



Figure 2.12 Detail of the site showing the Ross Street Building prior to demolition in 2010 aerial photo. (Source: Google Earth with GML Additions).




Figure 2.13 2011 aerial view of the Life Sciences Precinct 5 eastern portion (indicated in red) showing bitumen carpark area and terracing in west apparent by large shadow, and higher terrace of RD Watt building and surrounds (Source: Google Earth with GML Additions 2015).

3.0 Aboriginal Heritage Desktop Assessment and Visual Inspection

3.1 Aboriginal Ethno-history

This section reproduces the ethnohistorical background provided in JMcDCHM 2005.³⁴

The Aboriginal people that lived in the area now occupied by the University of Sydney were either Cadigal or Wan(n)gal. These groups are local descent groups, otherwise referred to as local clans or territorial clans. Some confusion remains as to which clan is associated with what are now the grounds of the University of Sydney, arising from conflicting information contained within two historical quotes:³⁵

The tribe of Cadi inhabit the south side, extending from the sought head to Long-Cove; at which place the district of Wanne, and the tribe of Wangal, commences, extending as far as Parra-mata, or Rose-Hill. (King in Hunter [1968: 412]).

From the entrance of the harbour, along the south shore, to the cove adjoining this settlement the district is called Cadi, and the tribe Cadigal; the women, Cadigalleon. The south side of the harbour from the above-mentioned cove to Rose Hill, which the natives call Parramatta, the district is called Wann, and the tribe Wanngal. (Phillip 13 Feb 1790 [1992: 309])

The original inhabitants of the Sydney region relied on food gained through fishing and hunting, and the gathering of plants and small animals. The land and its rivers and estuaries were the source of a range of plant and animals for food and medicines; as well as raw materials for tools, weapons, shelters and body decoration.³⁶ Inhabitants of the current study area would have exploited both freshwater fauna and flora from the Blackwattle Swamp, as well as marine resources from the nearby Blackwattle Bay and associated mudflats (now covered by Wentworth Park). A variety of technology was used for obtaining food and raw materials, carrying small objects, and equipment making. Weapons were required for either offensive or defensive purposes.³⁷

Ultimately, the process of colonisation was one which saw the inhabitants of the study area dispossessed of their lands and of the food and plant resources that the lands provided very early in the establishment of Sydney. Steele suggests that the Aboriginal population of the area occupied by the Cadigal/Wan(n)gal, which included the study area, was reduced in number from approximately 50 individuals in 1788 to only three by 1790.³⁸ The decimation arose from impacts of dispossession, introduced disease, loss of access to traditional lands and resources, inter-tribal conflict, starvation, and the breakdown of traditional cultural practices.³⁹

3.2 Relevant Local Literature

A number of archaeological studies and academic works have been prepared that include the study sites and surrounding areas. Those works and reports of direct relevance to this due diligence assessment are detailed below and identified in Figure 3.1.

University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan 2002⁴⁰

The University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan was developed in 2002⁴¹ to define the heritage significance of the grounds of the University's Camperdown and Darlington campuses, and propose management policies for the conservation of that significance. Due to the degree and nature of

development on the site over the past 200 years, undisturbed Aboriginal archaeological sites were deemed highly unlikely to be preserved within the university grounds.

The conservation plan identified four areas of open land which were assessed as most likely to preserve PADs;

- St John's College Sports Ground in association with the now filled Orphan School Creek;
- areas around university ovals No. 1 and No. 2;
- areas adjacent to the boundary fence between the university grounds and Victoria Park; and
- within open areas around the Old Darlington School.

Subsequent archaeological investigations of St John's College Sports Ground, the university ovals and the areas around the Old Darlington School have demonstrated that no potential archaeological deposits have been preserved in these locations or, where remnant soil horizons are preserved, they are highly disturbed and of low archaeological potential (see overviews of JMcDCHM 2004 to 2009 below).

Dominic Steele and Jakub Czastka 2003⁴²—The Quadrant Site, Broadway

The Quadrant Site, 500m from the current study area on the corner of Broadway and Mountain Street, was the subject of archaeological testing by Dominic Steele Consulting Archaeology in 2001 and 2002. Blackwattle Creek originally passed through the Quadrant Site, which was also a natural swamp.

Excavation revealed that in a portion of the site natural soil profiles had been preserved beneath a capping of introduced fill, although these were truncated and disturbed. The soil profiles present at this site were comprised of a deep alluvial deposit, with the upper layers consisting of a Blacktown soil landscape.

Excavations during 2001 and 2002 uncovered a small remnant patch of sandy loam covering an area of approximately 5m x 10m, which contained 14 Aboriginal flaked stone artefacts from three of the 16 trenches excavated. This site was registered in AHIMS as site #45-6-2629. Consent to destroy the site was granted with the requirement for monitoring works; however, no further artefacts were located.

The artefact scatter was interpreted as a background distribution of stone artefacts in a landscape only sporadically visited by Aboriginal people. Steele and Czastka concluded that the limited Aboriginal archaeological evidence encountered at the Quadrant Site was the product of two factors. The first was the significant disturbance across the site in the historical period. The second was the way past Aboriginal people were likely to have utilised the natural environment:

The poorly-drained nature of the landscape at the Quadrant site is one possible explanation for the absence of more substantial Aboriginal archaeological remains identified during the investigation program. It is reasonable to assume that Aboriginal people in the past may have exploited the various resources available within these environments, but it is unlikely people established long-term occupation sites on them.⁴³

The report identifies that beyond the creek line and swamp, more elevated portions of the site located on Hawkesbury Sandstone would have been more favourable for Aboriginal occupation with a less ephemeral archaeological signature. Steele and Czastka note that these locations have generally experienced such a degree of historical development that the natural A horizon soils capable of bearing artefacts and archaeological deposits have been removed or heavily disturbed.

Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management 2004, 2005 and 2006⁴⁴—Reports Prepared for the Campus 2010 Project

Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management (JMcDCHM) undertook an Aboriginal heritage assessment of a portion of the University of Sydney's Camperdown and Darlington campus as part of upgrades and construction undertaken during the Campus 2010 project. This study area is shown in Figure 3.1. A survey was conducted across the study area in 2004. No Aboriginal objects and/or landscapes were identified or assessed to be of high archaeological significance or potential. Four areas of PAD were recorded as having low to moderate potential to contain intact archaeological deposits, and if in situ material was found it would be of high archaeological significance due to its rarity within the general location of the study area.

A program of archaeological testing was implemented at two of these PADs in 2005. The first was located at the former Geology Lawns (now the site of the Law Building; the second was at Maze Green, adjacent to the Old Darlington School).

Testing at the Geology Lawn revealed between 750mm and 1600mm of fill had been introduced above the A horizon soils. The A horizon was a sandy clay loam between 300mm and 500mm thick, and moderately disturbed as indicated by the presence of historical materials. One piece of flaked silcrete debitage was the only artefact retrieved from 8 test trenches at the Geology Lawn (Site #45-6-2745).

At Maze Green, test excavations revealed that a fill layer between 150mm and 1100mm deep had been introduced above the A horizon soils. Natural soil profiles consisted of a 150mm–250mm deep fine sandy clay loam A horizon grading to a yellowish brown clay B horizon. The soil profiles were significantly disturbed by historical activity. One test pit, close to the Old Darlington School, revealed sediments that appeared to represent a still, shallow freshwater pond and may be associated with early European occupation of the area prior to significant modification of the Blackwattle Swamp. One silcrete artefact was retrieved from disturbed overburden during testing; no artefacts were recovered from natural soil profiles (Site #45-6-2822).

Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management 2007 and 2009⁴⁵—Centre for Obesity, Diabetics and Cardiovascular Research (CODCD) Project

In 2007 JMcDCHM undertook an Indigenous Archaeological Assessment of the proposed ARC Medical Building development to determine the nature, extent and integrity of Aboriginal relics and PADs within the study area. Due to the extensive land disturbance that had previously occurred in this study area, no sites or surface artefacts were identified and no areas were assessed as having high potential for intact archaeological deposits. Geotechnical investigation indicated that the original swampy stream line of the Orphan School Creek may be represented in organic deposits beneath fill between 3m to 5m deep.

Ground truthing downgraded the archaeological potential of two areas of PAD identified in the University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan along the northeastern margin of St John's Oval and within Oval 2. These areas were reassessed as having low archaeological potential.

Further investigation was recommended should the RMC Gunn Building, Veterinary Science Building and the HK Ward Gymnasium Building be demolished as their demolition may reveal intact archaeological deposit. The HK Ward Gymnasium Building has since been demolished to make way for the Charles Perkins Centre which was under construction when McDonald's assessment was being conducted.

Godden Mackay Logan + JMcDCHM 2012⁴⁶—Abercrombie Street Precinct

In 2012 GML + JMcDCHM was engaged to prepare a Preliminary Aboriginal Archaeology Assessment Report for the redevelopment of the Abercrombie Street Precinct within the Darlington campus of the University of Sydney (Figure 3.1). No landscape features associated with Aboriginal archaeological objects or potential Aboriginal archaeological objects were identified within the study area. Due to extensive twentieth-century construction and landscaping within the precinct, the potential for subsurface archaeological deposits was assessed as low.

Biosis Pty Ltd 2012⁴⁷—Wattle Street PAD

In 2012, Biosis Pty Ltd was engaged to undertake an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment at 445–473 Wattle Street, Ultimo, to determine the archaeological potential of the project area. The study area was bounded to the east by Blackwattle Lane which roughly follows the original line of Blackwattle Creek. Geotechnical investigation determined that historical fill layers extended to a depth of 2.5m below the current ground surface. This fill was found to be capping intact alluvial soils extending to a depth of at least 7m despite being located within the area of disturbed terrain mapped by Chapman and Murphy.⁴⁸

The considerable depth of these alluvial soils indicates that they may be preserved across the extent of the 2012 study area and potentially further afield. The alluvial sediments were interpreted as potential natural topsoils in association with the Blackwattle Creek banks. This association with a permanent freshwater resource (Blackwattle Creek) is significant as current modelling for Aboriginal sites predicts that the density and complexity of sites will increase with stream order. The area was registered on AHIMS as site #45-6-3064 as a PAD with high to moderate potential to contain Aboriginal sites and/or objects, with the recommendation for testing and monitoring should works impact on the alluvial soil deposit. No artefacts were recovered during the geotechnical testing of these sediments.

Mary Dallas Consulting Archaeologists 2013—St Paul's College

In 2013, Mary Dallas Consulting Archaeologists (MDCA) undertook a Preliminary Due Diligence Aboriginal Heritage Assessment for St Paul's College for the area covering the St Paul's Oval and college buildings (Figure 3.1). St Paul's Oval was constructed in the 1920s by levelling and filling using the same spoil from construction of the city railway as was used to fill the Orphan School Creek flats.⁴⁹ Land use history in this study area was found to have significantly modified and filled original land surfaces as well as caused significant ground disturbance due to several phases of college building development. Therefore, the potential for subsurface archaeological deposits to be preserved in situ was assessed as low across the majority of the study area.

An area was identified to the north of the study area in which remnants of the Orphan School Creek course and banks may have been preserved below the current ground surface, therefore presenting the potential for preserving archaeological deposits associated with the watercourse.

GML 2013 University of Sydney Campus Improvement Program Aboriginal Due Diligence

This due diligence assessment studied six areas within the university campus: the Merewether, City Road, Engineering, Health, Life Sciences and Cultural Precincts (Figure 3.1) The Merewether, Life Sciences and Cultural Precincts were assessed as having low to moderate potential to preserve intact subsurface archaeological deposits below building foundations and in open areas. The City Road,

Engineering and Health Precincts were found to have been heavily disturbed resulting in their having low to no potential to preserve intact subsurface archaeological deposits.

Of primary relevance to this study was the assessment of archaeological potential in the Life Sciences Precinct. Archaeological potential was described based on known impacts, where potential was found to exist across the west of this precinct, in association with the JD Stewart (Veterinary Sciences) Building, RMC Gunn Building, McMaster Building and Gate Keepers Lodge. The assessment found that the east of this precinct, including the RD Watts Building (the current study area) held no archaeological potential.



Figure 3.1 Previous studies adjacent to the current study areas outlined in red. (Source: GoogleMaps with GML additions 2015)

3.3 Visual Inspection of the Study Area

A site visit was conducted on 13 July 2015 by Shezani Nasoordeen, and confirmed that the description provided by Coffey's Initial Geotechnical Site Assessment⁵⁰—Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Development (FASS) 14 May 2015 remain unchanged. The description for the FASS site is edited from their observations.

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

- The site is broadly terraced, with the northeastern end near the peak of a ridge. The site has an overall southwest grade towards the corner of Ross Street and Science Road. Two concrete retaining walls, one with a timber section, divide and support the terraced levels.
- The area immediately east of the Ross Street gate is currently occupied by several single-level demountable buildings on top of a bituminised surface with subsurface drainage and services. This area rises gently to the east up to the terrace on which the RD Watt building sits, then abruptly rises to a modified terrace.
- The RD Watt Building is along the southern portion of the site along Science Road. Some shallow retaining walls, less than 2m in height, are located at the front of the RD Watts Building. Planter areas with vegetation and trees, as well as concrete walkways with stairs and parking/access driveways surround the building. Parking and access driveway areas comprise concrete and asphalt. A larger level concrete area exists along the upper terrace portion of the site. The RD Watt Building is located on a terrace which follows the upslope of Science Road, and is higher than Parramatta Road.
- A steeply battered slope on the northern portion of the property, up to approximately 6m in height grades below the study area towards Parramatta Road to the north. The slope is covered with a layer of geotextile, vegetation, trees and mulch. An area of exposed fill was also visible within the slope.
- Substation 54, Ross St Storage Facility, Native Animal House and converter container rooms are located in the centre and eastern areas of the study site.
- Subsurface services including stormwater drains, electrical and communications services are evident across the site.

Administrative Building and Carslaw Extension Study Area

- The Carslaw Extension site slopes gently to the west and the area of the proposed Administration Building.
- The Carslaw site is terraced with sandstone facing and contains mature trees and large garden beds which are raised above the level of the road. This abuts the current Carslaw Building, which is likely to have disturbed topsoils in the immediate surroundings.
- The western boundary of the Carslaw Extension is bounded by the footbridge. Paving and levelling to match the road has occurred.

- The Administration Building area is bitumenised, with a carpark, it is abutted on the east by the gates on Eastern Avenue.
- The carpark appears to be located on a raised knoll and is level with City Road.
- A road adjacent to the oval, which was visible in the 1943 aerial, is present and cordoned off.
- The carpark is 2–3m lower than the adjacent oval, which was modified and raised using modern rubble.
- The footprint of the nearby Madsen Building extends into the north of the current carpark area, and appears to have impacted soils adjacent to the entry into the carpark.
- The area where the v-shaped building occurred is located in the northwest corner of the Administration Building footprint.



Figure 3.2 Location of the proposed FASS Building, demountable village view to the east along the rise of Science Road. (Source: GML 2015)



Figure 3.3 Location of the proposed FASS Building, terracing apparent adjacent to RD Watt Building (Source: GML 2015)



Figure 3.4 Location of the proposed FASS Building, View to the west from highest point in the study area. Significant modification of levels of the area is apparent (Source: GML 2015)



Figure 3.5 Example of steep battering of slopes adjacent to Parramatta Road, fill overlying in foreground (Source: GML 2015)



Figure 3.6 Mature trees line the site of the proposed Carslaw extension, view to the northwest (Source: GML 2015).



Figure 3.7 View to the northwest from the footbridge on City Road towards the proposed site of Administration Building. (Source: GML 2015)



Figure 3.8 Carpark on proposed Administration Building site, view to the north towards Madsen Building. The ground slopes to the east along city Road. (Source GML 2015).

3.4 Synopsis of the Desktop Assessment and Visual Inspection

The desktop assessment and visual inspection do not indicate that there is Aboriginal archaeological potential associated with the area of the proposed development for SSD7081, SSD7054 and SSD7055.

The Administrative Building and Carlaw Extension study area has been found to hold no Aboriginal archaeological potential due to the extensive history of development.

The Life Sciences Precinct area as a whole has been significantly disturbed (most significantly in the area of the demountable village and the terracing of the site) and in previous assessments has been characterised⁵¹ as holding low to moderate potential to preserve subsurface Aboriginal archaeological deposits. According to historical documents, the south area of this precinct—further west of the current study site boundary—overlies the line of the second-order tributaries of the Orphan School Creek (Figure 2.1). Geotechnical investigations indicate that creek line deposits are preserved below 3–5 m of fill introduced during the 1920s in that area indicating that Aboriginal objects may be contained within natural soil profiles associated with the creek (as detailed by GML 2013, Section 3.2).

However, the eastern portion of the FASS study area is outside the specified area identified as having low to moderate potential to preserve subsurface Aboriginal archaeological deposits. Due to the long history of land use and development across the study area, it is clear that the majority of the natural ground surface within the proposed development area has been subject to extensive disturbance due to cutting and filling activities associated with the ongoing development and redevelopment of the university and its grounds. This eastern portion of this precinct is therefore assessed as having low to no potential to preserve intact subsurface archaeological deposits.

4.0 Aboriginal Community Consultation

4.1 Introduction

Aboriginal community consultation is required for this assessment of Aboriginal heritage in order to make a valid assessment of Aboriginal (heritage) 'values', as stipulated by the DGEARs in Section 1. This includes those Aboriginal memories, stories and associations between the Aboriginal people and their traditional lands or Country.

Aboriginal people frequently express an enduring connection to their Country, a connection that transcends generations, both past and present. The connection is frequently expressed as a sense of belonging, which may manifest through physical objects or place; alternatively it may be presented as an intangible idea, where an appreciation of an unseen quality or non-materialistic value connects a place in the landscape, tradition, observance, custom, lore belief and/or history to the person or group describing the item, event or value. The notion of intangible, social, or community values is essential to Aboriginal people as 'the effective protection and conservation of this heritage is important in maintaining the identity, health and wellbeing of Aboriginal people'.⁵²

In order to gather social and community views and opinions with respect to Aboriginal heritage and identify and address Aboriginal heritage values, the OEH requires proponents to adhere to the OEH guidelines Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements.⁵³ In addition to providing a mechanism for engaging the Aboriginal community, the directives in the guidelines must be followed for any study that might eventually be used to support a development application, as the SSD 7081, SSD7055 and SSD7054.

4.2 The Process of Consultation

These consultation guidelines set out a process involving identification, registration, engagement and consultation with Aboriginal peoples who may hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the significance of an Aboriginal object, place or cultural value. The initial stage of consultation was undertaken to identify whether any Aboriginal cultural values exist for the study area in compliance with the DGEARs (discussed in Section 1).

Adherence with guidelines involves following a number of stages, which comprise:

1. informing Aboriginal people about the nature and scope of the proposal;
2. understanding what might be present in the landscape and its cultural significance;
3. determining the potential impacts and the proposed strategies to deal with them; and
4. reviewing the report.⁵⁴

Aboriginal groups are invited to register interest as a party to consultation (including the placing of local press advertisement[s]), responses are sought from the Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs) on the proposed assessment methodology, and an opportunity to comment on the assessment reports and recommendations is provided to the RAPs. The guidelines specify timeframes for each stage of the consultation process. Further details pertaining to these stages are described below.

The Aboriginal community consultation for this project has been carried out in accordance with the OEH guideline. This chapter contains specific details of Aboriginal community consultation with regard to the heritage assessment of the study area.

The complete log of all communications between GML and RAPs and all letters, responses and details pertaining to this consultation are provided in Appendix A.

4.2.1 Stage 1: Notification of Project

The aim of Stage 1 is to ‘identify, notify and register Aboriginal people who hold cultural knowledge relevant to determining the cultural significance of Aboriginal objects and/or places in the area of the proposed project’.⁵⁵ The identification process involves:

- initial letters sent to select government agencies to determine relevant Aboriginal stakeholder groups to contact; and
- placement of a notice in the local press, inviting Aboriginal people who hold relevant cultural knowledge to register in the process of community consultation.

A letter notifying all identified Aboriginal people and the Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC) about the proposed project must be sent to each individual and group identified through the above stages. Aboriginal people have a minimum of 14 days after the letter was sent or the notice was published in the newspaper to register an interest in the project.

The outcome of Stage 1 is a list of Aboriginal people who have registered for being involved in consultation—the ‘Registered Aboriginal Parties’ (RAPs). The RAPs are to be involved for the remainder of the project; no Aboriginal consultation outside of the RAPs is required.

Letters requesting contact details of Aboriginal people or organisations that may hold cultural knowledge relevant to the study area and any known heritage issues to be taken into consideration (Step 1 notifications), were sent via email on 3 July and 15 July 2015 to:

- the NSW OEH;
- Registrar, *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* (NSW);
- the National Native Title Tribunal;
- Native Title Services Corporation (NTSCorp);
- the City of Sydney Council;
- the Parramatta Local Land Services (formerly Parramatta Catchment Management Authority); and
- the Metropolitan Local Area Land Council (MLALC).

Responses were received from the following groups:

- the NSW OEH (10 July 2015);
- the National Native Title Tribunal (17 July 2015); and
- the City of Sydney Council (28 July 2015);

The OEH provided a list of Aboriginal people and organisations to consult, no further lists were provided by the other two statutory bodies.

A notification was also placed in the *Central Courier* on 8 July 2015, inviting registrations of interest by Aboriginal people with cultural knowledge relevant to the project area. Those Aboriginal people who were identified during the Step 1 notifications were contacted via letter on 16 July 2015, providing information regarding the project and inviting them to register an interest by 30 July 2015 (Step 2 notifications—14 days).

4.2.2 Stages 2 and 3: Presentation of information about the proposed project and gathering information about cultural significance

GML provided the Aboriginal due diligence heritage assessment to the RAPs identified through Stage 1 of the Aboriginal Community consultation process. GML wrote to the RAPs to:

- present the project methodology for the Aboriginal heritage assessment, including the current recommendations for the project area for review and comment;
- request written or verbal comment on the current assessment for the project area; and
- seek information to identify whether there are any Aboriginal objects and/or places of cultural value associated with the specific study areas.

4.3 Registered Aboriginal Parties

Table 4.1 Aboriginal People and/or Organisations that Registered an Interest.

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact
Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council	Lee Davison and Nathan Moran
Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA)	Gordon Morton and Celestine Everingham
Tocomwall	Danny Franks
Goobah Development Pty Ltd (Murrin clan)	Basil Smith
Gulaga	Wendy Smith
Murramarang	Roxanne Smith
Cullendulla	Janaya Smith
Biamanga	Seli Storer
Elouera	Lenard Nye
EORA	Kahu Brennan
Badu	Karia Bond
Walbunja	Hika Te Kowhai
Wandandian	William Bond
Tharawal	Violet Carriage
Ngunawal	Edward Stewart

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact
Ngarigo	Newton Bond
Dharug	Andrew Bond
Yerramurra	Robert Parson
Murrin	Tarlarra Te Kowhai
Thauaira	Shane Carriage
Djiringanj	Keith Nye
Kurringgai	Toni Brierley
Bidawal	Richard Andy
Nundagurri	Newton Carriage
Gangangarra	Kim Carriage
Walgalu	Ronald Stewart

One other Aboriginal organisation registered, but they did not wish for their details to be released. In total there are 27 registrants. A copy of the notification and details of registered Aboriginal parties will be provided to the OEH and the LALC by 30 August 2015 (excepting those that did not wish for their details to be released).

4.4 Aboriginal Consultation

As a consequence of this project's DGEARs, the university has undertaken to identify, assess and recognise Aboriginal values associated with the whole university. This wider Aboriginal assessment project is currently ongoing and being undertaken independently from this assessment process.

Given the history of development associated with the university and the number and extent of prior Aboriginal assessments (which have not previously identified intangible values), coupled with low to no archaeological potential of the two study areas, the RAP consultation was undertaken by phone and correspondence.

The Aboriginal community was provided with the draft copy of this report for review and comment. Provision of the report to RAPs acted as the provision of project methodology (Stage 2) and RAPs were asked to respond or comment within 28 days. The RAPs were asked to identify whether the two study areas contained or held association with Aboriginal values (tangible or intangible), Aboriginal traditions, or other cultural aspects, directly or indirectly connected with the study area (Stage 3).

Responses received from the RAPs included:

- The Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council.

The MLALC have expressed a concern for the harm to potential Aboriginal objects through the process of construction which encompasses all three sites, F07, F23 and A02. They identify that all the areas which are part of previous Aboriginal land management practices are of high cultural value and significance to the Aboriginal community. MLALC did not object to the project proceeding on account of the general high cultural value association with the study areas.

Table 4.2 Submissions received from RAPs, and GML response

<i>RAP Submission</i>	<i>GML Response</i>
<p>Metro Local Aboriginal Land Council (19 August 2015)</p> <p><i>I have read the report and am happy with the contents in regards to the Aboriginal cultural heritage components.</i></p> <p><i>As mentioned within the report, the study area and surrounding areas were used by Aboriginal people of the Gadigal and Wangal clans before and during British arrival. These areas were frequently used in day to day life as part of their land management practices, food gathering, meeting places and ceremonial gatherings. MLALC and the Aboriginal community within its boundaries hold all of its land and the cultural practices that were and are carried out within it of high cultural value and significance.</i></p> <p><i>The cultural practices that were carried out within the study area of this project are no exception.</i></p> <p><i>Although there is low potential of Aboriginal archaeological deposits within the study area, MLALC are concerned for the harm of any such potential Aboriginal objects that may be present and uncovered during ground disturbance, excavation and construction works involved.</i></p> <p><i>However, MLALC has no objections to the project proceeding and look forward to further involvement with the project.⁵⁶</i></p>	<p>This assessment demonstrates the very low to no archaeological potential of the specific study areas. In recognising the concern of the MLALC, the project and construction of the various buildings should include an Aboriginal cultural heritage induction process and a mechanism for Aboriginal heritage discovery.</p> <p>GML acknowledge the cultural value which the MLALC has identified for the wider university study area. GML understands that the University of Sydney is to undertake a project for Community Consultation on Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Values, to capture the wider intangible heritage values which exist for the site. This project team should consult with the MLALC with respect to their comment on cultural value. As GML is not involved in this project, further comment or discussion of wider values is beyond the scope of this assessment.</p>
<p>Murramarang (28 August 2015)</p> <p><i>[...] supports the methodology and wishes to be kept informed</i></p>	<p>GML note that Murramarang wish to be informed about the development and support the methodology.</p>
<p>Goobah Developments (28 August 2015)</p> <p><i>[...] after much consideration my Elders have decide to to [sic] inform that they support the Methodology with the inclusion that you convene a [sic] on site inspection and discuss the Methodology in detail, please let me know if this is possible.</i></p>	<p>GML have provided all known detail of the methodology within the due diligence assessment. GML also replied that the site is available to be visited and is accessible should Goobah Developments wish to visit it.</p>

<p>Biamanga (28 August 2015)</p> <p><i>Biamanga support the methodology and wish to continue with our expression of interest in the project. I would like to be kept informed of any further developments.</i></p>	<p>GML note that Biamanga wish to be informed about the development and support the methodology.</p>
<p>Cullendulla (28 August 2015)</p> <p><i>This is confirmation of support to the proposed methodology and any further interest with the project and participation.</i></p>	<p>GML note that Cullendulla are interested in the project, wish to participate and support the methodology.</p>
<p>Gulaga (28 August 2015)</p> <p><i>We support the methodology associated with the above proposed methodology and wish to be kept informed of all stages of the development</i></p>	<p>GML note that Gulaga are interested in the project, wish to participate and support the methodology.</p>

4.5 Requirements for Future Aboriginal Consultation

- Copies of the final due diligence report must be sent to all Aboriginal groups/organisations that are identified during Stage 1, Step 1.
- As the cultural values identified in this assessment are not directly associated with the study area and apply to the wider University of Sydney's Camperdown campus, it is recommended that the project (that is the works outlined in this assessment associated with F07, F23 and A02) may proceed with caution, and that this report be supplied to the RAPs.

5.0 The Proposed Works and Potential Impacts

5.1 Description of the Proposed Works

5.1.1 Proposed Faculty of Arts and Sciences Precinct

The following is edited from Initial Geotechnical Site Assessment—Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Development (FASS) 14 May 2015.

Development at this site will require the demolition and removal of several existing buildings, demountable structures and containers. These structures include the A34a/b Substation, R04a Ross St Storage Facility, A40 Native Animal House, Agricultural Glasshouse, demountable buildings and converted container rooms.

The proposed development includes the construction of a new education and teaching building, as the FASS Building of up to five storeys, on the western half of the site where there is currently a Demountable Village. At this stage it is understood that there is no planned basement level. The FASS Building is shown on the concept drawings to the north of the RD Watt building spanning across the eastern to central portion of the subject area. The footprint generally is in the area of the Agricultural Glasshouse demountable building, Ross St storage facility and substation.

The existing RD Watt Building, dating back to 1916, is listed as a cultural heritage asset and is planned for redevelopment.

5.1.2 Proposed Carslaw Extension and Administration Building

Proposed development of the Carslaw Extension will require deep excavation to one level below street level, underneath Eastern Avenue, to match the existing Carslaw Building. The Administration Building will also require bulk excavation, two levels below ground, requiring excavation up to 8m in depth (Figure 5.6 to 5.8). Excavation will include below ground services for the two new buildings. The footprint of the two buildings are:

- located near line of mature trees which edge the Carslaw Building and City Road, east of the footbridge; and
- over the carpark west of the footbridge on City Road, spanning the area up to the Eastern Avenue gates.

5.2 Possible Impacts Arising from the Proposed Works

The proposed works are likely to involve:

- demolition of existing structures;
- bulk excavation for footings of buildings and below-ground levels of up to 8m (two levels);
- landscaping and road paving; and
- installation of subsurface services and infrastructure.

5.2.1 Possible Impacts to Proposed Faculty of Arts and Sciences Study Area

The proposed work would impact on the known extent of fill in the FASS site, and bedrock, approximately 2m below the current ground-surface levels (Figure 5.2 and Figure 5.3). Due to the numerous historical disturbances in this area, including air raid trenching, pastoral clearing, vegetation stripping, major earthworks and demolition of buildings, the likelihood of Aboriginal objects remaining is very low to none.

5.2.2 Possible Impacts to the Proposed Administration Building and Carslaw Extension

The proposed work for the Administration Building and Carslaw Extension would impact the soil horizons in both locations to a depth of 7 to 8 metres (Figures 5.4 to Figure 5.8). Given the shallow nature of soil horizons and the various impacts to this soil horizon through pastoral activities—clearing, stripping and associated excavation for footings for the construction of the Carslaw Extension—it is likely all soils are highly disturbed. The likelihood of Aboriginal objects remaining is very low to none.

5.2.3 Synopsis of Potential Impacts to Aboriginal Archaeology

As all three precincts are identified as having very low to no potential to retain Aboriginal archaeological deposits and/or Aboriginal objects, it is the finding of this assessment that Aboriginal objects are unlikely to be present and thus would not be impacted by the proposed work.




Figure 5.1 Proposed development plan for FASS building, the footprint is outlined in red. (Source: BatesSmart Architect Pty Ltd 2015)



Figure 5.2 Proposed east and north elevations for proposed FASS building. (Source: BatesSmart Pty Ltd 2015)




Figure 5.3 Proposed west and south elevations for FASS building (A02). (Source: BatesSmart Architects Pty Ltd 2015)




Figure 5.4 Proposed development footprint for Administration Building (F23) and the new Carlaw Extension. (F07) (Source: University of Sydney 2015).



Figure 5.5 Proposed development for F23 Administration building. (SSD7055) (Source: Warren and Mahoney Architects Pty Ltd 2015).




Figure 5.6 Proposed development of F23 Administration building, including basement levels, view to the north. (Source: Warren and Mahoney Architects Pty Ltd 2015).




Figure 5.7 Proposed development of F23 Administration building, including basement levels, view to the east. (Source: Warren and Mahoney Pty Ltd 2015).



Figure 5.8 Proposed development for F07 (LEES1) proposed Carslaw Extension. (Source: Warren and Mahoney Architects Pty Ltd 2015).

6.0 Recommendations and Conclusions

This due diligence report has identified the following conclusions regarding the Aboriginal archaeology of the study area:

- Past Aboriginal inhabitants are likely to have used the wider university area as a component of their territory.
- Given the small size of the study area and its distance from environmental foci, the study area may have been associated with general resource gathering activities rather than more permanent campsites. This type of past landscape use would have been ephemeral and unlikely to leave an archaeological signature.
- Extensive earth disturbing development has occurred continuously for over 200 years since European settlement of Sydney. This includes forest clearance, farming, grazing, construction of gardens, roads and buildings, the introduction of fill to level and terrace the natural topography of the land, as well as the landscaping and paving of ground surfaces.
- Since 1950, extensive single and multi-storey development has occurred within the two study areas identified in this report. Given the nature of modern engineering and construction methods, the excavation of strip footings and foundations required for large multi-storey buildings is likely to have removed any in situ subsurface Aboriginal archaeological deposits.
- No areas within the current study area can be categorised as undisturbed.
- Previous archaeological investigations have revealed extremely low artefact densities are contained within archaeological deposits within and near the university grounds.
- As the quantity of in situ artefacts from the vicinity of the university is extremely low, any in situ artefacts or sites found within the university would be extremely rare and may hold high archaeological significance.
- Several areas of deep alluvial sediments with the potential to contain Aboriginal objects have been identified in association with Blackwattle Creek and Swamp within 1km of the study area.
- Previous archaeological investigations in surrounding areas near the current study areas have shown that some remnant natural soil horizons are present below historical fill layers on Petersham Hill and within the Darlington campus. However, the historical land use has disturbed the A soil horizons to such an extent that any Aboriginal objects are unlikely to be in situ.
- Geotechnical investigations have indicated that natural soil horizons may be preserved below 3–5m of historical fill in the area associated with the former Orphan School Creek, to the west of the FASS building.
- This assessment has found low to nil potential for Aboriginal objects to occur within the two study areas⁵⁷.

- The Aboriginal community have identified that the wider University of Sydney Camperdown Campus area is of cultural value and significance. This value can be recognised and recorded during the university's campus-wide study of Aboriginal values.

6.1 Required Aboriginal Heritage Management

In order for the proposed works to proceed, a number of Aboriginal heritage management requirements should be undertaken, including provision of the final due diligence Aboriginal heritage assessment to the RAPs.

As the Aboriginal community have identified cultural values which are not directly associated with the study area, this Aboriginal heritage assessment has been updated to record this information and capture the Aboriginal consultation process undertaken before the report was finalised.

The project may proceed with caution (that is, the works as outlined in this assessment associated with F07, F23 and A02 may proceed). An Aboriginal cultural heritage induction should be developed in collaboration with the MLALC. This should include an Aboriginal sites discovery protocol.

7.0 Endnotes

- ¹ Department of Environment Climate Change and Water (DECCW) 2010, *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974. Fact Sheet 1*.
- ² Department of Planning 2015, *Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements*, Attachment SSD7055.
- ³ DECCW, *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010*, Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, April 2010.
- ⁴ DECCW (now OEH) 2010, *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales*, pp 24–28.
- ⁵ DECCW (now OEH) 2010, *Code of Practice for Archaeological Investigation of Aboriginal Objects in New South Wales*, pp 24–28.
- ⁶ DECCW. 2009, *Due diligence guidelines for protection of Aboriginal objects in NSW*.
- ⁷ DECCW 2010, *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974. Fact sheet 2*.
- ⁸ GML Heritage, University of Sydney Campus Improvement Program Aboriginal Heritage Due Diligence Report, report prepared for University of Sydney, 2013.
- ⁹ Site card Numbers 45-6-2629 and 45-6-2676.
- ¹⁰ In Section 2.0, the 'study area' refers to the area including and surrounding the footprint of SSD7081, SSD7054 and SSD7055.
- ¹¹ Chapman, G and Murphy, C 1989, *Soil Landscapes of the Sydney 1:100 000 Sheet*, Sydney, Soil Conservation Service of NSW, p 30.
- ¹² Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Sydney University Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the Law Building Site, Camperdown Campus and at Maze Green, the Old Darlington School. Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, 2005.
- ¹³ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Sydney University of Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the University of Sydney Central Site, Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, 2006, p 7.
- ¹⁴ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Sydney University of Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the University of Sydney Central Site, Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, 2006, p 11.
- ¹⁵ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Sydney University of Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the University of Sydney Central Site, Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, 2006 p 11.
- ¹⁶ GML Heritage.
- ¹⁷ Barani, 'Aboriginal People and Place', viewed 16 July 2015 <<http://www.sydneymarani.com.au/sites/aboriginal-people-and-place>>.
- ¹⁸ JMcDCHM, Sydney University Campus 2010, Test Excavations at the University of Sydney Central Site, Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, October 2006, p 16.
- ¹⁹ For further details refer to Sections 2.2.5 and 3.1.
- ²⁰ Coffey Geotechnics Pty Ltd, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Development (FASS) Initial Geotechnical Site Assessment, report prepared for The University of Sydney 2015.
- ²¹ Mitchell, PB, Soil materials and geomorphology at The Tin Sheds, University of Sydney, report prepared for Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management Pty Ltd, 2006.
- ²² Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management 2006, Sydney University of Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the University of Sydney Central Site, Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, p 12.
- ²³ JMcDCHM, Sydney University of Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the University of Sydney Central Site, Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, p. 6.
- ²⁴ Casey and Lowe 2012, *Archaeological Assessment & Impact Statement: University Accommodation, St Paul's College*, The University of Sydney, report prepared for Citta Property Group, p 11.
- ²⁵ Colley, S, and Attenbrow, V, 'Does technology make a difference? Aboriginal and colonial fishing in Port Jackson, New South Wales.' in *Archaeology in Oceania*, 47, 2012, 69–77.
- ²⁶ Colley, S, 'Fish and fishing in colonial New South Wales: new evidence from the Quadrant site in Sydney in *Post Medieval Archaeology* 47, 2013, 120–136.
- ²⁷ Pearson, M, Marshall, D, Ellsmore, D, Attenbrow, V, Rosen, S, Kerr, R and Betteridge, C 2002, *University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan*, Vol. 2, prepared for Facilities Management Office, University of Sydney.
- ²⁸ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, University of Sydney: ARC Medical Research Building, Indigenous Archaeological Assessment, report prepared for Jones Lang LaSalle, 2007 p 13.
- ²⁹ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, University of Sydney: Centre for Obesity Diabetics and Cardiovascular Research (CODCD) Project, Aboriginal Heritage Assessment, report prepared for the University of Sydney, 2009 p12.
- ³⁰ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Archaeological Survey for an Aboriginal Heritage Assessment, University of Sydney NSW, prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, 2004, p 12.
- ³¹ That is, SSD7081, SSD7054 and SSD7055.
- ³² Photographs of this are available in Section 3.0

- ³³ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Sydney University Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the Law Building Site, Camperdown Campus and at Maze Green, the Old Darlington School. Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd., pg 5, 2005.
- ³⁴ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, Sydney University Campus 2010: Test Excavations at the Law Building Site, Camperdown Campus and at Maze Green, the Old Darlington School. Darlington Campus, report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, 2005.
- ³⁵ Pearson, M, Marshal, D, Ellsmore, D, Attenbrow, V, Rosen, S, Kerr, R and Betteridge, C 2002, *University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan*, Volumes 1 and 2.
- ³⁶ Attenbrow, V 2010 (2nd ed) *Sydney's Aboriginal Past: Investigating the archaeological and historical records*, UNSW Press, Sydney; Benson, D and Howell, J 1995, *Taken for Granted: The Bushland of Sydney and its Suburbs*, Kangaroo Press and Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney; Kohen, J 1986, 'Prehistoric Settlement in the western Cumberland Plain: Resources, environment and technology', unpublished PhD thesis, Macquarie University.
- ³⁷ Pearson, M, Marshal, D, Ellsmore, D, Attenbrow, V, Rosen, S, Kerr, R and Betteridge, C 2002, *University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan*, Volumes 1 and 2.
- ³⁸ Dominic Steele Consulting Archaeology 2001, Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment Report, Broadway & Mountain St Development Site, Sydney, report prepared for Australand Holdings Ltd and College Square Residential Pty Ltd, July 2001; Butlin, N 1983, *Our Original Aggression: Aboriginal populations of south-eastern Australia 1788–1850*, George, Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- ³⁹ City Plan Heritage 2004, University of Sydney SIT: Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment, report to FJMT Architects on behalf of the University of Sydney, p 33.
- ⁴⁰ Pearson M et al., *University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Plan*, in *Environmental Protection*, Sydney, report prepared for the Facilities Management Office, University of Sydney, 2002.
- ⁴¹ GML understands that this report has been superseded by the 2014 University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Management Plan, but advises that the archaeological sensitivity assessment remains the same.
- ⁴² D Steele & J Czastka, *Archaeological Salvage Excavations at the Quadrant, Broadway.*, report prepared for Australand Holdings., 2003.
- ⁴³ Steele and Czastka.
- ⁴⁴ JMcDCHM, *Archaeological Survey for an Aboriginal Heritage Assessment*, University of Sydney, NSW, unpublished report prepared for Capital Insight Pty Ltd, June 2004.,
- ⁴⁵ JMcDCHM, *University of Sydney: Centre for Obesity Diabetics and Cardiovascular Research (CODCD) Project, Aboriginal Heritage Assessment*, unpublished report prepared for the University of Sydney, September 2009.
- ⁴⁶ Godden Mackay Logan Pty Ltd & JMcDCH Management, *Abercrombie Precinct Redevelopment: Preliminary Aboriginal Archaeological Assessment*, , 2012.
- ⁴⁷ Biosis Research, 445-473 Wattle Street , *Ultimo: Proposed Student Accommodation Development - Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report*, unpublished report prepared for Cultural Resources Management, September 2012, <O:\Consulting\GML Resources>.⁴⁷
- ⁴⁸ Chapman and Murphy, *Soil Landscapes of the Sydney 1:100,000 Sheet* , p. 30.
- ⁴⁹ Jo McDonald Cultural Heritage Management, University of Sydney: ARC Medical Research Building, Indigenous Archaeological Assessment, report prepared for Jones Lang LaSalle, 2007, p 34.
- ⁵⁰ Coffey Geotechnics Pty Ltd, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Development (FASS) Initial Geotechnical Site Assessment. Report prepared for University of Sydney, 2015.
- ⁵¹ GML Heritage 2013.
- ⁵² DECCW 2010, *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010*.
- ⁵³ DECCW 2010, *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010*.
- ⁵⁴ DECCW 2010, *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010*, p 10.
- ⁵⁵ DECCW 2010, *Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010*, p 10.
- ⁵⁶ extract from 15-0344mlalcc2 response
- ⁵⁷ That is, SSD7081, SSD7054 and SSD70555.

8.0 Appendices

Appendix A

Aboriginal Consultation Log—University of Sydney Buildings F23 & F07

Aboriginal Consultation Log—University of Sydney Buildings F23 & F07—15-0344

Stage 1—Notification of project proposal and registration of interest

Stage 1, Step 1—Compilation of a list of Aboriginal stakeholders

Body/Group	Contact	Date Sent	Date Reply	Comment	Reference
OEH region office	Ms Fran Scully Archaeologist Aboriginal Heritage and Planning Office of Environment and Heritage PO Box 668 PARRAMATTA NSW 2124	3 July 2015	10 July 2015	Provided a list of Aboriginal stakeholders known to OEH that may have an interest in the project. As it is an SSI, the consultation process should be in accordance with the relevant SEARS issued by the Department of Planning and Environment.	15-0344oehc1 – email
Local Aboriginal Land Council (LALC)	Mr Nathan Moran Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council PO Box 1103 STRAWBERRY HILLS NSW 2012	15 July 2015			15-0344mlalcc1 – email
The Registrar, <i>Aboriginal Lands Right Act 1983</i>	The Registrar, Aboriginal Land Rights Act PO Box 112 GLEBE NSW 2037 Att: Ms Megan Mebberson	15 July 2015	18 August 2015	The project area did not appear to have Registered Aboriginal Owners pursuant to Division 3 of the ALRA 1983.	15-0344alrac1 – email
National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT)	National Native Title Tribunal GPO Box 9973 SYDNEY 2000 Attention: Ms Melissa O'Malley	15 July 2015			15-0344nnttc1 – email

Body/Group	Contact	Date Sent	Date Reply	Comment	Reference
Native Title Services Corporation (NTSCORP Limited)	Native Title Services Corporation PO Box 2105 STRAWBERRY HILLS NSW 2012	15 July 2015			15-0344ntscs1 – email
Local Council	City of Sydney GPO Box 1591 Sydney NSW 2001	15 July 2015	27 July 2015	City of Sydney declined GML's request to provide a list of any relevant Aboriginal people/groups who should be consulted with respect to the project.	15-0344cscs1 – email
Greater Sydney Local Land Services (formerly CMA)	Greater Sydney Catchment Management Authority Greater Local Land Services Office PO Box W274, Parramatta Westfield NSW 2150	15 July 2015	7 August 2015	The Greater LLS declined to provide a list of Aboriginal stakeholders but would forward our request to the Advisory committee but advised that this comment on the list by the Advisory Committee would not be in the capacity as the Greater LLS, but would be the suggestion of an individual.	15-0344gscmac1 – letter

Approximately 10 days should be allowed for these groups to respond.

Stage 1, Step 2—Newspaper Advert

Newspaper	Date Printed	Reference
Central Courier	8 July 2015	201500708Tearsheet

14 days (22 July 2015) must be allowed for Aboriginal people to respond to the newspaper advertisement.

List of Aboriginal groups/people from Step 1 and Step 2.

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact	How the name was obtained and any comments	Reference
Aaron Broad		OEHL List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-0344oehl1 Response
Badu	Karia Lea Bond	OEHL List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-0344oehl1 Response
Bilinga	Christopher Payne	OEHL List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-0344oehl1 Response
Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA)	Gordon Morton	OEHL List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-0344oehl1 Response

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact	How the name was obtained and any comments	Reference
Eric Keidge		OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Goobah Developments	Basil Smith	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Gunyu	Darlene Hoskins-McKenzie	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Jerrigong	Joanne Stewart	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
MLALC	Nathan Moran	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Munyunga	Peter Foster	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Murrumbul	Levi McKenzie-Kirkbright	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Nundagurri	Newton Carriage	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Pemulwuy CHTS	Pemulwuy Johnson	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Tocmwall (tow)	Scott Franks	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Walbunga	Hika TeKowhai	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Wingikara	David Bell	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Wullung	Lee-Roy James Boota	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response
Yerramurra	Robert Parson	OEH List of Aboriginal Stakeholders	15-03444oe1 Response

Stage 1, Step 3—Aboriginal notification of the proposed project and an offer to be involved in the consultation

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact	Date Sent	Reference
Aaron Broad		16 July 2015	15-03444abc1 - letter
Badu	Karia Lea Bond	16 July 2015	15-03444bc1 - email
Bilinga	Christopher Payne	16 July 2015	15-03444bic1 - email
Darug Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA)	Mr Gordon Morton Ms Celestine Everingham	16 July 2015	15-03444cwc1 -email

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact	Date Sent	Reference
Eric Keidge		16 July 2015	15-03444ekc1 - letter
Goobah Developments	Basil Smith	16 July 2015	15-03444gdc1 - email
Gunyu	Darlene Hoskins-McKenzie	16 July 2015	15-03444gc1 - email
Jerringong	Joanne Stewart	16 July 2015	15-03444jc1 - email
MLALC	Nathan Moran	16 July 2015	15-03444mlalcc1 - email
Munyinga	Peter Foster	16 July 2015	15-03444mc1 - email
Murrumbul	Levi McKenzie-Kirkbright	16 July 2015	15-03444mic1 - email
Nundagurri	Newton Carriage	16 July 2015	15-03444nc1 - email
Pemulwuy CHTS	Pemulwuy Johnson	16 July 2015	15-03444pc1 - email
Tocomwall (tow)	Scott Franks	16 July 2015	15-03444dachac1 - letter
Walbunja	Hika Tekowhai	16 July 2015	15-03444wacc1 - email
Wingikara	David Bell	16 July 2015	15-03444wic1 - email
Wullung	Lee-Roy James Boota	16 July 2015	15-03444wc1 - email
Yerramurra	Robert Parson	16 July 2015	15-03444yc1 - email

14 days (30 July 2015) must be allowed for Aboriginal people to register an interest to be consulted.

Stage 1 Complete—Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAP)

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact	Date Received and comments	Reference
Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council	Lee Davison/ Nathan Moran	20 July 2015—email	20150720_Mlcalc response
Goobah Developments	Basil Smith	20 July 2015 - email	
Gulaga	Wendy Smith	20 July 2015 - email	
Murramarang	Roxanne Smith	20 July 2015 - email	

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Contact	Date Received and comments	Reference
Cullendulla	Janaya Smith	20 July 2015 - email	
Biamanga	Sell Storer	20 July 2015 - email	
Darug Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA)	Celestine Everingham	21 July 2015—Phone call to register	Phone call
Elouera	Lenard Nye	21 July 2015 - email	
EORA	Kahu Brennan	21 July 2015 - email	
Badu	Karia Bond	21 July 2015 - email	
Walbunja	Hika Te Kowhai	21 July 2015 - email	
Wandandian	William Bond	21 July 2015 - email	
Tharawal	Violet Carriage	21 July 2015 - email	
Ngunawal	Edward Stewart	21 July 2015 - email	
Ngarigo	Newton Bond	21 July 2015 - email	
Dharug	Andrew Bond	21 July 2015 - email	
Yerramurra	Robert Parsons	21 July 2015 - email	
Murrin	Tarlara Te Kowhai	21 July 2015 - email	
Thauaira	Shane Carriage	21 July 2015 - email	
Djiringanj	Keith Nye	21 July 2015 - email	
Kurringgai	Toni Brierley	21 July 2015 - email	
Bidawal	Richard Andy	21 July 2015 - email	
Nundagurri	Newton Carriage	22 July 2015 – email	
Gangangarra	Kim Carriage	22 July 2015 – email	
Walgalu	Ronald Stewart	22 July 2015 – email	
Murrumbul	Levi McKenzie-Kirkbright	23 July 2015 – email – personal details not to be released to OEH/LALCs	
Tocomwall	Danny Franks	27 July 2015 - email	

The proponent must provide a copy of the registered Aboriginal parties to the OEH and the LALC within 28 days of the closing data for registering an interest.

Stage 2—Presentation of information about the proposed project

Stage 2, Step 1—Presentation of proposed project information and provision of proposed assessment methodology to the RAPs

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Date Sent	Date Reply	Comments, outcomes and/or issues	Reference
Badu - Karia Bond	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Badu
Biamanga - Sell Storer	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Biamanga
Bidawal - Richard Andy	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Bidawal
Cullendulla - Janaya Smith	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Cullendulla
Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA) - Gordon Morton, Celestine Everingham	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD DACHA
Dharug - Andrew Bond	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Dharug
Djiringanj - Keith Nye	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Djiringanj
Elouera - Lenard Nye	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Elouera
EORA - Kahu Brennan	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD EORA
Gangangarra - Kim Carriage	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Gangangarra
Goobah Development Pty Ltd - Basil Smith	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Goobah
Gulaga - Wendy Smith	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Gulaga
Kurringgai - Toni Brierley	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Kurringgai
Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council	31 July 2015	19 August 2015	MLALC has no objections to the project proceeding, and identifies that the study area and surrounding areas were, and continue to be important to Aboriginal people. The written correspondence has been provided herein.	15-0344 receipt DD MLALC
Murramarang - Roxanne Smith	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Murramarang
Murrin - Tarlarra Te Kowhai	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Murrin

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Date Sent	Date Reply	Comments, outcomes and/or issues	Reference
Murrumbul - Levi McKenzie-Kirkbright	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Murrumbul
Ngarigo - Newton Bond	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Ngarigo
Ngunawal - Edward Stewart	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Ngunawal
Nundagurri - Newton Carriage	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Nundagurri
Tharawal - Violet Carriage	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Tharawal
Thauaira - Shane Carriage	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Thauaira
Tocomwall - Danny Franks	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Tocomwall
Walbunja - Hika Te Kowhai	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Walbunja
Walgalu - Ronald Stewart	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Walgalu
Wandandian - William Bond	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Wandandian
Yerramurra - Robert Parson	31 July 2015			15-0344 receipt DD Yerramurra
28 Days allowed for comments (from the 31 July) – 28 th August.				

The record of agreed outcomes and/or contentious issues should be supplied to all registered Aboriginal parties. The MLALC identified that the works could proceed, though expressed a concern for Aboriginal objects which may occur within the footprint.

Stage 3—Seek information from RAPs and Review of Aboriginal Heritage Assessment

Stage 3, Step 3—Seek information from RAP on (a) the presence of Aboriginal objects of cultural value and (b) places of cultural value

RAP	Date Sent	Date Reply	Comments and/or cultural values identified	Reference
MLALC	31 July 2015	19 August 2015	<p>Taken from MLALC's response:</p> <p><i>The study area and surrounding areas were used by Aboriginal people of the Gadigal and Wangal clans before and during British arrival. These areas were frequently used in day to day life as part of their land management practices, food gathering, meeting places and ceremonial gatherings. MLALC and the Aboriginal community within its boundaries hold all of its land and the cultural practices that were and are carried out within it of high cultural value and significance.</i></p> <p><i>The cultural practices that were carried out within the study area of this project are no exception.</i></p> <p><i>Although there is low potential of Aboriginal archaeological deposits within the study area, MLALC are concerned for the harm of any such potential Aboriginal objects that may be present and uncovered during ground disturbance, excavation and construction works involved.</i></p> <p><i>However, MLALC has no objections to the project proceeding and look forward to further involvement with the project.</i></p> <p>Therefore MLALC have identified that areas which were used by Aboriginal people are of high cultural value and significance to the Aboriginal community. MLALC also identified a concern for the harm to Aboriginal objects through construction.</p>	15-0344mlalcc2 response
Murramarang - Roxanne Smith	31 July 2015	28 August 2015	<p><i>Our support of methodology is for the project at University of Sydney Buildings, Camperdown. Stage 2 and 3.</i></p>	20150828 Roxanne Smith response
Goobah Development Pty Ltd - Basil Smith	31 July 2015	28 August 2015	<p><i>"after much consideration my Elders have decide to inform that they support the Methodology with the inclusion that you convene a on site inspection and discuss the Methodology in detail, please let me know if this is possible."</i></p>	20150828 Basil Smith response

RAP	Date Sent	Date Reply	Comments and/or cultural values identified	Reference
Biamanga - Seli Storer	31 July 2015	28 August 2015	<i>Biamanga support the methodology and wish to continue with our expression of interest in the project. I would like to be kept informed of any further developments.</i>	20150828 Seli Storer response
Cullendulla - Janaya Smith	31 July 2015	28 August 2015	<i>This is confirmation of support to the proposed methodology and any further interest with the project and participation.</i>	20150828 Janaya Smith response
Gulaga - Wendy Smith	31 July 2015	28 August 2015	<i>We support the methodology associated with the above proposed methodology and wish to be kept informed of all stages of the development</i>	20150828 Wendy Smith response

The Aboriginal heritage assessment which was presented to the Aboriginal community was also provided as a mechanism for collecting information about specifically known or identified places of significance to the Aboriginal community. Responses were received from the six RAPs (the end of the review period is the 28th August 2015). No specific values were identified that were associated with the study area. GML have recommended that the university should develop an Aboriginal cultural heritage induction with the MLALC, which includes an Aboriginal object/ site/ place discovery protocol.

Stage 4—Final report sent to RAPs

This due diligence assessment was sent to the following RAPs on 1st September April 2015 by email and post.

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Comments	Reference
Badu - Karia Bond	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Badu
Biamanga - Seli Storer	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Biamanga
Bidawal - Richard Andy	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Bidawal
Cullendulla - Janaya Smith	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Cullendulla
Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments (DACHA) - Gordon Morton, Celestine Everingham	By post	15-0344 DACHA
Dharug - Andrew Bond	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Dharug
Djiringanj - Keith Nye	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Djiringanj
Elouera - Lenard Nye	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Elouera

Aboriginal Organisation/Person	Comments	Reference
EORA - Kahu Brennan	Email	15-0344 receipt DD EORA
Gangangarra - Kim Carriage	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Gangangarra
Goobah Development Pty Ltd - Basil Smith	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Goobah
Gulaga - Wendy Smith	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Gulaga
Kurringgai - Toni Brierley	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Kurringgai
Metropolitan Local Aboriginal Land Council	Email	15-0344 receipt DD MLALC
Murramarang - Roxanne Smith	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Murramarang
Murrin - Tarrarra Te Kowhai	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Murrin
Murrumbul - Levi McKenzie-Kirkbright	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Murrumbul
Ngarigo - Newton Bond	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Ngarigo
Ngunawal - Edward Stewart	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Ngunawal
Nundagurri - Newton Carriage	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Nundagurri
Tharawal - Violet Carriage	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Tharawal
Thauaira - Shane Carriage	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Thauaira
Tocomwall - Danny Franks	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Tocomwall
Walbunja - Hika Te Kowhai	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Walbunja
Walgalu - Ronald Stewart	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Walgalu
Wandandian - William Bond	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Wandandian
Yerramurra - Robert Parson	Email	15-0344 receipt DD Yerramurra

Appendix E

University of Sydney Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by AHMS (February 2016)