## ALING YARDS WIND FARM HERITAGE

## **PURPOSE**

Anderson Environmental Consultants Pty Ltd (Anderson Environmental) was commissioned by UFWA to undertake an indigenous and non-indigenous cultural heritage impact assessment of the project.

Anderson Environmental's assessment was conducted in two parts being:

- a desktop assessment; and
- field assessment and surveys.

Following the preparation of Anderson Environmental's report, Environmental Resources Management Australia Pty Ltd (ERM) was engaged by UFWA to undertake an assessment of the significance of heritage sites referred to in the Anderson Environmental report and prepare a supplementary heritage impact assessment report.

The purpose of the ERM report was to identify the archaeological/scientific and cultural/social values of sites identified during Anderson Environmental's field survey and assess their significance.

The Anderson Environmental report outlines the results of a heritage investigation of the project in relation to the potential impact of the proposed activity on indigenous, non-indigenous and cultural heritage values, including the results of the 2005 surveys by Heritage Concepts. The assessment also outlines recommendations to mitigate the potential heritage impacts of the project.

## **KEY FINDINGS & IMPACTS**

An indigenous and non-indigenous cultural heritage survey and draft impact assessment was previously undertaken by Heritage Concepts in June 2005. The 2005 assessment found 14 Aboriginal Archaeological sites and 5 historic cultural sites across the landscape.

The indigenous cultural heritage survey by Anderson Environmental detected eight additional Aboriginal Archaeological sites distributed on both the eastern and western sides of the site. Anderson Environmental found that none of the sites detected would likely be impacted by the project.

The following three sites which were found in the 2005 surveys occur near proposed turbines and/or infrastructure and therefore have the potential to be impacted (refer to Figure 58 – Aboriginal Archaeological and Historic Cultural Heritage Sites):

- Site PYWF A11 located near Turbine P47.
- Site PYWF A10 located near access track between turbines P45 and P46.
- Site PYWF A7 located near access track between turbines P54 and P55.

It may be possible to avoid these sites through the micro-siting of turbines and access tracks; however, a range of options will be explored in the future Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) prior to the construction phase. If impact cannot be avoided due to terrain restrictions, then the heritage sites would be salvaged and relocated nearby as instructed by the relevant agency.

In the supplementary heritage impact assessment, ERM notes that of the 14 sites recorded in the Heritage Concepts 2005 Report, A7, A10 and A11 contain a moderate archaeological sensitivity and scientific significance, whilst also having a high Aboriginal cultural significance. ERM recommends that direct impact upon these three sites be avoided through micro-siting and through effective construction management as part of a CHMP.

The Anderson Environmental surveys detected the following sites and artefact finds in Table 26.

In relation to non-indigenous heritage, Anderson Environmental found that a number of non-indigenous cultural heritage items are located within the site, including Mingary Park Airstrip, Quobleigh basalt chimney and plantings, Steam Boiler, Stockyards and Stillwell burial ground. However, none of the non-indigenous cultural heritage items located within the site would be disturbed as part of the project.

Furthermore, none of the non-indigenous sites are considered to be significant and none are listed under any heritage register or recorded in the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) for Oberon and Upper Lachlan Shires, or the recent Cultural Heritage Study of the Upper Lachlan Shire.

The cultural significance of the site was assessed in consultation with Aboriginal stakeholders who hold cultural knowledge or responsibility for the land within the project site. This process identified the site as holding a high level of Aboriginal cultural significance, as it is situated within areas that were used for hunting, gathering and camping by past Aboriginal groups.

TABLE 26 Survey results of indigenous artefacts found on site

| Site No. & Contents                                   | Heritage Type | Location   | Impact Significance  |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| Site 1<br>8 stone fragments                           | Indigenous    | Towards the south-east boundary of the site adjacent to a fenceline.   | Low significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.              |
| Site 2<br>4 artefacts                                 | Indigenous    | Downhill from site 1 along the cleared fenceline area.   | Low significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.              |
| Site 3<br>6 artefacts                                 | Indigenous    | This site is present further downslope along the fenceline from Site 2.  | Low significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.              |
| Site 4<br>5 artefacts                                 | Indigenous    | Top of a rise on the southern side of the Abercrombie River, outside the site boundary.                                    | Low significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.              |
| Site 5 1 core and five flakes and two large artefacts | Indigenous    | On the southern side of the Abercrombie River on the lower eastern knoll near to the racecource outside the site boundary. | Moderate significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.         |
| Site 6<br>35 various flakes and cores                 | Indigenous    | Top of a hill approximately 800 metres south-west from Site 5.   | Moderate to High significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance. |
| Site 7 1 core and backblade artefacts                 | Indigenous    | Towards the south-western side of the site boundary.   | Moderate significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.         |
| Site 8<br>55 artefacts                                | Indigenous    | Approximately 3km north of Site 7, in the west side of the site.   | Moderate significance. Pejar LALC agrees with this assessment of significance.         |

## **KEY FINDINGS & IMPACTS**

In terms of actual impacts caused by the project, ERM found that the only real risks associated with turbine placements and construction is associated with site P8. Therefore, ERM recommends that sub-surface investigation may be warranted associated with any turbines proposed within 100m of site P8, which could occur post development consent. ERM also recommends that a minimum distance or separation buffer of 100 metres should be maintained from any turbine and site P8.

In response to the identification of the project site as holding a high level of Aboriginal cultural significance, the layout of the project components has been carefully designed to minimise impact on the identified archaeological sites, and mitigation measures have been developed to further minimise impacts on archaeological and cultural heritage. This includes the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Management Plan for the project and consultation and collaboration with the Registered Aboriginal Parties.

The report recommends the following actions in order to preserve areas of cultural heritage significance and amelioration of potential impacts;

• Avoid, as far as practicable, impacts on the known archaeological sites.

A NUMBER OF NON-INDIGENOUS CULTURAL HERITAGE ITEMS ARE LOCATED WITHIN THE SITE, INCLUDING MINGARY PARK AIRSTRIP, QUOBLEIGH BASALT CHIMNEY AND PLANTINGS, STEAM BOILER, STOCKYARDS AND STILLWELL BURIAL GROUND. HOWEVER, NONE OF THE NON-INDIGENOUS CULTURAL HERITAGE ITEMS LOCATED WITHIN THE SITE WOULD BE DISTURBED AS PART OF THE PROJECT.

- A comprehensive Cultural Heritage Management Plan should be prepared in consultation and collaboration with the Registered Aboriginal Parties to reduce and mitigate the impacts of the project on any artefacts which may be detected within disturbance zones.
- The movement of identified objects is considered to be a suitable mitigation measure in most cases as the distances involved would not be significant, and many of the objects may have been moved in the past via water movement, erosion or vehicle/tractor movements such as road grading and cultivation of the ground.
- The Cultural Heritage Management Plan should also outline management strategies for the management of any potential unrecorded sites which are identified within the site during construction of the project.
- If impacts to any further sites which are identified cannot be avoided then further investigation would be required in consultation with Registered Aboriginal Parties and OEH. This would include sub-surface digs and analysis.
- As the detailed design of the proposed access tracks and electrical connections were not available at the time the field surveys were conducted, potential deviations to the surveyed routes may be made during detailed design to reduce impact(s) on the land.
- Once the proposed access track locations and other disturbance areas are pegged on the ground, additional targeted surveys of these areas should be undertaken. Where these additional targeted surveys identify any further sites, test pits should be undertaken in order to determine the extent of significance of any sites which would be potentially impacted.
- The final micrositing of the proposed infrastructure should be undertaken in consideration of utilising and upgrading as much as possible the existing farm access tracks where possible to achieve an overall site plan which minimises unnecessary new soil disturbance.
- A minimum distance or separation buffer of 100 meters to be maintained from any turbine and site P8. If the separation distance is not practical, then a sub-surface investigation should be undertaken for any turbine proposed within 100m of site P8.





