in order for Niche to provide a more detailed assessment of the ecology. Please provide additional information in regards to the ecology/resource exploitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</strong></td>
<td>In regards to Section 8.7, Niche makes general high-level references to past land use and disturbance within the Study Area; however, no maps are provided in order to support Niche’s statements; if Niche intends to discuss the past land use and disturbance of the Study Area then it is appropriate that a map be included in order for the RAPs to understand. Niche references Figure 3 and Figure 4 in Section 8.7; however, neither map is relevant, nor provides any information to support Niche’s argument. Please include a map of the land disturbance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to paragraph 1 on page 29, Niche states that “the Study Area most likely lies within...”; Warrabinga does not agree with the use of ambiguous terminology. Please be clear about where the Study Area lies; Niche has reviewed Pearson (1981) as part of preparing the DRAFT ACHAR, so there is no reason to be ambiguous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to Section 9.2, Warrabinga requires clarity as to whether Niche undertook a search of the AHIMS database, or whether they relied purely on the Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database. As Niche is aware AHIMS is managed by the OEH, and a requirement of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974 that all recorded Aboriginal sites must be registered with AHIMS; however, there is no legislation that requires Moolarben to register all recorded Aboriginal sites on their Aboriginal Heritage Database, and as such is not appropriate to solely rely on a search of the Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database. Please provide evidence that an AHIMS search was undertaken for the Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to paragraph 2 on page 30, Niche states that “most of the sites are within 200 m of ephemeral drainage lines, which is probably a result of the sporadic presence of water”; please clarify what Niche means by ephemeral. Warrabinga understands ephemeral to mean 1st and/or 2nd order of streams, as identified under the Strahler system of stream orders, and/or seasonal watercourses. Please clarify what Niche means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Can Niche clarify what they by “most of the sites are within 200 m of ephemeral drainage lines”, does this mean that the majority of identified Aboriginal sites are within 200m. Please clarify whether this statement is limited to the Aboriginal sites present within the Study Area, or within the entire Moolarben Coal complex. Please provide a percentage of Aboriginal sites within 200m of ephemeral drainage lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to the last paragraph of Section 9.3, Niche states that the predictive model proposed by Pearson has been revised and refined; however, Niche does not provide expand and/or provide details on how the predictive model has been revised and refined. It should be pointed out that Warrabinga does not have the appropriate background information to understand what parts of Pearson’s predictive model have been revised. Please clarify whether the results from the current assessment are compared against the revised predictive model. Please clarify whether the revision of Pearson’s predictive model differs from the predictive model proposed by Kuskie? Please provide details of the data used to support the revision of Pearson’s model?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>On page 41, Niche provides a high-level discussion of the previous assessments within Moolarben; however, no details are provided in regards to how the investigation areas discussed relate to the Study Area. Please provide a map detailing the extent of the previous investigation areas within Moolarben in relation to the Study Area; an understanding of how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to the landscape photographs, no details are provided in regards to direction that the photograph was taken. Please detail the direction of the photographs provided in the DRAFT ACHAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>The measuring tapes used in Plates 4, 5, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 do not provide any indication of the length or distance that is being measured or shown in the photograph. This being the case, measurements should be provided. The use of a tape measure in these photos is pointless, a range pole or a mini rod would be far more appropriate. The increments marked on the measuring tape are not visible and cannot be read. We would expect going forward in the future, a range pole or a mini rod would be used to reduce this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to Plate 9, Warrabinga has several of issues with the label of this particular plate: 1. Does not state whether the artefact was recorded at one of the 10 Aboriginal sites within the Study Area; 2. Example of detailed-photo of located archaeological object. This suggests that Warrabinga, as an Aboriginal organisation, is unable to identify an artefact; and, 3. Insensitive statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to S1MC140, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S1MC140 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 3 artefacts were identified. Please update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to S2MC400, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC400 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 2 artefacts were identified. Please update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to S2MC401, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC401 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 10 artefacts were identified. Please update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to S2MC404, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC404 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 11 artefacts were identified. Please update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017</td>
<td>In regards to S2MC405, Warrabinga questions whether Niche took photographs of the artefacts identified at the Aboriginal site, considering there is an absence of artefact photographs for S2MC405. Please clarify whether Niche took photographs of the artefacts from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>In regards to S2MC407, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC407 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 2 artefacts were identified. Please update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Section 12.1 provides information on the survey undertaken as part of the current assessment; however, no information was provided on what the distances between participants was adjusted too when they moved to areas with higher ground visibility. Please provide maps of transects covered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Further, no impacts to this site are proposed as a result of the Modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Paragraph 1 of Section 14.1, mentions that the Study Area was significantly larger, than the proposed disturbance area; please provide details and a map to show what Niche means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Paragraph 2 of Section 14.2, states that “other sites have the potential to be impacted by indirect impact due to their proximal location to the disturbance boundary”; please clarify what Niche means by this. Please clarify which Aboriginal sites will be indirectly impacted by the works. Please clarify whether indirect impacts are limited to the Aboriginal sites within the Study Area, or will Aboriginal sites outside the Study Area be indirectly impacted. Please provide a map to show the Aboriginal sites that are likely to be indirectly impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>All Aboriginal sites that will be directly and/or indirectly impacted by the proposed construction works must be All sites recorded within the Study Area (and all sites identified in the immediate surrounds which may be subject to indirect impacts) have been subject to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>The last few points that Warrabinga would like to draw you attention to are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The NSW DECCW Aboriginal Cultural Heritage: Standards and guidelines kit (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1997) is now outdated, please update your documents accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Warrabinga would like confirmation on who, in reference to page 57, Section 13.2, concluded that there were no further areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage value identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

subject to archival/baseline recording, prior to impacts occurring.

On this basis, further detailed recorded is not considered warranted prior to salvage (for relevant sites). It is noted the approved Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan includes detailed procedures for site recording prior to salvage, which will be followed for the Modification.
areas of particular cultural significance (including within Study Area) MCO would review and update (where necessary) the management of these areas/sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under section 15 on page 61, please provide information on how the new sites are addressed in the management plan? Also, please include relevant sections on the management plan.</td>
<td>As described in Section 15, the HMP would be updated to include the extent of the Modification and the management of Aboriginal heritage values in it. This includes the salvage of sites S1MC140, S2MC402, S2MC403 and S2MC404, consistent with the requirements of the approved Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As all Aboriginal heritage is considered sensitive by Warrabinga, we are of the opinion that two (2) versions of the ACHAR should be prepared: one for public exhibition (if necessary), which has all references to the location of Aboriginal cultural heritage and comments provided by the Aboriginal community redacted, and one version of the report for assessment by the Consent Authority.</td>
<td>Noted. An ACHA is required to be included in support of the EA. This ACHA is required to be compliant with relevant guidelines and the NPW Regulation, and hence need to include a minimum amount of information (including the location of the sites). It is also noted the locations of the sites are publicly available via the AHIMS Register, in previous assessments and the approved Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13 June 2017, Warrabinga NTCAC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warrabinga is of the opinion that insufficient information has been presented in order for us to provide comment on the proposed development in relation to Aboriginal heritage, as well as the fact that Moolarben Coal has not confirmed the likely nature and extent of the Aboriginal sites present within the Project Area. Once the requested information has been provided in an updated ACHAR, we will be able to provide a comment on the proposed development. It should be noted that this may not be Warrabinga’s last response in regards to the documentation provided</td>
<td>MCO has provided responses (in Section 6 and this table) to all of the comments received to date. A copy of the final ACHA report will be made available to all RAPs during the public exhibition period for the Environmental Assessment. During this exhibition period all RAPs will have the opportunity to review and provide additional comment on the final ACHA report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to-date by Moolarben Coal; Warrabinga will provide additional responses until such time as we feel that our concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.

Warrabinga would like to remind Moolarben Coal that the DRAFT Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment should not be finalised until all comments and concerns raised by the RAPs have been addressed.

Warrabinga would like to remind Moolarben Coal that the project should not proceed any further until all comments and concerns raised by the RAPs have been addressed, including previous correspondence that has not yet been addressed.

14 June 2017, MGATSIC

...after discussing this with our community our reply is that our comments are not heard or dealt with.
7. Heritage Register Searches

7.1 Commonwealth Registers

Under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, 1999, two mechanisms have been created for the protection of heritage places of National or Commonwealth significance (http://www.environment.gov.au/heritage/places/national/index.html) – the National Heritage List (NHL) and the Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL). The NHL provides protection to places of cultural significance to the nation of Australia, while the CHL comprises natural, Aboriginal and historic heritage places owned and controlled by the Commonwealth. There are no management constraints associated with listing on the Register of the National Estate (RNE) unless the listed place is owned by a Commonwealth agency.

A search of the online Australian Heritage Database, which includes items from the CHL and RNE was conducted on 23 March 2017. Search terms used were: Mid-Western Regional, Ulan and Wollar. No heritage items were identified within or in close proximity to the Study Area.

7.2 State Registers

7.2.1 State Heritage Register

The State Heritage Register (SHR) holds items that have been assessed as being of State Significance to NSW. The State Heritage Inventory (SHI) contains items that are listed on Local Environmental Plans and/or on a State Government Agency’s section 170 register (OEH website – www.heritage.nsw.gov.au/index.html). An assessment of heritage significance is required for items greater than 50 years in age. Items appearing on either the SHR or SHI have been granted a defined level of statutory protection under NSW legislation.

Searches of the SHR and SHI were completed on 23 March 2017. No heritage items were listed in the Study Area.

7.2.2 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act Registers (EP&A Act)

Each Local Government Area is required to create and maintain a Local Environmental Plan that identifies and conserves Aboriginal and Historic heritage items. These items are protected under the EP&A Act and the NSW Heritage Act, 1977.

A search of the Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan, 2012 was undertaken on 23 March 2017. There are no Aboriginal heritage items listed in the Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan, 2012 that are located specifically within the Study Area or immediate surrounds.

7.2.3 National Parks and Wildlife Act Registers (AHIMS)

An extensive search of the Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) was conducted on 15 May 2017 (AHIMS ID #281205 and #281212; Appendix 5) for the area surrounding the Study Area. The search identified a total of 167 Aboriginal sites, including one (1) site located within the subject area. The Aboriginal sites were recorded during the numerous environmental assessments of the Moolarben, Ulan and Wilpinjong Coal Mines, indicating intensive levels of previous archaeological assessment. Each of the three mines maintain databases of the number and nature of Aboriginal sites in their project boundaries and the extent of previous archaeological survey.
8. Landscape Context

8.1 Overview
Consideration of the landscape is essential to the definition and interpretation of past Aboriginal land use across a landscape, and is a requirement of any Aboriginal archaeological and cultural heritage investigation (DECCW 2010a: 8). The landscape may provide clues as to those areas of land that may have been more intensively used by Aboriginal people in the past due to the presence of resources such as water, stone, plants and animals and other raw materials or landscape features associated with sustenance, shelter, tool manufacture and cultural activities. The landscape provides the context within which the material remains of past Aboriginal occupation may be preserved and detected due to the movement of soil through geomorphic processes such as erosion or its removal from the landscape through past land use and disturbance (DECCW 2010a: 8). By considering these factors, an Aboriginal cultural heritage investigation may develop a sampling strategy for identifying any tangible Aboriginal heritage values within the Study Area. However, this assessment aimed to achieve 100% coverage of the Study Area and consequently no sampling strategy was needed for the survey component.

8.2 Topography
The Study Area is situated within the Central Tablelands region of NSW, south-east of Ulan, and comprises 10 separate sections that altogether cover approximately 105 ha (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The Study Area is generally comprised of flat-topped rocky ridges, steep upper slopes and more gently-sloping mid and lower slopes, alluvial flats and undulating country. The slopes are covered by re-growth forest vegetation, while the flats and undulating landforms have been historically cleared for pasture and heavily impacted by various agricultural activities (Figure 3) (Plate 1 to Plate 4). The highest elevation within the Study Area is approximately at 590 metres (m) above sea level, while the lowest point is approximately 430 m above sea level.

8.3 Geology
The Study Area is situated in the north-western part of the Sydney Basin and is characterised by Late Permian age Illawarra Coal Measures (mudstone, claystone, coal (including the Ulan Seam mined by MCO), torbanite and rhyolitic tuff) which is overlain by the Narrabeen Group (sandstone, conglomeratic sandstone, chert, shale coal and torbanite) (Dubbo 1:250k Geological Series Sheet SI 55-4).

There are no known raw material sources for the manufacture of stone artefacts in the Study Area, though the geological formations of Illawarra Coal Measures and Narrabeen Group sandstones are known to have provided exploitable quartz conglomerates across the region. Outcrops and exposed veins of tuff and cherts within the Illawarra Coal Measures and Narrabeen Group sandstone may also have provided raw materials for the manufacture of stone artefacts. Geology mapping for the MCO (including the Study Area) is provided in Figure 5.

8.4 Soils
There are three soil landscapes within the Study Area: the Ulan, Lees Pinch and Bald Hill Soil Landscapes (Murphy and Lawrie 1998) (Figure 4). The summaries below are derived from the Soil Landscape descriptions provided by Murphy and Lawrie (1998).
Hydrology and Soils
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The lower elevations of the Study Area are situated within the Ulan Soil Landscape, which is typically found in association with low undulating rises and creek flats on slopes between 2% and 10% gradient (Plate 5). Yellow podzolic soils are present on the lower slopes and drainage lines with yellow and brown earths on footslopes, minor areas of earthy sands and occasional occurrences of yellow solodic soils. The Ulan Soil Landscape had moderate to high levels of erosion. Approximately 80% of the Study Area is situated on the Ulan Soil Landscape.

The Lees Pinch Soil Landscape, situated on the lower to mid-slopes and occasionally on ridges, covers approximately 15% of the Study Area (Plate 6). This soil landscape is typically found in association with sandstone plateau and hillslopes with boulder debris and rock outcrops, and slopes between 15% and 40%. Soils in the landscape are shallow siliceous sands with yellow earths and yellow podzolic soils on the lower slopes. The Lees Pinch Soil Landscape is subject to high levels of downslope erosion. Large sections of the Study Area were found only retaining skeletal heavily eroded soils.

The ridgeline around the proposed new haul road between OC2 and OC4 is dominated by the Bald Hill Soil Landscape which is typically characterised by low hillocks with moderately steep slopes between 10% and 35%. The Bald Hill Soil Landscape includes euchrozems on crests, euchrozems-chocolate soils intergrades on mid slopes with brown clays on lower slopes. Rock outcrops are often present.
8.5 Hydrology

Water is considered one of the primary factors in the prediction of the location of Aboriginal sites in the landscape. The Study Area falls within the Moolarben Creek and Bora Creek catchments. The majority of the Study Area is located various distances from permanent water sources, ranging from 10 m up to 2 km (Figure 3 and Figure 4). First and second order drainage depressions are located within Area A, F, G, H, J and K of the Study Area and are likely to act as temporary sources of potable water (i.e. after rain, water may have temporarily collected in depressions and lower lying areas) (Figure 4). At the time of the survey these areas had various amounts of water following a very high winter seasonal rainfall.

8.6 Ecology

A number of ecological resources are known to have been exploited by the Wiradjuri (the traditional Aboriginal people of the area) including possums, kangaroos, wallabies, wombats, kangaroo rats, lizards, snakes, goannas, birds, insects and a range of plant species (Pearson 1981: 335). Many of these resources would have been available in the local landscape of the Study Area.

The Study Area is largely comprised of two distinct vegetation types, open woodland and exotic/native grassland/pasture. Due to the historical clearing which has taken place within exotic/native grassland/pasture areas, the fauna habitat features are generally quite limited. In contrast, open woodland areas within the survey area contain a broad suite of habitat features (Eco Logical Australia, 2017). The vegetation within the Study Area is in poor to moderate condition owing to the presence of existing roads and evidence of agricultural activities such as historic clearing and cultivation disturbance. The original environment has been the subject to various levels of disturbance particularly since the colonisation of the area by white settlers.
8.7 Past land use and disturbance

The Study Area has largely been used for grazing and various small scale agricultural activities. Property modifications in the Study Area have included large scale vegetation clearance, construction of rural infrastructure such as vehicle access tracks, fences, stockyards, dwellings, various sizes of dams and some modification to select drainage lines (Figure 3 and Figure 4). The flat and slightly sloping sections of the Study Area have been almost entirely cleared of native vegetation and impacted by various intensity of ploughing (Plate 3). Heavy erosion and sheet wash has resulted in a high percentage of soil loss on slopes and elevated part of the Study Area. The periphery of the Study Area, including the mid to upper slopes and more elevated parts are more revegetated and have had less impact from agricultural activities. The wider environment of the Study Area has been impacted by various mining activities due to the operation of the MCC and a number of other mines in the surrounding areas including the Ulan Coal Mine and the Wilpinjong Coal Mine.

8.8 Summary

The above landscape context demonstrates that the Study Area contains some resources capable of supporting a range of past Aboriginal land use. There are permanent and temporary water sources in the Study Area and also some potential for outcrops of stone resources in the western section of the area. There is also some potential for the preservation of surface and sub-surface Aboriginal objects across the surface of the Study Area, particularly in association with lower slopes, drainage depressions, flats and terraces. Moreover, there is a moderate to high possibility for rock shelters located on steep slopes and ridges covered by the Lees Pinch Soil Landscape, which could have been used by Aboriginal people in the past.

Archaeological visibility and exposure within the Study area is variable due to the cover of grasslands and re-growth woodland. Visibility and exposure occur as a result of recent ploughing, grazing practices, associated with rural structures, erosion and surface wash around drainage lines and on slopes.
9. Aboriginal Archaeological Context

9.1 Ethnography and History

At the time of first contact, the Study Area lay within the land occupied by Wiradjuri speaking people (Tindale 1974, Horton 1994), close to boundaries with the Kamilaroi, Gweagal and Wonnarua speaking peoples. Pearson (1981: 81) hypothesises three possible Wiradjuri speaking clans living at Bathurst, Wellington and Mudgee – Rylstone. The Study Area most likely lies within the Mudgee - Rylstone group’s area. Based on his review of historical sources, Pearson (1981: 75) suggested that most day to day activities were undertaken by groups of up to 20 individuals who came together into larger groups at certain times of the year to utilise a resource or undertake law or ceremonial activities.

During the 1820s, increasing European settlement along the Cudgegong River and from Mudgee to Wellington would have resulted in increasing upheaval to traditional Aboriginal practices. Hostilities between the local Aboriginal population and non-indigenous settlers peaked between 1824 and 1826 with the advent of martial law by Governor Brisbane and resistance from Windradyne, a Wiradjuri man (Haglund 1999). Settlement increased with the gold rush between the 1850s and 1870s, causing further displacement of the local Aboriginal population.

Today, Wiradjuri people continue to live in the district and maintain an interest in their cultural heritage. The revitalisation of the Wiradjuri language has been taking place over the last 10 years with the publication of *A First Wiradjuri Dictionary* and Wiradjuri being taught at schools and TAFE in Parkes and Forbes (Senior and Rudder 2005).

9.2 Previous Archaeological Works at the Moolarben Coal Complex

MCO has developed the Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database which includes all previously recorded Aboriginal objects and holds all information on Aboriginal archaeological resources relevant for the entire MCC. The Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database includes data regarding 871 Aboriginal sites that have been located through various surveys including 454 of those which are located in the MCC. The considerably large number of sites comprise various site types and features often in context with one-another and display a high intensity of past Aboriginal occupation of the wider environment. Of these Aboriginal heritage sites, approximately 326 have been managed (i.e. salvaged) and require no further management, and 91 are located outside the boundary of the MCC. The details of the recorded sites at the MCC are summarised in Table 5.
Table 5: Summary of known Aboriginal sites at the Moolarben Coal Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal Object Features</th>
<th>Number of Aboriginal Objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefact Scatter (with or without PAD)</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding Grooves¹</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Finds (with or without PAD)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Shelters²</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Including grinding grooves with or without artefact scatters or isolated finds.
² Including rock shelters with or without art and/or artefact scatters and/or isolated finds and/or grinding grooves and/or PAD.

A search of the Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database indicated that there is one previously recorded Aboriginal site within the footprint of the Study Area, namely site S1MC140 (AHIMS ID #36-3-0949) which comprises an artefact scatter and is located within Area F of the Study Area.

The sites located within 1 km of the Study Area are all open sites are predicted to be stone artefact sites containing one or more artefacts. Approximately 80 percent of sites are located within 200 m of ephemeral drainage lines (i.e. those drainage lines which do not retain water for prolonged periods and generally only flow following prolonged rainfall), which is probably a result of the sporadic presence of water, increased ground exposures near the drainage lines and also the methodological framework used by previous archaeological surveys. In the wider context of the Study Area, landscapes similar to those that exist in the Study Area had several different site types recorded. On alluvial plains and creek terraces, isolated finds and artefact scatters are dominant, while on lower to upper slopes there are numerous rock shelters recorded including sites with art, PADs and artefact(s).

9.3 Regional Archaeological Studies

Archaeological studies provide material evidence of Aboriginal use of the landscape at times both before and after written history, and complements the oral histories and cultural knowledge held by the Aboriginal community.

The earliest evidence of Aboriginal occupation in the region was found at Granites 2 Shelter, located approximately 150 km south-west of the subject area, and dates to 7,000 years before present (BP) (Pearson 1981). A number of other archaeological excavations have been undertaken in the nearby area and resulted in dates of occupation in the last 5,000 years (Kuskie 2009).

A number of archaeological models for the distribution of material evidence of Aboriginal use of the landscape have been developed for the region. The purpose of archaeological models is to assist in the prediction of what Aboriginal sites may be present in the landscape and where they might be located.

The first archaeological model of the region was developed by Pearson (1981) through the analysis of sites in the Upper Macquarie. He identified a range of site types typical to the region including open camp sites, scarred trees and grinding grooves, as well as the presence of ceremonial sites and burial sites.
From his data Pearson (1981) proposed that:

- Most sites would occur between 10 m and 500 m from water, with the largest sites occurring nearest to water.
- Good soil drainage, views over watercourses, level ground with shelter from winds and elevation above cold air were important factors in site location.
- The majority of sites were in places that would originally have been open woodlands with an adequate source of fuel.
- Burials and grinding grooves would be located as close to habitation as possible.
- Grinding grooves required the presence of suitable stone, such as sandstone.
- Burials were most likely to occur where soils were deep enough for internment.
- Ceremonial sites such as earth rings and stone arrangements would be situated away from campsites, potentially in isolated places, on small hills or knolls but also on flat land.
- There was no obvious patterning to the location of scarred and carved trees beyond proximity to water and occupation sites.
- Quarries may occur where suitable sources of stone were present and accessible.
- Camp sites were rarely used by Aboriginal people in the past for longer than three nights and that sites with extensive archaeological deposits represented accumulation of material over multiple visits.

This model has since been revised and refined as part of the many archaeological assessments that have been conducted as part of the environmental assessment and approval process for the three mines located within 10 km of the subject area: Ulan Coal Mine, Wilpinjong Coal Mine and the MCC.

Ulan Coal Mine

The Ulan Coal Mine is an open cut and underground coal mine located adjacent to and north-west of the MCC, near the village of Ulan. The Ulan Coal Mine has been operational since the 1920s. In 2009, the Ulan Coal Mine sought a consolidated Part 3A Approval. Archaeological assessment of the Ulan Coal Mine commenced in the 1980s (Haglund 1980) with 29 assessments occurring over subsequent years (Table 5).

An Aboriginal sites database was developed for the Ulan Coal Mine as part of the environmental assessment process for the Part 3A Approval (Kuskie 2009). Revision 10 of the Ulan Coal Mine Aboriginal Sites Database included 1,274 Aboriginal sites within the Ulan Coal Mine, including 322 rock shelters with PADs (Table 7). The most frequent Aboriginal site features known within the Ulan Coal Mine were artefact scatters and open sites, rock shelters with PADs and isolated artefacts.

Open camp sites range in size at the Ulan Coal Mine from one stone artefact to 990 stone artefacts (Kuskie 2009: 109). The bulk of open camp sites contain less than 10 artefacts and most sites occur within a 50 square metre (m²) area or less (Kuskie 2009: 109).

Table 6: Summary of Assessments at the Ulan Coal Mine (Source: Kuskie 2013a: 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Preliminary Archaeological Survey of the Coal mining Area at Ulan, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1981a</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey and Sampling at the Site of the Ulan Coal Mine, Ulan, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1981b</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Mine: Archaeological Investigation in Connection with Proposed Changes in Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corkill</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Survey for Aboriginal Archaeological Sites at Ulan Colliery, New South Wales: proposed Overland Conveyor and Creek Site Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Sample Surveys in Relation to Proposed Mine Extension in the Ulan Area, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1996a</td>
<td>Archaeological Excavation Completed for Ulan Coal Mines Ltd: NPWS Site 36-3-177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1996b</td>
<td>Archaeological Inspection and Monitoring of Track and Drill Site East of Ulan Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Ulan Open Cut Mine: Trench Through Proposed Highwall Zone 3: Aboriginal Heritage Aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1999a</td>
<td>Addendum to Ulan Coal Mines Second Longwall Project Environmental Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1999b</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Mines Second Longwall Project Environment Statement: Preliminary Survey for Aboriginal Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>1999c</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Mines Pty Ltd: Archaeological Review and Inspection in Relation to Potential High Wall Mining – Areas West and North-west of Trench A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therin</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Spring Gully 5 Salvage Excavation Usewear and Residue Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>An Assessment of Two Aboriginal Grinding Grooves Sites at Ulan Coal Mine, Central Tablelands, New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>2001a</td>
<td>Salvage Excavation Completed for Ulan Coal Mines Ltd: Site SG5 Aboriginal Rock Shelter Site Vol I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund</td>
<td>2001b</td>
<td>Salvage Excavation Completed for Ulan Coal Mines Ltd: Site SG5 Aboriginal Rock Shelter Site Vol III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2001a</td>
<td>Salvage Excavation Completed for Ulan Coal Mines Ltd Site SG4 Aboriginal Rock Shelter Vol II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie and Webster</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Aboriginal Heritage within Longwall Panels 18-22, Mining Lease 1468 and 1341, Ulan Coal Mine, Central Tablelands, New South Wales, Volumes 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>An Archaeological Assessment of a Proposed Basalt Quarry within Mining Lease 1468, Ulan Coal Mine, Central Tablelands New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie and Clarke</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Proposed Open Cut Mine extension, Additional Infrastructure and Consolidation Consents at Ulan Coal mine New South Wales: Aboriginal heritage Assessment (Vol. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Proposed Open Cut Mine Extension, Additional Infrastructure and Consolidation Consents at Ulan Coal mine New South Wales: Aboriginal heritage Assessment (Vol. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie and Clarke</td>
<td>2005a</td>
<td>Proposed Open Cut Mine Extension, Additional Infrastructure at Ulan Coal Mine: Aboriginal heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie and Clarke</td>
<td>2005b</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Aboriginal heritage within SMP Application Area (Longwall Panels 23-25 and W1) of Mining Lease 1468, Ulan Coal Mine, Central Tablelands. Vol A and Vol B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie and Clarke</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of Aboriginal Heritage within SMP Application Area (Longwall Panels W2 and W3) of Mining Lease 1468, Ulan Coal Mine, Central Tablelands, New South Wales: Volume A and Volume B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Mines Limited: Project Waratah: Preliminary Aboriginal Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Continued Operations Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2010a</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Continued Operations Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment – Supplementary Report for North 1 panels Project Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2012a</td>
<td>Ulan Coal Continued Operations Project: Test excavations of Aboriginal Rock Shelter Sites within the North 1 Panels - Interim Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Summary of Aboriginal Sites at the Ulan Coal Mine as of 2009 (Source: Kuskie 2009: 108)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal Site Features</th>
<th>Number of Aboriginal Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artefact scatters and Open Sites</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Artefacts</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding Groove</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding Grooves and Artefact Scatters</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochre Quarry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarred Trees</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarred Tree with Artefact Scatters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Arrangements</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterhole/Well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with Artefacts</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with Grinding Grooves</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with Grinding Grooves and Artefacts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with Art</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with Art and Artefacts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with PADs</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,274</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stone artefact assemblage at the Ulan Coal Mine as of 2009 consisted of over 9,000 items (Kuskie 2009: 118). Most artefacts were made from quartz, with tuff and chert being the next most common raw material type. Acidic volcanics, basalt, bone, breccia, chalcedony, flss, granite, ironstone, lithic sandstone, quartzite, rhyolite, sandstone, shell, silcrete, siltstone and petrified wood stone artefacts were also present in small quantities. The bulk of the artefact assemblage comprised complete and broken flakes, angular fragments, cores and core fragments. Retouched and utilised flakes, backed artefacts, hammer stones, anvils and axes were also present.

An analysis of the spatial distribution of Aboriginal sites and artefacts was completed for the archaeological resources at the Ulan Coal Mine. This involved the separation of the landscape into distinct landform and slope classes (Kuskie 2009: 131). Approximately 62% of the Ulan Coal Mine consisted of comparable landforms to the subject area – that is simple slopes and ridge crests with first order drainage paths (Kuskie 2009: 21).

It was noted that overall, artefacts occurred at a very low mean density across the analysis area (Kuskie 2009: 133) and indicated a background discard. Level to gently inclined terraces had some of the highest densities of artefacts as did level to very gently inclined spur crests, while moderately inclined simple slopes had marginally higher densities of artefacts than gentle simple slopes and valley flats. This may be the result of the presence of assemblages within rock shelters.

Rock shelters were found to occur on scarps, simple slopes, spur crests and drainage depressions with sandstone rock formation. Artefact densities were found not to increase in density with proximity to water (Kuskie 2009: 135).
As a result of the previous archaeological assessment of the Ulan Coal Mine (Table 6), including spatial analysis of the distribution of sites and a review of the historical sources, an archaeological model was developed and has been refined (Kuskie and Clarke 2005b, 2007, Kuskie 2009). This model has subsequently been applied to the Wilpinjong Coal Mine and the MCC.

The model states that most evidence of occupation will date within the last 5,000 years though may have extended 30,000 – 40,000 years BP. The model determines three zones of resources: primary resource zones, secondary resource zones and a third zone that encompasses the land beyond primary and secondary resource zones (Kuskie 2009: 22).

**Primary resource zones**: areas of more abundant and diverse resource rich zones in north-east Wiradjuri territory including the junction of the higher order watercourses such as Goulburn and Talbragar Rivers would most likely be a focus of occupation. These zones may have supported nuclear and extended family base camps, community base camps and congregations of larger groups. This zone may have been subject to longer stays and more frequent occupation than other areas, such as secondary resource zones. The model states that these zones would contain substantially higher counts and densities of artefacts, a greater range of stone materials and artefact types and a higher number of activity areas would be present.

**Secondary resource zones**: these are areas where resources such as watercourses, swamps and wetlands occur in close proximity of higher order watercourses and associated flats and terraces. Examples of secondary resource zones in the Ulan area include higher order parts of Moolarben Creek. In the model these zones were utilised for regular but sporadic seasonal encampments of small parties, but occupations of the encampments would typically have been for short periods. Compared to the surrounding areas this resource zone will host moderately higher counts and densities of artefacts, a number of activity areas, and a relatively broad range of raw materials and artefact types (but much lesser range than sites in primary resource zones).

**Outside primary and secondary zones**: occupation is anticipated to be hunter gatherer activities with small parties of men, women or children. Movement across the landscape would be transitory between resource locations and may include special purpose journeys for ceremonial purpose or the procurement of stone. Utilisation of landforms such as simple slopes, ridge crests, spur crests and lower order watercourses would be far less intense than that found in primary and secondary resource zones.

The evidence of this occupation would be low to very low artefact counts and densities, little range in the number of activity areas, and dates of sporadic occupation rather than continuous occupation. Evidence of stone quarries at sources may also be present.

In this model, activities that may have occurred in the landscape include food procurement and processing, food consumption, maintenance and production of tools, the building of shelter, children’s play, ceremonial activity, spiritual activity, burials and social and political activity by Aboriginal people.

The bulk of these activities would be supported through the presence of material evidence; in particular through the stone artefact assemblage. For instance, food procurement and processing might be evident through the presence of usewear residue on stone tools. Ceremonial activities may be evident by the presence of carved trees, bora grounds and stone arrangements.
The archaeological model predicts that most stone artefacts will be made of quartz due to its ease of access and availability in the local landscape. The model hypothesises that the relative intensity of use of each of the materials will be dependent on the proximity of the original source of the stone. Most stone procurement is hypothesised to have occurred during normal daily and seasonal movement without the need for special purpose visits. As a result of the abundance of available local stone, the stone is less likely to exhibit intensive reduction as evidence of conservation of material.

Most stone technology will be basic and non-specific (e.g. complete and broken flakes) with low frequencies of microblade or microlithic technologies, bipolar knapping, backing and usewear.

Grinding grooves for the sharpening of ground edge axes may occur on exposed sandstone bedrock but are unlikely to occur in high numbers and most likely represent occasional activity and short term activities rather than special purpose visits.

**Wilpinjong Coal Mine**

The Wilpinjong Coal Mine is an open cut mine located adjacent to and east of the MCC. The Wilpinjong Coal Mine was approved under Part 3A of the EP&A Act and has been operational since 2006. During this time, 18 Aboriginal archaeological assessments are known to have occurred (Table 8).

In 2005 Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd (Navin Officer) undertook the primary environmental assessment, identifying 224 Aboriginal sites and PADs at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine, and subsequently completed a series of salvage excavations, and surface collections and rock art recording of some shelter sites (Navin Officer 2005, 2006a, 2006b). An Aboriginal and Cultural Heritage Management Plan was developed for the Wilpinjong Coal Mine (WCPL 2008). Between 2006 and 2009, Kayandel Archaeological Services (2006a, 2006b, 2006c, 2006d, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008a, 2008b, 2009a, 2009b; Boer-Mah 2006) completed a number of surface collections and test excavations. Many of these reports were not available for review at the time of this assessment.

**Table 8: Summary of Assessments at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine (Source: Kuskie 2013b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Wilpinjong Coal Project Appendix F Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd</td>
<td>2006a</td>
<td>Wilpinjong Coal Project: Archaeological Salvage and Post EIS Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Officer Heritage Consultants Pty Ltd</td>
<td>2006b</td>
<td>Baseline Recording of Three Aboriginal Rock Arts Sites WCP 72, 152 and 163 at Wilpinjong, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayandel Archaeological Services</td>
<td>2006a</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Rapid Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subsequently, South East Archaeology undertook a review of archaeological assessments at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine as part of a proposed modification to the Wilpinjong Coal Mine, and provided an updated Aboriginal sites database, an analysis of some stone artefacts recorded during an archaeological survey for the proposed modification and an updated distribution and occupation model (Kuskie 2013a, 2013b).

As of April 2013, the Wilpinjong Coal Mine Aboriginal Sites Database contained 463 Aboriginal sites (Kuskie 2013a, Table 9). Aboriginal site types known to occur at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine include individual stone artefacts, stone artefact scatters, scarred and carved trees, a stone quarry, a ceremonial site, grinding grooves, resources sites such as waterholes and rock shelters with art, stone artefacts, archaeological deposit orPADs. A number of areas of contemporary cultural significance have been identified including Castle Rock and the high density archaeological deposits at Cumbo Creek.

### Table 9: Summary of Aboriginal Sites at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine (Source: Kuskie 2013b: 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal Site Features</th>
<th>Number of Aboriginal Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bora/ceremonial site and carved tree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding grooves</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding Grooves and open artefact site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic quarry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Aboriginal mounds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Artefact site</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible cultural value and association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stone artefact assemblage at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine was found to be waterworn and terrestrial quartz dominant. The dominance of quartz is thought to relate to the accessibility of quartz conglomerates in the local geological landscape. Tuff and chert were also present in the stone artefact assemblage and very small frequencies of acidic volcanic stone, jasper, petrified wood, porphyritic rhyolite and quartzite (Kuskie 2013b: 56).

The types of artefacts in the assemblage were also found to be consistent with the Ulan Coal Mine stone artefact assemblage (Kuskie 2013a, 2013b: 58). Complete and broken flakes were the most common artefact types followed by angular fragments, cores and core fragments. Retouched or utilised flakes were also present while backed artefacts such as bondi points and geometric microliths made up a less than 2% of the overall assemblage. A tula slug and hammerstone were also present (Kuskie 2013a, 2013b: 58-59).

The revised archaeological model presented by Kuskie (2013a, 2013b) is consistent with the current models for the archaeological resources at the Ulan Coal Mine.

The most recent comprehensive field survey at the Wilpinjong Coal Mine was undertaken by South East Archaeology between March and June 2014 as part of the Wilpinjong Extension Project (Kuskie 2015a). This survey identified 137 additional sites within the Wilpinjong Extension Project open cut extension and infrastructure areas, comprising:

- 73 rock shelters with PADs;
- 60 open artefact sites;
- two (2) waterholes/wells;
- one (1) rock shelter with artefacts and art; and
- one (1) rock shelter with artefacts and ochre quarry.

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with art</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with art and PAD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with artefacts</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with artefacts and art</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with artefacts and waterhole/well</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock shelter with PAD</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarred Tree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarred tree (possible – Aboriginal)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarred tree (possible – European)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterhole possible</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterhole/well</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>463</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This feature description is used in the original source with no further explanation.*
9.4 Local archaeological studies

Table 10 provides a summary of the archaeological assessments that have been undertaken to date at the MCC.

Table 10: Summary of past Aboriginal archaeological assessments at the Moolarben Coal Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2006a</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2006b</td>
<td>Responses to Issues Raised in Respect of the Moolarben Coal Project Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2008a</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2008b</td>
<td>Aboriginal Heritage Plan for MCP Stage 1 Development Areas: Open Cut 1 and Main Infrastructure Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Tree Management Australia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Report: Aboriginal Cultural Assessment of Scarred Tree (ref. 36-3-0798: SIMC1) at Ulan, New South Wales for Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2009a</td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage &amp; Archaeological Assessment for Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1 Infrastructure Area &amp; Proposed Water Sharing Pipeline Modification Project in Support of a section 75w (2) Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2009b</td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage &amp; Archaeological Assessment for Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1 Northern Borefield Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2009c</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Executive Summary Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffey Natural Systems</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Response to Submissions Report – Part A Moolarben Coal Project – Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Disturbance Report for Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm and Foley</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Management Report on Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1: Open Cut &amp; Main Infrastructure Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2: Aboriginal Heritage Advice on Potential Impact to Aboriginal Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>2011a</td>
<td>Moolarben Preferred Project Report: Aboriginal Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>2011b</td>
<td>Archaeological Collection &amp; Excavation: Northern Borefield, Moolarben Coal Operations, Ulan, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>2011c</td>
<td>Due Diligence Assessment of Proposed Exploration Drill Sites EL 6288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Due Diligence Assessment of Proposed Exploration Drill Sites EL 6288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen Bailey</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 Preferred Project Report Response to Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2012a</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 – Preliminary Report on Aboriginal Heritage Survey of Geotechnical Investigation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2012c</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project: Preliminary Aboriginal Heritage Assessment of Proposed Temporary Workers Accommodation Near Ulan, Central Tablelands of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2013a</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1 – Preliminary Report on Aboriginal Heritage Survey of Open Cut 2 Drilling Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2013b</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project – Stage 1 Optimisation Modification, Near Ulan, Central Tablelands of New South Wales: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>2013c</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2: Aboriginal Heritage Assessment of Proposed Ul– Wollar Road and Essential Energy Powerline Realignments, Near Ulan Central Tablelands of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014a</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Mine OC4 South-West Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014b</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex UG1 Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014a</td>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project, Central Tablelands of New South Wales: Stage 1 – Report on Additional Aboriginal Heritage Survey and Salvage of Proposed Core Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014c</td>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 – Preliminary Report on Aboriginal Heritage Survey of Underground 1 Drilling Areas in October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for Underground 4 (UG4) south drilling works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015b</td>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 – Preliminary Report on Aboriginal Heritage Survey of Proposed Murragamba Road Realignment February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015c</td>
<td>Kuskie</td>
<td>Stage 1 Open Cut 2 – Report on additional Aboriginal heritage survey and salvage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015a</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for six boreholes and associated access tracks in Open Cut 4 (OC4) March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015b</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for the Southern RIM Area drilling program March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015c</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for the Northern RIM Area drilling program March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015d</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1 Modification 9 Project Approval May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015e</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for the proposed Stage 2 coal conveyor May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015f</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Aboriginal archaeological due diligence assessment for Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 Project Approval May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015g</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Assessment of potential Aboriginal rockshelter sites S1MC345 and S1MC352 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015a</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment - Moolarben Coal Complex UG1 Optimisation Modification June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015b</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Paleo A, Paleo B, Paleo C, NW01 and NW02 Exploration Boreholes Aboriginal Objects Due Diligence Assessment December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016a</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Conservation Fence Aboriginal Heritage Survey and Assessment March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016b</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Dun Dun East Biodiversity Offset Area, Hargraves, NSW Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Values Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016c</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex- Relocation of Telstra Services Aboriginal heritage pre-surface disturbance survey April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016d</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex Longwalls 101 – 103 Aboriginal Heritage Survey Report June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016e</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex – Fire Trail Aboriginal objects due diligence assessment June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016f</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex – Open Cut 3, Mining Lease Drilling Programme, Aboriginal cultural heritage survey July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016g</td>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Complex – Open Cut 4 Mining Lease Drilling Programme, Aboriginal cultural heritage survey assessment July 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some parts of the Study Area had been already assessed for Aboriginal heritage values by some of the earlier reports. Approximately 10% of the entire Study Area associated with the proposed Modification was the subject to previous systematic surveys. The proposed internal haul road between OC2 and OC4 had been entirely covered by previous surveys and consequently was not subject of the field survey component. Other sections of the Study Area that had been partially previously surveyed are listed in Table 11 below.

### Table 11: Sections of the Study Area in context to previous archaeological assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Percentage previously surveyed prior to this assessment (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area G</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area H</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area J</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area K</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2006, an ACHA for environmental assessment of Stage 1 of the Moolarben Coal Project (EL6288) was undertaken and included an investigation area of 34.8 square kilometres (km²) (Hamm 2006a). This area was surveyed using a sampling strategy with effective survey coverage of 1.1%. The assessment identified 222 Aboriginal sites including isolated artefacts, artefact scatters, rock shelters with artefacts/art, a possible scarred tree and a grinding groove site (Hamm 2006a: 4). Site S1MC140 (AHIMS ID #36-3-0949) was also recorded during this survey and consequently assessed as having low scientific significance (Hamm 2006a: 86).

In response to submissions on the environmental assessment for Stage 1, three cultural landscapes were identified by the RAPs including the Bora Creek alluvial flats, the Goulbourn River and the Drip.
An area of 37 km² was investigated for Aboriginal heritage values in 2008 as part of the Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 (Hamm 2008a). This assessment work identified 258 new Aboriginal sites: 102 isolated artefacts, 150 artefact scatters, five (5) rock shelters with artefacts, one (1) grinding groove site, 33 PADs and 4,825 stone artefacts. Aboriginal sites were found to concentrate around the central and southern portion of Murragamba Creek within 100 m of the creek channel, within 100 m of the “Eastern Creek” tributary of Wilpinjong Creek, within 100 m of the headwaters of the Wilpinjong Creek (northern catchment) and the Moolarben Ridge south of Carrs Gap and the Trig station flank of the ridge (Hamm 2008a). Management recommendations included the surface collection of 133 Aboriginal sites, the test excavation and salvage of 34 sites and recording of six (6) sites.

An Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan (AHMP) was developed for the initial Stage 1 works in 2008. In the process of actioning the management and mitigation measures, Hamm and Foley (2010) completed test excavations across the OC1 area and mine infrastructure area. An approximate surface area of 13,700 m² was subject to mechanical exposure (surface scrapes) and 271 m² was excavated by hand/shovel testing, resulting in the recovery of 2,643 artefacts and identification of 35 new open artefact sites (Hamm and Foley 2010).

In 2011, AECOM assessed a revision to the Stage 2 Project. The assessment targeted Stage 2 surface facilities, the southern portion of a proposed modified haul road and the south-eastern boundary of an alternative out of pit emplacement location, two rock shelter sites and the Red Hills and Murragamba Creek Management Areas. No additional sites were identified and an updated impact assessment was completed for the proposed works (AECOM 2011b: 1).

In addition to the above work an additional 16 Aboriginal cultural heritage sites have been documented as the result of various due diligence activities at the MCC.

A revised AHMP was subsequently approved and implemented to include all of the Stage 1 Project areas and replace the earlier AHMP for the OC1 and mine infrastructure area. The revised AHMP contained an updated summary of the Moolarben Coal Mine Aboriginal Sites Database (Kuskie 2013d, 2013a, Table 5), which at that time contained a total of 531 Aboriginal sites.

Subsequent work including the Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1 Optimisation Modification (Kuskie 2013a), Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2 utilities realignments (Kuskie 2013c), gap surveys of the OC2 area and due diligence assessments for drilling activities has resulted in an additional 72 sites being recorded since January 2013. Niche has carried out an assessment for the UG1 Optimisation Modification in 2015 (Niche 2015a) as well as numerous due diligence assessments and pre-clearance surveys resulting in the identification of more than 200 additional sites. Currently there has been 871 Aboriginal sites identified at the MCC. Open artefact sites (including artefact scatters and isolated finds) are the most frequent site type with occasional grinding groove sites, rock shelters with art, artefacts and/or PADs also being present.
10. Synthesis and Predictive Model

As described in Section 9 and Section 11, in some cases there is overlap between the Study Area for the Modification and those areas that were subject to previous systematic survey for earlier development approvals at the MCC.

During previous survey works one Aboriginal heritage site (an artefact scatter) of low scientific significance was identified within the Study Area (Figures 6, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3).

The Study Area is situated on simple slopes and steep slopes and ridge crests and first order drainage paths with gently to moderately inclined slopes, and foot slopes and undulating plains. The distance from water is varied between 10 m and 3 km. Sandstone formations are present within the steeper hills. It is therefore anticipated that in the steeper areas, any evidence of Aboriginal occupation is likely to take the form of rock shelters with the potential for art, artefacts or PADs.

On the foot slopes and undulating plains it is anticipated, as demonstrated by the distribution and site type of known sites, that there will be open sites containing stone artefacts. These sites may generally occur anywhere within this terrain, but may be more frequently encountered in favourable occupation areas which may often be associated with differentiation in the landscape (e.g. hill crests and flats).

In accordance with the current predictive model for the MCC, this landscape would be considered as being outside a primary or secondary resource zone. The occupation will therefore most likely represent transient movement through the landscape for activities such as hunting or gathering, and this would be reflected in low counts and densities of Aboriginal sites and artefacts. Any artefacts contained within the rock shelters will most likely be made of locally obtained quartz with infrequent artefacts of tuff or chert. Types of artefacts will most likely be complete or broken flakes with infrequent occurrences of other technologies such as retouched flakes, backed artefacts and other stone tool technologies.

Considering the archaeological context, the following predictive statements for the Study Area are made:

- Closed sites (such as rock shelters with the potential for art, artefacts and/or PADs) have the potential to occur in the Study Area.
- Culturally modified trees may occur where mature age trees are present; but are unlikely to occur in the Study Area due to the levels of past vegetation clearance.
- Grinding grooves are typically found on sedimentary rock surfaces such as sandstone and may occur within the Study Area where suitable rock surfaces exist in context of permanent and/or temporary water.
- Stone arrangements are very rare but do occur in the wider region. There is limited chance of these occurring in the Study Area due to the level of surface disturbance from past land use.
- Burials are rare but do occur in the wider region and are associated with sandy soils and rockshelters. There is potential that burials occur in context with rock shelters but are unlikely to be preserved in the Study Area due to the high level of erosion and surface disturbance.
- There are no known ceremonial sites in the Study Area and they are unlikely to occur as they have not previously been identified during previous Aboriginal community consultation for the MCC. Moreover, it is extremely hard to identify ceremonial sites using only archaeological methods.
- Archaeological visibility and exposure within the Study Area is likely to be low to moderate due to the cover of native and improved grasslands and re-vegetated ridges. Visibility and exposure will most likely occur as a result of grazing practices and erosion and surface wash around drainage lines and on slopes.
*Further assessment has been undertaken at this site, and the site is considered not to be of Aboriginal origin.
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11. Aboriginal Heritage Survey Methodology

A Proposed Methodology for the assessment was provided to the RAPs on 4 January 2017. A copy of the Proposed Methodology is provided in Appendix 4. Following comments from the RAPs decision was made to cover all unsurveyed parts of the Study Area. The survey methodology was developed in accordance with Section 5.3 of the HMP.

11.1 Survey sampling strategy

The Code of Practice for the Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW 2010b) requires a stratified and weighted sample of the landscapes to be assessed based on their occurrence in an impact or disturbance footprint, and the anticipated Aboriginal cultural heritage potential within those landforms.

Due to the relatively small and accessible size of the subject area, and because the Study Area included some areas previously subject to systematic surveys, a detailed landscape or landform sampling strategy was not applied. Rather, the approach taken was to use a high intensity transect survey across the majority of the Study Area, including all those landforms that occur within them. Because the previous survey efforts have provided adequate samples and coverage, those previously surveyed areas were not systematically re-surveyed during the current assessment (although occasionally these areas were traversed to reach current survey areas).

11.2 Survey methods

The Aboriginal heritage survey was conducted in two stages between 21 February and 24 February 2017, and between 14 March and 15 March 2017.

All survey transects were conducted on foot. Survey participants were generally spaced between 5 m and 10 m apart and features or exposures of interest were opportunistically investigated in more detail (Plate 7). Spacing between field participants was adjusted according to the surface visibility and exposure frequency.

Survey transects were recorded on handheld non-differential GPS units with an average accuracy of ± 5 m. Environmental variables such as overall landform, slope, distance from water, visibility, soils and the presence of stone outcrops were recorded, and representative photographs were taken.

Located archaeological sites and Aboriginal objects were recorded in accordance with the Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW 2010b) using standard archaeological practice and according to requirements of AHIMS recording protocol including:

- Marking the location of every identified archaeological object and/or feature (Plate 8).
- Photo recording of the overall site including scale and markers for objects and/or features (Plate 8).
- Non-differential GPS recording of centre point and extent of every archaeological site.
- Description of features, objects, general environment, landscape unit, soils, disturbance levels and initial significance.
- Photo records of representative number of archaeological objects and/or features (Plate 9).
A comments and suggestion log was also maintained during the survey allowing for the RAPs present to provide any comments regarding cultural values of the survey area or management recommendations to be documented. Comments were received for logistical and safety concerns only. All comments were recorded and provided to MCO representatives.

Plate 7: Example of survey participant spacing

Plate 8: Example of marking located archaeological objects

Plate 9: Example of located archaeological object, S2MC404
12. Survey Results and Discussion

12.1 Overview

All of the previously unsurveyed sections of the Study Area, and all its landforms and soil landscapes have been subject to systematic survey and assessment during the field campaign (Figure 7). The survey team conducted all transects on foot with the average distance of 5 m to 10 m distance between participants. Distance was adjusted (i.e. to less than 5 m apart) on areas with higher ground surface visibility (GSV) and in areas with rock outcrops and slopes covered with large boulders to inspect all possible locations for rock shelters.

Visibility varied across the surveyed areas from poor (less than 5%) up to 70% to 80% on frequently ploughed paddocks and exposed upper slopes and ridge tops. Visibility was restricted by high grass cover with the exception of exposures from vehicles and animal tracks, earthworks, agricultural activities and surface wash and erosion in drainage lines. Effective survey coverage was less than 5% due to the thick grass cover on the open areas and sometimes thick undergrowth in the re-vegetated woodland.

Notwithstanding, the survey provided an opportunity to inspect ridge slopes and tops for closed sites such as rock shelters and overhangs, and is considered sufficient for the purposes of this assessment. A summary of survey and landform coverage is provided in Table 12.

Table 12: Summary of survey coverage and landform unit area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landform / Survey Unit</th>
<th>Survey and Landform Unit Area (m²)</th>
<th>Visibility (%)</th>
<th>Exposure (%)</th>
<th>Effective Coverage (m²)</th>
<th>Effective Coverage (%)</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
<th>Number of Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alluvial Plains / Terraces</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (3), Isolated Find (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage depression /</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moolarben Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low to Mid slopes</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper slopes</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rock Shelter with PAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge line / plateaux</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Isolated Find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,960</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (5), Isolated Find (3), Rock Shelter with PAD (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey confirmed the degree of past land use and disturbance—vegetation clearing, agricultural activities, grazing, construction of rural infrastructure and consequent heavy erosion that frequently resulted in complete loss of top soil — identified from the desktop assessment. The survey confirmed the general pattern of Aboriginal objects in the wider area and also confirmed the predictive model developed for the Study Area. Open sites comprising artefact(s) were found on the eroding, elevated terrace of Moolarben Creek, on foot slopes and periphery of alluvial flats adjacent to ridge lines and on top of rocky ridge plateaux. One closed site comprising a rock shelter with PAD was located on a steep, rocky slope.
12.2 Survey results

Altogether nine (9) Aboriginal heritage sites were identified during the field survey. Details of the recorded objects are provided in Table 13 below.

Table 13: Details of identified Aboriginal objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHIMS ID</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Coordinates (MGA/GDA)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scientific Significance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3226</td>
<td>S2MC400</td>
<td>55H E 760505 N 6417171</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (2)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 5 m x 10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3225</td>
<td>S2MC401</td>
<td>55H E 760690 N 6417473</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (10)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 50 m x 10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3224</td>
<td>S2MC402</td>
<td>55H E 761432 N 6418173</td>
<td>Isolated Find</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 2 m x 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3223</td>
<td>S2MC403</td>
<td>55H E 761267 N 6418384</td>
<td>Isolated Find</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 2 m x 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3222</td>
<td>S2MC404</td>
<td>55H E 760929 N 6419108</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (11)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 50 m x 10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3221</td>
<td>S2MC405</td>
<td>55H E 760515 N 6417282</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (5)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 10 m x 10 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3220</td>
<td>S2MC406</td>
<td>55H E 762518 N 6425721</td>
<td>Isolated Find</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 2 m x 2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3219</td>
<td>S2MC407</td>
<td>55H E 761975 N 6425325</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter (2)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 10 m x 5 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3218</td>
<td>S2MC408</td>
<td>55H E 762045 N 6425394</td>
<td>Rock Shelter with PAD</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Large shelter: 3.5-4 m wide, 5 m deep, 1.5 m high. Facing W with its entrance is sheltered by a rock overhang. Estimated extent of PAD is 5 m x 3.5 m and depth is 20-50 centimetres (cm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above listed sites, the survey also re-located the previously recorded site S1MC140 (AHIMS ID #36-3-0949). Details of this Aboriginal heritage site provided in Table 14 below.

Table 14: Details of S1MC140

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHIMS ID</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Coordinates (MGA/GDA)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scientific Significance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0949</td>
<td>S1MC140</td>
<td>E761278 N6416654</td>
<td>Artefact Scatter</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Estimated site extent is 240m by 20m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.3 Description of Individual Sites

During the Modification survey campaign, nine (9) new Aboriginal heritage sites were identified and recorded. These sites are summarised below, along with a description of the previously recorded site also located during the field surveys.

AHIMS #36-3-0949/S1MC140

This is an artefact scatter comprising three (3) stone artefacts located on mid slope and upper slope landforms in a gap between two ridge tops (Plate 10, Plate 11 and Plate 12). The artefacts were quartz complete flakes, a quartz core and a chert retouched flake located on an exposure on a heavily eroded vehicle track. There were a few other pieces of quartz noted in the vicinity, however these did not have artefact features or attributes and were possibly the result of the heavy use of the vehicle track and consequent erosion. The scientific significance of S1MC140 was assessed as low.

Plate 10: Location of S1MC140

Plate 11: Example of artefact showing part of dorsal surface and angle of ventral surface, S1MC140

Plate 12: Artefact showing ventral surface, S1MC140
AHIMS #36-3-3226/S2MC400

This is an artefact scatter comprising two (2) stone artefacts located on the lower, foot slopes landform in a heavily grazed paddock (Plate 13, Plate 14 and Plate 15). The artefacts were quartz complete flakes, located on an exposure in the south-western corner of a paddock. There were a few other pieces of quartz noted in the vicinity, however these did not have artefact features or attributes and were possibly the result of the grading of Moolarben Road which is located adjacent to the paddock. The scientific significance of S2MC400 was assessed as low.

![Plate 13: Location of S2MC400](image1)

![Plate 14: Artefact showing ventral surface, S2MC400](image2)

![Plate 15: Artefact showing ventral surface, S2MC400](image3)

AHIMS #36-3-3225/S2MC401

This is an artefact scatter comprising ten (10) stone artefacts located on the alluvial plain landform in a paddock heavily ploughed and used for growing crops (Plate 16, Plate 17 and Plate 18). The artefacts included quartz complete flakes, retouched chert flakes and quartz and chert flaked pieces located on an exposure around a heavily eroded unformed vehicle track. The area has been the subject of significant erosion and in some areas the bedrock was visible. The scientific significance of S2MC401 was assessed as low.
This is an isolated stone artefact located on the alluvial plain landform in a paddock heavily ploughed and recently used for grazing (Plate 19 and Plate 20). The artefact was a quartz complete flake located on an exposure along a plough mark. The scientific significance of S2MC402 was assessed as low.
AHIMS #36-3-3223/S2MC403

This is an isolated stone artefact located on the alluvial plain landform in a paddock heavily ploughed and recently used for grazing (Plate 21 and Plate 22). The artefact was a quartz proximal flake located on an exposure along a plough mark approximately 10 m south of an unformed vehicle track. The scientific significance of S2MC403 was assessed as low.

AHIMS #36-3-3222/S2MC404

This is an artefact scatter comprising eleven (11) stone artefacts located on the south bank and elevated terrace of Moolarben Creek landform in a paddock (Plate 23, Plate 24 and Plate 25). The artefacts included quartz complete flakes, silcrete retouched flakes, chert complete flakes and flaked pieces from various raw material located on and around a heavily eroded unformed vehicle track. It is likely that the extent of site S2MC404 is significantly larger than the documented area, however visibility in this area was limited during the field surveys. The scientific significance of S2MC404 was assessed as moderate.
Plate 25: Same artefact showing dorsal surface, S2MC404

AHIMS #36-3-3221/S2MC405

This is an artefact scatter comprising five (5) stone artefacts located on the alluvial plain landform in a paddock heavily ploughed and recently used for grazing (Plate 26). The artefacts included quartz complete flakes, and quartz flaked pieces located on an unformed vehicle track west of a gate connecting two paddocks. High levels of erosion were recorded around S2MC405. The scientific significance of S2MC405 was assessed as low.

Plate 26: Location of S2MC405
AHIMS #36-3-3220/S2MC406

This is an isolated stone artefact located on the ridge top/plateaux landform on a re-vegetated ridge line (Plate 27). The artefact was a silcrete multidirectional core located on an exposure along an animal track. Visibility was restricted by leaf litter and also high percentage of angular rock pieces. The scientific significance of S2MC406 was assessed as low.

Plate 27: Artefact showing ventral surface, S2MC406

AHIMS #36-3-3219/S2MC407

This is an artefact scatter comprising two (2) stone artefacts located on the mid-upper slopes landform in an old quarry adjacent to the pit wall of OC1 (Plate 28, Plate 29 and Plate 30). The artefacts were a quartz complete flake, and a quartz core located on a heavily excavated and eroded part of the old quarry. The scientific significance of S2MC407 was assessed as low.

Plate 28: Location of S2MC407
Plate 29: Artefact showing ventral surface, S2MC407
Plate 30: Artefact showing ventral surface, S2MC407

AHIMS #36-3-3218/S2MC408

This is a rock shelter with PAD located on the western upper slope of a rocky ridge (Plate 31 and Plate 32). The site is a large rock shelter that has the possibility of containing a moderately undisturbed deposit. No artefacts and art were visible at the site. The entrance of the shelter faces west and is sheltered by a substantial overhang. The scientific significance of S2MC408 was assessed as low.

Plate 31: Location of S2MC408  Plate 32: Photo taken inside S2MC408
13. Cultural Heritage Values and Significance Assessment

13.1 Assessment Framework

The Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS 2013) defines the basic principles and procedures to be observed in the conservation of important places. It provides the primary framework within which decisions about the management of heritage sites in Australia should be made. The Burra Charter defines cultural significance as being derived from the following criteria presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Definition of Heritage Values from the Burra Charter (Source: Australia ICOMOS 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Significance Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic value</td>
<td>Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria may include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture and material of the fabric; the smells and sounds associated with the place and its use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic value</td>
<td>Historic value encompasses the history of aesthetics, science and society, and therefore to a large extent underlies all of the terms set out in this section. A place may have historic value because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, an historic figure, event, phase or activity. It may also have historic value as the site of an important event. For any given place the significance will be greater where evidence of the association or event survives in situ, or where the settings are substantially intact, than where it has been changed or evidence does not survive. However, some events or associations may be so important that the place retains significance regardless of subsequent treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific value</td>
<td>The scientific or research value of a place will depend upon the importance of the data involved, on its rarity, quality or representativeness, and on the degree to which the place may contribute further substantial information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social value</td>
<td>Social value embraces the qualities for which a place has become a focus of spiritual, political, national or other cultural sentiment to a majority or minority group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.1.1 Other approaches: scientific significance

The categorisation into aesthetic, historic, scientific and social values is one approach to understanding the concept of cultural significance. However, more precise categories may be developed as understanding of a particular place increases.

The NSW DECCW guidelines for the significance assessment of Aboriginal archaeological sites are contained within the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage: Standards and Guidelines Kit (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1997). The Kit identifies two main streams in the overall significance assessment process: the assessment of cultural/social significance to Aboriginal people and the assessment of scientific significance to archaeologists. This approach encapsulates those aspects of the Burra Charter that are relevant to Aboriginal archaeological sites. The guidelines specify the following criteria for scientific significance, as paraphrased in Table 16.
Table 16: Criteria for assessing archaeological/scientific significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Potential</td>
<td>It is the potential to elucidate past behaviour which gives significance under this criterion rather than the potential to yield collections of artefacts. Matters considered under this criterion include – the intactness of a site, the potential for the site to build a chronology and the connectedness of the site to other sites in the archaeological landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>As a criterion, representativeness is only meaningful in relation to a conservation objective. Presumably all sites are representative of those in their class or they would not be in that class. What is at issue is the extent to which a class of sites is conserved and whether the particular site being assessed should be conserved in order to ensure that we retain a representative sample of the archaeological record as a whole. The conservation objective which underwrites the ‘representativeness’ criterion is that such a sample should be conserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarity</td>
<td>This criterion cannot easily be separated from that of representativeness. If a site is ‘distinctive’ then it will, by definition, be part of the variability which a representative sample would represent. The criteria might best be approached as one which exists within the criteria of representativeness, giving a particular weighting to certain classes of site. The main requirement for being able to assess rarity will be to know what is common and what is unusual in the site record but also the way that archaeology confers prestige on certain sites because of their ability to provide certain information. The criterion of rarity may be assessed at a range of levels: local, regional, state, national, and global.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Potential</td>
<td>Heritage sites and areas should be conserved and managed in relation to their value to people. It is assumed that archaeologists have the ability to speak of the value of sites to members of their own profession. Where archaeologists or others carrying out assessments are speaking for the educational value of sites to the public, the onus is on them to go to the public for an assessment of this value, or to reputable studies which have canvassed public demand for education. The danger, otherwise, is that archaeologists would be projecting their values onto a public which is itself given no voice on the matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Archaeologists are not expected to include an assessment of aesthetic significance along with their assessment of scientific significance. In relation to heritage places, aesthetic significance is generally taken to mean the visual beauty of the place. Aesthetic value is not inherent in a place, but arises in the sensory response people have to it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.1.2 Grading values and significance

The following gradations, where a site or zone satisfies at least one criterion, have been applied to provide a measure of the values/significance for Aboriginal objects identified within the Study Area, and to provide an overall assessment of the significance of each of the zones used that define the Study area.

**Low:** The site or object contains only a single or limited number of features, and has no potential to meaningfully inform our understanding of the past beyond what it contributes through its current recording (i.e. no or low research potential). The site or object is a representative but unexceptional example of the most common class of sites or objects in the region. Many more similar examples can be confidently predicted to occur within the Study Area, and in the region.
**Moderate:** The site or object derives value because it contains features, both archaeological and contextual, which through further investigation may contribute to our understanding of the local past. These features include, but are not limited to: the relationship with landscape features or other Aboriginal archaeological sites or areas of identified heritage importance; diagnostic archaeological or landscape features that inform a chronology; and a relatively large assemblage of stone artefacts. The presence of a diverse artefact and feature assemblage, and connectedness with landscape features and other notable sites provide relatively higher representative and rarity values than sites of low significance.

**High:** The site or object has value because it contains archaeological and/or contextual features which through further investigation may significantly contribute to our understanding of the past, both locally and on a regional scale. These features include, but are not limited to: Aboriginal ancestral remains; the site’s relationship with landscape features or other Aboriginal archaeological sites or areas of identified heritage importance; diagnostic archaeological or landscape features that inform a chronology; and a very large assemblage of stone artefacts associated with other features such as oven remains or shell middens. Such sites will be relatively rare, and will be representative of a limited number of similar sites that make up this class; hence they derive high representative and rarity values.

### 13.2 Statements of Significance for the Study Area

The Study Area (and immediate surrounds) contains ten (10) Aboriginal heritage sites, nine (9) of which were recorded during this assessment. No further areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage value were identified. Nine (9) of the recorded sites were assessed as having low scientific significance, whilst the remaining site (S2MC404) was assessed as having moderate scientific significance.

#### 13.2.3 Social Value

The Study Area and in general, the MCC area, has social value to the Wiradjuri community. It is also noted that Aboriginal people who are not Wiradjuri have identified a social and cultural connection to the place (Kuskie 2013a: 59).

#### 13.2.4 Aesthetic Value

The Study Area has no outstanding values for aesthetic characteristics in the local area and/or region and/or state. No aesthetically significant archaeological site has been identified. There was no art work identified inside the rock shelter at S2MC408 that would provide aesthetic value for the site. The RAPs have not made comment on the aesthetic values of the Study Area.

#### 13.2.5 Historic Value

Consultation with the RAPs, desktop investigations and background literature review identified no direct historical figures, events, phases or activities within the historical or oral history records relevant to the Study Area. The Study Area has not been demonstrated to be important to the cultural or natural history of the local area and/or region and/or state. The RAPs expressed that the Study Area has an important place in the wider cultural values of the area.
13.2.6 Scientific (Archaeological) Value
The Study Area has limited potential to yield information that would contribute to a further understanding of the cultural or natural history of the local area and/or region and/or state. The Study Area contains Aboriginal objects, but these have very limited research or information potential beyond their current recording and incorporation into the AHIMS and Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database.

13.2.7 Cultural Value
With the exception of the Aboriginal heritage sites identified during this survey and previous surveys there were no specific areas or places of cultural value identified during the survey for the Modification. However, previous assessments have identified and documented cultural values for the MCC area, including:

- Archaeological sites having contemporary cultural value because they provide a tangible link to the traditional past (Kuskie 2013a: 59).
- The presence of flora and fauna species with known traditional uses (Kuskie 2013a: 59).
- The area of Moolarben Ridge to the south of Carrs Gap having contemporary cultural value to the Wiradjuri community (Hamm 2008b, Kuskie 2013a). The Modification would not affect this area or these values.
- The area along the Goulburn River known as “The Drip” is considered to have high cultural value as the sites represent easily identified material remains and the area is ceremonially important (Hamm 2006a). The Modification would not affect this area or these values.
14. Impact Assessment

The Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW (OEH 2011) requires that both direct and indirect impact to Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places be considered. Generally, direct impact refers to occasions where an activity physically impacts a site or objects and therefore affects the heritage values of the site or objects (e.g. disturbance of the ground surface or soil units in areas where known Aboriginal objects exist or in areas that require further investigation to confirm the presence or absence of Aboriginal objects or cultural value).

Indirect impact is usually taken to mean impact stemming from secondary consequences of the activity, and may affect sites or objects as an indirect consequence of the activity. Examples of such indirect impact are increased visitors to a site, or increased erosion in an area as a result of an activity.

14.1 Potential impacts associated with the Modification

The area subject to survey for this assessment was larger than the current Study Area. Detailed mine planning and refinement of the final proposed disturbance area has resulted in the avoidance of direct impact to some identified heritage sites.

For the purposes of this assessment, the two (2) Aboriginal heritage sites that occur within the proposed disturbance area are considered to have the potential to be directly impacted by the proposed mining activities, which will involve the excavation of soil profiles and will result in the complete removal of potential archaeological resources. Other sites have the potential to be impacted by indirect impact due to their proximal location to the disturbance boundary.

14.2 Summary of potential impacts

As required by the Code of Practice for the Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in NSW (DECCW 2010b), a consideration of the likely impacts (and loss of value) to Aboriginal heritage sites within the Study Area as a result of the Modification is listed in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Type of Impact</th>
<th>Degree of Impact</th>
<th>Consequence of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1MC1401</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC400</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC401</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC402</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC403</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC404</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC405</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC406</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC407</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2MC408</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: AHIMS ID #36-3-0949
The Modification is located in an area of low Aboriginal archaeological potential that has been subject to systematic survey, and unanticipated impacts and harm to cultural values are not likely. Taken within the context of the known Aboriginal heritage sites at the Moolarben Coal Complex, the sites discussed in this report are all of low to moderate scientific significance, and harm to some of these sites represents a low level of harm and loss of cultural value. Such low levels of harm are not significant in terms of the principles of ecological sustainable development and inter-generational equity described and recommended in the Guide to investigating, assessing and reporting on Aboriginal cultural heritage in NSW (OEH 2011).

14.3 Consideration of Cumulative Impacts
Cumulative impacts are the successive, incremental and combined impacts of one or more activities on the environment, including cultural heritage values. Taken in context with pre-existing development and conservation in the region, it is considered that the Modification would occur within existing approved mining lease areas, adjacent to already approved disturbance footprints.

None of the identified Aboriginal objects within the Study Area are assessed as rare or unique, and they represent a well-documented and researched segment of Aboriginal archaeological resources in the area. The Modification is not expected to cause a loss of heritage resources that could be viewed as being very rare or unique or unlikely to exist elsewhere. Therefore the Modification would not result in any significant cumulative impact on Aboriginal heritage in the region.
15. Management Measures and Recommendations

The Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016), which was prepared in consultation with the RAPs, anticipates the type of harm described in this assessment, and as such provides a robust management framework within which to manage both the impacts and avoidance of impact to Aboriginal heritage sites and values.

On this basis, the following recommendations are made:

1. An AHIMS site card should be submitted for the AHIMS register for all newly recorded sites in line with legislative requirements under the NPW Act.

2. The sites S1MC140 (AHIMS#39-3-0949) and S2MC404, which will be subject to direct impact as a result of the Modification, should be salvaged following the protocol described by the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016).

3. Should any of the remaining sites be impacted by any ancillary surface infrastructure that may be required for the Modification, those sites should be salvaged following the protocol described by the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016).

4. For any previously unrecorded Aboriginal heritage sites that may be identified during the Modification, they should be managed consistent with the requirements outlined in the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016).

5. MCO should implement emergency response procedures for any unexpected discovery of Aboriginal objects and/or skeletal remains during construction activities for the Modification, in accordance with the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (MCO 2016).

6. The HMP should be updated to include the extent of the Modification and the management of Aboriginal heritage values within it.

7. MCO should continue to liaise with the RAPs throughout the construction activities for the Modification.
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Appendix 1 – Community Consultation Log
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ORGANISATION/PERSON CONTACTED</th>
<th>HOW CONTACTED</th>
<th>CONTACTED BY</th>
<th>NATURE OF CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/01/2017</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>Proposed Methodology was distributed for review and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/02/2017</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Operations</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Debbie Foley, Murong Gialinga Aboriginal &amp; Torres Strait Islander Corporation</td>
<td>Provided comments on the Proposed Methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/02/2017</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Operations</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Lance Syme, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Provided comments on the Proposed Methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24/02/2017</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>Field Surveys</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>Field surveys run 21-24 February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/03/2017</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>Proposed Methodology Addendum was distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15/03/2017</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>Field Surveys</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>Additional field surveys run 14-15 March 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/05/2017</td>
<td>Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>A copy of the draft ACHA was provided for review and comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/06/2017</td>
<td>Moolarben Coal Operations</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kristen Kerr, Warrabinga NTCAC</td>
<td>Provided comments on the draft ACHA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14/06/2017 | Moolarben Coal Operations     | Email         | Debbie Foley, Murong Gialinga Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Corporation | Provided comments on the draft ACHA.
Appendix 2 – Correspondence to the Aboriginal Community
4 January 2017

Mudgee Local Aboriginal Land Council  
Tony Lonsdale  
PO Box 1098  
MUDGEE NSW 2850  

Dear Tony  

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT  

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  
MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

Warrabinga Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation
Lance Syme
PO Box 282
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Dear Lance

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5:00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  
MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD  

[Signature]

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

Murong Gialinga Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Corporation
Larry & Debbie Foley
PO Box 1097
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Dear Larry & Debbie

RE: Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bad 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  
MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

North East Wiradjuri Company Ltd
Lyn Syme
PO Box 29
KANDOS NSW 2848

Dear Lyn

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

Craig McConnell
6 Wanda Crescent
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Dear Craig

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  
MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

Aleisha Lonsdale
PO Box 1098
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Dear Aleisha

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  
MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD  

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

Warranha Ngumbaay
C/- Aleisha Lonsdale
PO Box 1098
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Dear Warranha

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bad 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely  
**MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD**

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
4 January 2017

Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation
Brad Bliss
PO Box 2290
ORANGE NSW 2800

Dear Brad

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken for additional surface disturbance areas.

As part of this process, MCO is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 herein referred to as the Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

Due to your previous involvement and/or interest in Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex, you have been automatically registered for the consultation process associated with the Modification. You do not need to contact MCO to register for the Modification.

Proposed Methodology

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Modification, including a description of the Modification.

In accordance with the Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, we have provided the Proposed Methodology for your review and feedback.

Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may be used to affect, inform or refine the Proposed Methodology.
If you wish to provide input on the following components of the Proposed Methodology, please make a written submission to MCO by **5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017** (via the contact details provided at the end of this letter):

- The nature of the Proposed Methodology.
- Any Aboriginal objects or places of cultural value within the investigation area, or issues of cultural significance, that you are aware of.
- Any restrictions or protocols you may consider necessary in relation to any information of sensitivity that you may provide.
- Any other factors you consider to be relevant to the heritage assessment.

All comments received will be taken into consideration as the Methodology is finalised.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Modification, or to provide any feedback with respect to the Proposed Methodology, could you please direct all correspondence to MCO via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436  
Email: trent.cini@yancoal.com.au

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you wish to discuss further.

Yours sincerely

MOOARLEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

[Signature]

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Mudgee Local Aboriginal Land Council
Tony Lonsdale
PO Box 1098
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Attention: Tony Lonsdale

Dear Tony,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Craig McConnell
13 Guntawang Road
Galambine NSW 2850

Attention: Craig McConnell

Dear Craig,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Murlong Gialinga Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation
Larry and Debbie Foley
PO Box 1097
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Attention: Larry and Debbie Foley

Dear Larry and Debbie,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

North East Wiradjuri Company Ltd
Lyn Syme
PO Box 29
KANDOS NSW 2848

Attention: Lyn Syme

Dear Lyn,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Warranha Ngumbaay
C/- Aleisha Lonsdale
PO Box 1098
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Attention: Warranha Ngumbaay

Dear Warranha,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Warrabinga Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation
Lance Syme
PO Box 282
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Attention: Lance Syme

Dear Lance,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Wellington Valley Wiradjuri Aboriginal Corporation  
C/- Bradley Bliss 
PO Box 2290 
ORANGE NSW 2800

Attention: Bradley Bliss

Dear Brad,

RE: Moolarben Coal Complex – Open Cut Optimisation Modification Draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini  
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator  
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850  
Phone: (02) 6376 1436 
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase  
Environmental and Community Manager
12 May 2017

Aleisha Lonsdale
PO BOX 1098
MUDGEE NSW 2850

Attention: Aleisha Lonsdale

Dear Aleisha,

RE: MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX – OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION DRAFT ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Requirements for Proponents 2010 (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010) issued by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage, please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification).

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA and have those comments included and considered in the final report, you are invited to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 5.00 pm on Friday 9 June 2017. All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration in the finalisation of the ACHA. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

If you have any queries regarding the Modification or to provide any comments on the draft ACHA, could you please direct all correspondence to Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd via the following contact details:

Trent Cini
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003, Mudgee NSW 2850
Phone: (02) 6376 1436
Email: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

MOOLARBEN COAL OPERATIONS PTY LTD

Graham Chase
Environmental and Community Manager
Appendix 3 – Correspondence from the Aboriginal Community
Subject: FW: Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

From: Murong Gialinga [mailto:muronggialinga@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, 2 February 2017 5:59 PM
To: Trent Cini

Subject: Re: Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

To Trent Cini
Environment Coordinator
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd

OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION -ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT. We are replying gto the open cut OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION _ABORIGINAL CULTURE after reading it we would like all areas to be throughly surveyed not just some areas. The Archaeologist & Environment staff to listen to the Aboriginal Groups s concerns and -connecting to country also their Cultural knowledge. Kind Regards Debbie Foley

From: Trent Cini <Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 4 January 2017 9:43 AM
To: Murong Gialinga

Subject: Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Larry & Debbie,

Please find attached correspondence from Moolarben Coal Pty Ltd regarding the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

Please let me know if you require a hard copy of the attached correspondence.

Regards,

Trent Cini | ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd
SITE: 4250 Ulan Road, Ulan NSW 2850
POSTAL: Locked Bag 2003 Mudgee NSW 2850 Australia
PHONE: +61 2 6376 1436
FAX: +61263761599
MOBILE: 0408312269
EMAIL: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au
WEBSITE: www.moolarbencoal.com.au
Trent Cini  
Environmental Coordinator  
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd  
Locked Bag 2003  
Mudgee NSW 2850  

7th February 2017

Dear Stephanie,

RE: 1st Round of Comment on the Proposed Methodology for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Below you will find our comments in regards on the Proposed Methodology for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment prepared by Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd.

Warrabinga has registered and been determined for upwards of 10 claims within the extent of our country. There is no reason to suggest that a determination on our whole of country claim will not be made in the near future.

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd has provided no details in regards to who the Archaeologist will be for the project. Please provide details.

Warrabinga has experienced how Aboriginal archaeological consultants will treat our heritage differently. We would like to ensure that the Aboriginal archaeological consultant for the project will both consider our heritage appropriately, and will consider our concerns and comments appropriately.

In point two on page 1 of the proposed methodology, it is stated that “minor increase in disturbance limits at OC2”; please clarify what you mean by minor increase. That is an arbitrary statement, and everyone has a different idea as to what constitutes at minor increase.

As a result of this “minor increase in disturbance limits at OC2” will the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be updated to reflect this increase?

In point three on page 1 of the proposed methodology, it is stated that “changes to alignment of the haul road from OC2 to OC3 and the location of the OC3 Mine Infrastructure Area”; please provide a map which addresses this point.

It is always appropriate when discussing changes to any infrastructure, haul roads, Aboriginal heritage, etc., to include a map of the specific area, especially when the Registered Aboriginal Parties are being requested to provide comment on the proposed methodology.
In point four on page 1 of the proposed methodology, it is stated that “changes to the pit limits of OC3 and associated out of pit waste dump”; please provide a map which addresses this point.

In point five on page 1 of the proposed methodology, “new internal haul from OC2 to OC4”; please provide a map which addresses this point.

In point six on page 1 of the proposed methodology, “new site access to OC3 via Moolarben Road, and associated widening of the existing Moolarben Road”; please provide a map which addresses this point.

In point seven on page 1 of the proposed methodology, “other minor ancillary infrastructure”; please provide a map which addresses this point.

At this point Warrabinga is of the opinion that an insufficient degree of information has been provided in order for us to make any comment on the proposed methodology; a high level map with an “indicative Study Area” is not appropriate. If you have a proposed location for specific infrastructure, you need to supply Warrabinga with this information.

Warrabinga requires that the maps as requested above, and that an amended proposed methodology for the project be issued.

If the provided proposed methodology has been prepared to comply with the Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents (DECCW, 2010), then the document needs to include the following details in order to be in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents (DECCW, 2010):

- Environmental context;
- Archaeological context;
- Identify and list which Aboriginal sites will be potentially impacted by the proposed works; and,
- Previous disturbance to Aboriginal sites within the Study Area.

The information above is all necessary in order for Warrabinga to provide a comment in regards to the proposed methodology being put forward by Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd.

Please do not point Warrabinga to review the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan in order to gather this information. It is the responsibility of the party who prepared the document to address Section 4.2 and 4.3 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents (DECCW, 2010) to provide this information in a single document in order for us to provide a response; it is not the responsibility of the Registered Aboriginal Parties to gather this information.
It should be noted that this may not be Warrabinga’s last response in regards to the documentation provided to-date by Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd; Warrabinga will provide additional responses until such time as we feel that our concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.

Warrabinga would like to remind Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd that the project should not proceed any further until all comments and concerns raised by the RAPs have been addressed.

Should you wish to have a meeting to discuss the issues we have raised please coordinate this with our office via email (info@warrabinga.com.au).

Regards,

Virginia Doig
Director
Trent Cini
Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd
Senior Environment and Community Coordinator
Locked Bag 2003,
Mudgee NSW 2850

13th June 2017

Dear Trent,

RE: 1st Round of Comment on the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Below please find our comments in regards to the DRAFT Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHAR) for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification prepared by Niche Environment and Heritage (Niche).

First off, we would like to make it clear that Niche should not finalise the DRAFT Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report for Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification, May 2017 until they have received confirmation from Warrabinga that we are of the opinion that all our concerns have been addressed. We would also like to clarify that all our concerns must be addressed in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report.

Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Warrabinga notes that the comments we provided on the 7th February 2017 for the Proposed Methodology are not included in the ACHAR. The comments issued by Warrabinga to Moolarben (as directed) were within the 28 day comment period, and as such must be addressed within the DRAFT ACHAR. Can Moolarben please confirm that they are in receipt of the comments issued by Warrabinga?

Attached to this letter is a copy of the comments issued by Warrabinga on the 7th February 2017. Warrabinga expects that our comments and/or queries raised in response to the Proposed Methodology are addressed in an amended DRAFT ACHAR.

Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Warrabinga notes that not all the extents of the Study Areas are visible in Figure 3 (i.e. K, I, E, C, E, D and B). Please provide “zoomed-in” maps of Study Areas K, I, E, C, E, D and B for Figure 3. Please ensure that the “zoomed-in” maps are replicated for all the other maps in the DRAFT ACHAR. This is not an unreasonable request, especially when Warrabinga and the other Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) for the project do not have access to the spatial data for the
project, and we are being asked to provide commentary on the cultural significance within the Study Area.

On page ii of the Executive Summary, it is stated that a total of 10 Aboriginal sites have been identified; however upon review of Figure 6, Warrabinga noted that the colour used to demarcate "Isolated Finds" blended in with the colour used to identify the "Current Survey Coverage". Please clarify why the exact same colour was chosen to demarcate to item that where overlaid on each other.

Upon review of Figure 6, Warrabinga noted that the current survey coverage is larger than the Study Area. Please explain why this is the case. Please clarify whether the entire current survey coverage area is discussed and assessed within this ACHAR, or whether the ACHAR is limited to the current Study Area.

Please clarify whether the nine (9) newly identified Aboriginal sites have been registered with AHIMS. Please provide copies of the AHIMS numbers and site cards for each of the identified Aboriginal sites in the ACHAR.

In Table 11 and 12, Niche provides an estimated extent of each Aboriginal site; however, no map is provided detailing the extent of the Aboriginal sites. Please provide a map detailing the estimated extent of each of the Aboriginal sites. If Niche is unable to provide a map of each of the estimated extents, please provide details on the estimated extent (i.e. square, circle, rectangle buffer).

Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Niche does not include a map that details the location of the construction footprint in relation to the identified Aboriginal sites. This is necessary in order for Warrabinga to understand how the proposed construction works will impact identified Aboriginal sites. Please provide a map that details the estimated extent of each of the sites, overlaid with the proposed construction footprint. Please ensure that close-up maps focused on the identified Aboriginal sites are included in the DRAFT ACHAR.

Upon review of the DRAFT ACHAR, Niche provides no comment on whether areas of Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) (that are not identified in relation to recorded Aboriginal sites) are within the current Study Area. Please clarify whether areas of PAD are present within the current Study Area, and if so, whether the PAD will be impacted by the proposed construction works.

In Section 12.3, the nine (9) newly identified Aboriginal sites have been identified or assessed as having 'low scientific significance'; what is Niche is using as the definition of scientific significance? Please clarify how scientific significance differs to archaeological significance. It is best to keep language and phraseology consistent and fluid throughout a document to save any confusion or misunderstanding. There is a similar confusion on page 40, paragraph two (2) which states that a recorded site
was assessed as having low significance. Please clarify if this significance refers to the cultural heritage significance, the archaeological significance, or the overall significance of the site. Please update the DRAFT ACHAR to reflect the significance type.

In regards to point 1 on page 16, it is stated that “increased disturbance limits around OC2 and OC3”; please clarify what you mean by increased disturbance limits. Niche has provided no details about what this statement refers to.

Please clarify whether the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be updated to reflect the increased disturbance limits around OC2 and OC3.

In regards to point 2 on page 16, it is stated that "OC2 final landforms to retain highwalls/lowwalls and additional dams in the final landform"; please clarify what Niche means by this.

In regards to point 9 on page 16, it is stated that "minor changes to alignment of haul road from OC2 to OC3 and location of OC3 Mine Infrastructure Area, with associated change in disturbance"; please provide a map which addresses this point. Please provide a map to show how the changes to the alignment of the haul road will differ from the original alignment of the haul road. Please clarify whether the minor changes to the alignment of haul road was surveyed as part of the current assessment.

It is always appropriate when discussing changes to any infrastructure, haul roads, Aboriginal heritage, etc., to include a map of the specific area, especially when the RAPs are being requested to provide comment on the proposed methodology.

In regards to point 10 on page 16, it is stated that "additional internal road from OC2 to OC4 via Carts Gap"; please provide a map which addresses this point. Please clarify whether the proposed alignment for the additional internal road was surveyed as part of the current assessment.

In regards to point 11 on page 16, it is stated that "additional rail loading infrastructure (e.g. second load out bin) for increased product coal rate"

In the proposed methodology issued in January 2017, it was stated in point 6 on page 1 that "new site access to OC3 via Moolarben Road, and associated widening of the existing Moolarben Road"; please clarify whether this new site access will still be constructed.

The response by Niche to Murong Gialinga Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Corporation under section 6.2, page 21, needs more information. The statement is as
follows "...the level of survey undertaken was considered sufficient to achieve the goals of the assessment", please address who considered it sufficient, and by what means? It should not be necessary for Warrabinga to point out to Niche that predictive models are ever evolving, and that just because the predictive model indicates that an area does not need additional survey, does not mean that additional survey isn’t required.

It should also be noted, that unless Niche has surveyed 100% of the entire Study Area, then it is always appropriate to resurvey an area, especially when there have been long periods (i.e. 6 to 12 months) between surveys; because Aboriginal sites that were previously unidentified may have become exposed and in suitable environs to be identified.

In regards to paragraph 2 of Section 7.2.2, Warrabinga acknowledges that according to the Mid-Western Regional Local Environmental Plan, 2012 that there are no Aboriginal heritage items located "specifically within the study area"; however, Warrabinga requires clarity as to whether the LEP identifies Aboriginal sites outside the Study Area, but within close proximity to the Study Area. Please provide articulated information in regards to this.

In regards to Section 8.2, Niche makes general high-level references to topography and landforms within the Study Area; however, no maps are provided in order to support Niche’s statements; if Niche intends to discuss the topography and landforms of the Study Area then it is appropriate that a map be included in order for the RAPs to understand. Please include a map of the topography and landforms.

In regards to Section 8.3, Niche does not provide any references for the geology. Please provide references. Niche does not provide a geology map for the Study Area; if Niche intends to discuss the geology of the Study Area then it is appropriate that a map be included in order for the RAPs to understand. Please include a map of the geology.

In regards to Section 8.6, Niche is extremely scant on providing information about the ecology/resource exploitation of the Study Area; Warrabinga would expect that based on the number of assessments (both archaeological and ecological) that have been undertaken within the extent of Moolarben Coal, that more information would be available in order for Niche to provide a more detailed assessment of the ecology. Please provide additional information in regards to the ecology/resource exploitation.

In regards to Section 8.7, Niche makes general high-level references to past land use and disturbance within the Study Area; however, no maps are provided in order to support Niche’s statements; if Niche intends to discuss the past land use and
disturbance of the Study Area then it is appropriate that a map be included in order for the RAPs to understand. Niche references Figure 3 and Figure 4 in Section 8.7; however, neither map is relevant, nor provides any information to support Niche's argument. Please include a map of the land disturbance.

In regards to paragraph 1 on page 29, Niche states that "the Study Area most likely lies within..."; Warrabinga does not agree with the use of ambiguous terminology. Please be clear about where the Study Area lies; Niche has reviewed Pearson (1981) as part of preparing the DRAFT ACHAR, so there is no reason to be ambiguous.

In regards to Section 9.2, Warrabinga requires clarity as to whether Niche undertook a search of the AHIMS database, or whether they relied purely on the Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database. As Niche is aware AHIMS is managed by the OEH, and a requirement of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1974 that all recorded Aboriginal sites must be registered with AHIMS; however, there is no legislation that requires Moolarben to register all recorded Aboriginal sites on their Aboriginal Heritage Database, and as such it is not appropriate to solely rely on a search of the Moolarben Coal Aboriginal Heritage Database. Please provide evidence that an AHIMS search was undertaken for the Study Area.

In regards to paragraph 2 on page 30, Niche states that "most of the sites are within 200 m of ephemeral drainage lines, which is probably a result of the sporadic presence of water"; please clarify what Niche means by ephemeral. Warrabinga understands ephemeral to mean 1st and/or 2nd order of streams, as identified under the Strahler system of stream orders, and/or seasonal watercourses. Please clarify what Niche means.

Can Niche clarify what they by "most of the sites are within 200 m of ephemeral drainage lines", does this mean that the majority of identified Aboriginal sites are within 200m. Please clarify whether this statement is limited to the Aboriginal sites present within the Study Area, or within the entire Moolarben Coal complex. Please provide a percentage of Aboriginal sites within 200m of ephemeral drainage lines.

In regards to the last paragraph of Section 9.3, Niche states that the predictive model proposed by Pearson has been revised and refined; however, Niche does not provide expand and/or provide details on how the predictive model has been revised and refined. It should be pointed out that Warrabinga does not have the appropriate background information to understand what parts of Pearson's predictive model have been revised. Please clarify whether the results from the current assessment are compared against the revised predictive model.
Please clarify whether the revision of Pearson’s predictive model differs from the predictive model proposed by Kuskie? Please provide details of the data used to support the revision of Pearson’s model?

On page 41, Niche provides a high-level discussion of the previous assessments within Moolarben; however no details are provided in regards to how the investigation areas discussed relate to the Study Area. Please provide a map detailing the extent of the previous investigation areas within Moolarben in relation to the Study Area; an understanding of how each investigation area relates spatially to one another will build context.

In regards to the landscape photographs, no details are provided in regards to direction that the photograph was taken. Please detail the direction of the photographs provided in the DRAFT ACHAR.

The measuring tapes used in Plates 4, 5, 8, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 do not provide any indication of the length or distance that is being measured or shown in the photograph. This being the case, measurements should be provided. The use of a tape measure in these photos is pointless, a range pole or a mini rod would be far more appropriate. The increments marked on the measuring tape are not visible and cannot be read. We would expect going forward in the future, a range pole or a mini rod would be used to reduce this issue.

In regards to Plate 9, Warrabinga has several of issues with the label of this particular plate:

1. Does not state whether the artefact was recorded at one of the 10 Aboriginal sites within the Study Area;
2. Example of detailed-photo of located archaeological object. This suggests that Warrabinga, as an Aboriginal organisation, is unable to identify an artefact; and,
3. Insensitive statement.

Warrabinga expects that Niche resolve this issue before redistributing the DRAFT ACHAR.

In regards to S1MC140, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S1MC140 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 3 artefacts were identified. Please update.

In regards to S2MC400, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC400 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 2 artefacts were identified. Please update.
In regards to S2MC401, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC401 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 10 artefacts were identified. Please update.

In regards to S2MC404, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC404 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 11 artefacts were identified. Please update.

In regards to S2MC405, Warrabinga questions whether Niche took photographs of the artefacts identified at the Aboriginal site, considering there is an absence of artefact photographs for S2MC405. Please clarify whether Niche took photographs of the artefacts from S2MC405; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 5 artefacts were identified.

In regards to S2MC407, Warrabinga requests that Niche provide photographs of all artefacts recorded at S2MC407 in the DRAFT ACHAR; this is not an unreasonable request, especially when only 2 artefacts were identified. Please update.

In regards to the photographs of the artefacts in the DRAFT ACHAR, Niche has provided no details as to whether the photograph was of the ventral or dorsal surface, and the artefact type. Please update photographs.

Section 12.1 provides information on the survey undertaken as part of the current assessment; however, no information was provided on what the distances between participants was adjusted to when they moved to areas with higher ground visibility. Please provide maps of transects covered.

Paragraph 1 of Section 14.1, mentions that the Study Area was significantly larger, than the proposed disturbance area; please provide details and a map to show what Niche means.

Paragraph 2 of Section 14.2, states that “other sites have the potential to be impacted by indirect impact due to their proximal location to the disturbance boundary”; please clarify what Niche means by this. Please clarify which Aboriginal sites will be indirectly impacted by the works. Please clarify whether indirect impacts are limited to the Aboriginal sites within the Study Area, or will Aboriginal sites outside the Study Area be indirectly impacted. Please provide a map to show the Aboriginal sites that are likely to be indirectly impacted.

All Aboriginal sites that will be directly and/or indirectly impacted by the proposed construction works must be subject to archival/baseline recording, prior to impacts occurring.

The last few points that Warrabinga would like to draw you attention to are as follows:
The NSW DECCW Aboriginal Cultural Heritage: Standards and guidelines kit (National Parks and Wildlife Service 1997) is now outdated, please update your documents accordingly.

Warrabinga would like confirmation on who, in reference to page 57, Section 13.2, concluded that there were no further areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage value identified.

Under section 15 on page 61, please provide information on how the new sites are addressed in the management plan? Also, please include relevant sections on the management plan.

As all Aboriginal heritage is considered sensitive by Warrabinga, we are of the opinion that two (2) versions of the ACHAR should be prepared: one for public exhibition (if necessary), which has all references to the location of Aboriginal cultural heritage and comments provided by the Aboriginal community redacted, and one version of the report for assessment by the Consent Authority.

Warrabinga is of the opinion that insufficient information has been presented in order for us to provide comment on the proposed development in relation to Aboriginal heritage, as well as the fact that Moolarben Coal has not confirmed the likely nature and extent of the Aboriginal sites present within the Project Area. Once the requested information has been provided in an updated ACHAR, we will be able to provide a comment on the proposed development.

It should be noted that this may not be Warrabinga’s last response in regards to the documentation provided to-date by Moolarben Coal: Warrabinga will provide additional responses until such time as we feel that our concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.

Warrabinga would like to remind Moolarben Coal that the DRAFT Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment should not be finalised until all comments and concerns raised by the RAPs have been addressed.

Warrabinga would like to remind Moolarben Coal that the project should not proceed any further until all comments and concerns raised by the RAPs have been addressed, including previous correspondence that has not yet been addressed.

Should you wish to have a meeting to discuss the issues we have raised please coordinate this with our office via email (info@warrabinga.com.au).

Regards,
WARRABINGA
Native Title Claimants Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 282
Mudgee NSW 2850
Office: 02 4627 8622
Fax: 02 4605 0815

Virginia Doig
Director
Subject: FW: Moolarben Coal Complex - Open Cut Optimisation Modification Draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

From: Murong Gialinga [mailto:muronggialinga@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, 14 June 2017 4:35 PM
To: Trent Cini <Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au>
Subject: Re: Moolarben Coal Complex - Open Cut Optimisation Modification Draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Good afternoon Trent after discussing this with our community our reply is that our comments are not heard or dealt with Kind Regards Debbie

From: Trent Cini <Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au>
Sent: Monday, 15 May 2017 2:11 PM
To: muronggialinga@hotmail.com
Subject: Moolarben Coal Complex - Open Cut Optimisation Modification Draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Larry and Debbie,

Please find attached correspondence from Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd regarding the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

Please let me know if you require a hard copy of the attached correspondence.

Regards,

Trent Cini | SENIOR ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COORDINATOR

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd
SITE: 4250 Ulan Road, Ulan NSW 2850
POSTAL: Locked Bag 2003 Mudgee NSW 2850 Australia
PHONE: +61 2 6376 1436
FAX: +61 2 6376 1599
MOBILE: 0408 312 269
EMAIL: Trent.Cini@yancoal.com.au
WEBSITE: www.moolarbencoal.com.au
Appendix 4 – Proposed Open Cut Underground Optimisation Modification Methodology
INTRODUCTION

The Moolarben Coal Complex is located approximately 40 kilometres north of Mudgee in the Western Coalfield of New South Wales (NSW) (Figure 1) in the Mid Western Regional Local Government Area.

Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd (MCO) is the operator of the Moolarben Coal Complex on behalf of the Moolarben Joint Venture (Moolarben Coal Mines Pty Ltd, Sojitz Moolarben Resources Pty Ltd and a consortium of Korean power companies). MCO and Moolarben Coal Mines Pty Ltd are wholly owned subsidiaries of Yancoal Australia Limited.

Mining operations at the Moolarben Coal Complex are currently approved until 31 December 2038 and would continue to be carried out in accordance with NSW Project Approval (05_0117) (Moolarben Coal Project Stage 1) as modified and NSW Project Approval (08_0135) (Moolarben Coal Project Stage 2) as modified.

Stage 1 at the Moolarben Coal Complex has been operating for several years and at full development will comprise three open cut mines (OC1, OC2, and OC3), a longwall underground mine (UG4), and mining related infrastructure (including coal processing and transport facilities). Stage 2 at the Moolarben Coal Complex has commenced and at full development will comprise one open cut mine (OC4), two longwall underground mines (UG1 and UG2) and mining related infrastructure (Figure 2).

The management of Aboriginal heritage at the Moolarben Coal Complex is undertaken in accordance with the Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan (dated December 2015).

Moolarben Coal has identified that an opportunity exists to optimise open cut mining operations, to improve mining efficiencies and increase run-of-mine (ROM) coal production. This will require an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to be undertaken in relation to those areas that the Modification applies (Figure 2).

Of relevance to the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, the Modification would involve (but is not limited to) the following activities:

- Increase in combined (Stage 1 and Stage 2) open cut ROM coal production.
- Minor increase in disturbance limits at OC2.
- Changes to alignment of the haul road from OC2 to OC3 and the location of the OC3 Mine Infrastructure Area.
- Changes to the pit limits of OC3 and associated out of pit waste dump.
- New internal haul from OC2 to OC4.
- New site access for OC3 via Moolarben Road, and associated widening of the existing Moolarben Road.
- Other minor ancillary infrastructure.

The Modification would require a modification to both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Moolarben Coal Project Approvals (05-0117 and 08-0135) under Section 75W of the EP&A Act.

Moolarben Coal is seeking to engage with Aboriginal community stakeholders as part of the preparation for lodgement of a modification request under Section 75W of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. The Modification request is referred to as the Modification.
The areas of land that the above activities relate to are indicatively shown on Figure 2 (at the back of this document). Of note is that portions of these areas have previously been surveyed for disturbance and the management of Aboriginal heritage in these areas is guided by the approved *Moolarben Coal Complex Heritage Management Plan* (dated December 2015).

An Environmental Assessment would be prepared for the Modification and it is expected to include the following key specialist assessments:

- Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- Biodiversity Assessment.
- Surface Water Assessment.
- Groundwater Assessment.
- Noise Assessment.
- Air Quality Assessment.

The Proposed Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Modification is outlined below. MCO invites Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) to provide comments (either verbally or in writing) on the Proposed Methodology.

**PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS**

Various Aboriginal cultural heritage survey and assessments have previously been undertaken at the Moolarben Coal Complex, including (but not limited to):

- *Moolarben Coal Project – Stage 1 Optimisation Modification, Near Ulan, Central Tablelands of New South Wales: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment* (South East Archaeology, 2013).
- *Moolarben Coal Complex UG1 Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment* (Niche Environment and Heritage, 2014b).
- Various campaigns of pre-clearance salvage.
- Various campaigns of test pit investigations and monitoring.
- Various campaigns of additional survey work.

Based on the results of these previous investigations, Figure 2 presents the locations of Aboriginal heritage sites within and in immediate proximity to the Study Area. Only one site is located within the indicative Study Area for the Modification, namely site S1MC140 a previously recorded artefact scatter. Site S1MC140 is labelled on Figure 2.
PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

The Proposed Methodology for the Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment is as follows:

- Provision of existing information on Aboriginal heritage sites within the Study Area and surrounds.
- Representative field survey of the Study Area (in areas where sufficient survey coverage has not already been obtained).
- Conduct an archaeological assessment (including an archaeological significance assessment) of any known or potential Aboriginal heritage sites identified within the Study Area (which may include the use of existing information).
- A request by MCO to RAPs for comments regarding the cultural significance of Aboriginal heritage sites and/or areas within the Study Area.
- In consultation with the RAPs, identification of recommended management and mitigation measures for Aboriginal heritage sites/areas within the Study Area.
- Provide a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the RAPs for their review and feedback.
- Documentation of feedback received as part of the cultural assessment from RAPs for presentation in the final Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (subject to the sensitivity of the information provided).

In accordance with the *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010* (NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), MCO requests that RAPs provide, where relevant, during the conduct of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, cultural information regarding:

- whether there are any Aboriginal sites/objects of cultural value to Aboriginal people in the Study Area or surrounds; and
- whether there are any places of cultural value to Aboriginal people in the Study Area or surrounds.

This may include places of social, spiritual and cultural value, historic places with cultural significance, and potential places/areas of historic, social, spiritual and/or cultural significance.

SENSITIVE CULTURAL INFORMATION – MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL

In the event that a RAP has sensitive or restricted public access information, it is proposed that MCO would manage this information (if provided by the Aboriginal community) in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.
It is anticipated that the protocol would include making note of and managing the material in accordance with the following key limitations/requirements as advised by the relevant RAP at the time of the information being provided:

- any restrictions on access to the material;
- any restrictions on communication of the material;
- any restrictions on the location/storage of the material;
- any cultural recommendations on handling the material;
- any contextual information;
- any names and contact details of persons authorised by the relevant Aboriginal party to make decisions concerning the Aboriginal material and the degree of authorisation;
- any details of any consent given in accordance with customary law;
- the level of confidentiality to be accorded to the material; and
- any access and use by the RAPs, of the cultural information in the material.

All RAPs should be aware of the mandatory NSW Office of Environment and Heritage requirement that all feedback provided must be documented in the final Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report, including copies of any submissions received and the proponents response to the issues raised.

ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Following consultation on the Proposed Methodology and the undertaking of any required field components, a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report will be prepared. The draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report will be provided to RAPs for comment and will include:

- Details of the sites/objects and/or places and their precise locations within the Study Area and an assessment of potential impacts from the Modification.
- Detailed records of the consultation conducted with RAPs and how any comments received throughout the assessment process were considered.
- Management and mitigation recommendations drawing on information provided by RAPs and the results of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

CRITICAL TIMELINES

Critical timelines for the Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment are outlined below:

1. Collation of cultural significant information – ongoing throughout process until the end of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period.
4. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to RAPs for review and comment – February/March 2017.
5. Provision of comments from RAPs on draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to MCO – March/April 2017.
6. Finalise Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment in consideration of comments received – April/May 2017.
REFERENCES


Niche Environment and Heritage (2014a) Moolarben Coal Mine OC4 South-West Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

Niche Environment and Heritage (2014b) Moolarben Coal Complex UG1 Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

FIGURES
ADDENDUM TO THE PROPOSED METHODOLOGY FOR THE MOOLARBEN COAL COMPLEX OPEN CUT OPTIMISATION MODIFICATION ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

10 March 2017

Since finalisation of the Proposed Methodology for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (dated 4 January 2017), and following future detailed mine planning, Moolarben Coal Operations Pty Ltd has identified an additional area being investigated for new coal conveying infrastructure.

As a result, the study area and survey area for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification (the Modification) have been slightly modified to include this additional area.

The representative field surveys for the Modification, which were described in the original Proposed Methodology for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (dated 4 January 2017), would therefore be augmented to also focus on the indicative survey area(s) presented in Figure 1.

There are no other proposed amendments to the Proposed Methodology for the Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (dated 4 January 2017), including no change to:

- Preliminary predictive model.
- Proposed assessment methodology.
- Sensitive cultural information management protocol.
- Content of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

Attachments:
Figure 1 – Moolarben Coal Complex Open Cut Optimisation Modification Revised Indicative Survey Area
LEGEND

- NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service
- Other Mining Operations
- Mining Lease Boundary
- Approved Road Realignment (not yet constructed)
- Approved Haul Road
- Existing/Approved Development
- Open Cut Mining Area
- Out-of-pit Emplacement
- Surface Infrastructure Area
- Underground Longwall Layout
- Indicative Additional Study Area

Source: MCO (2017); NSW Dept of Industry (2016); Office of Environment and Heritage NSW (2016)

Figure 1
Appendix 5 – National Parks and Wildlife Act Registers (AHIMS)
Niche Environment and Heritage
PO Box 3104
Umina Beach  New South Wales  2257
Attention: Balazs Hansel
Email: bhansel@niche-eh.com

Dear Sir or Madam:


The context area of your search is shown in the map below. Please note that the map does not accurately display the exact boundaries of the search as defined in the paragraph above. The map is to be used for general reference purposes only.

A search of the Office of the Environment and Heritage AHIMS Web Services (Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System) has shown that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aboriginal sites are recorded in or near the above location.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aboriginal places have been declared in or near the above location. *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If your search shows Aboriginal sites or places what should you do?

- You must do an extensive search if AHIMS has shown that there are Aboriginal sites or places recorded in the search area.
- If you are checking AHIMS as a part of your due diligence, refer to the next steps of the Due Diligence Code of practice.
- You can get further information about Aboriginal places by looking at the gazettal notice that declared it. Aboriginal places gazetted after 2001 are available on the NSW Government Gazette [website](http://www.nsw.gov.au/gazette) website. Gazettal notices published prior to 2001 can be obtained from Office of Environment and Heritage's Aboriginal Heritage Information Unit upon request.

Important information about your AHIMS search

- The information derived from the AHIMS search is only to be used for the purpose for which it was requested. It is not be made available to the public.
- AHIMS records information about Aboriginal sites that have been provided to Office of Environment and Heritage and Aboriginal places that have been declared by the Minister;
- Information recorded on AHIMS may vary in its accuracy and may not be up to date. Location details are recorded as grid references and it is important to note that there may be errors or omissions in these recordings.
- Some parts of New South Wales have not been investigated in detail and there may be fewer records of Aboriginal sites in those areas. These areas may contain Aboriginal sites which are not recorded on AHIMS.
- Aboriginal objects are protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 even if they are not recorded as a site on AHIMS.
- This search can form part of your due diligence and remains valid for 12 months.
### Extensive search - Site list report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3027</td>
<td>S2MC 347</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762025</td>
<td>6424710</td>
<td>Closed site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3028</td>
<td>S2MC 348</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762027</td>
<td>6424745</td>
<td>Closed site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3029</td>
<td>S2MC 349</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761992</td>
<td>6424821</td>
<td>Closed site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3030</td>
<td>S2MC 350</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762036</td>
<td>6424934</td>
<td>Closed site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3031</td>
<td>S2MC 351</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762001</td>
<td>6424823</td>
<td>Closed site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -, Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0016</td>
<td>Ulan Murrangaba</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760796</td>
<td>6421957</td>
<td>Closed site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Art (Pigment or Engraved) : -</td>
<td>Shelter with Art 1299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0045</td>
<td>S1MC 40</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760441</td>
<td>6421958</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0047</td>
<td>S1MC 42</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760408</td>
<td>6421838</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0048</td>
<td>S1MC 43</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760558</td>
<td>6421874</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0050</td>
<td>S1MC 45</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760582</td>
<td>6421721</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0051</td>
<td>S1MC 46</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760547</td>
<td>6421941</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0052</td>
<td>S1MC 47</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760637</td>
<td>6422033</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0053</td>
<td>S1MC 48</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760569</td>
<td>6421916</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-0054</td>
<td>S1MC 49</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760543</td>
<td>6422069</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum :GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760702 - 762313, Northings : 6422090 - 6426560 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site locations. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 92.

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0856</td>
<td>S1MC51</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760434</td>
<td>6422195</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0857</td>
<td>S1MC52</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760422</td>
<td>6422175</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0859</td>
<td>S1MC54</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760966</td>
<td>6421764</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0860</td>
<td>S1MC55</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760964</td>
<td>6421902</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0861</td>
<td>S1MC56</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76036</td>
<td>6421882</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0862</td>
<td>S1MC57</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760906</td>
<td>6421882</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1041</td>
<td>S1MC225</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761752</td>
<td>6425887</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1042</td>
<td>S1MC226</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761726</td>
<td>6426232</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1043</td>
<td>S1MC227</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761825</td>
<td>6426206</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1059</td>
<td>S1MC243</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762310</td>
<td>6424801</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0798</td>
<td>S1MC1</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760670</td>
<td>6424444</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Modified Tree</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0799</td>
<td>S1MC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760840</td>
<td>6424339</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0800</td>
<td>S1MC3</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760846</td>
<td>6424309</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0801</td>
<td>S1MC4</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760866</td>
<td>6424307</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0802</td>
<td>S1MC5</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760867</td>
<td>6424306</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0803</td>
<td>S1MC6</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760890</td>
<td>6424301</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum : GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760702 - 762313, Northings : 6422090 - 6426560 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site locations. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 92

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0804</td>
<td>S1MC7</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760867</td>
<td>6424294</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0805</td>
<td>S1MC8</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760548</td>
<td>6424002</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0806</td>
<td>S1MC9</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760508</td>
<td>6424018</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0807</td>
<td>S1MC10</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760645</td>
<td>6424004</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0808</td>
<td>S1MC11</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760924</td>
<td>642968</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0809</td>
<td>S1MC12</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760933</td>
<td>642948</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0810</td>
<td>S1MC13</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761054</td>
<td>6423910</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0811</td>
<td>S1MC14</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761050</td>
<td>6423907</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0812</td>
<td>S1MC15</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761252</td>
<td>6425269</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0813</td>
<td>S1MC16</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761168</td>
<td>6425107</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0814</td>
<td>S1MC17</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760997</td>
<td>6425271</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0821</td>
<td>S1MC24</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760514</td>
<td>6425250</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0822</td>
<td>S1MC25</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761802</td>
<td>6425783</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0823</td>
<td>S1MC26</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761766</td>
<td>6425183</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0824</td>
<td>S1MC27</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761828</td>
<td>6425100</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0825</td>
<td>S1MC28</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761627</td>
<td>6425002</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0826</td>
<td>S1MC29</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761619</td>
<td>6424707</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>3439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiteID</td>
<td>SiteName</td>
<td>Datum</td>
<td>Zone</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Site Status</td>
<td>SiteFeatures</td>
<td>SiteTypes</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0827</td>
<td>S1MC30</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76135</td>
<td>6424559</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0828</td>
<td>S1MC31</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76132</td>
<td>6424567</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0829</td>
<td>S1MC32</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76124</td>
<td>6424585</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0830</td>
<td>S1MC33</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76125</td>
<td>6424584</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0831</td>
<td>S1MC34</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76128</td>
<td>6424583</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0832</td>
<td>S1MC35</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76125</td>
<td>6424584</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0833</td>
<td>S1MC36</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761255</td>
<td>6424616</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0834</td>
<td>S1MC37</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761256</td>
<td>6424618</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0835</td>
<td>S1MC38</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761279</td>
<td>6424617</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0836</td>
<td>S1MC39</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761280</td>
<td>6424620</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0837</td>
<td>PAD 1 Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761452</td>
<td>6424581</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0838</td>
<td>PAD 2 Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761265</td>
<td>6424364</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0839</td>
<td>PAD 3 Moolarben Coal</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761265</td>
<td>6423392</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1143</td>
<td>S1MC306</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762426</td>
<td>6424590</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1145</td>
<td>S1MC308</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761997</td>
<td>6424705</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorders</td>
<td>Mr Giles Hamm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum : GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760702 - 762313, Northings : 6422090 - 6426560 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site locations. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 92

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2602</td>
<td>S2MC262</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762104</td>
<td>6421992</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2653</td>
<td>S2MC270</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762243</td>
<td>6423241</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0691</td>
<td>CE-15-1F</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761205</td>
<td>6425777</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0708</td>
<td>CE-32-1F</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760509</td>
<td>6424577</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0709</td>
<td>CE-33-1F</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760810</td>
<td>6425593</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1378</td>
<td>S2MC251</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762203</td>
<td>6423681</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Habitat Structure : - Artefact : 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>101603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1208</td>
<td>S2MC61</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762172</td>
<td>6421977</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>101603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1209</td>
<td>S2MC62</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762104</td>
<td>6421992</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 67</td>
<td></td>
<td>101603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1478</td>
<td>Ulan ID#85 (Identifer 85)</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762012</td>
<td>6426721</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td>102138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-1480</td>
<td>Ulan ID87(Identifier 87)</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761593</td>
<td>6426739</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td>102138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3123</td>
<td>S1MC 426</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761559</td>
<td>6426461</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3049</td>
<td>S2MC341</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761325</td>
<td>6422151</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3050</td>
<td>S2MC338</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761398</td>
<td>6422083</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3051</td>
<td>S2MC339</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761440</td>
<td>6421928</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3052</td>
<td>S2MC335</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762104</td>
<td>6422493</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3053</td>
<td>S2MC334</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762218</td>
<td>6423210</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3054</td>
<td>S2MC332</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761520</td>
<td>6422280</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum : GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760702 - 762313, Northings : 6422090 - 6426560 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site locations. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 92.*

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3056</td>
<td>S2MC330</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761747</td>
<td>6422626</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3057</td>
<td>S2MC329</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762051</td>
<td>6422445</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3060</td>
<td>S2MC322</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762358</td>
<td>6422467</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3062</td>
<td>S2MC326</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762273</td>
<td>6422328</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3063</td>
<td>S2MC328</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762002</td>
<td>6422319</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3064</td>
<td>S2MC337</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761398</td>
<td>6422159</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3066</td>
<td>S2MC311</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762405</td>
<td>6422925</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3068</td>
<td>S2MC342- S2MC333</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761864</td>
<td>6422414</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3133</td>
<td>S2MC346</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761262</td>
<td>6422263</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3134</td>
<td>S2MC345</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761254</td>
<td>6422314</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3135</td>
<td>S2MC344</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760969</td>
<td>6422406</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3136</td>
<td>S2MC343</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761698</td>
<td>6422385</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3143</td>
<td>MUG1-Mod 3</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762078</td>
<td>6423457</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir or Madam:


The context area of your search is shown in the map below. Please note that the map does not accurately display the exact boundaries of the search as defined in the paragraph above. The map is to be used for general reference purposes only.

A search of the Office of the Environment and Heritage AHIMS Web Services (Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System) has shown that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Aboriginal sites are recorded in or near the above location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Aboriginal places have been declared in or near the above location. *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If your search shows Aboriginal sites or places what should you do?

- You must do an extensive search if AHIMS has shown that there are Aboriginal sites or places recorded in the search area.
- If you are checking AHIMS as a part of your due diligence, refer to the next steps of the Due Diligence Code of practice.
- You can get further information about Aboriginal places by looking at the gazettal notice that declared it. Aboriginal places gazetted after 2001 are available on the NSW Government Gazette (http://www.nsw.gov.au/gazette) website. Gazettal notices published prior to 2001 can be obtained from Office of Environment and Heritage's Aboriginal Heritage Information Unit upon request.

Important information about your AHIMS search

- The information derived from the AHIMS search is only to be used for the purpose for which it was requested. It is not be made available to the public.
- AHIMS records information about Aboriginal sites that have been provided to Office of Environment and Heritage and Aboriginal places that have been declared by the Minister;
- Information recorded on AHIMS may vary in its accuracy and may not be up to date. Location details are recorded as grid references and it is important to note that there may be errors or omissions in these recordings,
- Some parts of New South Wales have not been investigated in detail and there may be fewer records of Aboriginal sites in those areas. These areas may contain Aboriginal sites which are not recorded on AHIMS.
- Aboriginal objects are protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 even if they are not recorded as a site on AHIMS.
- This search can form part of your due diligence and remains valid for 12 months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</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>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0027</td>
<td>Cooks Gap;</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760387</td>
<td>6415931</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Grinding Groove : -</td>
<td>Axe Grinding Groove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0015</td>
<td>Cook Gap;</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760387</td>
<td>6415931</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Grinding Groove : -</td>
<td>Axe Grinding Groove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0863</td>
<td>S1MC58</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761241</td>
<td>6419040</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0864</td>
<td>S1MC59</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761274</td>
<td>6419089</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0865</td>
<td>S1MC60</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761555</td>
<td>6418906</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0886</td>
<td>S1MC78</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761628</td>
<td>6417183</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0887</td>
<td>S1MC79</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761592</td>
<td>6417154</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0888</td>
<td>S1MC80</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761535</td>
<td>6417281</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0889</td>
<td>S1MC81</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761547</td>
<td>6417308</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0890</td>
<td>S1MC82</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761563</td>
<td>6417309</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0891</td>
<td>S1MC83</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761557</td>
<td>6417330</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0892</td>
<td>S1MC84</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761580</td>
<td>6417360</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0893</td>
<td>S1MC85</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761613</td>
<td>6417323</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0894</td>
<td>S1MC86</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761612</td>
<td>6417508</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0895</td>
<td>S1MC87</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761615</td>
<td>6417500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0896</td>
<td>S1MC88</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761608</td>
<td>6417465</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0897</td>
<td>S1MC89</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761591</td>
<td>6417421</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum : GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760237 - 763634, Northings : 6415324 - 6419464 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site location. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 75. This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>Permits</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0898</td>
<td>S1MC90</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761579</td>
<td>6417403</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0899</td>
<td>S1MC91</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761631</td>
<td>6417624</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0900</td>
<td>S1MC92</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761659</td>
<td>6417596</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0901</td>
<td>S1MC93</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761659</td>
<td>6417588</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0902</td>
<td>S1MC94</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761638</td>
<td>6417728</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0903</td>
<td>S1MC95</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762537</td>
<td>6415994</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0904</td>
<td>S1MC96</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762530</td>
<td>6416009</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0905</td>
<td>S1MC97</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762523</td>
<td>6416029</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0906</td>
<td>S1MC98</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762475</td>
<td>6416038</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0907</td>
<td>S1MC99</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762553</td>
<td>6416059</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0908</td>
<td>S1MC100</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762414</td>
<td>6416282</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0909</td>
<td>S1MC101</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762415</td>
<td>6416283</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0910</td>
<td>S1MC102</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762379</td>
<td>6416477</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0911</td>
<td>S1MC103a</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762693</td>
<td>6416081</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0866</td>
<td>S1MC61</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761650</td>
<td>6418891</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0867</td>
<td>S1MC62</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761503</td>
<td>6418958</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0868</td>
<td>S1MC63</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761502</td>
<td>6418979</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum :GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760237 - 763634, Northings : 6415324 - 6419464 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site location. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 75

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0869 S1MC64</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761502</td>
<td>6419898</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0870 S1MC65</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761362</td>
<td>6418984</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0871 S1MC66</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761345</td>
<td>6418974</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0872 S1MC67</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761298</td>
<td>6418996</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0873 S1MC68</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761300</td>
<td>6419026</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0874 S1MC69</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761300</td>
<td>6419031</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0875 S1MC70</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761427</td>
<td>6419023</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0876 S1MC71</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761428</td>
<td>6419024</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0877 S1MC72</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761421</td>
<td>6419023</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0878 S1MC73</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>761429</td>
<td>6419089</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0939 S1MC130</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>762600</td>
<td>6418163</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0940 S1MC131</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>762763</td>
<td>6418104</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0941 S1MC132</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>763451</td>
<td>6417107</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0942 S1MC133</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>763477</td>
<td>6417119</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0943 S1MC134</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>763507</td>
<td>6417086</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0944 S1MC135</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>763535</td>
<td>6417042</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0945 S1MC136</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Recorder</td>
<td>Mr.Giles Hamm</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>762737</td>
<td>6417948</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum : GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760237 - 763634, Northings : 6415324 - 6419464 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site location. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 75.

This information is not guaranteed to be free from error 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 omission.
AHIMS Web Services (AWS)
Extensive search - Site list report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0946</td>
<td>S1MC137</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762338</td>
<td>6418398</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0947</td>
<td>S1MC138</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762315</td>
<td>6418451</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0948</td>
<td>S1MC139</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762549</td>
<td>6417807</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0949</td>
<td>S1MC140</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761278</td>
<td>6416654</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0950</td>
<td>S1MC141</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761499</td>
<td>6416796</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0951</td>
<td>S1MC142</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761479</td>
<td>6417036</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0952</td>
<td>S1MC143</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761535</td>
<td>6417066</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-0953</td>
<td>S1MC144</td>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761519</td>
<td>6417142</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : 1</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2614</td>
<td>S1MC332</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762299</td>
<td>6418767</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2615</td>
<td>S1MC333</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762086</td>
<td>6418954</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2616</td>
<td>S1MC334</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761975</td>
<td>6418915</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2617</td>
<td>S1MC335</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761874</td>
<td>6419277</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2618</td>
<td>S1MC336</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761725</td>
<td>6418961</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD) : -</td>
<td>Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report generated by AHIMS Web Service on 15/05/2017 for Balazs Hansel for the following area at Datum :GDA, Zone : 55, Eastings : 760237 - 763634, Northings : 6415324 - 6419464 with a Buffer of 200 meters. Additional Info : confirm site location. Number of Aboriginal sites and Aboriginal objects found is 75
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SiteID</th>
<th>SiteName</th>
<th>Datum</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Site Status</th>
<th>SiteFeatures</th>
<th>SiteTypes</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2619</td>
<td>S1MC337</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761575</td>
<td>6419390</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2620</td>
<td>S1MC338</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761564</td>
<td>6419379</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2621</td>
<td>S1MC339</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761544</td>
<td>6419370</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2622</td>
<td>S1MC340</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>761472</td>
<td>6419251</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2983</td>
<td>S1MC384</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760788</td>
<td>6419355</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-2985</td>
<td>S1MC386</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>760565</td>
<td>6419600</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Potential Archaeological Deposit (PAD): -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3137</td>
<td>S1MC419</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>763297</td>
<td>6417006</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3138</td>
<td>S1MC418</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>763075</td>
<td>6417264</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3139</td>
<td>S1MC417</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>763087</td>
<td>6417264</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3140</td>
<td>S1MC416</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>763087</td>
<td>6417293</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-3-3141</td>
<td>S1MC414</td>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>762715</td>
<td>6417560</td>
<td>Open site</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Artefact : -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Niche Environment and Heritage
A specialist environmental and heritage consultancy.

Head Office
Niche Environment and Heritage
PO Box 2443 North Parramatta NSW 1750
Email: info@niche-eh.com

All mail correspondence should be through our Head Office