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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tarrawonga Coal Pty Ltd (TCPL) proposes to extend the Tarrawonga Coal Mine (TCM), located near Gunnedah, New South Wales (NSW) (the Tarrawonga Coal Project) (The Project). TCPL has commissioned Kayandel Archaeological Services to undertake an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) of this area for inclusion in a Project application under 3A of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.

TCM is located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east of Boggabri and 42 km north-west of Gunnedah in central northern NSW. The Project would involve the extension of mining operations to the east into Exploration Licence 5967 and to the north into Coal Lease 368.

This ACHA was conducted to assess the likely impact of the proposal on Aboriginal Heritage, in accordance with legislative requirements.

An Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System Database search was conducted to identify whether any Aboriginal objects or places had previously been recorded in the area. The previous archaeological work revealed models that were valid for the subject area and provided insight into current predictive models.

Consultation with the Aboriginal community resulted in the formation of a sampling strategy prior to field survey. The survey was conducted on the 14 to 17 March 2011. Fifty-seven sites were identified within the subject area during the March 2011 surveys. An additional four sites had been previously recorded in the subject area. These sites comprised of open artefact scatters, modified trees and isolated artefacts. The landform types in the subject area were identified and this was used to correlate the frequency of sites.

Comments from the registered Aboriginal groups are provided in the assessment.

Also included in this assessment are the impact assessment, management strategies, and recommendations for the Project.
ABBREVIATIONS

ACHA: Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment
AHIMS: Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System
Code of Practice: Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW 2010)
DECCW: NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (now referred to as the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage)
EA: Environmental Assessment
EP&A Act: NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 as amended
KAS: Kayandel Archaeological Services
NPWS: NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service
OEH: NSW Office of Environment and Heritage
TCM: Tarrawonga Coal Mine
TCPL: Tarrawonga Coal Pty Ltd
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Proponent
The Tarrawonga Coal Mine (TCM) is owned and operated by Tarrawonga Coal Pty Ltd (TCPL), which is a joint venture between Whitehaven Coal Mining Pty Ltd (Whitehaven) (70% interest) and Boggabri Coal Pty Limited (BCPL) (a wholly owned subsidiary of Idemitsu Australia Resources Pty Ltd) (30% interest). TCPL is the proponent for the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project).

1.2 Purpose and Project Brief
Kayandel Archaeological Services (KAS) was commissioned by TCPL to prepare an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the subject area described below which would be covered by the Part 3A Application under the New South Wales (NSW) Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (EP&A Act) for the Project.

1.3 The Subject Area
The TCM is located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east of Boggabri and 42 km north-west of Gunnedah in central northern NSW (Figure 1). The proposed Project would involve the extension of mining operations to the east into Exploration Licence (EL) 5967 and to the north into Coal Lease (CL) 368. Figure 2 shows the layout of the proposed Project. For the purpose of this assessment, the subject area excluded areas previously approved for mining activities (i.e. Approximate Extent of Existing/Approved Surface Development – Figure 2) and those currently proposed for mining activities by BCPL (i.e. Proposed Boggabri Coal Mine Surface Development Extent – Figure 2).

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Assessment
The objective of this study is to provide TCPL with an ACHA suitable for inclusion in an Environmental Assessment (EA) in support of a Project Application under Part 3A of the EP&A Act. This study involves a description of context of the subject area, identification of heritage places and cultural values in the subject area, an assessment of the potential impacts to Aboriginal heritage as a result of the Project and development of recommendations to minimise, manage and mitigate potential impacts.
This assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the relevant requirements of the various advisory documents and guidelines. These guidelines and documents include:

- **Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 - Part 6 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974** (NP&W Act) (NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water [DECCW], 2010a) (now referred to as the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage [OEH]).

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

- **Draft Guidelines for Aboriginal Cultural Impact Assessment and Community Consultation** (NSW Department of Environment and Conservation [DEC], 2005).


- **Aboriginal Cultural Heritage: Standards and Guidelines Kit** (NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service [NPWS], 1997).


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

### 1.5 Project Framework (development application, zoning study, etc)

This report has been prepared in consideration of the requirements of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) and as such is required to include specific information. The proposed Project will involve an application under Part 3A of the EP&A Act. Until Part 3A approval is granted, all Aboriginal objects within the subject area remain legally protected under the NP&W Act, as amended.

### 1.6 Study Limitations

Poor ground surface visibility was a constraint during the field assessment conducted for this Project. Vegetation (including grass in paddocks, regenerating trees and natural forest in the State Forest) covered much of the subject area, impeding inspection of the ground surface, limiting the effectiveness of the survey. Varying landforms within the subject area resulted in different levels of visibility; see Section 6 for a detailed area description. It is therefore possible that some sites (e.g. stone artefacts) may be present in the subject area that have not been identified during the recent surveys. However, it is considered that the survey and literature review identified all site types and significance levels present within the subject area and therefore the assessment provided herein is robust.
1.7 Structure of this Report

This report has been prepared in consideration of the requirements of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) and as such is required to include specific information.

Section 1 outlines the development proposal area and the objectives and structure of this report. This is followed by a list of the investigators and contributors involved with the report in Section 2. The description of the development proposal is included in Section 3. Section 4 describes the details of consultation and partnership with the indigenous communities. Aboriginal ethnography and history in the subject area is described in Section 5.

Landscape context is outlined in Section 6 and includes descriptions of land use history, climate, landscape, hydrology, vegetation, soils and geology of the subject area. A review of previous archaeological work undertaken in the area, including Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) database, NSW State Heritage Inventory, and the Australian Heritage Register database searches are documented in Section 7.

The background information relevant to previous archaeological work is summarised in Section 7 which includes the regional archaeological context, relevant ethnohistory and previous predictive models for the subject area.

The regional character of Aboriginal land use and its material traces is described in Section 8. Section 9 contains the predictions and distribution of evidence within the subject area, based on information gathered through previous research and the landscape context. The archaeological survey and data collection information is documented in Section 10, and describes the methodology used during the survey and site recording and a description of the areas surveyed.

The results are displayed in Section 11 and are presented in tables which comply with the Code of Practice. Discussion and analysis of these results is outlined in Section 12. Following the discussion, the cultural heritage significance assessment is presented in Section 13 which outlines the archaeological significance of the subject area. Section 14 sets out the impact assessment for the subject area and Section 15 outlines the management and mitigation measures. Section 16 discusses the recommendations for the assessment as well as details for the distribution of this report. References cited in this report are outlined in Section 17.
2. INVESTIGATORS AND CONTRIBUTORS

This report relied upon a collective effort from KAS personnel. The field survey was conducted by Lance Syme, Melissa Dunk, Caroline Hubschmann, Catherine Vermeltfoort, and Warwick Wright from KAS. The report was drafted by Melissa Dunk and Catherine Vermeltfoort and was reviewed by Beth White and Lance Syme.

As per Section 1.6 of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b), the qualifications of the KAS subject team are outlined and summarised in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lance Syme</td>
<td>BArts (Arch/Paleo), MACCAI, M.ICOMOS</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>Survey, report review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Dunk</td>
<td>B.Arch (Hons)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Report drafting, GIS mapping, survey assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Hubschmann</td>
<td>BSC/BA (Hons), PhD</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Survey assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Vermeltfoort</td>
<td>B.Arch (Hons)</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Report drafting, survey assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth White</td>
<td>BA (Hons), M.Phil, MACCAI</td>
<td>27 years</td>
<td>Reviewed earlier draft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: KAS personnel and qualifications

Lance Syme, Principal Archaeologist, Kayandel Archaeological Services  
BA (Arch/Paleo), M.ICOMOS, Full Member AACAI

As principal archaeologist and director of KAS, Lance has conducted projects that have variously included Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal community consultation, heritage management liaison, field survey, site recording, archaeological excavation, artefact analysis and interpretation, archival research, and report preparation detailing heritage assessment and recommendations for cultural management plans. Projects undertaken to date have been completed within a full range of statutory contexts ranging from principal roles carried out as part of the Master planning process, conservation management planning, preparation of environmental impact statements (EIS), locality specific review’s of environmental factors, and the needs that develop as a consequence of ongoing Development Applications.

Beth White, Senior Archaeologist, Kayandel Archaeological Services  
(Honours), M.Phil, Full Member AACAI

Beth has twenty-five years of experience in cultural heritage management as a consulting archaeologist. During this time she has held several positions with the NPWS, assisted in the development of general heritage policy and contributed to more than 150 archaeological reports covering field survey, excavations, artefact analysis and planning studies. Beth specialises in the analysis of lithic assemblages.
Caroline Hubschmann, Archaeologist, Kayandel Archaeological Services  
BSc/BA (Honours), PhD  
Caroline has extensive experience conducting field surveys, managing fieldwork teams, writing reports, conducting background research, consulting with local communities and operating global positioning service (GPS), differential GPS (DGPS) and total station equipment. She has participated in numerous survey projects in diverse environmental contexts including Mudgee, Gunnedah, Mt Hope, Shoalhaven, Tarrawonga and Geelong. Caroline obtained her BA (Hons)/BSc from Monash University, where she also completed her PhD in Archaeology and Ancient History. Prior to joining Kayandel she gained extensive excavation experience in Egypt working with the Dakhleh Oasis Project and the Amarna Project, during which time she excavated the Roman settlement site of Kellis, and the pharaonic town of Mut el-Kharab.

Melissa Dunk, Archaeologist, Kayandel Archaeological Services  
BArch (Honours)  
As a qualified Archaeologist, Melissa completed her Bachelor of Archaeology (Honours) at La Trobe University and specializes in Historical Archaeology of Australia. Her thesis examined Chinese ceramics found in Far North Queensland. She has extensive fieldwork experience in Aboriginal heritage assessments at Atherton, Mildura, Mudgee, Gunnedah among others as well as participating in the World Heritage Listed site at Royal Exhibition Building, Carlton. Melissa also has technical skills in GIS mapping which includes operating GPS, DGPS and a total station. She has completed her PADI open water diver certificate in the hopes of advancing her interests in Maritime Archaeology. She is currently registered through the Victorian Department of Planning and Community Development as a registered cultural heritage advisor as well as memberships in the Australasian Society for Historical Archaeology and National Trust.

Catherine Vermelfoort, Archaeologist, Kayandel Archaeological Services  
BArch (Honours)  
As a qualified archaeologist and member of KAS, Catherine Vermelfoort graduated with a BA of Archaeology (Hons.) from La Trobe University in 2009 before moving on to complete an archaeological field school in Guatemala under Dr Richard Hansen. Prior to joining Kayandel, she gained archaeological field work experience in Victoria, and also in Belize and Guatemala working on Pre Classic, Classic, and Late Classic Maya sites. She has the experience to carry out tasks including archaeological field surveys, site recording, test and salvage excavations, artefact interpretation, and report preparation for cultural management plans.
3. THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

The proposed development will involve an application under Part 3A of the EP&A Act.

A detailed description of the Project is provided in Section 2 in the Main Report of the EA. The layout of the proposed Project is shown on Figure 2.

The main activities associated with the development of the Project would include (Figure 2):

- continued development of mining operations in the Maules Creek Formation to facilitate a Project run-of-mine (ROM) coal production rate of up to 3 million tonnes per annum, including open cut extensions:
  - to the east within Mining Lease (ML) 1579 and Mining Lease Application (MLA) 2; and
  - to the north within CL 368 (MLA 3) which adjoins ML 1579;
- ongoing exploration activities;
- construction and use of a services corridor (including haul road link) directly from the Project open cut mining operation to the upgraded Boggabri Coal Mine Infrastructure Facilities;
- use of upgraded Boggabri Coal Mine Infrastructure Facilities for the handling and processing of Project coal and the loading of Project product coal to trains for transport on the Boggabri Coal Mine private rail spur to the Werris Creek Mungindi Railway;
- construction and use of a new mine facilities area including relocation of existing mine facilities infrastructure and service facilities;
- use of an existing on-site mobile crusher for coal crushing and screening of up to 150,000 tonnes of domestic specification coal per annum for direct collection by customers at the mine site;
- use an existing on-site mobile crusher to produce up to approximately 90,000 cubic metres of gravel materials per annum for direct collection by customers at the mine site;
- progressive backfilling of the mine void behind the advancing open cut mining operation with waste rock and minor quantities of coarse reject material;

\[1\] Subject to approvals and upgrades being in place for the transfer of Project ROM coal to the Boggabri Coal Mine Infrastructure Facilities.
continued and expanded placement of waste rock in the Northern Emplacement (including integration with the Boggabri Coal Mine emplacement) and Southern Emplacement, as mining develops;

progressive development of new haul roads and internal roads, as mining develops;

realignment of sections of Goonbri Road and construction of new intersections;

construction of an engineered low permeability barrier to the east and south-east of the open cut to reduce the potential for local drainage of alluvial groundwater into the open cut;

removal of a section of Goonbri Creek within the Project open cut and the establishment of a permanent Goonbri Creek alignment and associated flood bund to the east and south-east of the open cut;

progressive development of sediment basins and storage dams, pumps, pipelines and other water management equipment and structures;

continued development of soil stockpiles, laydown areas and gravel/borrow areas;

ongoing monitoring and rehabilitation; and

other associated minor infrastructure, plant, equipment and activities.

The proposed life of the Project is 17 years, commencing 1 January 2013.

In Project Year 1 only, or until approvals and upgrades are in place for the transfer of Project ROM coal to the Boggabri Coal Mine Infrastructure Facilities, the Project would make continued use of the existing on-site ROM coal handling areas, coal crushing, screening and loadout facilities. Road transport of sized ROM coal to the Whitehaven Coal Handling and Preparation Plant would also continue in this initial period (with no increase in the currently approved maximum off-site coal trucking rate).

A number of alternatives to the Project were considered by TCPL in development of the Project description. These alternatives are described in Section 6 in the Main Report of the EA. In addition, Section 6 in the Main Report of the EA also provides consideration of the Project against the principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development as outlined in both Section 3A of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, 1999 and Section 6(2) of the NSW Protection of the Environment Administration Act, 1991.
4. PARTNERSHIP WITH INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

4.1. Introduction

DECCW (2010a) recognises and values Aboriginal cultural heritage. Evidence of Aboriginal occupation are present as objects throughout the NSW landscape, and live in the memories, stories and associations of Aboriginal people in their traditional land or country. Aboriginal cultural heritage is an essential part of Aboriginal people’s cultural identity, connection and sense of belonging to country. OEH recognises that Aboriginal people who hold cultural knowledge should be provided an opportunity to inform OEH of the cultural significance of objects or places, and have an input into the management of their cultural heritage (DECCW 2010a).

In recognising the rights and interests of Aboriginal people in their cultural heritage, OEH acknowledges that Aboriginal people are the primary source of information about the value of their heritage and how this is best protected and conserved; must have an active role in any Aboriginal cultural heritage planning process; must have early input into the assessment of cultural significance of their heritage and its management so that they can continue to fulfil their obligations towards their heritage; must control the way in which cultural knowledge and other information relating specifically to their heritage is used, as this may be an integral aspect of its heritage value (DECCW 2010a).

The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 – Part 6 National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1964 (DECCW, 2010a) sets out a process for identifying Aboriginal parties who may have information on the cultural significance of objects or places, and provides Aboriginal people with opportunities to comment on the methods used to identify and assess the cultural significance of objects or places, and opportunities to contribute to the development of management options and recommendations (DECCW 2010a). Consultation for the Project was carried out in accordance with these guidelines and Clause 80C of the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Regulation, 2009 on which the guidelines are based.

Prior to the release of the DECCW’s 2010 consultation guidelines (DECCW, 2010a), guidance on community consultation was specified in National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974: Part 6 Approvals – Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants (DEC, 2004). One of the key differences between the 2004 and 2010 consultation guidelines is that the 2004 guidelines require Aboriginal stakeholders who register after the specified registration closing period be included in the Draft ACHA review stage. As specified in Section 4.2 below, three stakeholder groups registered after the specified registration closing period however were included in all steps of the assessment from that point forward, including field work, discussions regarding cultural significance and review of the Draft ACHA.
4.2. Community Consultation

A summary of the community consultation undertaken for the Project is outlined below.

TCPL provided written notification to the organisations listed in Table 2 and asked for names of any Aboriginal persons or groups who could hold cultural knowledge of, or have a right or interest in Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the subject area or surrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation</th>
<th>Written Notification Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC)</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Registrar, NSW Aboriginal Land Rights Act, 1983</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Title Services Corporation Limited (NTSCORP Limited)</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECCW Dubbo Environmental Protection and Regulation Group (EPRG)</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Native Title Tribunal</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namoi Catchment Management Authority</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrabri Shire Council</td>
<td>23 September 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Notified organisations and date of notification

TCPL then wrote to the Aboriginal parties identified by the organisations listed in Table 2, as well as those parties previously consulted with for either the TCM or the nearby Whitehaven-owned Rocglen Coal Mine. These parties were all invited to register an interest in the process of community consultation with TCPL regarding the ACHA for the proposed Project. In addition to the written notifications, a notice was placed in the Namoi Valley Independent (2 November 2010) seeking registrations from any additional interested Aboriginal parties.

The Aboriginal parties listed in Table 3 registered their interest in being involved in the consultation process for the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Aboriginal Stakeholders</th>
<th>Date of Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>2 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigundi Bame Traditional People¹</td>
<td>2 March 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>2 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>4 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giwir Consultants</td>
<td>15 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>4 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnga Consultants¹</td>
<td>25 January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>4 November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Chief LALC¹</td>
<td>1 March 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Registered Aboriginal stakeholders and date of registration

¹ These stakeholders registered after the closing date, however, were included in all steps of the consultation process (after their registration) for completeness, an open consultation process and in accordance with the DEC (2004) consultation guidelines.
4.3. Review of the Draft Methodology

The discussion below details the comments received in relation to the Draft Methodology and how they have been considered and/or addressed as part of the assessment.

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation recommended that:

“…a new management plan be implemented for extensions to the coal mine.”

As outlined in Section 15, a new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan would be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan would be developed prior to works which would harm known Aboriginal cultural heritage sites in the subject area and would be developed in consultation with the registered Aboriginal parties and OEH.

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation commented:

“…the 2005 Management Plan, reflects the Local Aboriginal Lands Council as the key Aboriginal Stake Holder. This is not accurate and we must ensure that other Aboriginal Stake Holders are recognised as such.”

The involvement of all registered Aboriginal parties in the ACHA process for the Project is outlined in Section 4.2. Recommendations 2 and 5 in Section 16 provides for the involvement of all registered parties in ongoing management:

2. A new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be developed for the TCM in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH to define the agreed management and mitigation measures. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan should be developed prior to any works which would harm Aboriginal cultural heritage sites in the subject area and should be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH.

5. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan includes a protocol for the involvement of the registered Aboriginal stakeholders in future field salvage/investigations. The protocol may include a roster system or similar due to the large number of registered stakeholders and in consideration of safety and logistical constraints.

The following comments were provided by Cacatua Culture Consultants and Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation in relation to the Cultural Heritage Assessment for the TCM Modification (Cupper, 2010) which was included as an attachment to the Draft Methodology.
Cacatua Culture Consultants commented:

“there has been no mention of an Offset for the replacement (like for like) area for the impacting of Aboriginal sites or places. We believe this should be discussed once the last of the survey area is undertaken due to not knowing fully what this area may hold.”

Section 11 provides the results of the recent surveys and describes the Aboriginal heritage sites located within the subject area. Section 15 outlines the management and mitigation measures that will be undertaken to manage the potential impacts of the Project on known Aboriginal heritage sites.

Cacatua Culture Consultants commented:

“Another concern in the report with regards to E3.1 (as we feel that is part of the Aboriginal side of caring for country) is the amount of threaten [sic] tree species that are going to be impacted on…”

We assume that the reference to E3.1 in the above quoted comment is a reference to Section 3.1 of Cupper (2010), which was included as an attachment to the Draft Methodology. No threatened flora species or ecological communities listed under either the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act, 1995 or the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, 1999 have been recorded in the subject area (FloraSearch, 2011). A complete flora assessment (FloraSearch, 2011) is provided in Appendix F of the EA.

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation commented:

“E8.2…the assessment has concluded that the isolated find of stone artefacts is not of high scientific significance and does not have high social or cultural value. Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation deems that any loss of cultural heritage must be taken seriously and can only support those items salvaged from the site being returned to that site once rehabilitation has commenced.”

We assume that the reference to E8.2 in the above quoted comment is a reference to Section 8.2 of Cupper (2010), which was included as an attachment to the Draft Methodology.

As recommended in Section 15, Aboriginal artefacts directly impacted by the Project would be salvaged for safekeeping in consultation with the registered Aboriginal parties. It is anticipated that the Aboriginal community would provide advice on the storage of collected artefacts and management of artefacts at the completion of Project activities (e.g. artefact replacement onto the post-mining landscape).
4.4. Information Session

Prior to the field survey the registered Aboriginal parties were provided information about the proposed Project and the proposed cultural heritage assessment process in the form of a draft methodology and an on-site information session held at the TCM on 25 January 2011. The purpose of the draft methodology and information session was to explain the Project and consultation process in detail, define roles of the registered Aboriginal parties and the proponent, identify any protocols for obtaining and using sensitive cultural information and to give the registered Aboriginal parties an opportunity to comment on the proposed method of the assessment and to provide any relevant information on the cultural significance of the subject area.

The registered Aboriginal parties who participated in the field survey are listed in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Aboriginal Parties</th>
<th>Representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Yani Wortley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigundi Bilame Traditional People</td>
<td>Gary Griffiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Josh Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>George Sampson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Mick Wortley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Les Draper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnga Consultants</td>
<td>Karen Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Ron Griffen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Peter Beale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Registered Aboriginal stakeholders who participated in the field survey

4.5. Gathering Information about Cultural Significance

During the initial information session, as part of the review of the draft methodology and during the field survey, the registered Aboriginal parties were asked to contribute their knowledge on the subject area and the sites that were found. This information contributed to the assessment of the cultural heritage significance of the subject area and is discussed further in Section 13.

4.6. Review of Draft Report

The draft report was provided to the registered Aboriginal parties for comment, in accordance with requirement 4.4 of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 – Part 6 National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1974 (DECCW 2010a). This section documents the comments received from the Aboriginal parties in response to the draft report and/or during the Project Information Session and how they have been considered and/or addressed as part of the assessment.

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants and Minnga Consultants (John Matthews from Aboriginal Native Title Consultants on behalf of Minnga Consultants) indicated that:

They supported the Project and were satisfied with work that had been undertaken to date.
Cacatua Culture Consultants commented that:

“We agree with the report at this point in time.”

Bigundi Biame Traditional Owners commented that:

“Thank you for your comprehensive report in relation to the above project. In relation to this report we agree with the comments made Mitigation Measures, General Management Measures and Recommendations. It is gratifying to have reports identifying the historical presence of Aboriginal people in this area.”

Bigundi Biame Traditional Owners commented that:

“This report identifies some very important findings and the hope that one day our children will be able to walk in the footsteps of our ancestors, and be able to touch the stone used to sharpen tools by many generations before them, to see the tree from which an ancestor removed the bark to make a shield or coolamon, or just to stand in the space occupied by tens of thousands of years of our ancestors, to experience the spiritual connection.”

The following groups indicated that they supported the proposed management and mitigation measures and recommendations that were outlined in the report.

- Aboriginal Native Title Consultants;
- Bigundi Biame Traditional Owners;
- Cacatua Culture Consultants;
- Giwiir Consultants;
- Minnga Consultants; and
- Red Chief LALC.

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants, Giwiir Consultants and Minnga Consultants indicated that:

They were satisfied with the consultation process that was undertaken for the Project.

Cacatua Culture Consultants commented that:

“We are concerned with the impact that this will have on Aboriginal significant items and places that may be located within the Tarrawonga Coal area, so we totally agree with the further investigation that was discussed on the site tour and information session.”
This ACHA provides an investigation into the Aboriginal cultural heritage values of the subject area and surrounds. As part of the ACHA, a field survey was undertaken in March 2011 to identify Aboriginal sites or places located within the subject area. The results of this survey are described in Section 11. Section 14 provides an assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on Aboriginal cultural heritage within the subject area.

It is considered that the survey undertaken was adequate to determine archaeological and cultural significance of the subject area and to undertake a comprehensive impact assessment. Notwithstanding, undertaking some sub-surface investigations along Goonbri Creek prior to disturbance would likely add to the local knowledge and record of Aboriginal heritage and past usage.

Therefore, Recommendation 3 in Section 16 provides for the “further investigation” mentioned in the Cacatua Culture Consultants comment:

3. Prior to disturbance along Goonbri Creek, a subsurface investigation should be undertaken. This investigation should include representative test pits and/or grader scrapes along the banks of Goonbri Creek within the proposed disturbance area. This investigation should be developed and detailed in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan.

The purpose of this work would be to add to the recorded knowledge of the Aboriginal heritage of the site prior to disturbance.

Giwiir Consultants provided the following comments verbally:

Giwiir Consultants supported the recommendation that further archaeological work should be undertaken along Goonbri Creek. In particular, they said that they like to see sub-surface work undertaken along Goonbri Creek including grader scrapes and sieving of the soil for artefacts.

Section 16 describes the proposed recommendations the TCPL will implement as part of the Project. As discussed above, Recommendation 3 provides for further archaeological work along Goonbri Creek including subsurface works.

Giwiir Consultants also recommended that:

“Scar trees should be fenced off to avoid damage during the operations.”

As outlined in Section 15, culturally modified trees located outside (but in close proximity) of the Project disturbance areas would be suitably fenced and signed to reduce the risk of incidental damage. Culturally modified trees subject to direct disturbance would be considered for salvage and a suitable location for the storage and/or display of the salvaged sections would be identified and managed in consultation with the Aboriginal community.
Cacatua Culture Consultants provided the following comments:

“We understand the proposed impact and the Archaeological significance within the area is moderate to low, we cannot say the same for the Cultural significance of the area.”

An assessment of the archaeological and cultural significance of the subject area is provided in Section 13. Registered Aboriginal parties have been consulted throughout the assessment process and their comments regarding the cultural significance of the subject area have been included.

“We agree with the report at this point in time. We do fully support the recommendations section of the report on page 67 that states a new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and be developed prior to any worked (sic) which may harm Aboriginal cultural heritage sites or places of significances. However we would like to put forward that a three day workshop be undertaken to develop a new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan. We have had good success with this before and that this should be made a priority.”


2. A new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH to define the agreed management and mitigation measures. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan should be developed prior to any works which would harm Aboriginal cultural heritage sites in the subject area and should be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH.

“We also believe while contractors are undertaking their mine inductions more awareness should be place (sic) on Aboriginal Heritage Culture and the disturbance of Aboriginal significant items and the steps they should take when they are located. Also why they should stay to tracks and places that they are allocated.”

The current TCPL Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management Plan (R.W. Corkery & Co. Pty Limited, 2005) requires that prior to any person undertaking work on the TCM, they must undergo a Cultural Awareness induction training programme. The induction training programme includes procedures to be adopted in the event of a discovery of a potential site or artefact. Personnel involved in topsoil stripping activities are given additional training in the recognition of Aboriginal sites and artefacts.
The Cultural Awareness induction training programme would continue as part of the new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan, recommended to be developed as part of the Project. In addition, personnel would be instructed on the importance of staying within designated areas to avoid accidental disturbance to Aboriginal heritage sites.

Bigundi Biame Traditional People provided the following comments:

“Whilst legislation determines Government Departments will receive compensation for the destruction of historically and culturally significant Aboriginal sites. This in no way compensates the Aboriginal Community for the loss of culturally significant and historical sites that cannot be replaced. I am struggling to understand how it is that Tarrawonga Coal Project intend (sic) to minimise the damage to these irreplaceable culturally significant sites.

Maybe someone could explain how the damage would be minimised if the Sydney Opera house or the Harbour Bridge was to be removed next week. I cannot imagine anyone, would not be outraged. They are icons of Australian history and culturally significant as such.”

The management and mitigation measures that would be undertaken by TCPL to manage the impact of surface disturbance on Aboriginal heritage sites within the subject area are outlined in Section 15. These management and mitigation measures would be defined in consultation with the Aboriginal community in a new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan that would be developed as part of the Project (refer to Recommendation 2, Section 16).

“Aboriginal people in our area have had very limited access to local significant sites and artefacts. There are a number of documents and monuments created by Non indigenous residents in this area, but most of the truly significant artefacts were removed from the area and lost to the local indigenous people many years ago.

European settlement and Laws limited the access of aboriginal people to many traditional sites. The laws of the day and fear of punishment to aboriginal people further destroyed the passing of oral history and the skills to maintain important sites.”

As outlined in Section 15, TCPL would provide opportunities for Aboriginal community members to access known Aboriginal sites located on TCM owned land (e.g. for cultural reasons or as part of scheduled field activities) in accordance with occupational health and safety requirements.

“I am seeking a face to face meeting to further discuss the content of this report.”
A meeting was held between TCPL representatives and Wayne Griffiths and Greg Griffiths from Bigundi Biame Traditional People to further discuss the Project and the ACHA on the 15 August 2011. At the meeting, Wayne and Greg voiced their concern that cultural heritage was being described and assessed on a project-by-project basis across the Gunnedah basin due to project assessment legislative requirements. Wayne and Greg indicated that they would like to see a region-wide cultural heritage study undertaken that could then be used as part of a cultural and language repatriation program they are implementing and planning to expand. Wayne and Greg also voiced a request that TCPL form a partnership with other regional mining companies and the local Aboriginal community to support Aboriginal community programs such as the cultural and language repatriation program.

In addition, a meeting was held between TCPL representatives and Robert Horne (CEO) of the Red Chief LALC on 15 August 2011 to discuss the Project and the ACHA.

Red Chief LALC similarly indicated concern that cultural assessments are undertaken on a project-by-project basis and that the Aboriginal community and regional mining companies would benefit from a region-wide cultural heritage study.

In response to these requests, an additional recommendation (Recommendation 6) have been added to Section 16, as follows:

6. A protocol/program be developed for TCPL to sponsor existing or new projects that benefit the wider Aboriginal community. These may include (for example): development and implementation of educational programs (e.g. Aboriginal culture and language programs); development of a regional cultural heritage assessment and record; and/or potential employment/skill development opportunities. Any such sponsorship should be made available to the wider Aboriginal community with submissions presented to TCPL and projects selected by TCPL based on their individual merit and benefit to the wider Aboriginal community.
5. ABORIGINAL ETHNOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

5.1. Aboriginal Land Use

Written records and reports of Aboriginal people at the time of early European occupation make only occasional comments about Aboriginal lifeways, and at a time when those lifeways had already been disrupted by the consequences of European occupation: the effects of disease, displacement of people from traditional lands and disruption to traditional food and other resources.

The Gunnedah basin fell within the area covered by the Kamilaroi (or Gamilaraay) dialect of the “Darling Tributaries” language. Kamilaroi extended from about Walgett in the north, southwards to about Willow Tree (Wafer and Lissarrague 2008) (Figure 3). Wafer and Lissarrague (2008) also discuss Mathews’ (1903) suggestion that Guyinbaraay (“Guinbrai”) was spoken around Gunnedah, but conclude that the dialect was probably spoken in south-central Queensland.

An overview of observations of Aboriginal people in the early historic period was compiled by O’Rourke’s (1997) work. Elsewhere there is a widely accepted model of ‘ranges’ (hunting grounds) overlapping with or containing ‘estates’ defined in terms of special totem sites (lands held by religious title). However, O’Rouke’s (1977) compilation of observations for the Kamilaroi, indicate that range and estate were co-extensive - or that a distinction between the two may not have existed (MacDonald, 1999).

Of particular interest here are observations suggesting how people used the landscape. There were several reports of villages of circular huts with conical roofs made from reeds, grass and boughs, or sometimes of bark, with bark floors. The reports by Allan Cunningham and Major Thomas Mitchell indicated that such villages were associated with substantial permanent water supplies – such as at Barbers Lagoon on the Namoi River, on the Gwydir River and Cox Creek. O’Rourke (1997) suggested that each clan may have consisted of perhaps 160 adult men, women, adolescents and children. Each clan probably resided most of the year at a small number of established, favourable locations within their estate.

The exploitation of animal food resources in the past are likely to have been eels, freshwater crayfish, yabbies, tortoises, mussels, birds, eggs, kangaroos, wallabies, koalas, possums, emus, echidnas, lizards, snakes and frogs. Local available plant foods would have also been utilised such as grass seeds, wild orange, emu apple, melons, tubers, yams and roots. Mature trees found in the area would have been utilised for their bark in the manufacture of watercraft. Nets and fishing line made out of local resources would have been used to trap fish or waterbirds (Mathews, 1903).
Figure 3: Map of language areas in central NSW (Wafer and Lissarrague, 2008:217)
If the settlement model described above did apply, then it may have resulted in a distinctive pattern of site distribution. Large dense sites resulting from long-term residential and domestic occupation would have been associated with major or permanent water supplies. Small sites from logistical use by small task groups or daytime camps would have existed in the hinterland terrain surrounding major resource areas.

5.2. Aboriginal History
The period following contact between Aboriginal people and Europeans tended to follow a similar course in different parts of Australia (Prentis, 1988, reported by Rich, 1989). Aboriginal reactions to Europeans included initial avoidance, followed by cautious approach and establishment of friendly relations, then resistance (military resistance) and adaptation (which can be defined as cultural resistance). European reactions to Aboriginal people included an initial ambiguous mix of friendship and revenge until c.1850. This was generally followed by protection and segregation to “smooth the pillow of a dying race” from c.1850 to World War II. This was followed by a policy of assimilation from 1937. Recently there has been a shift to self-determination and a reclaiming of cultural identity. Throughout the historic period Aboriginal people were not passive in their interaction with Europeans but could and did make constructive responses to determine the shape of relations (Prentis, 1988, reported by Rich, 1989).

Initially, Aboriginal people were generally discouraged by the European explorers who travelled across the Liverpool Plains: John Oxley in 1818 and Allan Cunningham in 1827. George Clarke (an escaped convict) is reported to have lived with Aboriginal people on the Liverpool Plains for a number of years up until 1831 (Mahaffey, 1980). Also it was recorded that Thomas Mitchell travelled across the Liverpool Plains utilising Aboriginal people as guides (Jervis, 1962 in Rich, 1989).

Changes occurred in the Liverpool Plains between 1820 and 1830s with the increase of agricultural practices. The relationship between the Aboriginal people and pastoralists of the area was initially not violent but this changed with the massacre at Myall Creek in 1838. In 1881 a Protector of Aborigines was appointed, which resulted in a Protection Board established. (Prentis, 1988, reported by Rich, 1989). The violence continued in the area as the appointed Protector of Aborigines became overwhelmed by the large work area. This caused more violence and harsh relationships between the Aboriginal people and European settlers, although this was not always the case in areas in the north eastern parts of NSW (Prentis, 1988, reported by Rich, 1989). It is expected that traditional values and activities remained on the Liverpool Plains, practiced by the Kamilaroi people up until the twentieth century.
In the early twentieth century Aboriginal people in the area were settled on a reserve, which expanded across 20 acres of land located near the Namoi River approximately 20 km from the subject area. This reserve called Baan Baa Aboriginal Reserve (AR 32747) operated between 1901 and 1918 (Thompson, 1981).

The number of Kamilaroi people declined over time due to the loss of land, disturbance to environment and social networks. The influence of disease sweeping through the area during the time also affected the Kamilaroi people (Mitchell, 1839; Parker, 1905; O’Rourke, 1997). Post contact many Kamilaroi people worked in association with pastoral stations and homesteads acquiring jobs as labourers (O’Rourke, 1997). Bevan O’Regan (a local station owner) recalled details of earlier Aboriginal people settling at a site on Goonbri Creek. This location is in close proximity to the subject area and these people are quite probably associated with the areas to the south near Gins Gully.
6. **LANDSCAPE CONTEXT**

The natural environment of an area influences the availability of local resources such as food and raw materials for artefacts, rock platforms for engravings and axe sharpening, and rock outcrops that may provide shelter. The landscape also provides the sediments which may bury objects and archaeological features, as well as the erosive processes that might expose or disperse them. Detailing the landscape context is an integral procedure that assists with the modelling of potential past Aboriginal landuse practices and/or predicting site distribution patterns within any given landscape (Guilfoyle, 2006).

With respect to Aboriginal archaeology, land formation processes may impact upon the type and frequency of archaeological remains. Past climate may also impact upon the location and types of resources available, which in turn would impact upon settlement and mobility patterns of past Aboriginal groups in the area (NPWS, 1997: 16; Mulvaney and Kamminga, 1999).

The location of different site-types (such as middens, open artefact scatters, axe grinding grooves, petroglyphs [engravings], etc.) are strongly influenced by factors such as these along with a range of other associated features, which are specific to different land systems and bedrock geology (Mulvaney and Kamminga, 1999).

The Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) requires a review of landscape context to assist in the determination or prediction of the potential of a landscape to have accumulated or preserved objects, the ways Aboriginal people may have used the landscape in the past, with regard to identifiable resources or focal points for activities, and the likely distribution of the material traces of Aboriginal land use based on these factors.

6.1. **Land Use History**

The subject area landscape appears to have undergone significant changes since European occupation began in the early-mid 19th century. The changes/impacts observed have occurred primarily as a consequence of European land management strategies. Suffice it to say that the survey area landscape is far removed from that which earlier Aboriginal inhabitants lived in. Due to the past landuse and disturbances, this would ultimately affect the context of any potential archaeological sites. The removal of the vegetation and modification of the soils through agricultural practices and erosion in the past has reduced the potential for archaeological remains to survive (Plate 1).
6.2. Climate

The subject area is situated on the north western slopes of NSW and experiences a temperate climate. The climate of the area is influenced somewhat by the landscape to the west but more by the substantial mountain ranges located to the east and south.

The climate can be characterised by mild to hot summers and cool winters. Average daily maximum temperatures are highest in January (32 degrees Celsius [°C]) and average daily minimum temperatures are lowest in July (5°C) (Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology [BoM], 2011).

The rainfall in the local area results from the passage of one of three major synoptic systems. The regular movements of cold fronts across NSW, the passage of moist upper atmosphere low cells into the area from Queensland or the passage of inland tropical cyclones or low pressure systems (BoM, 2011). The subject area receives approximately 619 mm of rainfall per annum (BoM, 2011).
6.3. Landscape Description and Recording

The basis of describing and recording landscape will provide information when assessing the material traces from past Aboriginal activity. This will also help with assessing the archaeological potential of the subject area with focus on defining site variability and patterning. From the information gathered in this section, the landscape in the subject area can be characterised into the following five landscape units:

- Ridge top (Plate 2);
- Saddle;
- Upper slope (Plate 3);
- Lower slope (Plate 4); and
- Plain2 (Plate 5).

These varying landscapes are found across the subject area and are useful as they contribute to the predictive model for potential archaeological deposits (PADs), and inform survey strategy.

Elevations in the subject area range from 370 metres (m) Australian Height Datum [AHD] on the hills in the north down to 260 m AHD on the floodplains of Bollol and Goonbri Creeks in the south. It is expected that most of the landscapes in the subject area will be prone to degradation (net sediment loss) due to the presence of slopes with active water flow (slope wash, sheet and gully erosion) and past agricultural practices (e.g. extensive clearing and grazing). The findings of the survey may have been affected by these processes.

Plate 2: Typical ridge top slope landscape
Plate 3: Typical upper slope landscape

---

2 “Plain” as used in this report is equivalent to the Central Mixed Soil Floodplains (Namoi Catchment Water Study - Phase 2 Report, August 2011).
6.4. Hydrology

The subject area is situated in the foothills of the Willowtree Range approximately 12 km east of the Namoi River. The main local drainages within the vicinity of subject area are Nagero, Bollol and Goonbri Creek. These creeks drain west to the Namoi River.

The Nagero Creek catchment rises along the southern margin of the Willowtree Range in the Leard State Forest north of the subject area. The section of Nagero Creek that is located in the vicinity of the subject area is ephemeral and only flows during or after prolonged rainfall events or periods of frequent rainfall.

The headwaters of Bollol Creek rise in timbered hilly terrain approximately 20 km east of the subject area. More than half of the southern portion of subject area is within the Bollol Creek catchment. Bollol Creek is also ephemeral, flowing for short periods during and following prolonged rainfall events.

Goonbri Creek, which is a tributary of Bollol Creek, rises on the eastern slopes of the Willowtree Range. Similar to the other creeks in the vicinity of the Project, Goonbri Creek is an ephemeral creek and only flows during and following prolonged rainfall events (Gilbert & Associates, 2010).
6.5. Vegetation

Past modification of the vegetation is evident in the modern landscape of the subject area. Much of the vegetation on the alluvial plains to the west, east and south of the subject area has been extensively cleared for grazing and cultivation following European settlement in the early to mid nineteenth century. The largest area of remnant vegetation occurs in the hills and ranges in the north of the subject area and forms part of the Leard State Forest. A number of fencelines and access tracks have been cleared throughout this area. More recently, there has been substantial earthworks and vegetation clearance in the vicinity of the subject area associated with the adjoining Boggabri Coal Mine. The distribution of remnant vegetation across the subject area can be seen on Figure 2.

6.6. Soils

Soil landscapes are important to define when contributing to the subject area’s site formation processes. Field observations indicate that soils within the subject area are dominated by loam and gravely sand with contrasted solodic profiles. The sand to loam horizon lies on top of sandy, medium clays. The sandy topsoils become finer on the plains, and along the drainage lines the soil ranges from red clay loams to dark earths and heavy alluvial clay.

6.7. Geology

The subject area is located in the Gunnedah Basin, which contains Permian and Triassic sediments. The Gunnedah Basin forms the central part of the Sydney-Gunnedah-Bowen Basin which extends across the eastern fringe of Australia (Branagan and Packham, 2000).

A north-south trending ridge of volcanic rocks, known as the Boggabri Volcanics, divides the Gunnedah Basin into the Maules Creek sub-basin to the east and the Mullaley sub-basin to the west and south. The subject area is situated on the western side of the Maules Creek sub-basin. The sedimentary stratigraphy of the subject area is dominated by lithic conglomerate, lithic sandstone, siltstone, minor claystone, coal seams and localised volcanic rocks. Figure 4 shows the local geology in the vicinity of the subject area.

The subject area comprises of low hills and ridges of volcanic and sedimentary bedrock, which gently slope down to alluvial plains. The summits of the two major hills in the vicinity of the subject area are remnants of the Boggabri Volcanics (rhyolitic to dacitic lavas and ashflow tuffs (Brown et al., 1992; Roberts et al., 2004) and Maules Creek Formation (sandstones and conglomerates). It is possible that the rhyolite in these formations could include stone suitable for manufacture of flaked artefacts.
7. **PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL STUDIES**

The following section aims to describe, analyse and synthesise previous archaeological information, to contribute to a baseline for what is known about Aboriginal cultural heritage in the subject area. This research is suitable to the size and scale of the proposed activity in the subject area.

7.1. **Regional archaeological context**

Aboriginal people may have occupied the Gunnedah basin in the Late Pleistocene, from the end of the Last Glacial Maximum. At Lime Springs, south of Gunnedah, stone artefacts were found associated with megafauna within a deposit dated 19,300 ± 500 BP (SUA-915). The artefact assemblage showed change over time in artefact size, types and raw material proportions. The earlier assemblage consisted of small flakes of a variety of siliceous rock types, while the latter industry was “Karton” in nature with large horsehoe cores and scrapers, often of tuff (Gorecki *et al.*, 1984). These artefact types were once thought to be Pleistocene in age, sometimes occurring in the Early Holocene. It was part of the Australian Core Tool and Scraper industry (Lourandos, 1997), but is now thought to be a chronological marker.

In the middle Holocene several types of finely made small implements were added to the toolkit; in this region backed artefacts are the most frequent of these. The flaking technology was characterised by the production of blades, together with technological changes in core preparation and controlled flake production. Fine grained siliceous rock types were preferred (Lourandos, 1997). On the New England, excavations at Bendemeer showed that backed artefacts were used during the last 1,500 years or so (McBryde, 1974) and at Graman from about 5,500 BP (McBryde, 1974).

Edge ground hatchets were also added to the toolkit, perhaps by 4,500 BP (McBryde, 1974). Petrological analysis of hatchets was combined with information on the distribution of hatchets across northern NSW (Binns and McBryde, 1972). Hatchets found in the Boggabri and Namoi River areas were predominantly Group 2B. These hatchets were of coarse and fine-grained greywackes with pale bluish-green inclusions, mostly derived from metamorphosed andesitic volcanic detritus, which originated from the Moore Creek quarry north of Tamworth. Hatchets from this quarry are numerous and widely distributed. They are abundant in the Liverpool Plains and extend northerly and north-westerly into the Western Slopes and Plains, along the Darling River to Wilcannia. They also occur on the New England Tableland from Walcha-Bendemeer to Inverell-Glen Innes, and one was found south of Willow Tree. (Binns and McBryde, 1972).
The distribution of 2B hatchets from the Moore Creek quarry is remarkably similar to the distribution of the Kamilaroi (Gamilaraay) and Anaiwan language areas (Wafer and Lissarrague, 2008). These hatchets may have usually been distributed by people related through language or some other social association, which may have been in place for the last few thousand years of prehistory. The current subject area falls within that distribution area.

7.2. Local Archaeology

7.2.1. AHIMS Database Search

An AHIMS search was carried out on 17 December 2010. The search was conducted using the coordinates set out in Table 5. The size of the search area was sufficient to allow adequate landscape interpretation and also provided a large number of registered Aboriginal sites to assist in an understanding of the distribution of Aboriginal cultural heritage across the landscape. The results of the AHIMS search are included in Appendix 1. It should be noted that the distribution of sites in the AHIMS database is a reflection of where site surveys have been previously carried out, as well as the locations of the sites themselves. Other sites are likely to be present, but in areas which have not been searched and/or obscured by thick grass or buried below the ground surface. The definition for site types can be found in Appendix 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>219516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>6602037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: AHIMS Database Search Criteria (GDA94)

The results of the AHIMS search are summarised in Table 6 and are shown on Figure 5. A total of 90 sites have been previously recorded within the search area with open artefacts the most common site type. Culturally modified trees were the second-most frequent site type. One site was listed as ‘restricted’ meaning that it was considered to include culturally-sensitive information. No engraving, grinding grooves, or shelter sites had been recorded, probably reflecting a paucity of suitable sandstone formations in the search area. The summary of registered sites in the region of the subject area provides insight into forming predictive models for the subject area and is discussed in Section 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Artafact</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Artafact and Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open PAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted AHIMS Access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Site types from AHIMS database search
Note: Due to the scale of this map registered sites may overlap and their view are therefore constricted.
Three Aboriginal cultural heritage sites, NAS1 (also known as NAS01), NIS01 and NAS2 (also known as NAS02), have been previously identified within the currently approved TCM disturbance area (Figure 6). These three sites are isolated finds of stone artefacts (NAS1, NIS01 and NAS2). Sites NAS1 and NIS01 and Site NAS2 have been salvaged under Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permits 2312 and 3361, respectively.

Four Aboriginal cultural heritage sites have been previously identified within the subject area (BC17, BC18, BC22 and GGOS1) (Figure 6). These four sites consist of three isolated finds (BC17, BC18 and BC22) and one open artefact scatter (GGOS1) which will be detailed in Section 11.

7.2.2. NSW State Heritage Inventory

A NSW State Heritage Inventory search was completed on 30 March 2011 and yielded no Statutory Listed Heritage Items in the subject area.

7.2.3. The Australian Heritage Database

An Australian Heritage Database search was completed on 30 March 2011 and yielded no records in the subject area.

7.2.4. Report Search

A search for reports on archaeological studies in the local area included AHIMS, reference lists in previous reports and internet searches. A list of known studies was compiled (Table 7). Most of these found Aboriginal objects and/or areas of potential. Most of the open artefact scatters had small numbers of visible artefacts. None of the reports described archaeological excavations, so it is not known whether larger numbers of artefacts would have been present at the reported locations, but beyond areas of ground exposure.
## Table 7: Previous Aboriginal cultural heritage studies in the Gunnedah/Narrabri area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cupper (2010)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Results of a cultural heritage assessment of the TCM.</td>
<td>This survey did not encounter any additional items or places of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insite Heritage (2010)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Result of a cultural heritage assessment for the continuation of Boggabri Coal Mine.</td>
<td>A total of 77 archaeological sites (artefact scatters, isolated finds and scarred trees combined).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Surveys &amp; Reports (2009)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>An Aboriginal Heritage Assessment for Narrabri Coal Mine.</td>
<td>Forty-three sites were recorded during the survey within the Panels 1 to 7 of the survey area. One scarred tree, one fireplace, 12 isolated artefacts, 19 sites with five artefacts or less, and nine sites that contained more than five artefacts were recorded. Of these, only seven sites contained 10 or more artefacts, and only one was believed to contain more than 100 artefacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Surveys &amp; Reports (2007)</td>
<td>Gunnedah Shire</td>
<td>An Aboriginal Heritage Assessment of the Belmont Coal Project site (now Rocglen Coal Mine) and transport route.</td>
<td>Seven sites were recorded but only three, two artefact scatters and an isolated artefact would be impacted upon by the Project. Four scarred trees were found but did not fall within the potential impact zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navin Officer Heritage Consultants (2007)</td>
<td>Namoi River</td>
<td>Results of a cultural heritage assessment of the potential impacts of three options for the Keepit Dam Upgrade.</td>
<td>Total of 28 previously unidentified Aboriginal sites were recorded. Sites comprise five isolated finds, 13 artefact scatters, nine scarred trees and one stone procurement source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Surveys &amp; Reports (2005)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Archaeological investigation on the proposed East Boggabri (Tarrawonga) Coal Mine.</td>
<td>Eight Aboriginal sites were identified consisting of one scarred tree, six artefact scatters and an isolated artefact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm (2005)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Results of a cultural heritage assessment of Boggabri Coal Project.</td>
<td>Identified 59 sites including 30 artefact scatters, 26 isolated finds, and four scarred trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purcell (2000)</td>
<td>Brigalow Belt South Bioregion</td>
<td>ACHAs of NSW Western Region.</td>
<td>This assessment covered a large regional area and within it they located and recorded 1,110 Aboriginal sites, with 311 sites found within the Liverpool plains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haglund (1985)</td>
<td>Gunnedah Shire</td>
<td>Archaeological investigations of areas within proposed coal mining in Gunnedah area. Report to the Vickery Joint Venture.</td>
<td>Four extensive artefact scatters found with two located on the banks of the Namoi River, which were tested by excavation. Findings of surface artefacts and test excavations recovered artefacts that were low in number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson (1981)</td>
<td>Gunnedah Shire</td>
<td>EIS for proposed Vickery Coal Mine Project.</td>
<td>This assessment included investigations for the proposed Vickery Mining site. Several site types were found including axe-head grinding grooves, two open artefact scatters and some smaller open sites near minor drainage channels, on slopes and ridge tops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamminga (1978)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Report on proposed coal mining operation at Boggabri.</td>
<td>This archaeologically investigation examined the proposed Vickery Mining site which included the Vickery State Forest. No Aboriginal sites were identified during this assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3. Previous Predictive Models

Previous predictive models highlight the potential occurrence of a certain site type based on previous archaeological investigations in the wider area. A credible predictive model can help focus archaeological reconnaissance, and direct research to areas within a region that holds archaeological potential; although predictions need to be ground-truthed and tested. Using predictive models can be a highly effective means of stratifying conventional random sample surveys over large areas.

Two predictive models developed for the Gunnedah/Narrabri area during previous archaeological studies are relevant to the subject area (Archaeological Surveys & Reports, 2007; Cupper, 2010).

Archaeological Surveys & Reports (2007) made predictions relating to the Belmont Coal Project (now Rocglen Coal Mine), located approximately 15 km south-west of the subject area. Given the absence of suitable sandstone outcrops, presence of only one defined drainage line, limited sources of material suitable for knapping tools and implements they predicted that isolated artefacts or low density artefact scatters could be present and visible in erosion features along the banks of the central drainage line. Areas of PADs could be present, but intact occupation deposits would not be and scarred or carved trees more than 150 years old could be present in the area. Other site types would not be present.

Cupper (2010) created a predictive model of Aboriginal cultural heritage site distribution for the TCM Modification. Cupper (2010) predicted that stone artefact scatters and isolated finds of stone artefacts could occur anywhere but were more likely to be found on well-drained, level ground within 200 m of water sources, and mostly likely to be encountered adjacent to creeks and associated swampy areas. Scarred trees could occur anywhere that mature trees had survived, but given the extent of land clearing the probability of finding them would not be high. Burials would be unlikely, given the region’s acidic soils were not suited to preserving bone and other organic material. Freshwater shell middens would not occur, because they are rarely found more than 100 m from permanent water sources. Earthen features including mounds, ovens, hearths, stone arrangements and ceremonial rings are normally restricted to level ground, the former usually adjacent to water sources. They would be unlikely to be found because previous land disturbance such as earthworks associated with mining activities, grading roads and fence lines and ploughed cultivation during agricultural cropping would probably have destroyed them if they had originally occurred in the area. Sites dependent upon the presence of rock formations such as rock shelters, axe-head grinding grooves and rock art sites would be improbable because the subject area was devoid of suitable rock outcrop. The volcanic and sedimentary bedrock in the low hills and ridges does not form caves or overhangs, and was not suited to quarrying, but Aboriginal people may have collected pebbles and cobbles from colluvial and alluvial deposits for stone artefact knapping.
Cupper (2010) also noted that other places associated with spiritual aspects of traditional Aboriginal society such as ceremony and dreaming sites may have been located at topographically distinct or unique features, which could not be predicted from an examination of maps or other records.

In conclusion, the model from Archaeological Surveys & Reports (2007) predicted only small density artefact scatters or isolated artefacts would be present in the subject area. They also mentioned that modified trees older than 150 years could be present in the area. This predictive model is valid for the current subject area as the landforms of this project are shared by the region. Cupper's (2010) predictive model is also valid for the current subject area. This model is based on the shared landscape description between the subject areas. The past predictive models in association with the landscape context for the subject area enable current predictions to be made, which is discussed in Section 9.
8. **REGIONAL CHARACTER**

The purpose of describing the regional character is to effectively synthesise the previous archaeological work and landscape context within the subject area.

The region surrounding the subject area can be characterised by low hills and ranges giving way to open alluvial plains. Numerous small streams arise in the ranges and may flow intermittently after rain. These small streams flow into larger streams that meander across the plains, forming waterholes and billabongs.

The predominant archaeological evidence of Aboriginal occupation of the region exists as isolated finds and small artefact scatters eroding from shallow soils. Large complex sites appear to be rare. Occasionally, other types of material traces can be found, such as scarred trees. However, the presence of scarred trees will be restricted to areas where vegetation clearing and the impact of bushfires have been minimal.

The patchy ethnohistoric evidence suggests that Aboriginal people at the time of European contact may have lived in semi-sedentary residential camps, with well-constructed huts. Such camps should result in large sites with dense archaeological materials. To obtain food and other resources for these camps logistical trips would have been made into the surrounding hinterland, resulting in the discard of small numbers of tools and debris during individual activities. Over time, these logistical trips could result in an accumulation of numerous small sites and isolated finds.

Archaeological investigations at Lime Springs south of Gunnedah (Gorecki *et al*., 1984) and in the New England region (McBryde, 1974) indicate change over time in stone artefact assemblages. It is highly likely that those technological changes were related to changes in the way tools were used, and also to other changes in settlement organisation and mobility. If so, the site distribution pattern consisting of rare large sites and numerous small sites, may have been in place only in the recent past. Archaeological investigations in the region should be designed to test the antiquity of this regional character.
9. **PREDICTIONS**

A revised site distribution model for the subject area can be made, taking into account the details of previous archaeological research (Section 7), the landscape context of the subject area (Section 6) and the regional context (Section 8):

- Aboriginal objects could be expected on the ridge top, saddle and upper slopes which were likely to be vantage points to the landscape below.
- Sites could be expected to occur near ephemeral streams or creeks across the plain, especially if swamps or billabongs are or used to be present.
- Site survival is likely to be higher where disturbance from historic and current agricultural practices is low.
- Scarred trees could occur where mature trees have survived bush fires and land clearing.
- Site types such as shelters with art and/or deposit, axe grinding grooves, and engravings would not be expected in the current subject area due to the absence of outcropping sandstone.
- Burials are not expected due to an expected paucity of alkaline sand bodies.
10. COLLECTION OF FIELD DATA

10.1. Methodology of Archaeological Survey

The objective of the field survey was to identify places of Aboriginal cultural significance in the subject area.

An assessment of the subject area was made based on the level of disturbance from previous land use, survey variables (ground visibility and archaeological visibility) and the potential archaeological sensitivity of the area.

The methodology for the field survey involved:

- A focus on the areas which had a high probability of locating traditional Aboriginal artefacts, including creek beds and banks, and eroded tracks.
- The definition of the beginning and end points of the survey transects by physical markers such as roads, fire tracks and fences.
- The identification of landforms and areas of potential archaeological sensitivity.
- The numerical ordering of survey units based on the location of the area and the group who surveyed it.
- Representative coverage of all survey units, including those with low probability.

10.2. Conduct of Archaeological Survey

The archaeological field survey was conducted based on the sampling strategy developed in accordance with Requirement 5a of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) (Appendix 3).

The survey was conducted from 14 March 2011 until 17 March 2011 (inclusive). The participants of the field survey were Lance Syme, Melissa Dunk, Caroline Hubschmann, Catherine Vermeltfoort, and Warwick Wright of KAS, together with George Sampson (Cacatua Culture Consultants), Peter Beale (Red Chief LALC), Gary Griffiths (Bigundi Blame Traditional People), Les Draper (Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation), Josh Matthews (Bullen Bullen Consultants), Yani Wortley (Aboriginal Native Title Consultants), Karen Matthews (Minnga Consultants), Ron Griffen (Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation) and Mick Wortley (Giwiir Consultants) representing the Aboriginal community. The participants were divided into two teams of approximately 6 to 7 people. Each team consisted of two archaeologists with 4 or 5 representatives from the community. The survey was completed in hot weather conditions, with intermittent sun and shade at times, where one day was overcast with slight showers.
The following tasks were carried out:

- The survey team systematically walked transects covering all available sections of each area.
- The survey team was spread out horizontally approximately 10 to 20 m from each other.
- Transects were mapped and recorded using a hand-held GPS.
- The land surface and vegetation conditions were described, including grass cover, any exposed soils, rocks, and ground visibility.
- Ground surface exposures were inspected for Aboriginal objects.
- Trees were examined for traces of marks or scars by traditional Aboriginal people.

Generally the ground surface was covered by thick vegetation. Visible ground surface within the survey areas were associated with vehicle tracks, erosion from past agricultural clearing/land practices and creeklines. The survey team walked transects starting at easily accessible areas such as tracks, fence lines or roads and travelled systematically throughout the area. Special attention was focused on exposed areas as these were associated with higher visibility.

**10.3. Survey Units**

In accordance with Requirement 5c of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) archaeological survey units were defined and recorded.

The subject area was divided into the following survey units:

- Area 1 – north-east of the mine in the forested area; a triangle of land delineated by access track.
- Area 2 – east of the mine in an area of grassland, south of Area 1.
- Area 3 – east of the mine on the eastern side of the creek and adjacent to Area 6.
- Area 4 – north east of the mine on the eastern side of the creek, north of Area 3.
- Area 5 – east of the mine, on the western side of the creek adjacent to Area 2.
- Area 6 – far eastern extension section of the mine, adjacent to Area 4 and 3.
- Area 7 – south western extension of the mine, a triangular shaped area.
- Area 8 – two sections south of the mine, one in an open area in between Areas 110 and 112, the second area running along the southern side of the creek.
- Area 9 – the northerm extent of the mine, the largest area.
- Area 101 – east of the mine adjacent to Area 111 and Area 103.
- Area 102 – a small area east of the mine in and around an old quarry.
Area 103 - east of the mine, adjacent to Area 101 and 1.

Area 104 - east of the mine, adjacent to Area 105 on the western side of the creek.

Area 105 - east of the mine and adjacent to Area 103 and 104.

Area 106 - north east of the mine, adjacent to Area 104 on the western side of the creek.

Area 107 - south east of the mine, adjacent to Area 8 on the eastern side of the creek.

Area 108 - adjacent to area 7 directly south of the mine.

Area 109 - south of the mine, adjacent to Area 7 on the western side of creek.

Area 110 - south east of the mine, adjacent to Area 8 and 113, a rectangular area delineated by the road to the north and fence to the east.

Area 111 - east of the mine, adjacent to Area 2, a rectangular shaped area.

Area 112 - south of the mine, a large open paddock adjacent to area 8.

Area 113 - south eastern extent of the mine, adjacent to Area 110 encompassing the creek.

10.4. Location Information and Geographic Reporting

In accordance with Requirement 8 of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) the locations of all survey transects and any Aboriginal objects identified were recorded using GPS (hand-held) set to the Map Grid of Australia 1994 (MGA94).

10.5. Survey Coverage Data

The subject area was divided up into separate areas in order to gain a thorough understanding of the area as a whole. All landforms were sampled during the survey. The main areas that were focused upon were the creek lines, exposures on the plains and dense woodland areas in the north of the subject area as these would be more likely to yield a high density of Aboriginal artefacts, due to the high visibility and/or undisturbed nature of the areas. When establishing survey methodology for the subject area, the Aboriginal parties were consulted for their feedback on survey coverage (Section 4).

Factors which affected the survey coverage included:

- Ground surface exposure and visibility.
- Access constraints, including vegetation constraints and road access.
- The number of surveyors available.
11. RESULTS

11.1. Visibility Variables

The effectiveness of an archaeological field survey is heavily reliant upon the obtrusiveness of the Aboriginal site being looked for and the incidence and quality of ground surface exposure. Visibility variables have been estimated for all areas where a comprehensive survey was carried out in the subject area. This data provides a measurement with which to gauge and compare the effectiveness of the survey and the level of sampling conducted. They may also be utilised to determine the numbers and types of sites that may be present but which could not be identified by the survey due to poor ground visibility and exposure.

Ground surface visibility is a measure of the bare ground visible to the archaeologist during the field survey. There are two variables used to assess ground surface visibility:

- The frequency and extent of exposures encountered by the archaeologist.
- The quality of visibility within those exposures.

The major factors affecting the quality of ground surface visibility within an area of exposure are the extent of vegetation and ground litter, the depth and origin of the exposure, the extent of recent sedimentary deposition and the level of visual interference from surface gravels. Two variables of ground surface visibility were estimated during the survey. These being:

- A percentage estimate of the total area of ground inspected which contained useable exposures of bare ground.
- A percentage estimate of the average levels of ground surface visibility within those exposures. This is a net estimate and accounts for all visual and physical variables that have affected the visibility including the archaeological potential of any sediment or rock exposed.

Various Aboriginal site types exhibit different levels of prominence within the landscape. This is an important factor to consider when assessing the impact on visibility levels. Sites present upon or within rock exposures, such as grinding grooves, engravings and rock shelters, are more likely to be encountered than sites which are located on or within sedimentary contexts with little or no ground surface relief. A common factor affecting visibility is the presence of small rocks, pebbles and gravels in the exposure. If these particular raw materials are also suitable for stone artefact manufacture it may make stone artefact identification more difficult.
Visibility within the subject area varied depending on the type of landscape which was surveyed. Poor visibility was exhibited within most areas of thick forest and open areas with thick high grass. In contrast, visibility was very good in areas with high exposure such as clearings and quarries. Some areas of exposure throughout the subject area were eroded vehicle tracks.

Areas 1, 101, 102 and 105 can be described as upper slopes and they exhibited generally poor visibility, approximately 10%, although there were areas of exposure which allowed up to 50% visibility.

Areas 2, 5, 104, 106 and 111 are described as lower slopes. Visibility was generally poor due to thick vegetation in these areas. Eroded vehicle tracks provided the only high visibility locations in these areas. Area 111 contained slightly better visibility than Areas 2 and 5.

Areas 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112 and 113 are located on the plain. These areas contained good visibility closer to the creek, but further out visibility reduced significantly due to increased vegetation.

Area 103 was a saddle along the continuous ridge. It had poor visibility due to dense vegetation.

Area 9 was described as ridge top and contained very poor surface visibility, as the ground was covered with leaf litter and tree branches.

**11.2. Site Recording**

In accordance with Requirement 7 of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) sufficient information was recorded at each site to be able to complete AHIMS site recording forms. The definition for site types can be found in Appendix 2. A brief summary description of each of the Aboriginal heritage sites identified during the field surveys are provided below. Representative photographs of the Aboriginal heritage sites identified during the field surveys are provided in Sections 11.2.1 to 11.2.3. A summary of the known Aboriginal heritage sites within the subject area is included as Appendix 4. Site cards of the known Aboriginal heritage sites within the subject area are provided in Appendix 5.
11.2.1. **Open Artefact Scatters**

Twenty-one open artefact scatters were identified during the March 2011 field survey. One additional open artefact scatter (GGOS1) was previously identified along the haul road. This information is summarised Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Landform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-003</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-004</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upperslope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-015</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-016</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-017</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-018</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-019</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-020</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-021</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGOS1</td>
<td>GGOS1</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Summary of open artefact scatters*

Sites TCEP-05-001 (Site 26) and TCEP-05-020 (Site 45) are shown on Plates 6 and 7.
TCEP-OS-001 (Site 26 - Figure 6 and Plate 6)
Located on a level position approximately 50 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of three artefacts.

TCEP-OS-002 (Site 27 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 20 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts.

TCEP-OS-003 (Site 28 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 30 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of four artefacts (including a core).

TCEP-OS-004 (Site 29 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 80 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts.

TCEP-OS-005 (Site 30 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 100 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts.
**TCEP-OS-006 (Site 31 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 40 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of six artefacts (including one core).

**TCEP-OS-007 (Site 32 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 20 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of eight artefacts.

**TCEP-OS-008 (Site 33 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 40 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of three artefacts.

**TCEP-OS-009 (Site 34 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a high density artefact scatter consisting of 61 artefacts (including 10 cores).

**TCEP-OS-010 (Site 35 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 100 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of three artefacts.

**TCEP-OS-011 (Site 36 - Figure 6)**
Located on a slightly inclined position approximately 200 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of three artefacts. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

**TCEP-OS-012 (Site 37 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 20 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of four artefacts (including one core).

**TCEP-OS-013 (Site 38 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 200 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of seven artefacts (including two cores).

**TCEP-OS-014 (Site 39 - Figure 6)**
Located in an elevated position approximately 700 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.
TCEP-OS-015 (Site 40 – Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts (including one core).

TCEP-OS-016 (Site 41 – Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 30 m south of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

TCEP-OS-017 (Site 42 – Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 80 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts (including one core). The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

TCEP-OS-018 (Site 43 – Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of six artefacts (including two cores). The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

TCEP-OS-019 (Site 44 – Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

TCEP-OS-020 (Site 45 – Figure 6 and Plate 7)
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of six artefacts. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

TCEP-OS-021 (Site 46 – Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 180 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a low density artefact scatter consisting of two artefacts.
GGOS 1 (Site GGOS1 - Figure 6)

Located on a level position approximately 100 m north of Goonbri Creek, this site had been found previous to the March 2011 survey. It has been identified as a medium density artefact scatter consisting of 15 to 20 artefacts. The artefacts identified were flaked chalcedony, volcanics, mudstone, porcellanite and chert with a maximum artefact density of 4 per square metre (m²).

11.2.2. Scarred Trees

Eleven modified scarred trees were identified during the March 2011 field survey. Table 9 contains a summary of the sites that contain scarred trees found within the subject area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Landform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-001</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-002</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-003</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-004</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-005</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-006</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-007</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-009</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-010</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-011</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Summary of scarred trees

Sites TCEP-ST-003 (Site 49) and TCEP-ST-005 (Site 51) are shown on Plates 8 and 9.
TCEP-ST-001 (Site 47 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest, this site has been identified as a modified tree and lies in close proximity with TCEP-ST-010 and TCEP-ST-011. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect. The shape of the scar is characterised by an oval and its orientation is north.

TCEP-ST-002 (Site 48 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a modified tree. The tree is currently a stump and the shape of the scar is characterised by an oval, with an orientation facing north.

TCEP-ST-003 (Site 49 - Figure 6 and Plate 8)
Located on a level position approximately 150 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as a modified tree. The shape of the scar is characterised by being round in shape and its orientation facing south-west.

TCEP-ST-004 (Site 50 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position alongside Goonbri Road approximately 150 m north of Goonbri Creek, this site has been identified as a modified tree. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect. The width of the scar is 260 mm with an orientation facing south-east.

TCEP-ST-005 (Site 51 - Figure 6 and Plate 9)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m north of Goonbri Creek, this site has been identified as a modified tree in close proximity to TCEP-ST-006. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect. The tree has two scars both characterised by a round shape, with an orientation facing north.

TCEP-ST-006 (Site 52 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m north of Goonbri Creek, this site has been identified as a modified tree in close proximity to TCEP-ST-005. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect. The shape of the scar is characterised by an oval and its orientation is north.

TCEP-ST-007 (Site 53 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 250 m north of Goonbri Creek, this site has been identified as a modified tree. The tree has two scars both characterised by an oval shape, with an orientation facing north.
TC EP-ST-008 (Site 54 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 300 m west of Bollool Creek this site has been identified as a modified tree. It lies in close proximity to TCEP-ST-009. The shape of the scar is characterised by an oval, with an orientation facing south-west.

TC EP-ST-009 (Site 55 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 100 m west of Bollool Creek this site has been identified as a modified tree. It lies in close proximity to TCEP-ST-008. The shape of the scar is characterised by an oval, with an orientation facing south-west.

TC EP-ST-010 (Site 56 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest, this site has been identified as a modified tree. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect. The shape of the scar is characterised by an oval, with an orientation facing south-east.

TC EP-ST-011 (Site 57 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest, this site has been identified as a modified tree. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect. The width of the scar is 110 mm and orientation on the tree is 280 degrees. The shape of the scar is characterised by an oval, with an orientation facing south-west.

11.2.3. Isolated Finds
Within the subject area, 25 isolated finds were identified during the March 2011 survey and three isolated finds (BC17, BC18 and BC22) had been previously recorded in the area between the Tarrawonga and Boggabri Coal mines. This information is summarised in Table 10. It is important to note that although these sites contain one artefact, the lack of density may have been limited by the visibility and exposure conditions during survey and therefore may not reveal an accurate extent of the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Landform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Landform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-012</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Saddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-019</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-020</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-021</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-022</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-023</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-024</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-025</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC17</td>
<td>BC17</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC18</td>
<td>BC18</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC22</td>
<td>BC22</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Summary of isolated artefacts

Sites TCEP-IF-003 (Site 3) and TCEP-IF-010 (Site 10) are shown on Plates 10 and 11.
**TCEP-IF-001 (Site 1 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 400 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated flake. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect.

**TCEP-IF-002 (Site 2 - Figure 6)**
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest this site has been identified as an isolated stone flake. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect.

**TCEP-IF-003 (Site 3 - Figure 6 and Plate 10)**
Located on a level position approximately 50 m south of Bollol Creek this site has been identified as a hammer stone artefact.

**TCEP-IF-004 (Site 4 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 300 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated artefact.

**TCEP-IF-005 (Site 5 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 10 m south of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated flaked artefact.

**TCEP-IF-006 (Site 6 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 300 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated quartz flake artefact.

**TCEP-IF-007 (Site 7 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 30 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated flaked artefact.

**TCEP-IF-008 (Site 8 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 150 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated artefact with potential retouch.

**TCEP-IF-009 (Site 9 - Figure 6)**
Located on a level position approximately 150 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated silcrete flake artefact.
TCEP-IF-010 (Site 10 - Figure 6 and Plate 11)
Located on a elevated position approximately 380 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated silcrete flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-011 (Site 11 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 150 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated mudstone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-012 (Site 12 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position approximately 1,000 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated stone flake.

TCEP-IF-013 (Site 13 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position approximately 1,500 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated mudstone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-014 (Site 14 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position approximately 900 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated fine-grained siliceous (FGS) flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-015 (Site 15 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position approximately 700 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated stone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-016 (Site 16 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 40 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated stone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-017 (Site 17 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 10 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated stone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-018 (Site 18 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated stone flake artefact.
TCEP-IF-019 (Site 19 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 50 m south of Bollol Creek this site has been identified as a grinding stone artefact possibly made of sandstone.

TCEP-IF-020 (Site 20 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 20 m east of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as an isolated silcrete flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-021 (Site 21 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 300 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated silt stone core.

TCEP-IF-022 (Site 22 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 200 m north of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated silt stone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-023 (Site 23 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated grey stone flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-024 (Site 24 - Figure 6)
Located on a slight inclined position approximately 20 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated quartz flake artefact.

TCEP-IF-025 (Site 25 - Figure 6)
Located on a level position approximately 30 m west of Goonbri Creek this site has been identified as isolated stone flake artefact.

BC17 (Site BC17 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest this site had been found previous to the March 2011 survey and identified as an isolated stone flake. The site is gently sloping with an east to southeast aspect.

BC18 (Site BC18 - Figure 6)
Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest this site had been found previous to the March 2011 survey and identified as an isolated stone flake. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect.
BC22 (Site BC22 - Figure 6)

Located on an elevated position in Leard State Forest this site had been found previous to the March 2011 survey and identified as an isolated stone flake. The site is gently sloping with an east to south-east aspect.

The survey visibility and exposure varied across the subject area and was dependent on the landforms. In Table 11 the survey coverage is separated into individual survey areas which are categorised by their particular landform found across the subject area. The largest area of effective coverage was Area 112. Although this was the largest area surveyed, it contained low visibility. Area 102 contained the largest effective coverage percentage with 72% although no Aboriginal objects were found within this area. The high amount of visibility and exposure was likely caused by the past disturbances of the area. The effective coverage for the plain areas was gathered from 10 survey areas while lower slope contained six survey areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Areas</th>
<th>Landform</th>
<th>Survey unit area (m²)</th>
<th>Visibility %</th>
<th>Exposure %</th>
<th>Effective coverage area (m²)</th>
<th>Effective coverage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
<td>236,597</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>946,187</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>183,245</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14,660</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>375,246</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30,020</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>418,589</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33,487</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>934,270</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4,671</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>856,223</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17,124</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>1,152,533</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23,051</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
<td>313,842</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
<td>371,192</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7,424</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
<td>23,108</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>16,638</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Saddle</td>
<td>269,667</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>460,835</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46,084</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>250,787</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5,016</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>174,109</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8,705</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>210,623</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16,850</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>105,029</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>344,606</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5,169</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>1,110,436</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22,209</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>410,442</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12,313</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
<td>1,750,719</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52,522</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>962,704</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9,627</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
Area effectively surveyed (m²) = effective coverage area
% of landform effectively surveyed = area effectively surveyed / landform area x 100

Table 11: Survey Coverage Data
The effective coverage was sufficient for the assessment of Aboriginal objects, given the size of the areas within limited exposure. Based on analysis of the survey results and the subject area, it was determined that there was not a high probability of sub-surface Aboriginal objects being present with conservation value to the extent that would require test excavation. Notwithstanding, Sections 15 and 16 describe a recommendation to undertake subsurface works along Goonbri Creek prior to disturbance.

11.3. Survey Results Summary
A total of 57 sites were identified from 22 survey areas during the March 2011 surveys. An additional four sites (BC17, BC18, BC22 and GGOS1) had been previously recorded in the subject area. The location of all recorded sites within the subject area and surrounds is provided on Figure 6. The survey surroundings were diverse and characterised by the landscape description in Section 6.3. The site with the highest artefact density was site TCEP-OS-009 (labelled as site 34 on Figure 6) located within the lower slope along the western bank of Goonbri Creek. Over 60% of recorded sites were found within 200 m of Goonbri Creek and are associated with the surrounding plain or lower slope landforms. The plain landscape provides a 360 degree clear view of the surrounding area whereas the lower slopes contain pockets of clear view. Only one ridge top and saddle area was identified within the subject area and this was situated to the north of the existing TCM. The exposures at each site were found to be consistent as they were associated with erosion as a by product of vehicle movement, agricultural vegetation clearance or cattle.

The relationship between the extents of the exposure at sites was based on how frequently or recently erosive processes had occurred. The recorded artefact materials were comprised of quartzite, chalcedony, silt stone, volcanic and FGS. Approximately 20 cores, being items from which smaller flakes were struck, were identified as well as one hammer stone and one grinding stone (discovered in association with Bollol Creek). The majority of artefacts found were small in size although this provides potential evidence for flaking technology evolution i.e. production of geometric microliths.
12. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This subject area represents a number of artefact scatters, with low density varying in size from a couple of artefacts to 61 artefacts discovered in one scatter. This medium density scatter was located within the plain landscape adjacent to Goonbri Creek. There was low artefact densities found amongst the ridge top and upper slope areas. We were therefore unable to compare site composition in these areas against the sites with higher densities found within the plain and lower slope areas. The 21 artefact scatters within the subject area provide some evidence of the form in which lithic materials were procured and utilised in and around the subject area e.g. locally available raw materials being present in higher frequencies and larger general sizes than non-local raw materials. Seven open artefacts sites where identified within earlier surveys for the TCM site (Cupper, 2010, Archeaological Surveys & Reports, 2005).

The findings of the survey enable refinement of the predictive models outlined in Section 7.3 to be made. Predominately these refinements are in relation to expected site extents and artefact densities of sites within close proximity to permanent/semi permanent water sources. Previous regional surveys recorded similar densities of artefacts to the current study (Table 12).

The findings of this survey as well as the findings of past archaeological/cultural investigations in and around the subject area (summarised in Table 12), provide detailed information on land use and past Aboriginal activities. The results contribute towards a risk based impact assessment and development of management and mitigation measures (including the development of recommendations for future archaeological investigations and recordings prior to disturbance) under Part 3A of the EP&A Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAS (2011) (current report)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Aboriginal assessment for the proposed extension of TCM.</td>
<td>Fifty-seven sites identified comprising 11 scarred trees, 25 isolated finds and 21 open scatters containing between two and 61 artefacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupper (2010)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Results of a cultural heritage assessment of the TCM.</td>
<td>This survey did not encounter any additional items or places of Aboriginal cultural heritage significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insite Heritage (2010)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Result of a cultural heritage assessment for the continuation of Boggabri Coal Mine.</td>
<td>A total of 77 archaeological sites were identified which included artefact scatters, isolated finds and scarred trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Surveys &amp; Reports (2009)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>An Aboriginal Heritage Assessment for Narrabri Coal Mine.</td>
<td>Forty-three sites were recorded comprising one scarred tree, one fireplace, 12 isolated artefacts, 19 sites with five artefacts or less, and nine sites that contained more than five artefacts. Of these, only seven sites contained 10 or more artefacts, and only one was believed to contain more than 100 artefacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Surveys &amp; Reports (2005)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Archaeological investigation on the proposed East Boggabri (Tarrawonga) Coal Mine.</td>
<td>Eight Aboriginal sites were identified consisting of one scarred tree, six artefact scatters and an isolated artefact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm (2005)</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire</td>
<td>Results of a cultural heritage assessment of Boggabri Coal Project.</td>
<td>Identified 60 sites including 30 artefact scatters, 26 isolated finds &amp; four scarred trees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Summary of artefacts identified by past archaeological surveys compared to current project
13. **SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT**

13.1. **Background**

While all Aboriginal objects are afforded protection under the NP&W Act, decisions about appropriate management of individual cultural heritage items or sites is usually based on their assessed significance (archaeological and cultural) as well as the likely impact of the proposed development and the benefits of the development. The Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b) requires significance assessment in accordance with the processes set out in the Burra Charter.

Australia ICOMOS (1988) adopted the Burra Charter Guidelines in which cultural significance means aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is a concept which helps in estimating the value of places. The places that are likely to be of significance are those which help an understanding of the past, enrich the present, and may be of value to future generations. The Guidelines develop the following definitions:

- **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.

- A place may have **historic value** because it has influenced, or has been influenced by, a 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.

- The **scientific or research value** of a place will depend on 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.

- **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.

The process of significance assessment has received considerable attention since the early 1980s and criteria for assessing these values have been developed and adapted to deal specifically with Aboriginal cultural heritage.
Cultural significance indicates the importance of a site or feature to Aboriginal communities. This category may include sites, items and landscapes that people may have traditional ties with, as well as areas that may have contemporary importance to Aboriginal communities. Places of cultural value may have social significance to Aboriginal communities, they may have historic value through association with historic themes (e.g. missions or massacres), or they may take on value because of their rarity or because a place may be able to contribute new information about the past. Places may have aesthetic significance, being natural features with symbolic values, dramatic presence or tranquil qualities. Cultural significance may not be in accord with the interpretations made by archaeologists - a site may have low archaeological significance but high Aboriginal significance, or vice versa.

Scientific or archaeological significance may be assessed by placing a site, feature or landscape in a broader regional context and by assessing its individual merits in the context of current archaeological discourse. This type of significance relates to the ability of a site to answer current and future research questions, which may be influenced by physical condition (integrity), information potential, rarity and/or representativeness.

13.2. Cultural Significance of the Subject Area

A number of comments regarding the cultural significance were made by the registered Aboriginal parties during the Project information session, field surveys and review of the draft report as follows:

- All sites/artefacts have some cultural significance to Aboriginal people.
- Artefacts found in the subject area were of a similar cultural value to other artefacts known from the region.
- Areas with reduced visibility would likely have artefacts of a similar cultural significance to those recorded by the surveys.
- An additional pre-clearance survey of Leard State Forest should be undertaken prior to disturbance to identify any additional cultural trees not identified during the surveys.

In addition to the above listed general comments, Bigundi Biame Traditional Owners provided several specific comments regarding cultural significance:

"This report identifies some very important findings and the hope that one day our children will be able to walk in the footsteps of our ancestors, and be able to touch the stone used to sharpen tools by many generations before them, to see the tree from which an ancestor removed the bark to make a shield or coolamon, or just to stand in the space occupied by tens of thousands of years of our ancestors, to experience the spiritual connection."

And
“Whilst legislation determines Government Departments will receive compensation for the destruction of historically and culturally significant Aboriginal sites. This in no way compensates the Aboriginal Community for the loss of culturally significant and historical sites that cannot be replaced. I am struggling to understand how it is that Tarrawonga Coal Project intend (sic) to minimise the damage to these irreplaceable culturally significant sites.

Maybe someone could explain how the damage would be minimised if the Sydney Opera house or the Harbour Bridge was to be removed next week. I cannot imagine anyone, would not be outraged. They are icons of Australian history and culturally significant as such.”

Comments received regarding the cultural significance of the subject area from the registered Aboriginal parties are documented in the Aboriginal consultation log (Appendix 6), provided in full in the written correspondence received from the Aboriginal parties (Appendices 7 and 8), and quoted in Section 4.

13.3. Assessment of Archaeological Significance

Rarity and Representativeness: is an assessment of how rare or common a site or landscape is. In theory, heritage items may be determined to be significant because they are rare forms, or they may be considered to be very good typical forms. Whether items are of rare or common forms will depend to some extent on the variables used to distinguish them. Open sites, for example, may be distinguished from grinding grooves or scarred trees according to the general type of evidence present (e.g. stone artefacts distinguishable from trees with marks or grooves on rock platforms). To assess rarity and representativeness site type can be used initially, then this category subdivided until a satisfactory level of (dis)similarity is achieved. Within the general group “open artefact scatters”, sites may be distinguished according to other variables, such as their content, or their landscape setting. Technically, an assessment of representativeness should identify both what is typical or common as well as what is rare.

Research potential: is an assessment of the ability of a site or landscape to provide information to answer questions about the past. Several criteria may be considered.

Physical condition: Sites or landscapes in good physical condition are generally able to provide information on spatial relationships between (for example) stone artefacts, other remains, chronological units if present, and landscape settings:

- The connectedness of individual sites or landscapes - is the content, site or landscape part of a complex of related sites or landscapes?

- The potential of a site or landscape to provide a relative or absolute chronology extending back into the past; i.e. stratified sequences of cultural materials and/or dateable materials such as organic remains (radiocarbon dating), or sealed or cultural deposits (optical or thermo luminescence).
The ability of the site or landscape to provide a large sample size (large numbers of stone artefacts, art motifs, grinding grooves etc) about which statistically significant statements can be made.

13.4. Assessment of Archaeological Potential of the Subject Area

Due to the extent of sites and the features found, it is possible to provide some guidance towards the archaeological significance of the subject area. There are two site types found within the subject area, which are open artefact scatters and modified trees. Burials were not expected or found in the subject area. Furthermore, no rock outcrops were present in the subject area which may have revealed significance for their uses in grinding or art.

Rarity and Representativeness: Open artefact scatters have previously been found throughout the region and therefore are a relatively common site type. Open artefact scatters have been found in various landscape settings throughout the subject area. This is also true of modified trees.

Physical condition: Certain areas of the subject area have been disturbed due to mining activities, agricultural activities such as clearing of trees and other vegetation and cattle, however archaeological deposits may not have been completely disturbed by these processes. Other areas, such as the Leard State forest, contain good integrity and would more likely contain intact archaeological deposits.

Connectedness: The physical connectedness of the survey areas within the subject area depends on the type of landscape and its overall characteristics. A large portion of the subject area is made up of lower slopes and plains. In terms of connectedness on a wider level, the area as a whole remains connected.

Potential for a Chronological Sequence: The potential for a chronological sequence depends on the extent of intact deposits within the subject area. Along Goonbri Creek one would expect an inconsistent chronological sequence as flooding (and subsequent erosion and deposition processes) would result in inaccurate chronological results. The potential for significant sub-surface deposits that provide intact chronological sequences is assessed to be low based on the soil profiles within the extent of the site.

Ability to produce statistically useful samples of artefacts: It would not be accurate to estimate the number of objects which might be present within the subject area, due to the scale and landform complexity of the subject area. If the survey areas retained a statistically useful number of objects this would increase the research significance and potential. An artefact assemblage of this nature could provide if analysed, information on the nature of site occupation in the regional context.
13.5. Statement of Archaeological Significance and Potential

The following significance assessment is based on the scientific or research value and is not based on the insight of Aboriginal people for their cultural significance assessment of these sites. The subject area has the potential to provide archaeological information as it contains open artefact scatters, isolated finds and modified trees. The overall subject area is assessed as containing low to moderate potential of significance due to the number of sites present and the way in which this information contributes to the nature of Aboriginal land use in the region. Table 13 provides significance ratings for known Aboriginal sites within the subject area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</th>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Significance Rating for Individual Criterion</th>
<th>Overall Archaeological Significance Rating (Local)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-023</td>
<td>23 Low Low Low Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</td>
<td>Significance Rating for Individual Criterion</td>
<td>Overall Archaeological Significance Rating (Local)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-JF-024</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Low, Low, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-JF-025</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Low, Low, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-003</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-004</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-015</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-016</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-017</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-018</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-019</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-020</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-021</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Low, Low, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC17</td>
<td>BC17</td>
<td>Low, Low, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC18</td>
<td>BC18</td>
<td>Low, Low, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC22</td>
<td>BC22</td>
<td>Low, Low, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGOS1</td>
<td>GGOS1</td>
<td>Moderate, Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13: Significance rating for individual sites identified in this study**

1. Archaeological significance ratings are provided on a local scale. These ratings would be reduced if assessed on a regional scale.
14. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Sixty-one sites comprised of open scatters, isolated finds and scarred trees have been identified within the subject area. The impact of the Project on these sites is determined by the future expansion and development of the TCM and the degree of harm this will cause. The type of harm defined in this assessment is direct and therefore the consequence of harm is a total loss of value. The Project would result in a total loss of value for 38 known sites and a possible loss of value for one known site (due to its proximity to the disturbance area) (Table 14). Twenty-two known sites would not be directly impacted by the Project (Table 14).

The one site listed as having a possible loss of value is located in close proximity to the proposed open cut extent and the proposed permanent Goonbri Creek alignment. To be conservative it has been assessed in this report as being impacted. Subject to final post approval engineering designs, it is possible that this site would not be impacted.

Artefact types recorded are not particularly sensitive to potential indirect impacts such as blast vibration or dust deposition. Therefore, impacts assessed below are based on direct disturbance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</th>
<th>Type of harm</th>
<th>Degree and Consequence of harm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-001</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-002</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-003</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-004</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-005</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-006</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-007</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-009</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-010</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-011</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Direct (Possible)¹</td>
<td>Total loss of value (Possible)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-012</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site number</td>
<td>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</td>
<td>Type of harm</td>
<td>Degree and Consequence of harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-019</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-020</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-021</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-022</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-023</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-024</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-IF-025</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-003</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-004</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-015</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-016</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-017</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-018</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-019</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-020</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC EP-O5-021</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 17</td>
<td>BC 17</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 18</td>
<td>BC 18</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 22</td>
<td>BC 22</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Total loss of value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Summary of impact assessment for subject area

1 This site is located in close proximity to the proposed open cut extent and the proposed Goonbri Creek alignment. To be conservative it has been assessed in this report as being impacted. Subject to final post approval engineering designs, it is possible that this site would not be impacted.
It should also be noted that the Aboriginal community provided various comments regarding cultural significance (Section 13.4).

Considering the nature and scale of historic and ongoing land disturbance processes in the region, predominantly due to agricultural activities; the nature and extent of identified and likely Aboriginal sites in the subject area; and the nature and scale of impacts associated with the Project; it is considered that the Project would not substantially increase cumulative impacts to Aboriginal heritage in the region.
15. MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Based on the known and predicted Aboriginal heritage values within the subject area, it is concluded that impacts to Aboriginal heritage as a result of the Project can be effectively managed or mitigated through the following actions and strategies. These actions and strategies have been developed in consideration of comments received from the Aboriginal community throughout the ACHA process. It is recommended that a new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be developed for the TCM in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH (previously referred to as DECCW) to define the agreed management and mitigation measures.

The measures presented below are considered best practice in the mining industry. Their effectiveness and reliability is demonstrated by their continued use and inclusion in management plans and strategies developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and to the satisfaction of government departments.

15.1. Surface Disturbance

It is recommended that the following measures be undertaken to manage the impact of surface disturbance on Aboriginal heritage sites within the subject area:

- TCPL maintain a record of known Aboriginal heritage sites and mark these sites on site plans and relevant Project documentation and implement a protocol for surface works to reduce the risk of accidental damage to known sites.
- Where practicable, known Aboriginal heritage sites be avoided during Project construction and operation works.
- The location of known Aboriginal heritage sites be considered during final detailed engineering designs of the road realignments and permanent Goonbri Creek alignment and avoided where practicable.
- Where avoidance of known Aboriginal heritage sites is not practicable, site(s) are subject to baseline recording in consultation with representatives of the Aboriginal community prior to disturbance and artefacts salvaged for safekeeping in consultation with the Aboriginal community. Baseline recording of sites would include completing an Aboriginal Site Impact Recording Form (or its equivalent) and submitting it to the AHIMS Registrar for each site.
- Culturally modified trees located outside (but in close proximity) of Project disturbance areas be suitably fenced and signed to reduce the risk of incidental damage.
If appropriate in the context of the tree condition, culturally modified trees subject to direct disturbance be considered for salvage and a suitable location for the storage and/or display of the salvaged sections be identified and managed in consultation with the Aboriginal community.

Prior to disturbance along Goonbri Creek, a subsurface investigation should be undertaken. This investigation should include representative test pits and/or grader scrapes along the banks of Goonbri Creek within the proposed disturbance area. This investigation should be developed and detailed in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan. The purpose of this work would be to add to the recorded knowledge of the Aboriginal heritage of the site prior to disturbance.

It is anticipated that the Aboriginal community would provide advice on the storage of collected artefacts, management of artefacts at the completion of Project activities (e.g. artefact replacement onto the post-mining landscape) and the implementation of management measures for salvaged culturally modified trees.

15.2. General Management Measures

It is recommended that the following general approach be taken to manage Aboriginal cultural heritage during the life of the Project:

- Ongoing consultation with the Aboriginal community over the life of the Project. Appropriate Aboriginal representation during archaeological fieldwork (e.g. collection of artefacts prior to disturbance).

- TCPL to provide opportunities for Aboriginal community members to access known Aboriginal sites located on TCM owned land (e.g. for cultural reasons or as part of scheduled field activities) in accordance with Occupational Health and Safety requirements.

- Erosion and sediment control works be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Project Approval and in consideration of other Aboriginal cultural heritage management measures.

- Any new Aboriginal heritage sites identified during the development of the Project be registered with the OEH in consultation with the Aboriginal community.

- A record of known Aboriginal heritage sites, their status and location be maintained by TCPL.
A protocol/program be developed for TCPL to sponsor existing or new projects that benefit the wider Aboriginal community. These may include (for example): development and implementation of educational programs (e.g. Aboriginal culture and language programs); development of a regional cultural heritage assessment and record; and/or potential employment/skill development opportunities. Any such sponsorship should be made available to the wider Aboriginal community with submissions presented to TCPL and projects selected by TCPL based on their individual merit and benefit to the wider Aboriginal community.
16. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations are based on:

- The legal requirements of the NP&W Act whereby it is illegal to damage, deface or destroy an Aboriginal relic without first obtaining the written consent of the Director General of NPWS;
- The requirements of the Code of Practice (DECCW, 2010b);
- The findings presented within this ACHA.

It is recommended that:

1. Project Approval should not be withheld on the grounds of Aboriginal heritage constraints.

2. A new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be developed for the TCM in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH to define the agreed management and mitigation measures. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan should be developed prior to any works which would harm Aboriginal cultural heritage sites in the subject area and should be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and OEH.

3. Prior to disturbance along Goonbri Creek, a subsurface investigation should be undertaken. This investigation should include representative test pits and/or grader scrapes along the bank of Goonbri Creek within the proposed disturbance area. This investigation should be developed and detailed in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan. The purpose of this work would be to add to the recorded knowledge of the Aboriginal heritage of the site prior to disturbance.

4. Appropriate AHIMS site cards be completed and submitted to OEH to satisfy any obligations under Section 89A of the NP&W Act and Requirement 7 of the Code of Practice.

5. The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan includes a protocol for the involvement of the registered Aboriginal stakeholders in future field salvage/investigations. The protocol may include a roster system or similar due to the large number of registered stakeholders and in consideration of safety and logistical constraints.
6. A protocol/program be developed for TCPL to sponsor existing or new projects that benefit the wider Aboriginal community. These may include (for example): development and implementation of educational programs (e.g. Aboriginal culture and language programs); development of a regional cultural heritage assessment and record; and/or potential employment/skill development opportunities. Any such sponsorship should be made available to the wider Aboriginal community with submissions presented to TCPL and projects selected by TCPL based on their individual merit and benefit to the wider Aboriginal community.
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APPENDIX 1: AHIMS REGISTER SEARCH

Note: This appendix contains culturally sensitive material and is available upon request and subject to approval by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage.
APPENDIX 2: SITE TYPES

The following is a brief description of the site types that may occur in the current subject area.
Predictions of the type and nature of sites considered likely to occur within the subject area is
provided below. Where relevant, these definitions have come directly from the New South Wales
(NSW) Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW) (2010b) Code of
Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales.

Artefact Scatters

Artefact scatters are defined by the presence of two or more stone artefacts in close association
(i.e. within 50 m of each other) (NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service [NPWS], 1997). An artefact
scatter may consist solely of surface material exposed by erosion, or may contain sub-surface
deposit of varying depth. Associated features may include hearths or stone-lined fireplaces, and
heat treatment pits.

Artefact scatters may represent:

- Camp sites: involving short or long-term habitation, manufacture and maintenance of stone
  or wooden tools, raw material management, tool storage and food preparation and
  consumption.
- Hunting or gathering activities.
- Activities spatially separated from camp sites (e.g. tool manufacture or maintenance).
- Transient movement through the landscape.

The detection of artefact scatters depends upon conditions of surface visibility, including
vegetation cover, ground disturbance and recent sediment deposition. Unfavourable conditions
can obscure artefact scatters and prevent their detection during surface surveys.

Bora Grounds

Bora grounds are a ceremonial site associated with initiations. They are usually comprise two
circular depressions in the earth, and may be edged with stone. Bora grounds generally occur on
soft sediments in river valleys, although they may also be located on high, rocky ground in
association with stone arrangements.
Burials

The internment of human remains varies considerably throughout NSW and over time. In some cases human remains were placed in hollow trees, caves or sand deposits and may have been marked by carved or scarred trees. Others may be marked through the scattering of shells, glass and other materials or planting of various species. In some cases, markers may have been historically removed (NPWS, 1998). Burials have been identified eroding out of sand deposits or creek banks, or when disturbed by development. Knowledge of the locations of burials is frequently dependent on community awareness and may not be culturally appropriate to disclose (NPWS, 1998).

Culturally Modified Trees

Culturally modified trees include scarred and carved trees and are defined by the process of deliberate removal of bark or wood from a tree. Cultural modification of trees occurred for several reasons including: the manufacture of items such as canoes, containers, shields or shelters; the manufacture of foot or hand holds for tree climbing; the hollowing of trees to collect food; and for carving (Long, 2005). Carved trees are caused by the removal of bark to create a working surface, on which petroglyphs are incised. Carved trees were used as markers for ceremonial and symbolic purposes, including burials. Scarring from cultural modification is most likely to be present only on mature/old growth trees remaining from original vegetation. While culturally modified trees were more common in the early 20th century; the natural lifespan of tree species, changes in landscape management practices and intense fire events have all reduced the visibility of culturally modified trees in the landscape. Furthermore, the identification of culturally modified trees is complicated by a range of natural impacts that result in very similar scarring patterns including long-term traumas, storm and fire damage, animal damage, impacts and abrasions and ringbarking (Long, 2005).

Isolated Artefacts

Isolated artefacts occur where only one artefact is visible in a survey area. These finds are not found in association with other evidence for prehistoric activity or occupation. Isolated artefacts occur anywhere and may represent loss, deliberate discard or abandonment of an artefact, or may be the remains of a dispersed artefact scatter.
Middens

Shell middens comprise deposits of shell remaining from consumption and are common in coastal regions and along watercourses. Middens vary in size, preservation and content, although they often contain artefacts made from stone, bone or shell, charcoal, and the remains of terrestrial or aquatic fauna that formed an additional component of the Aboriginal diet. Middens can provide significant information on landuse patterns, diet, chronology of occupation and environmental conditions.

Mythological/Traditional Sites

Mythological and traditional sites of significance to Aboriginal people may occur in any location, although they are often associated with natural landscape features. They include sites associated with dreaming stories, massacre sites, traditional camp sites and contact sites. Consultation with the local Aboriginal community is essential for identifying these sites.

Stone Arrangements

Stone arrangements include lines, circles, mounds, or other patterns of stone arranged by Aboriginal people. These may be associated with bora grounds, ceremonial sites, mythological or sacred sites. Stone arrangements are more likely to be identified on hill tops and ridge crests that contain stone outcrops or surface stone, where impact from recent landuse practices has been minimal.

Stone Quarries

A stone quarry is a place at which stone resource exploitation has occurred. Quarry sites are only located where the exposed stone material is suitable for use either for ceremonial purposes (e.g. ochre) or for artefact manufacture.
APPENDIX 3: SAMPLING STRATEGY

Archaeological Survey Sampling Strategy

In accordance with Requirement 5a of the Code of Practice (New South Wales [NSW] Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water [DECCW], 2010b), a sampling strategy was developed prior to the field survey. The sampling strategy was designed to:

- Identify all five landforms to be sampled within the subject area by dividing them up into distinct areas to be surveyed where practical.
- Priority was placed in on the landforms deemed to contain a high archaeological potential and as such recommended by the registered Aboriginal parties.
- The sampling strategy aimed to cover the area of expansion to the east and south of the existing mines (i.e. Tarrawonga and Boggabri).
## APPENDIX 4: SUMMARY TABLE OF SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Landform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-001</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-003</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-004</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-006</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-007</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-009</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-010</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-012</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-013</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-014</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-015</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-016</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-017</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-018</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-019</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-020</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-OS-021</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-001</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-002</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-003</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-004</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-005</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-006</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-007</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-009</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-010</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-ST-011</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Modified Tree (Scarred)</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-002</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-006</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-012</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Saddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>Site Code (refer Figure 6)</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Landform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Upper slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-016</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-017</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-019</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-020</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-021</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-022</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-023</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-024</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Lower slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCEP-IF-025</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 17</td>
<td>BC 17</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 18</td>
<td>BC 18</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC 22</td>
<td>BC 22</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Ridge top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGOS1</td>
<td>GGOS1</td>
<td>Artefacts</td>
<td>Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5: SITE CARDS

Note: This appendix contains culturally sensitive material and is available upon request and subject to approval by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage.
APPENDIX 6: CONSULTATION LOG
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person Contacted</th>
<th>Organisation Represented</th>
<th>Form of Contact</th>
<th>Contacted By</th>
<th>Organisation Represented</th>
<th>Nature of consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>Phil Purcell</td>
<td>Dubbo New South Wales (NSW) Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECC W) Environmental Protection and Regulation Group (EPRG) Office</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>Tarrawonga Coal Pty Ltd (TCPL)</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>Megan Mebberson</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>National Native Title Tribunal</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Native Title Services Corporation Limited</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Narrabri Shire Council</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Namoi Catchment Management Authority</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/09/10</td>
<td>Robert Horne</td>
<td>Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC)</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for names of Aboriginal parties or groups that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/09/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Kimberly Wilson (Senior Case Officer)</td>
<td>National Native Title Tribunal</td>
<td>Response received from National Native Title Tribunal. Advised that there were no native title claims in the subject area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/09/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Courtney Field (Assistant Research officer)</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983</td>
<td>Response received from Office of the Registrar. Advised that there were no Registered Aboriginal Owners in the subject area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/10/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Paul Houston (Aboriginal Heritage Planning Officer)</td>
<td>Dubbo DECCW EPRG Office</td>
<td>Response received from Dubbo DECCW EPRG Office. Advised of eight Aboriginal organisations/individuals that may have had an interest in registering in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>John and Margaret Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>George and Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Justin Matthews</td>
<td>Carrawonga Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Jean Hands</td>
<td>Ellielewis Cultural Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gomeroi Narrabri Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Christine Archbold</td>
<td>Hunter Valley Cultural Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Clifford Matthews</td>
<td>Minnga Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Daryl, John and Melissa Matthews</td>
<td>Upper Hunter Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/10</td>
<td>Jason Wilson</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official request for registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Public Notice</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Notice published in the Namoi Valley Independent seeking registrations of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>John and Margaret Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>George and Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project. Additional registration for Bullen Bullen Consultants - registration of interest had been previously received on 02/11/10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/11/10</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/10</td>
<td>Phil Purcell</td>
<td>Dubbo DECCW EPRG Office</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official record of the Aboriginal parties that registered an interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/12/10</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Official record of the Aboriginal parties that registered an interest in the consultation process for the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>John and Margaret Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine (TCM) on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the TCM on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>George and Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the TCM on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the TCM on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the TCM on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the TCM on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/11</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Distribution of the Draft Methodology and invitation to attend a Project information session at the TCM on 25/01/11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>John Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. John and Margaret to attend Project information session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. Lloyd Matthews to attend Project information session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. Donna and George Sampson to attend Project information session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. Giwiir Consultants to send a representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. Tammy Bush to attend Project information session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/01/11</td>
<td>Robert Horne</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. Robert Home to attend Project information session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/01/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/01/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of attendance at the Project information session on 25/01/11. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/01/11</td>
<td>John and Margaret Matthews, Lloyd Matthews, George and Donna Sampson, Tammy Bush and Robert Home.</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants, Bullen Bullen Consultants, Cacatua Culture Consultants, Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation and Red Chief LALC.</td>
<td>Project Information Session</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Project information session held at the TCM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/01/11</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>John Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants (on behalf of Minnga Consultants)</td>
<td>Registration of interest in the consultation process for the Project for Minnga Consultants (on behalf of John Matthews). Minnga Consultants included in the list of registered Aboriginal parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/11</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Comments received regarding the Draft Methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Comments received regarding the Draft Methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>John and Margaret Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>George and Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Clifford Matthews</td>
<td>Minnga Consultants</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/11</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Documentation of the outcomes of the Project information session and invitation to attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/11</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Registration of interest from Bigundi Biame Traditional People. TCPL invited them to also attend field surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14/03/11-17/03/11 | Lance Syme       | KAS                       | Verbal          | Peter Beale  | Red Chief LALC            | Field survey with Lance Syme, Melissa Dunk, Caroline Hubschmann, Catherine Vermeltoort, and Warwick Wright (Kayandel Archaeological Services [KASI]), Yani Wortley (Aboriginal Native Title Consultants), Gary Griffiths (Bigundi Blame Traditional People), Josh Matthews (Bullen Bullen Consultants), George Sampson (Cacatua Culture Consultants), Mick Wortley (Giwiir Consultants), Les Draper (Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation), Karen Matthews (Mingga Consultants), Ron Griffen (Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation) and Peter Beale (Red Chief LALC).  

14/03/11 | Lance Syme       | KAS                       | Verbal          | Peter Beale  | Red Chief LALC            | Lance Syme spoke to Peter Beale (Red Chief LALC) regarding access of resources in the area.  
In regards to Chelsedonite, that it isn’t found on the Tarrawonga site but more over near Boggabri mine site to the north.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
<p>| 15/03/11     | Lance Syme       | KAS                       | Verbal          | Peter Beale  | Red Chief LALC            | Discussion with Peter Beale who confirmed the existence of a Scarred Tree near Maules Creek near the known Bora Holes (stone arrangements), located to the north of Gunnedah and the subject area. He also noted that a human vertebrae was found south of town (Gunnedah) and it was handed to police. It is currently undergoing forensic investigation.                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person Contacted</th>
<th>Organisation Represented</th>
<th>Form of Contact</th>
<th>Contacted By</th>
<th>Organisation Represented</th>
<th>Nature of consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/03/11</td>
<td>All Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Lance Syme</td>
<td>KAS</td>
<td>Lance Syme asked the registered Aboriginal parties at the conclusion of the survey whether they were satisfied that the subject area (in particular Leard State Forest and Goonbri Creek) had been adequately surveyed. All registered Aboriginal parties agreed that if the subject area had been adequately surveyed for the purpose of an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment and added that any areas not specifically surveyed (due to visibility) would have similar cultural significance to other areas that were surveyed. The registered Aboriginal parties suggested at the conclusion of the survey that further archaeological surveys of Goonbri Creek and a pre-clearance survey of Leard State Forest should be undertaken prior to disturbance. The registered Aboriginal parties agreed that the details of these surveys should be developed as part of a management plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/03/11</td>
<td>All Registered Aboriginal Parties</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Lance Syme</td>
<td>KAS</td>
<td>Some registered Aboriginal parties suggested that all registered groups be involved in further archaeological field work at Tarrawonga not just the LALC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Jane Bender</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Jane confirmed that the board of Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation had met regarding the Project the week before and a letter was currently being drafted and would be received by the end of the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Robert Horne</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>John Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. John Matthews said he supported the Project and was satisfied with the work that had been undertaken and the management measures proposed. He also indicated that he was satisfied with the consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/07/11</td>
<td>Clifford Matthews</td>
<td>Minnga Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone disconnected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. No answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Donna Sampson said she had not received the draft ACHA and requested it be emailed to her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Rodney Matthews said he had not received the draft ACHA and requested it be emailed to her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Robert Home confirmed he had received the draft ACHA but hadn’t looked at it so felt he was unable to provide any preliminary comments. He said he would try to provide comments by the closing date (26/07/11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Provided with copy of draft ACHA as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Provided with copy of draft ACHA as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Donna Sampson confirmed receipt of draft ACHA. She said she would provide comments in the next few days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Blame Traditional People</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Wayne Griffiths said he would provide comments via email in the next few days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Gwen Griffen said she was currently busy and requested to be called back in half an hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/11</td>
<td>John Matthews</td>
<td>Aboriginal Native Title Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for alternative contact details for Clifford Matthews (Minnga Consultants). John Matthews didn’t know of an alternative phone number for Clifford Matthews. John Matthews said he had spoken to Clifford Matthews regarding the Project. John Matthews said Clifford Matthews supported the Project and was satisfied with the work that had been undertaken and the management measures proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Rodney Matthews said he had not received the draft ACHA that was emailed to him on the 20/07/2011. Requested it be emailed to him again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Gwen Griffen</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Lloyd Matthews</td>
<td>Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request for comments on the draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Provided with copy of draft ACHA as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA. Rodney Matthews said he had not yet checked his email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/07/11</td>
<td>Rodney Matthews</td>
<td>Giwiir Consultants</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Confirmation of receipt of draft ACHA and request for comments. Rodney Matthews confirmed he had received the draft ACHA and provided the following comments. Rodney agreed with the recommendation that further archaeological work should be undertaken along Goonbri Creek. In particular he said he would like to see sub-surface work undertaken along the creekline including grader scrapes and sieving of the soil. He said while the ACHA reported that the potential for significant sub-surface deposits was low due to thin soil profiles, sub-surface work often yielded a greater number of artefacts than what was found during a surface survey. Rodney said he would also like to see scar trees fenced off to avoid damage during operations. Rodney also indicated that he was satisfied with the consultation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/08/2011</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Comments received regarding Draft ACHA. Agreed with the mitigation and management measures and recommendations made in the report. Requested a meeting to further discuss the impact of the Project on the cultural heritage of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Person Contacted</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Form of Contact</td>
<td>Contacted By</td>
<td>Organisation Represented</td>
<td>Nature of consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/08/2011</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Donna Sampson</td>
<td>Cacatua Culture Consultants</td>
<td>Comments received regarding Draft ACHA. Agreed with the recommendations made in the report. Requested that a three day workshop be undertaken prior to the development of a new Cultural Heritage Management Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/2011</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request to attend a meeting with TCPL to further discuss the Project and Draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/2011</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request to attend a meeting with TCPL to further discuss the Project and Draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/2011</td>
<td>Wayne Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request to attend a meeting with TCPL to further discuss the Project and Draft ACHA. Wayne Griffiths confirmed he would be able to attend a meeting on 15/08/2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/2011</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request to attend a meeting with TCPL to further discuss the Project and Draft ACHA. Phone not answered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/2011</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Phone Call</td>
<td>Meghan Farr</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Request to attend a meeting with TCPL to further discuss the Project and Draft ACHA. Robert Home confirmed he would be able to attend a meeting on 15/08/2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/2011</td>
<td>Wayne and Greg Griffiths</td>
<td>Bigundi Biame Traditional People</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Meeting held between Danny Young from TCPL and Wayne and Greg Griffiths from Bigundi Biame Traditional People.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/2011</td>
<td>Robert Home</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Danny Young</td>
<td>TCPL</td>
<td>Meeting held between Danny Young from TCPL and Robert Home from Red Chief LALC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7: WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE - PROPOSED TO ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY
LETTERS TO ADMINISTRATORS, REGULATORS AND LOCAL COUNCILS
23 September 2010

Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water
Environment and Conservation Programs
PO Box 2111
DUBBO NSW 2830

Attention: Phil Purcell

Dear Phil,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.
For your information, the following Aboriginal stakeholders will be contacted by WHC and invited to register their interest in being consulted as part of the process described above.

- Bigundi Biame Gunnedarr Traditional People
- Gunidah Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation
- Min Min Aboriginal Corporation
- Bullen Bullen Consultants
- Aboriginal Native Title Consultants
- Cobronwonga Consultants
- Hunter Valley Consultants
- Cacatua Culture Consultants
- Minnga Consultants
- Aboriginal Native Title Consultants
- Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council
- Upper Hunter Heritage Consultants
- Ellilewis Cultural Heritage Consultants
- Giwiir Consultants

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
23 September 2010

Namoi Catchment Management Authority
35-37 Abbott Street
PO Box 546
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Dear Sir/Madam,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below. Specifically, WHC requires contact details of any established Aboriginal reference group within the “Area of Interest” that the Namoi Catchment Management Authority may be aware of.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
23 September 2010

Narrabri Shire Council
PO Box 261
NARRABRI NSW 2390

Dear Sir/Madam

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.

Yours sincerely
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below. Specifically, WHC requires a list of registered native title claimants, native title holders and registered Indigenous Land Use Agreements within the “Area of Interest” that the National Native Title Tribunal may be aware of.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.

Yours sincerely,
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
23 September 2010

Native Title Services Corporation Limited
PO Box 2105
STRAWBERRY HILLS   NSW   2012

Dear Sir/Madam

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
23 September 2010

The Registrar
Office of the Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983
PO Box 112
GLEBE NSW 2037

Attention: Megan Mebberson

Dear Megan,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below. Specifically, WHC requires a list of Aboriginal owners within the “Area of Interest” that the Office of the Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983 may be aware of.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.

Yours sincerely,
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
23 September 2010

Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council
PO Box 745
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Dear Sir/Madam,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, which are located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the **Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979** (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

For the purposes of meeting its consultation requirements as set out in the **Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010** (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW), WHC hereby notifies you that it would like to consult with any Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or who have a right or interest in, Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the “Area of Interest”.

Should you know of any Aboriginal person or group who may wish to be consulted in relation to the process described above, could you please provide their details before 5.00 pm on 13 October 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the DECCW and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council, unless they specify that they do not want their details released.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
LETTERS TO ABORIGINAL PARTIES
28 October 2010

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants
16A Mahogany Crescent
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Margaret and John Matthews

Dear Margaret and John,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Aboriginal Native Title Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Aboriginal Native Title Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Aboriginal Native Title Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
28 October 2010

Wayne Griffiths
Bigundi Biame Gunnedarr Traditional People
16 South Street
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Wayne Griffiths

Dear Wayne,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Bigundi Biame Gunnedarr Traditional People who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Bigundi Biame Gunnedarr Traditional People wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Bigundi Biame Gunnedarr Traditional People intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
28 October 2010

Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants
16A Mahogany Crescent
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Lloyd Matthews

Dear Lloyd,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
Dear George,

**TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS**

**ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT**

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979* (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of Cacatua Culture Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of Cacatua Culture Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Cacatua Culture Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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Carrawonga Consultants
16B Mahogany Crescent
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Justin Matthews

Dear Justin,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Carrawonga Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Carrawonga Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Carrawonga Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
28 October 2010

Ellilelewis Cultural Heritage Consultants
20 Acacia Circuit
SINGLETON   NSW   2330

Attention: Jean Hands

Dear Jean,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Ellilelewis Cultural Heritage Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Ellilelewis Cultural Heritage Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone:  02 6741 9316
Facsimile:  02 6742 3607
Email:  dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Ellilelewis Cultural Heritage Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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Giwir Consultants
8 Fitzgerald Avenue
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Michelle Stair

Dear Michelle,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Giwir Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Giwir Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Giwiir Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

[Signature]

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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Gomeroi Narrabri Aboriginal Corporation  
29 Doyle Street  
NARRABRI NSW 2390

Dear Sir/Madam,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Gomeroi Narrabri Aboriginal Corporation who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Gomeroi Narrabri Aboriginal Corporation wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Gomeroi Narrabri Aboriginal Corporation intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council
PO Box 745
GUNNEDAH    NSW    2380

Attention: Robert Horne

Dear Robert

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
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Gunida Gunyah
PO Box 439
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Jane Bender

Dear Jane,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Gunida Gunyah who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Gunida Gunyah wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Gunida Gunyah intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

[Signature]

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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Hunter Valley Cultural Consultants
40 Humphries Street
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Christine Archbold

Dear Christine,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Hunter Valley Cultural Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Hunter Valley Cultural Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Hunter Valley Cultural Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 877
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Gwen Griffen

Dear Gwen,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
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Mingga Consultants
11 Coolibah Close
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Clifford Matthews

Dear Clifford,

**TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS**

**ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT**

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979* (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Mingga Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Mingga Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Mingga Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
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23 Clews Street
DUBBO NSW 2830

Dear Jason,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any Aboriginal person or group who holds cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should you wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If you intend to register an interest and do not want your details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
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Upper Hunter Heritage Consultants
14 Edinglassie Drive
MUSWELLBROOK    NSW    2333

Attention:  Darryl, John, Melissa Matthews

Dear Darryl, John and Melissa,

TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community. The subject area for the Projects is shown as the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan.

The community consultation process will be carried out in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) (ACHC Requirements). The purpose of community consultation with Aboriginal people is to assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments referred to above. Pursuant to the ACHC Requirements, any representatives of the Upper Hunter Heritage Consultants who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or places(s) in the “Area of Interest” on the enclosed plan are hereby invited to register an interest in a process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

Should any representatives of the Upper Hunter Heritage Consultants wish to register an interest in the community consultation process described above could you please reply by 5:00 pm 16 November 2010 to WHC via the contact details provided below.

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au
WHC advises that the details of any Aboriginal person or group who registers an interest in the projects described above will be forwarded to the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water and the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. If Upper Hunter Heritage Consultants intend to register an interest and do not want their details released, could you please specify accordingly at registration.

Please note that any opportunities for employment would be separate to the consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Plan Showing “Area of Interest”
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TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) proposes to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east and 15 km south-east, respectively, of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW).

WHC plans to seek separate approvals under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW) to develop the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects. These proposed developments would include open-cut coal mines and related surface facilities including infrastructure areas, overburden emplacements, temporary topsoil stockpiles, water management infrastructure and road realignments. As part of the Part 3A Application Processes, WHC will be preparing Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects following consultation with the Aboriginal community within the "Area of Interest" for the project.

To assist WHC in the preparation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (AHCIs) for the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, WHC hereby invites any Aboriginal persons, Aboriginal groups or organisations who hold cultural knowledge relevant to the "Area of Interest" to register with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 km south-west of Boggabri, New South Wales. The applications for registration must be made by 5pm, November 16, 2010.

Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents

All proponents are required to consult with WHC regarding the Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects, located approximately 15 km south-west of Boggabri, New South Wales. The applications for registration must be made by 5pm, November 16, 2010.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Whitehaven Coal Limited (WHC) owns and operates the Tarrawonga Coal Mine, located approximately 15 kilometres (km) north-east of Boggabri in New South Wales (NSW) (Figure 1).

The NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW) (2010) defines Aboriginal cultural heritage as consisting of places and items that are of significance to Aboriginal people because of their traditions, observances, lore, customs, beliefs and history. Activities that impact the landscape may affect Aboriginal cultural heritage.

This document presents a draft methodology for the Aboriginal cultural and archaeological assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project). The proposed Project would involve an extension to current open cut mining operations. The current pit would be extended both north and east and would increase the life of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine by approximately 13 years (i.e. 8 to 10 years to 23 years).

This draft methodology has been designed to conform to the relevant requirements of various advisory documents and guidelines. These guidelines and documents include:

- Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales (DECCW, 2010b)
- Draft Guidelines for Aboriginal Cultural Impact Assessment and Community Consultation ( NSW Department of Environment and Conservation [DEC], 2005), for assessing potential impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage for development applications assessed under Part 3A of the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.
- The Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (Australia ICOMOS, 1999).

The remainder of this document is structured as follows:

Section 2: Provides an overview of the existing Tarrawonga Coal Mine.
Section 3: Outlines the objectives of Aboriginal community consultation.
Section 4: Provides an overview of previous archaeological investigations undertaken at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine.
Section 5: Describes the consultation steps undertaken to date for the Project.
Section 6: Provides a description of the proposed cultural heritage assessment methodology.
Section 7: Describes the proposed archaeological assessment methodology.
Section 8: Provides an overview of the proposed content of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report.
Section 9: Lists the references cited in this report.
2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The main activities associated with the development of the Project would include:

- Increase in the total life of mine coal production from 16.4 to approximately 55 million tonnes (Mt).
- Increase in the total mine life by approximately 13 years (i.e. 8 to 10 years to 23 years).
- Increase in the run-of mine (ROM) coal production rate from 2 to 3 million tones per annum (Mtpa).
- Increase in the mining fleet to facilitate the ROM coal production rate increase.
- Increase in the coal road transport movements from the mine site to the Gunnedah Coal Handling and Preparation Plant (CHPP) associated with the increased ROM coal production rate.
- Extension of the open cut by approximately 1,500 metres (m) and 400 m to the east and north of Mining Lease (ML) 1579, respectively.
- Increase in the total waste rock production from 123.3 to approximately 562 million bank cubic metres (Mbcm).
- Extension of the existing Northern Emplacement, Southern Emplacement and open cut infill areas.
- Relocation of the current coal crushing, screening and load-out facilities, as well as the administration and workshop areas to the south-east corner of the mine site.
- Potential construction and use of a coal conveyor linking the Project with the Boggabri Coal Mine coal preparation plant to the north-west which if constructed may remove the need for coal haulage to the Gunnedah CHPP.
- Construction and use of new soil stockpile areas.
- Construction and use of dams, channels, dewatering bores and other control measures to manage groundwater and surface water within and around the mine site, including construction of a diversion structure on Goonbri Creek to the east of the mine site.
- Re-alignment of approximately 3 km of the off-lease coal haulage road to the Gunnedah CHPP.
- Re-alignment of Goonbri Road and Dripping Rock Road to the south and east of the mine site.
- Use of a mobile crushing and screening plant to generate approximately 300,000 cubic metres ($m^3$) of gravel materials per annum for direct sale to customers (i.e. collection at the mine gate).
- Direct sale of approximately 450,000 tonnes (t) of domestic coal to customers (i.e. onsite crushing and screening and collection at the mine gate).

Table 1 provides an overview of the existing operations at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and the proposed alterations to these operations as part of the proposed Project.
Table 1
Overview of the Existing Tarrawonga Coal Mine and the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Feature</th>
<th>Approved Tarrawonga Coal Mine</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mine Life</strong></td>
<td>8 to 10 years.</td>
<td>Increase to approximately 23 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mining Method</strong></td>
<td>Conventional open cut truck shovel mining involving sequential removal of topsoil, overburden, interburden, coal extraction, progressive backfilling and rehabilitation.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Coal Production Rate</strong></td>
<td>Maximum 2 Mtpa.</td>
<td>Increase to 3 Mtpa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Cut Operating Hours</strong></td>
<td>7.00 am to 12.00 am Monday to Friday, 12.00 am to 3.30 am Tuesday to Saturday, and 7.00 am to 6.00 pm Saturdays.</td>
<td>Increase to 24 hours per day, seven days per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life of Mine Coal Quantity</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 16.4 Mt.</td>
<td>Increase to approximately 55 Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Cut Disturbance Area</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 205 hectares (ha).</td>
<td>Increase to approximately 620 ha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life of Mine Overburden Quantity</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 123.3 Mbcm.</td>
<td>Increase to approximately 562 Mbcm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blasting Hours</strong></td>
<td>9.00 am to 5.00 pm, Monday to Friday.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROM Coal Stockpile</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 150,000 t.</td>
<td>Re-location to the new on-site processing area to the south east of the open cut, and increase in capacity to up to 200,000 t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Export Coal On-site Crushing and Screening</strong></td>
<td>Loaded onto conveyor via hopper and crushed to 150 millimetres (mm) by the primary crusher. Coal requiring further beneficiation sent to product bin and the remainder crushed to 50 mm in secondary crusher. Coal transported off-site by road to the Gunnedah CHPP.</td>
<td>Re-location and construction of the on-site coal crushing and screening facilities to a location to the south east of the open cut. Coal to be transported off-site by road to the Gunnedah CHPP and/or via conveyor to the Boggabri Coal Mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Coal On-site Crushing and Screening</strong></td>
<td>Installation and use of a mobile crusher at the mine to enable the crushing and screening of up to 450,000 t of domestic coal per annum to 15 to 35 mm, until such time as Whitehaven’s proposed Canyon domestic Hub is approved.</td>
<td>Continued use of a mobile crusher at the mine to enable the crushing and screening of approximately 300,000 m² of gravel per annum for sale to local customers. Collection of the gravel ‘at the mine gate’ by customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Gravel On-site Crushing and Screening</strong></td>
<td>Not currently undertaken.</td>
<td>Installation and use of a mobile crusher at the mine to enable the crushing and screening of approximately 300,000 m² of gravel per annum for sale to local customers. Collection of the gravel ‘at the mine gate’ by customers. Operating hours at 24 hours per day, seven days per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-site Coal Crushing and Screening Operating Hours</strong></td>
<td>Coal processing permitted 7.00 am to 12.00 am Monday to Friday, 12.00 am to 3.30 am Tuesday to Saturday, and 7.00 am to 6.00 pm Saturdays.</td>
<td>Increase to 24 hours per day, seven days per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product Coal Stockpile</strong></td>
<td>Product coal stockpile area with a capacity of 35,000 to 50,000 t.</td>
<td>Re-location to the new on-site processing area to the south east of the open cut, and increase in capacity to up to 200,000 t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Supply</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 118 megalitres (ML) per annum used for dust suppression at mine site and at the coal crushing and load-out facility. Approximately 45 ML obtained from surface inflows to pit area and 73 ML from surface inflows to sediment basins and storage dams.</td>
<td>Potential increase in the amount of raw water used for dust suppression at mine site and at the coal crushing and load-out facility. Mine water supply to be obtained from surface inflows to pit area, sediment basins and storage dams, plus surface water and/or groundwater licences as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Continued)
Overview of the Existing Tarrawonga Coal Mine and the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Feature</th>
<th>Approved Tarrawonga Coal Mine</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Management</td>
<td>On-site water management system comprises of water management storages and collection drains, runoff diversions, sediment control and open pit dewatering. Disposal of excess mine water through licensed discharge points.</td>
<td>On-site water management system comprising water management storages and collection drains, runoff diversions, sediment control and open pit dewatering. Diversion of a section of Goonbri Creek. Potential disposal of excess mine water through licensed discharge points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity Supply</td>
<td>On-site diesel-powered generators, consisting of a single 820 kilovolt amperes (kVA) generator, one 300 kVA generator, and a system of integrated 7.5 kVA generators for lighting movable light plants.</td>
<td>On-site diesel generators with increased power supply capacity, or connection to the regional electrical grid at the new on-site processing area (i.e. south east of the open cut).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Transport Requirements</td>
<td>Construction and use of internal haul roads and main mine access road. Use of public roads for transport of coal by truck to the Gunnedah CHPP. Coal dispatch permitted between 7.00 am and 9.15 pm Monday to Friday, and 7.00 am and 5.15 pm Saturdays.</td>
<td>Construction and use of internal haul roads and main mine access road. Use of public roads for transport of coal by truck to the Gunnedah CHPP. Increased coal haulage hours to allow for increased ROM production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine infrastructure, service facilities and soil stockpiles</td>
<td>Crib hut, offices, hardstand, first aid building, maintenance workshop, toilets, wash bay, and light vehicle parking area. Topsoil stockpiles located to the south of the Northern Emplacement and the Southern Emplacement.</td>
<td>Re-location to near the new on-site processing area (i.e. south-east of the open cut).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>86 full-time on-site personnel plus additional contract personnel employed on an as-needs-basis.</td>
<td>Approximately 120 full-time on-site personnel plus additional contract personnel employed on an as-needs-basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the activities described above that require surface disturbance in addition to that already approved would be undertaken within the study area as shown on Figure 2. It is not known at this early stage in the Project the exact location of all Project components. However, they would all be located within the study area shown on Figure 2 and the field surveys and investigations to be undertaken as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment will cover the study area.

3 OBJECTIVE OF COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The objective of community consultation is for Aboriginal people to have the opportunity to improve assessment outcomes by:

- providing relevant information about the cultural significance and values of the Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s);
- influencing the design of the method to assess cultural and scientific significance of Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s);
- actively contributing to the development of cultural heritage management options and recommendations for any Aboriginal object(s) and/or place(s) within the study area; and
- commenting on the draft assessment report before it is submitted to government.
4 PREVIOUS ARCHEAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS

Several cultural heritage impact assessments of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine area and surrounds have been previously undertaken and include:

- *Tarrawonga Coal Mine Modification Cultural Heritage Assessment* (Landskape Natural and Cultural Heritage Management Pty Ltd, 2010).

A copy of the most recent of these (i.e. *Tarrawonga Coal Mine Modification Cultural Heritage Assessment* [Landskape, 2010]) is provided as background information to this draft methodology (Attachment 1).

In addition to the above, a recent search of the DECCW Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) register was undertaken on 15 September 2010 for a 100 square kilometre (km²) grid centered on the study area. Based on the results of the previous investigations and the September 2010 AHIMS search, a total of nine Aboriginal heritage sites have been identified within the study area and surrounds (Table 2 and Figure 2). A copy of the site cards for each of these sites is provided in Attachment 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AHIMS Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0111</td>
<td>BC-17</td>
<td>Stone artefact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0112</td>
<td>BC-18</td>
<td>Stone artefact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0113</td>
<td>BC-19</td>
<td>Stone artefact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0116</td>
<td>BC-22</td>
<td>Stone artefact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0157</td>
<td>GGOS 1</td>
<td>Stone artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0158</td>
<td>GGOS 2</td>
<td>Stone artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0159</td>
<td>GGOS 3</td>
<td>Stone artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0160</td>
<td>GGOS 4</td>
<td>Stone artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0092</td>
<td>NAS 1*</td>
<td>Stone artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0156</td>
<td>NAS 2*</td>
<td>Stone artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0161</td>
<td>NST 1*</td>
<td>Scarred tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-4-0093</td>
<td>NISO*</td>
<td>Stone artefact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note that the AHIMS locations for these sites vary from the surveyed locations for these sites. Surveyed locations are considered more accurate and have been used as the basis for Figure 2.
5 CONSULTATION TO DATE

A summary of the consultation undertaken to date in accordance with the Section 4.1 of the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (DECCW, 2010) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project is outlined below.

The following organisations were asked for names of Aboriginal persons or groups who may hold cultural knowledge of, or have a right or interest in Aboriginal objects, places and/or Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the study area or surrounds:

- DECCW Dubbo Environmental Protection and Regulation Group;
- Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council;
- The Register, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983;
- The National Native Title Tribunal;
- Native Title Services Corporation Limited (NTSCORP Limited);
- Narrabri Shire Council; and
- Namoi Catchment Management Authority.

WHC provided written notification of the proposed Project to Aboriginal stakeholders identified by the organisations listed above, as well as those stakeholders previously consulted with for either the Tarrawonga Coal Mine or the nearby Rocglen Coal Mine. These stakeholders were invited to register an interest in the process of community consultation with WHC regarding the Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment of the proposed Project.

In addition to the written notifications, a notice was placed in the Namoi Valley Independent (2 November 2010) seeking registrations from any additional interested Aboriginal stakeholders.

6 CULTURAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The objectives of the consultation process are described in Section 3.

In accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (DECCW, 2010), WHC requests that registered Aboriginal stakeholders provide, where relevant, during the conduct of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment, cultural information regarding:

- whether there are any Aboriginal 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.

The cultural assessment and consultation process will involve the following:

- distribution of this proposed assessment methodology to registered Aboriginal stakeholders;
- review of the proposed assessment methodology by registered Aboriginal stakeholders who may wish to advise any matters such as issues/areas of cultural significance that might affect, inform or refine the assessment methodology;
consultation with registered Aboriginal stakeholders regarding the cultural context and value of Aboriginal objects and/or places that may be in the study area or surrounds (including appropriate management of any cultural information provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders that is sensitive or has restricted public access);

assessment of the significance of Aboriginal objects and/or places located in the study area or surrounds based on the context, Aboriginal heritage values and archaeological assessment;

consultation with registered Aboriginal stakeholders regarding potential management options to avoid or mitigate harm and/or conserve known Aboriginal objects and/or places; and

documentation of feedback received as part of the cultural assessment from registered Aboriginal stakeholders for presentation in the final cultural heritage assessment report (subject to the sensitivity of the information provided).

Sensitive Cultural Information - Management Protocol

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC 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 will include making note of and managing the material in accordance with the following key limitations/requirements as advised by Aboriginal people 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 within the relevant Aboriginal group 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 registered Aboriginal parties, of the cultural information in the material.

7 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The archaeological assessment will involve the following:

- a search of the DECCW AHIMS database;
- a search of the National Heritage List, Commonwealth Heritage List and register of the National Estate;
- provision of existing information on Aboriginal heritage within the study area and surrounds to the registered Aboriginal stakeholders, including a copy of the most recent Aboriginal cultural heritage impact assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine (Attachment 1) and copies of AHIMS site cards for registered sites within the study area and surrounds (Attachment 2);
- literature review of relevant cultural heritage and archaeological reports and publications;
- site inspection/survey of known sites within the study area and the study area with the assistance of registered Aboriginal stakeholders;
• archaeological significance assessment based on existing information and additional information collected during the site inspections/survey and consultation with Aboriginal stakeholders; and
• preparation of an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report.

Information from previous archaeological investigations at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine will inform the site inspection/survey of the study area and will also be incorporated into the archaeological significance assessment.

8 ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Following consultation on the methodology of the cultural heritage assessment 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 registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and feedback and will include:

• details of the objects and places identified within the study area and an assessment of potential impacts from the Project;
• records of the Aboriginal stakeholder consultation conducted and how any comments received throughout the assessment process were considered; and
• proposed management and mitigation recommendations drawing on information provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders and the findings of the cultural and archaeological assessments.
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ATTACHMENT 1

TARRAWONGA COAL MINE MODIFICATION CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT
LETTERS REGARDING DRAFT METHODOLOGY
4 January 2011

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants
16A Mahogany Avenue
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: John and Margaret Matthews

Dear John and Margaret,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

Project Information Session

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period)

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

Critical Timelines

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
4 January 2011

Bullen Bullen Consultants
67 High St
Gunnedah    NSW    2380

Attention: Lloyd Matthews

Dear Lloyd,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

Project Information Session

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
**Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process**

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period)

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

**Critical Timelines**

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
4 January 2011

Cacatua Culture Consultants
Unit 1b, 11 Glenwood Drive
Thornton NSW 2322

Attention: George and Donna Sampson

Dear George and Donna,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

Project Information Session

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period)

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

Critical Timelines

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
4 January 2011

Giwiir Consultants
8 Fitzgerald Avenue
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Rodney Matthews

Dear Rodney,

**TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT**
**ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT**

**Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment**

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

**Project Information Session**

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period)

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

Critical Timelines

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
4 January 2011

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 439
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Jane Bender

Dear Jane,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

Project Information Session

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period)

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

Critical Timelines

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
Dear Gwen,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

Project Information Session

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period).

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

Critical Timelines

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: February/March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Please find enclosed for your review, a copy of the Draft Methodology for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, 2010), we provide the proposed methodology for your review and feedback. Your feedback may include the identification of issues or areas of cultural significance that may affect, inform or refine the proposed methodology or any protocols that you wish to be adopted into the information gathering process or assessment methodology.

Any feedback with respect to the proposed methodology is to be provided by 5.00 pm Tuesday 1 February 2011.

Project Information Session

Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) would like to offer registered Aboriginal stakeholders an opportunity to come to the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and attend a specific information session regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project (the Project) on Tuesday 25 January 2011. At this information session WHC will provide a presentation on the nature and scale of the Project, an overview of the impact assessment process and discuss the roles and responsibilities of participants and protocols for the management of any sensitive cultural heritage information.

This information session will also provide registered stakeholders with an opportunity to raise any cultural concerns or comments/perspectives regarding the Project or the draft assessment methodology.

Can you please indicate whether you are interested in attending the information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine on Tuesday 25 January 2011.
Key Aboriginal Community Input Points in the Assessment Process

Key input points in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment impact assessment process for feedback from the Aboriginal community regarding research methodology, cultural significance and management of potential impacts on heritage sites/values may include:

- written or verbal feedback prior to or during the on-site Project briefing meeting;
- written or verbal feedback on the attached Draft Methodology (enclosed);
- verbal feedback and comments during site inspection/survey of the study area (refer to enclosed Draft Methodology);
- written or verbal feedback following the site inspection/survey and prior to the issue of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment to the registered Aboriginal parties for review; and
- verbal or written feedback on the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

In addition to the above, written or verbal feedback can be provided at any stage throughout the consultation process (i.e. until the completion of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment review period)

In the event that a registered Aboriginal party has sensitive or restricted public access information it is proposed that WHC will manage this information in accordance with a sensitive cultural information management protocol.

Critical Timelines

As discussed above, provision of comments on the Draft Methodology to WHC is required by 5:00 pm on 1 February 2011.

Critical timelines for the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment of the Tarrawonga Coal Project are outlined below. Please note that these timelines are estimates at this early stage in the process and are provided to allow forward planning of personnel and resources. WHC will provide subsequent notification and clarification (i.e. actual dates and approach for field work participation) of the below timelines once greater certainty is available.

1. Information session for Aboriginal stakeholders: 25 January 2011.
3. Collation of cultural significance information: Ongoing throughout process until end of draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage report review period.
5. Provision of a draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report (including proposed management and mitigation measures) to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review: March 2011 (following field survey).
7. Finalisation of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report in consideration of comments received: April/May 2011.
Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the Draft Methodology and attendance at the Project information session to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
LETTERS REGARDING OUTCOMES OF PROJECT INFORMATION SESSION AND FIELD SURVEYS
24 February 2011

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants
16A Mahogany Crescent
MUSWELLBROOK   NSW   2333

Attention:  John and Margaret Matthews

Dear John and Margaret

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Aboriginal Native Title Consultants at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Aboriginal Native Title Consultants keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Aboriginal Native Title Consultants would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Aboriginal Native Title Consultants wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Aboriginal Native Title Consultants is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by 1 March 2011.

Contact Details

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoungh@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely  
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Bullen Bullen Consultants
67 High St
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Lloyd Matthews

Dear Lloyd

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Bullen Bullen Consultants at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Bullen Bullen Consultants keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Bullen Bullen Consultants would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Bullen Bullen Consultants wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Bullen Bullen Consultants is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by 1 March 2011.

Contact Details

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely  
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Cacatua Culture Consultants
Unit 1b, 11 Glenwood Drive
THORNTON NSW 2322

Attention: George and Donna Sampson

Dear George and Donna

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Cacatua Culture Consultants at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Cacatua Culture Consultants keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Cacatua Culture Consultants would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Cacatua Culture Consultants wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Cacatua Culture Consultants is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by 1 March 2011.

Contact Details

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Giwiir Consultants
8 Fitzgerald Avenue
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Rodney Matthews

Dear Rodney

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 14-17 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Giwiir Consultants at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Giwiir Consultants keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Giwiir Consultants would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Giwiir Consultants wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Giwiir Consultants is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by 7 March 2011.

Contact Details

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 439
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Jane Bender

Dear Jane

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
**Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment**

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by **1 March 2011**.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely  
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 877
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

Attention: Gwen Griffen

Dear Gwen

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by **1 March 2011**.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely  
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Minnga Consultants
11 Coolibah Close
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2333

Attention: Clifford Matthews

Dear Clifford

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Minnga Consultants at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Minnga Consultants keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Minnga Consultants would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Minnga Consultants wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Minnga Consultants is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by 1 March 2011.

Contact Details

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely  
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
24 February 2011

Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council
PO Box 745
GUNNEDAH    NSW    2380

Attention: Robert Horne

Dear Robert

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Record of Project Information Session

On 25 January 2011, Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd (WHC) held a project information session at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine. Seven representatives of various registered Aboriginal stakeholders attended the session.

At the information session:

- WHC provided an outline of the Tarrawonga Coal Mine and described the nature and scope of the Project.
- WHC provided an outline of the impact assessment process, including points where registered Aboriginal stakeholders are invited to provide input into the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.
- WHC provided key milestones for the completion of assessment activities and an indicative timeline for the provision of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment report to registered Aboriginal stakeholders for review and comment.
- WHC and registered Aboriginal stakeholders’ roles, functions and responsibilities were defined.
- WHC encouraged registered Aboriginal stakeholders to identify, raise and discuss any relevant cultural concerns, perspectives and assessment requirements.
- No specific feedback on the Draft Methodology was provided by registered Aboriginal stakeholders.
- No issues were raised by WHC or registered Aboriginal stakeholders that required further resolution.
- WHC advised that letters regarding the field surveys would be sent to registered Aboriginal stakeholders in the coming weeks.
Survey – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

At the project information session held on 25 January 2011, WHC advised that it would be facilitating an Aboriginal heritage field survey as part of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project. The field survey will allow representatives of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups to survey the study area and inspect known Aboriginal heritage sites within the study area.

It is planned to undertake the proposed field survey over a period of approximately three to four days from the 7 to 10 March 2011.

To facilitate the involvement of all registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups, field surveys will be undertaken in two teams on each of the field days, with archaeologists and Aboriginal stakeholders present in each team. Due to logistical and safety issues, each of the registered Aboriginal stakeholder groups is invited to send one representative to attend each of the field survey days.

WHC will pay one representative from the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council at a rate of $80 per hour for participation in the field survey and to cover reasonable travel or logistic expenses. An on-site sign-in sheet will be used to record hours worked, although WHC suggests that Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council keeps its own records for cross-checking.

Should additional representatives be required to assist with transportation to and from the site or other logistical or cultural reasons, WHC will endeavour to accommodate the additional persons. However, please note that there is no guarantee that additional persons will be able to attend the field surveys and that their attendance would be on a voluntary basis. Could you please advise if Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council would like for additional representatives to attend the field surveys on a voluntary basis.

To assist in survey planning, could you please advise WHC if there are any specific areas or sites within the study area that Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council wishes to survey or inspect. Please note that if any sites of particular interest are recorded by the other survey team, WHC will endeavour to facilitate an inspection of these sites by all attending representatives.

General Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) will be required by all those participating in the survey work which includes high visibility shirt or vest, safety boots (steel capped), hard hat, and safety glasses. Participants should bring their own food and water for the day.

Please note that the field surveys will commence each day at 8:30 am at the Tarrawonga Coal Mine site office. A brief site induction and discussion of field safety protocols will be held prior to commencing the field survey.
To assist with planning, could you please advise WHC whether Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council is able to participate in the proposed field survey/inspection by **1 March 2011**.

**Contact Details**

If you have any queries regarding the Tarrawonga Coal Project or to confirm your attendance at the field survey, please contact:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely  
WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

__________________________

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants
16A Mahogany Crescent
MUSWELLBROOK    NSW    2333

Attention:  Margaret and John Matthews

Dear Margaret and John,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone:  02 6741 9316
Facsimile:  02 6742 3607
Email:  dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Draft ACHA Report Ltr - Aboriginal Native Title Consultants (RES00400517).doc
27 June 2011

Bigundi Biame Traditional People
PO Box 254
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Attention: Wayne Griffiths

Dear Wayne,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010* (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Bullen Bullen Heritage Consultants
67 High Street
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Attention: Lloyd Matthews

Dear Lloyd,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Cacatua Culture Consultants
Unit 1b, 11 Glenwood Drive
Thornton NSW 2322

Attention: George and Donna Sampson

Dear George and Donna,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
 Telephone: 02 6741 9316
 Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
 Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Giwiir Consultants
8 Fitzgerald Avenue
MUSWELLBROOK    NSW    2333

Attention: Rodney Matthews

Dear Rodney,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone:  02 6741 9316
Facsimile:  02 6742 3607
Email:    dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

[Signature]

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 439
GUNNEDAH    NSW    2380

Attention: Jane Bender

Dear Jane,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation
PO Box 877
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Attention: Gwen Griffen

Dear Gwen,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoun@gwhitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

[Signature]

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER

Draft ACHA Report Ltr - Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation (RES00400523).doc
27 June 2011

Minnga Consultants
11 Coolibah Close
MUSWELLBROOK      NSW  2333

Attention: Clifford Matthews

Dear Clifford,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380  
Telephone: 02 6741 9316  
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607  
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

DANNY YOUNG  
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
27 June 2011

Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council
PO Box 745
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Attention: Robert Horne

Dear Robert,

TARRAWONGA COAL PROJECT
ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW, 2010) issued by the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH), please find enclosed for your review and comment, a copy of the draft Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment (ACHA) for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

Please note that Appendix 6: Site Cards of the draft ACHA has been provided on a CD due to the size of the printed version (445 pages). Please advise if you require a hard copy and one will be provided.

If you wish to provide comment on the draft ACHA, you are requested to do so (either in writing or verbally) by 26 July 2011 (inclusive). All comments received by that date will be taken into consideration as the ACHA is finalised. The final ACHA will be made available to you after completion.

Could you please direct all correspondence regarding the draft ACHA to:

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Telephone: 02 6741 9316
Facsimile: 02 6742 3607
Email: dyoung@whitehavencoal.com.au

Yours sincerely,

WHITEHAVEN COAL LIMITED

[Signature]

DANNY YOUNG
GROUP ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER
ATTACHMENT 2

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE SITE CARDS

Note: This attachment contains culturally sensitive material and is available upon request and subject to approval by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage
APPENDIX 8: WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE - ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY TO PROPONENT
RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM ADMINISTRATORS, REGULATORS AND LOCAL COUNCILS
Dear Danny,

WRITTEN NOTIFICATION AS REQUIRED UNDER DECCW ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE REQUIREMENT FOR PROPOMENTS 2010 – for The Tarrawonga and BlueVale/Canyon Coal projects near Boggabri

I refer to your letter dated 23rd September 2010 to the Department of Environment Climate Change and Water (DECCW) regarding the above matter.

A list of known Aboriginal parties that DECCW feels is likely to have an interest in this development is attached as Attachment 1 (overleaf). Please note this list is not necessarily an exhaustive list of all interested Aboriginal parties and receipt of this list does not remove the requirement of a proponent/consultant to advertise in local print media and contact other bodies seeking interested Aboriginal parties, in accordance with the Interim Requirements.

If you wish to discuss any of the above matters further please contact me, at your earliest convenience, on (02) 6883 5361.

Yours sincerely

Paul Houston
Aboriginal Heritage Planning Officer
EPRG North-West Branch

The Department of Environment and Climate Change is now known as
The Department of Environment Climate Change and Water.
ATTACHMENT 1
DECC LIST OF ABORIGINAL STAKEHOLDER GROUPS WITHIN THE NARRABRI LGA - AREA THAT MAY HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE PROJECT; PROVIDED AS PER THE ‘INTERIM COMMUNITY CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Title</th>
<th>Organisation/Affiliation</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Red Chief LALC</td>
<td>P O Box 745 GUNNEDAH NSW 2357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Sampson</td>
<td>(C/- Cucatua Culture Consultants)</td>
<td>49 Ibis Pde Woodberry NSW 2322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Gunida Gunyah</td>
<td>PO Box 439, Gunnedah NSW 2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Min Min Aboriginal Corporation</td>
<td>Po Box 877, Gunnedah NSW 2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>CEO Bigundi Biame Gunnedarr Traditional People</td>
<td>16 South Street, Gunnedah NSW 2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Gomeroi Narrabri Aboriginal corporation</td>
<td>29 Doyle Street, Narrabri NSW 2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Clews St, Dubbo NSW 2830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elli Lewis</td>
<td>Patrica Jean Hands</td>
<td>20 Acacia Circuit Singleton NSW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department of Environment and Climate Change is now known as
The Department of Environment Climate Change and Water
28 September 2010

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Dear Mr Young

Native Title Search Results of Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects

Thank you for your letter of 23 September 2010.

My search on 28 September 2010 found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register Type</th>
<th>NNTT Reference Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Native Title Register</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Native Title Claims</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unregistered Claimant applications</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register of Indigenous Land Use Agreements</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have included a NNTT Registers fact sheet to help you understand the search result.

Please note that there may be a delay between a native title determination application being lodged in the Federal Court and its transfer to the Tribunal. As a result, some native title determination applications recently filed in the Federal Court may not appear on the Tribunal’s databases.

We will invoice you for $21.45.

If you need more information please call me on 1800 640 501.
Yours sincerely

Kimberley Wilson
A/Senior Case Officer

Telephone (02) 9235 6328
Facsimile (02) 9233 5613
Email Kimberley.wilson@nntt.gov.au

Encl
Searching the NNTT Registers in New South Wales

Search service
On request the National Native Title Tribunal will search its public registers for you. A search may assist you in finding out whether any native title applications (claims), determinations or agreements exist over a particular area of land or water.

In New South Wales native title cannot exist on privately owned land including family homes or farms.

What information can a search provide?
A search can confirm whether any applications, agreements or determinations are registered in a local government area. Relevant information, including register extracts and application summaries, will be provided.

In NSW because we cannot search the registers in relation to individual parcels of land we search by local government area.

Most native title applications do not identify each parcel of land claimed. They have an external boundary and then identify the areas not claimed within the boundary by reference to types of land tenure e.g., freehold, agricultural leasehold, public works.

What if the search shows no current applications?
If there is no application covering the local government area this only indicates that at the time of the search either the Federal Court had not received any claims in relation to the local government area or the Tribunal had not yet been notified of any new native title claims.

It does not mean that native title does not exist in the area.

Native title may exist over an area of land or waters whether or not a claim for native title has been made.

Where the information is found
The information you are seeking is held in three registers and on an applications database.

National Native Title Register
The National Native Title Register contains determinations of native title by the High Court, Federal Court and other courts.

Register of Native Title Claims
The Register of Native Title Claims contains applications for native title that have passed a registration test.

Registered claims attract rights, including the right to negotiate about some types of proposed developments.

Register of Indigenous Land Use Agreements
The Register of Indigenous Land Use Agreements contains agreements made with people who hold or assert native title in an area.

The register identifies development activities that have been agreed by the parties.

Application summaries
An application summary contains a description of the location, content and status of a native title claim.

This information may be different to the information on the Register of Native Title Claims, e.g., because an amendment has not yet been tested.

How do you request a search?

This form says how much searches cost.

Mail, fax or email your request to the Tribunal’s Sydney registry, identifying the local government area/s you want searched.

Email: SydneySearch@nntt.gov.au
Fax: (02) 9233 5613
Address: GPO Box 9973, Sydney NSW 2001
Phone: (02) 9235 6300
Mr Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Ltd
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380

30 September 2010

Dear Danny

Re: Request - Search for Registered Aboriginal Owners

I refer to your letter dated 23 September 2010 regarding an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment in the Boggabri area in NSW.

I have searched the Register of Aboriginal Owners and the subject land does not appear to have Registered Aboriginal Owners pursuant to Division 3 of the Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983.

I trust that you are in contact with the Red Chief Local Aboriginal Land Council. The land council may be able to assist you with information and contact details for other interested groups.

Regards,

per Courtney Field
Assistant Research Officer
Office of the Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983
RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM ABORIGINAL PARTIES
From: Michelle Griffiths [mailto:wallis.griffiths@bigpond.com]
Sent: Wednesday, 2 March 2011 10:20 PM
To: 'dyoung@whitehavencoal.co.au'
Subject: Proposed field Surveys for Whitehaven Coal Pty Ltd

Dear Danny

Bigundi Biame Traditional People as an Aboriginal Stakeholder wish to participate in the proposed field surveys to be undertaken and the Aboriginal Cultural and Heritage Assessment for the Tarrawonga Coal Project.

I understand it was planned to undertake the proposed survey from the 7th to the 10th March 2011.

I would deeply appreciate if you could advise me of the revised dates, so I may arrange a sites officer for those days.

My apologies for the late response, I may contacted on 0409 220 756. My contact details are listed below.

Wayne Griffiths

Traditional owner

Bigundi Biame Traditional People
PO BOX 254

Gunnedah NSW 2380
Tel: 02 6742 0311

Mob: 0409 220 756
To Danny

Please be advises that Giwiir Consultants wish to register an interest and be involved in any consultation during the project. If you have any questions regarding this, please contact me on the provided number.

Regards

Rodney Matthews
Manager G.C
14/11/2010

Matthews Clan

To Tarrawonga & Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects

I, Lloyd Matthews, Aboriginal Elder, Heritage & Culture, would like to register an interest in the project at Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects.

67 High St
Bunnedah

Lloyd Matthews

Biller, Biller
Consultant

Phone 67420658
04/11/10

Mr Danny Young
Tarrawonga Coal Pty Ltd
Gunnedah Office
Whitehaven CHPP & Siding
PO Box 600
Gunnedah NSS 2380

RE: Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Dear Mr Young

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation wishes to express an interest to be consulted in relation to all matters relating to the Assessment of Aboriginal culture and heritage in our area. Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation has a major responsibility to its community to ensure the identification, preservation and protection of items of significance to Aboriginal people; it is not only artefacts’ but the landscape and its cultural setting.

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation represents a large portion of the Aboriginal community directly and indirectly.

If you require any information in regards to our Corporation please contact the writer, Mrs Jane Bender CEO or the Chairperson, Mr Stan Condran on the above mentioned contact details.

Sincerely

Jane Bender
CEO
Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation

N.B Please disregard the email address at the top of this letter. The correct email is jane@gunidagunyah.com.au
Bulleen Consultants
16A Mahogany Ave
MUSWELLBROOK NSW 2323

Arien Danny Souding Group Environmental Manager

We at Bulleen Bulleen Consultants would like to be involved with the Tabrawauna and Bluevale Canyon coal projects.

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Bulleen Bulleen Consultants do not want these details released to only to DECS, yours truly Matthew

and water.
Aboriginal Native Title Consultants

Attn Penny Jones Group Environmental Manager

We the Aboriginal Native Title Consultants

would like to be involved with the projects

Tarrawonga and Bluevale Canyon Coal Projects

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Aboriginal Native Title Consultants Do Not Want

these details released only to DECC and Water

Yours Faithfully

John W Matthews
Min-Min Aboriginal Corporation
1-55 Elgin Street
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Po Box 877,
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Phone No.: (02) 67424121
Fax No.: (02) 67425152

Date: 4/11/2010

Mr Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 60
Gunnedah NSW 2380

Dear Danny,

Min Min Aboriginal Corporation would like to register an interest in the Tarrawonga & Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment plan.

Regards

Gwen Griffen
Chairperson
4 November 2010

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO Box 600
GUNNEDAH NSW 2380

RE: TARRAWONGA AND BLUEVALE/CANYON COAL PROJECTS ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

Danny,

Thank you for your letter and map dated 28th October 2010. We would like to express our interest in being involved in the above Proposed Tarrawonga and Bluevale/Canyon Coal Projects Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment.

Cacatua Consulting is a small Aboriginal owned consulting business born out of concerns and aspirations to advocate for best practice cultural heritage conservation management and to assist proponents and Archaeologists to undertake cultural heritage archaeological assessment according with CHMA and AHIP processes and approved conditions. We aim to provide both quality Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment works and reporting while ensuring compliance to work specific practices. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require more information.

Yours truly

Donna Sampson
Administration

Main: Unit 1b/11 Glenwood Drive, Thornton NSW 2322
Ph: 02 4028 6942 Fax: 02 4028 6943
65 Jaeger Avenue, Gunnedah NSW 2380
Mobile: 0403 765 019 FX: 02 6742 1491
22 Ibis Parade, Woodberry NSW 2322
Ph: 02 4964 4685 Fax: 02 4964 4635
RESPONSES RECEIVED REGARDING DRAFT METHODOLOGY
Danny Young  
Group Environmental Manager  
Whitehaven Coal Limited  
PO Box 600  
Gunnedah NSW 2380

RE: Tarrawonga Coal Project Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Danny

Thank you for your letter dated 3rd January 2011 and the information session and site tour that was held on the 25th January 2011 they were helpful with our discussions on the area.

We would like it noted that even though we are a small Aboriginal owned company born out of concerns and aspirations to advocate for best practice cultural heritage conservation management. The Manager George Sampson is a known Kamilaroi man within this area and does not take lightly the impacts that are taking place within his boundaries and feels that his views would be reflected throughout the family that still reside within and the community.

We are concerned with the impact that this will have on Aboriginal significant items and places that may be located within the Tarrawonga Coal area, so we totally agree with the further investigation that was discussed on the site tour and information session. While you have mentioned that there is to be a Bio offset, there has been no mention of an Offset for the replacement (like for like) area for the impacting of Aboriginal sites or places. We believe this should be discussed once the last of the survey area is undertaken due to not knowing fully what this area may hold.

Another concern in the report with regards to E3.1 (as we feel that is part of Aboriginal side of caring for country) is the amount of threaten tree species that are going to be impacted on and would like to kept informed.

Yours truly

Donna Sampson  
Administration

Email: cacatua@reseldsl.net.au
RE: Tarrawonga Coal Mine Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment December 2010

Dear Mr Young

After thorough examination of the draft report as mentioned above Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation would like the following concerns addressed;

The general recommendation E 8.1.1 updated Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Management Plan for East Boggabri Coal Mine, is not a recommendation that Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation can support.

Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation would recommend that a new management plan be implemented for the extensions to the coal mine. As you are aware the 2005 Management Plan, reflects the Local Aboriginal Lands Council as the key Aboriginal Stake Holder. This is not accurate and we must ensure that other Aboriginal Stake Holders are recognised as such.

E 8.2 Management of cultural heritage within the modified disturbance area, the assessment has concluded that the isolated find of stone artefacts is not of high scientific significance and does not have high social or cultural value. Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation deems that any loss of cultural heritage must be taken seriously and can only support those items salvaged from the site being returned to that site once rehabilitation has commenced.

Sincerely

Jane Bender
CEO
Gunida Gunyah Aboriginal Corporation

N.B Please disregard the email address at the top of this letter. The correct email is jane@gunidagunyah.com.au
RESPONSES RECEIVED REGARDING DRAFT ACHA
31 July 2011

Danny Young
Group Environmental Manager
Whitehaven Coal Limited
PO box 600
Gunnedah NSW 2380

RE: Tarrawonga Coal Project Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment

Danny,

We have read and discussed the Tarrawonga Coal Project Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment. We understand the proposed impact and that Archaeological significance within the area is moderate to low, we cannot say the same for the Cultural significance of the area. We agree with the report at this point in time. We do fully support the recommendations section of the report on page 67 that states a new Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan be developed in consultation with the Aboriginal community and be developed prior to any worked which may harm Aboriginal cultural heritage sites or places of significances. However we would like to put forward that a three day workshop be undertaken to achieve this goal. We have had good success with this before and that this should be made a priority.

We also believe that while contractors are undertaking their mine induction more awareness should be place on Aboriginal Heritage Culture and the disturbance of Aboriginal significant items and the steps they should take when they are located. Also why they should stay to tracks and places that they are allocated.

Yours truly

Donna Sampson
Admin Dept.

Email: cacatua@resetdsl.net.au

UNIT 1b, 11 Glenwood Drive THORNTON NSW 2322 Ph: 02 4028 6942 Fax: 02 4028 6943
65 Jaeger Avenue, GUNNEDAH NSW 2380 Mob: 0403 765 019 Fax: 02 6742 1491
22 Ibis Parade WOODBERRY NSW 2322 Ph: 02 4964 4685 Fax: 02 4964 4635
Dear Danny

Thank you for your comprehensive report in relation to the above project.

In relation to this report we agree with the comments made Mitigation Measures, General Management Measures and Recommendations.

It is gratifying to have reports identifying the historical presence of Aboriginal people in this area.

Whilst legislation determines Government Departments will receive compensation for the destruction of historically and culturally significant Aboriginal sites. This in no way compensates the Aboriginal Community for the loss of culturally significant and historical sites that cannot be replaced. I am struggling to understand how it is that Tarrawonga Coal Project intend to minimise the damage to these irreplaceable culturally significant sites.

Maybe someone could explain how the damage would be minimised if the Sydney Opera house or the Harbour Bridge was to be removed next week. I cannot imagine anyone, would not be outraged. They are icons of Australian history and culturally significant as such.

Aboriginal people in our area have had very limited access to local significant sites and artefacts. There are a number of documents and monuments created by Non indigenous residents in this area, but most of the truly significant artefacts were removed from the area and lost to the local indigenous people many years ago.

European settlement and Laws limited the access of aboriginal people to many traditional sites. The laws of the day and fear of punishment to aboriginal people further destroyed the passing of oral history and the skills to maintain important sites. This report identifies some very important findings and the hope that one day our children will be able to walk in the footsteps of our ancestors, and be able to touch the stone used to sharpen tools by many generations before them, to see the tree from which an ancestor removed the bark to make a shield or coolamon, or just to stand in the space occupied by
tens of thousands of years of our ancestors, to experience the spiritual connection.

I am seeking a face to face meeting to further discuss the content of this report.

Wayne Griffiths
Traditional owner
Bigundi Biame Traditional People
PO BOX 254
Gunnedah NSW 2380
Tel: 02 6742 0311

Mob: 0409 220 756