

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

1. DETAILS OF APPLICANT

Permit to Interfere

Office Use only

Name of Applicant: Mr Norm McIlfratrick (Secretary)

Name of Company: Department of Infrastructure, Energy & Resources

Date of Application: 10th June 2010 (amended August 2nd 2010)

Street Address: 10 Murray Street, Hobart 7000

Postal Address: GPO Box 936
Hobart Tasmania 7001
Enquiries to Andrew Fowler, Senior Project Manager.

Telephone: (03) 6233 3126 (Mob) 0409 792 934

Fax: (03) 6233 8977

E-mail: Andrew.Fowler@dier.tas.gov.au

completed

Y: N:

2. PROPERTY DETAILS

UPI and PID number: The proposal is located on Crown land.
PID: 1587472 – Volume/Folio 113204/1 and 2
PID: 7158775 – Volume/Folio 26119/1
PID: 2057756
Volume /Folio: 242713/1(Road Reservation)
Council Road Reservation
Last amended on August 5th to more clearly define breakdown of Crown Land ownership, PID's, and Permit title.

completed

Y: N:

Description of proposal: This permit application relates to Section B of the Brighton Bypass alignment see **Map 1, Appendix 1**. A permit is sought by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) to allow for the construction of the Brighton Bypass Jordan River crossing. This application for a permit includes a proposal to interfere with a small portion (approximately 4%) of the larger site known as TASI 10757, recorded by Stone and Everett and depicted by the red site boundary in **Maps 2, 3 and 4** contained in **Appendix 1**, to allow for the construction of bridge structures, an embankment and relocation of some services. The proposed impacts will occur to the east and west of the archaeologically defined site known as the Jordan River levee and as defined by archaeologist Rob Paton. **This proposal does not include any destruction of the levee deposit.**

The DIER owned land represents 22.7% of TASI 10757 and includes the area represented by the yellow boundary on the photomontages included as **Maps 2 and 3 in Appendix 1** in addition to small sections of road and rail reserves. The Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment owns approximately 5.9%, Southern Water 2.6% of the site and the remaining 68.8% of TASI 10757 is located on private land and is subject to a range of land uses.

The majority of surface artefacts that were identified within TASI 10757 as it was initially recorded are located on the levee deposit and will not be disturbed. According to the data recorded by Stone and Everett, one surface artefact is located to the west of the levee deposit that will be impacted by the construction of the embankment. This permit application is to allow for the destruction of this surface artefact and possible additional anticipated surface and subsurface artefacts in this area.

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

As part of the TASI 10757 subsurface investigation, some artefacts were identified outside of the levee deposit within Trench 8. Archaeologist Rob Paton has stated that whilst some of these artefacts may have been deposited by Aborigines, many will have been moved off the levee by ploughing and modern movement of the top 20cm of sediments. Paton goes on to say that the artefacts are out of situ and in a plough zone. The artefacts do not have the same level of scientific significance as those contained in the levee.

It is proposed that the topsoil removed to allow for the construction of the embankment will remain on site and be utilised in the revegetation of the embankment batters.

Two surface artefacts to the east of the levee may be temporarily concealed during construction. Alternatively, given the provenance of the artefacts is most likely to be the levee, the artefacts could be identified and moved back onto the levee, ensuring their long term protection. No other surface artefacts were located in this area despite an intensive survey. Archaeologist Rob Paton has stated that no subsurface artefacts were located on the eastern side of the levee which suggests that a permit is required only because the piles that are proposed in this area are located within the inferred site boundary as proposed by Stone and since found to be an inaccurate depiction of the actual site.

The original proposal was to excavate and construct on part of the levee however, given the significance of the levee deposit (as apparent from the results of the investigation) the design and construction approach have been modified and now involves a long span bridge at a cost of around \$12 million.

The attached photomontages (**Map 2 and 3 in Appendix 1**) provide an indication of the proposal as constructed.

TASI 10757 was originally defined by Stone and Everett (2008) as the broader alluvial flood plain that extends well north and south of the bypass alignment (~1000m x ~300m). Stone stated that this boundary was inferred as the whole of the site was not investigated. However an archaeological investigation has established that the scientifically significant Aboriginal heritage values are focused on a raised levee deposit within the landscape unit (see below and **Maps in Appendix 1**). Paton stated that "...the levee deposit is approximately 1 metre deep 500 metres long and 60 metres wide" (Paton 2010:1). Based on evidence provided in the addendum to the interim report, it appears that had the site been more appropriately defined in the first instance that a permit would not have been required for the piles proposed on the eastern side of the levee deposit. Given the presence of one surface artefact and some subsurface artefacts in the plough zone to the west of the levee, a permit is required.

In addition to the above proposal, DIER would like to seek approval to relocate an artefact that is currently fenced for protection and within the eastern extent of Section A (west of William Street). Two outlying artefacts recorded as part of TASI 10757 are evident in **Map 4 in Appendix 1**. These artefacts were recorded during a later survey by Stone & Everett and as yet have not been relocated and verified by Paton. However, fencing has been constructed around the artefacts based on coordinates from the field survey. This proposal includes a request to temporarily relocate the southern-most artefact approximately 50m north to the location of the northern artefact for the period of construction and then returned to its original position at the completion of construction. This will provide for the best possible protection of these artefacts during the construction period.

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

The proposal involves the construction of a structure to allow the Jordan River and levee to be traversed and will form part of the Brighton Bypass. The structure and adjacent construction include the following elements:

West of the levee.

1. A bridge over the South Rail line and William Street including a bridge abutment within TASI 10757 as currently defined, although no relics have been identified in this area;
2. An embankment in the area outside of the levee requiring excavation of soft sediments that would otherwise cause settlement and possible failure of the highway embankment;
3. A bridge abutment west of the levee supporting a 70m bridge span across a dual carriageway above the levee. The abutment will feature a vertical wall to contain the embankment;
4. A temporary access road on the area west of the levee to provide access to the western abutment and for construction of the embankment;
5. A large culvert that extends under the embankment is also proposed to allow drainage of the water that accumulates at the back of the levee and would otherwise be retained by the road embankment. The culvert will eliminate the need to construct a drain through the levee; and
6. A narrow (~300mm wide x ~700mm deep) 15m trench to house a power cable and a short water main (approx 10m) from William Street to a new shed on private property adjacent to DIER Land is required to connect the property to power (see proposed location of cable in Map 5a). The trench is well west of the levee deposit. The power cable cannot be installed overhead due to safety requirements. The trench will be backfilled with the existing soil.

Above the levee

1. A 70m bridge span featuring separate structures for northbound and southbound carriageways predominantly constructed from steel with 2 x 70m steel box girders supporting each bridge. The spans will be launched from outside of the levee.

East of the levee

1. Two pairs of concrete piers located east of the levee (as defined by archaeologist Rob Paton), to support the 70m bridge span over the levee and the first of three shorter spans to cross the Jordan River flood plain and river. Piles will be driven into the floodplain which means that excavation will not be required for Pier 1. The pile caps immediately east of the levee will be constructed on ground (i.e. no excavation) to reduce disturbance adjacent to the levee and will be rotated to be parallel to the levee to provide the maximum possible clearance for the available 70m span. Soil will be excavated for Pier two closer to the Jordan River; and
2. Three shorter (approximately 32 metre) spans to cross the lower Jordan River flood plain and river with the eastern abutment being located on the eastern bank of the Jordan River.

Maps 5a and b in Appendix 1 provide a plan and elevation of the proposed bridge structure with the extent of the proposed embankment and other features clearly identified.

Maps 5c and d depict the areas of permanent and temporary impact respectively.

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

A more detailed description of the proposal is included as part of **Appendix 2**.

Boundary Fence.

A new boundary fence constructed to agricultural standard is required between DIER land and the Baker property to the south depicted as DIER Boundary, (southern boundary) of the **Map 5a**.

attached

Y: N:

attached

Y: N:

Attach map showing area of Impact and affected and adjacent relics, Sites and Areas (>1:25,000 scale)

Relevant maps are contained in **Appendix 1**.

Map 1: depicts the Northern Bypass alignment and each of the Sections within it.

Map 2: Photomontage of proposed Jordan River bridge from a southerly aspect

Map 3: Photomontage of proposed Jordan River from a westerly aspect.

Map 4: depicts TASI 10757, surface artefact locations, test pit locations, the more accurate extent of the levee site as defined by Paton and the proposed Jordan River bridge design.

Map 5a: A plan view of the road and bridge design including drainage, proposed conservation area and levee deposit. This map also includes the Power cable located on the neighbouring property

Map 5b: An elevation view of the road and bridge design including dimensions of key elements.

Map 5c: The plan indicates the footprint of the permanent construction impacts associated with the structures adjacent to the levee.

Map 5d: The plan indicates the temporary impacts associated with construction activity.

3. RELIC, SITE OR AREA INFORMATION
TASI number(s)
Attach completed TASI form(s)

TASI site 10757
Located in **Section B** of the Brighton Bypass, Northern Section see **Map 1 Appendix 1**.

N/A

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

**4. ABORIGINAL
COMMUNITY
CONSULTATION**

Attach or confirm
forwarding of report
or letter from
Aboriginal
Community agency.

This permit application has been prepared after a consultation framework was agreed between representatives of the Aboriginal community, DPIPWE, AHT, DIER and consulting archaeologist Rob Paton and his team.

After a protracted negotiation between Aboriginal community representatives and the Tasmanian Government in relation to concerns about the process related to Aboriginal community consultation and management of Aboriginal cultural heritage more generally, a number of meetings were held to discuss the permit to interfere application and the associated methodology associated with the investigation on the Jordan River levee, within Section B.

Both the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre (TAC) and the Tasmanian Aboriginal Land and Sea Council (TALSC) gave their support for the investigation to proceed under the revised methodology proposed by Rob Paton and included as **Appendix 7** and a new permit to interfere **Appendix 8**.

On the 5th February 2010 Michael Mansell notified DIER that the methodology was endorsed by the TAC. Michael stated that *"...Consultations between the proponent (in this case DIER) and Aboriginal representatives about the proposal and its potential for impact on Aboriginal heritage (have occurred). There have been many meetings both on and off site, the most recent taking place on-site on 4th February. We are satisfied with this aspect of the consultations."* (see **Appendix 6** for context).

When the first results were produced from the investigation, discussions occurred with TAC and TALSC in relation to alternative alignments. All documents including DRAFT documents were provided to TAC and TALSC prior to scheduled meetings in May and June, which were planned to explain the proposed bridge construction and to respond to Aboriginal community concerns about impacts on the levee deposit. As subsequent reports came to hand such as the addendum to the interim report and the OSL dating report, they were provided to TAC and TALSC.

DIER also provided several responses to TAC during May and June in response to a long list of detailed questions related to alternative alignment proposals, engineering, traffic and noise issues. The formal assessment and response to the TAC proposal is included in **Appendix 3**, Practical and Feasible Alternatives. A report on the Aboriginal Community consultation and engagement in addition to details related to recent meetings associated with this proposal is attached as **Appendix 6**.

attached
/confirmed
Y: N:

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

**5. ASSESSMENT
REPORT(S)**

Attach completed
report(s)

A number of assessment reports and attachments are included as the following Appendices:

Appendix 1: Maps and photomontages indicating TASI site, defined levee, road alignment, bridge structure and other relevant information.

Appendix 2: Development and Conservation Proposal – Description of proposed construction approach, mitigation and conservation proposals.

Appendix 3: Prudent and feasible alternatives discussion

Appendix 4: Interim Report and Addendum– Brighton Bypass (Northern Section - Jordan River) Interim report prepared by archaeologist Rob Paton. Luminescence chronology report also attached.

Appendix 5: Ground Penetrating Radar Report

Appendix 6: Aboriginal Community Consultation Overview.

Appendix 7: Final approved Jordan River levee methodology

Appendix 8: Revised Permit to Interfere

Appendix 9: Initial Permit to Interfere

Appendix 10: Initial approved methodology – Stage 2 Archaeological Scope of Works

Appendix 11: Report – Stone, T. and Everett, A. 2009

Appendix 12: Report – Everett, A. June 2008

attached

Y: N:

**6. PROPOSED
ACTION**

Attach a description
of proposed action
(including formal
plans if applicable)

Attached Yes:

A brief description of the proposal is included above in 'Description of Proposal'.

A more detailed description of the proposed action is included in **Appendix 2** and Maps are included in **Appendix 1**.

attached

Y: N:

attached

Attach a description
of the impact of the
proposed action on
the Relic(s)

Attached Yes:

A detailed description of the proposed action is included in **Appendix 2**.

Y: N:

attached

Attach a description
of
alternative options
canvassed

Attached Yes:

A discussion relating to the alternative alignments and construction approaches that have been considered is included in **Appendix 3**. The original proposal is discussed in the development proposal in **Appendix 2**.

Y: N:

attached

**7. PROPOSED
MITIGATION**

Attach proposals to
minimise or

Attached Yes: ✓

attached

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

Mitigate impact

A discussion of proposed mitigation is included as part of the
Development and conservation proposal in **Appendix 2**.

Y: N:

**8. SUMMARY
JUSTIFICATION
FOR PERMIT &
BACKGROUND
SUMMARY**

completed

DIER is proposing to construct a bypass to the east of the Brighton and Pontville townships and the associated existing Midland Highway. This application relates to part of the northern section of the Brighton Bypass. The proposed northern section of the alignment extends through land that has largely been used for agricultural purposes since European settlement.

Decades of planning have shown the proposed alignment to be the preferred option for the Brighton Bypass and northern approach to Hobart. The road corridor has been acquired by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER). Alternative alignments have been assessed and would not satisfy project objectives (safety, efficiency, economic, social, etc.) and would be at a prohibitive cost, subject to excessive delays and potentially not be approved by the Australian Government due to various shortcomings. An overview of the alternatives assessed is included in **Appendix 3**.

Investigation of Aboriginal Heritage values commenced in early 2008 and was completed in February 2010. Analysis of data, artefacts and sediment samples is continuing. The assessment involved two surface surveys, an extensive test pitting program and a focused excavation at the Jordan River levee site that included additional investigation techniques such as ground penetrating radar (GPR), optically stimulated luminescence dating (OSL) and detailed artefact analysis.

At the completion of the test pitting phase it became apparent that Aboriginal heritage values identified on the northern bypass alignment were largely focused in the area known as the Jordan River levee deposit which is immediately adjacent to the western bank of the Jordan River. A number of previously identified values across the alignment have also been either redefined or deregistered due to a secondary and more detailed assessment and interpretation of the sites. A permit to partially destroy has been issued for two sites (a small and medium artefact scatter) east of the Jordan River.

The northern bypass alignment was divided into 5 sections for the purposes of effectively managing the approvals processes.

The following progress has been made in relation to the five sections (see **Map 1 Appendix 1**):

Section A – (southern extent of alignment to William Street) – released for construction due to low sensitivity of landscape and minimal cultural material. One artefact has been fenced for protection. However, this proposal does include a request to temporarily relocate one of two outlying artefacts registered as part of TASI 10757. The two artefacts are currently fenced for protection. They can be identified on Map 4 in Appendix 1 as two red dots well west of the levee site.

Section B – (William Street to Jordan River) – TASI 10757 is located across this section and is the subject of this permit application. The investigation at this site was prematurely terminated and recommenced under a revised methodology and permit to interfere some 23 weeks later. The works stipulated in the methodology are now complete, the results of which form part of this application.

Section C – (Jordan River to Tea Tree Road) a permit was granted in December 2009 to partially destroy a small and a medium artefact scatter. Construction works have commenced at this site and works have been carried out in accordance with the permit. Parts of the two sites have been fenced to protect artefacts not impacted by the development.

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

Section D – (Tea Tree Road north to Unnamed Creek) released for construction due to low sensitivity and no surface or subsurface artefacts.

Section E – (north of Unnamed Creek to the Midland Highway) was released for construction after a report was accepted by AHT that proposed redefinition of three of the sites implicated in the bypass. Two previously recorded quarry sites were proven not to be Aboriginal sites and a scatter could not be identified, therefore TASI boundaries were adjusted accordingly. Sites within the corridor but outside of the impact area have been fenced to enable protection.

This application relates to **TASI 10757**, part of which intersects Section B of the proposed route, which extends from William Street to the Jordan River. Discussions will relate to this section only with the exception of relocating an outlying artefact associated with TASI 10757 to the west of the levee and William Street.

Section B is defined in more detail in **Map 4 Appendix 1**.

According to the TASI, no sites were previously recorded in Section B.

An initial site survey was undertaken by Aaron Everett in June 2008 to identify the presence of any Aboriginal heritage values throughout the proposed road alignment (see **Appendix 12**).

Everett did not locate and record any sites to the west of the Jordan River and what is now referred to as Section B at this time. However, when present during a subsequent geotechnical investigation, Everett did locate several surface artefacts on the levee.

Consistent with Everett recommendations, an additional survey was undertaken by Tim Stone and Aaron Everett in 2008 to enable a more detailed survey of the alignment. AHOs Leigh Maynard and Steve Stanton also participated in this survey. The report is included as **Appendix 11**. It is important to note that many of the sites recorded during this survey have been deregistered as a result of a subsequent investigation by archaeologist Rob Paton.

Stone and Everett described a site in Section B, which was subsequently registered as **TASI 10757**.

Stone and Everett described TASI 10757 "...as an extensive scatter of stone artefacts located on the alluvial flat on the west side of the Jordan River. The landform containing the artefacts is ~ 1000m long and ~ 300m wide". Stone went on to state that "...artefacts are distributed across the entire northern section where it crosses this landform and for at least 100m either side of the northern section boundaries. On the basis of this survey sample, the boundaries of TASI 10757 are inferred to approximate the entire alluvial flat". The locations of approximately 20 individual surface artefacts were recorded by Stone and Everett 2008. These artefacts can be identified on **Map 4 Appendix 1**.

Also see the interim report Addendum in **Appendix 4** for Paton's review of the description of this site. It was clearly recorded in the absence of appropriate data and should not have been recorded as the whole flood plain.

Stone went on to state that "...a significant geomorphic feature of the alluvial flat containing TASI 10757 is a >2m thick levee formed by the gradual overbank deposition of silt, in which case, the levee may preserve an important record of technological change".

In summary, Stone and Everett described TASI 10757 as "...simply a rich open campsite beside the Jordan River".

Y: N:

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

In the discussion section of the report Stone and Everett state that TASI 10757 is "...of particular interest because of its potential to contain cultural sequences. The Jordan River has constructed a silt levee on the alluvial flat containing TASI 10757, a gradual process that would probably have buried artefacts over several millennia". "...this process is important because the sediments may preserve a record of technological change. Moreover, this record is dateable using optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) methods....accordingly TASI 10757 is highly significant".

Stone and Everett state that the stone artefact assemblage recorded on the surface of TASI 10757 is "...typical of large, open campsites in the region" containing finished tools or amorphous flakes with retouch, suggesting that they have been used for cutting and scraping, and comparatively few cores. Thick edge and flat scrapers were the most frequently recorded formal tool types (discussion here relates to surface assemblage only).

Scientific significance (Stone and Everett 2008).

Site integrity (state of preservation or condition) – High, because the disturbance appears to be limited to ploughing of the surface.

Site structure (physical dimensions of the site) – high, because surface artefacts are highly likely to be stratified at depth by overbank deposition.

Site contents (type and range of occupation debris found in site) – Moderate, because diverse amount of cultural material, although raw material sources and reduction sites are not associated with these assemblages.

Representativeness (how often a particular site type occurs in an area) – High, because the site type is rare or unique.

Stone and Everett recommendations in relation to TASI 10757

1. Proposed road design should be modified to avoid disturbing 10757.
2. Particular consideration should be given to minimising any potential impacts on TASI 10757.

In the event that it is not possible to modify design to avoid sites further would require permit application and further archaeological investigation.

Stone and Everett recommended "...controlled archaeological excavation of a small and targeted sample of the levee deposit containing TASI 10757 should be undertaken to determine if the deposit preserves a stratified cultural sequence...the investigation would include excavation, and analysis of the artefacts, radiometric dating of the sediments and culturally appropriate curation of the material recovered. In this way, more detailed information would emerge about the site, its research potential and scientific and Aboriginal significance.

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

Initial approved methodology

The initial methodology proposed to excavate three 2m x 2m trenches aligned perpendicular to the strike of the levee ridge. This would allow for a cross section of the levee to be exposed. Optical and/or ¹⁴C dating would be applied to samples taken from excavated sediments to determine the chronostratigraphy for the archaeological deposits.

Analysis of surface and subsurface artefacts was also proposed.

A more detailed description of the method related to TASI 10757 is included in **Appendix 10**, Stage 2 Archaeological Scope of Works.

It is important to note that most of the smaller test pits that were proposed as part of the 300 test pit program along the alignment were not excavated in the vicinity of the levee (the number and placement of the 300 test pits was determined by a statistician whose input was based on a requirement of AHT). Given the depth of the deposit in this area it would have been problematic to excavate 50cm x 50cm pits (test pits 28 - 42). However, two test pits and a dam for sieving were excavated on the floodplain east of the levee which was found to be homogenous black clay and devoid of cultural material.

Although the test pitting across the majority of the alignment was completed, of the larger test pits on the Jordan River levee (TASI 10757) only one of the 3 proposed test pits was excavated to approximately 40cm when the Aboriginal community expressed their concern via the media about the impact of the investigation on the site values and the ultimate intention to destroy part of the site. The archaeologists ceased work in response to these concerns in late August 2009.

The investigation was postponed until such time as an elevated level of consultation was negotiated between the Aboriginal community and the Tasmanian Government for all developments in Tasmania. An agreement was also sought to recommence the investigation on the levee that was appropriate to gain temporal, spatial and cultural information related to the site.

The Aboriginal community also expressed concern in relation to other works occurring across the alignment. In response to this concern, DIER delayed the early works program.

The Aboriginal community continued to voice concern about the slow progress they were making in achieving a revised consultation process and other concessions and so on the 24th December 2009, AHOs were instructed by TALSC to cease all heritage work immediately. This meant that all heritage investigations came to a standstill across the State.

The impasse between the Government and the Aboriginal community continued until the 3rd of February 2010 when TAC informed AHOs that the work ban was lifted.

DIER and DPIPWE continued to meet and consult with TAC during January and a methodology to recommence the investigation of TASI 10757 on the Jordan River levee and an associated permit to interfere were negotiated and agreed by TAC and TALSC by 4th February 2010.

Additional information relating to the resolution of the impasse and the continuing negotiations with the Aboriginal community is included in the Aboriginal Community Consultation Overview, **Appendix 6**.

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

An important element of the negotiations related to the very tight timeframes remaining to undertake the investigative work proposed as part of the revised methodology. To date the project and investigation had sustained a 23 week delay (23rd August 2009 – 3rd February 2010).

Subsequently, it was agreed with the consultant archaeologist to undertake the required work over two work shifts per day. Site infrastructure was put in place to facilitate the longer work days.

This compression of the work program was discussed with both TALSC manager Fiona Newson and two of her board members and TAC representatives Michael Mansell and Aaron Everett. Most people accepted that timeframes were tight due to previous delays but that the proposed program of work was acceptable.

Importantly, all tasks included in the agreed methodology were completed which enabled the objectives of the investigations to be achieved.

In summary, the excavation of the levee deposit had two key objectives:

- To determine if the deposit contains a stratified cultural sequence;
- To demonstrate the degree of site intactness (p.8).

the revised methodology (**Appendix 7**), for Jordan River levee and TASI 10757 involved the following strategy:

- Completion of test pit 48 (2m x2m) to a standard outlined in the original methodology.
 - Commence test pit 49 (2m x 2m) to be completed to the standard as per original methodology.
 - Abandon test pit 47 and replace with 4 x 1m x 1m pits located in an east west line to define the western extent of the cultural material.
 - Two additional test pits (2m x 2m), one to the north and one to the south of test pit 48 to determine lateral spread of artefacts both within and outside of the impact zone.
 - Ground Penetrating Radar should be used in an attempt to locate any features such as burials within the sandy sediments.
 - OSL dating of stratified sediments.
 - Artefact analysis
 - Final report.
-

**APPLICATION FOR A PERMIT
UNDER SECTION 14 OF THE ABORIGINAL RELICS ACT 1975**

The archaeological investigation recommenced on Saturday 6th February and was completed on 26th February 2010.

DIER and the Aboriginal community waited until April 26th 2010 (approximately 8 weeks) for the final OSL dating information to be completed. The long period of time was utilised by revisiting the design of the Jordan River crossing so that any permanent impact on the levee site could be avoided. The revised proposal is described in **Appendix 2**. The Interim report and addendum to that report are included as **Appendix 4**.

In summary the interim report, prepared by CHMA archaeologists Rob Paton, Cornelia de Rochefort and Sophie Collins presents the following key findings:

- The Jordan River levee deposit is defined by Paton as approximately 1m deep, 500m long and 60m wide as depicted in the map on page 3 of the report. It is situated on an alluvial flood plain which is approximately 1000m long and 300m wide.
- OSL dating results are much older than expected and in stratigraphic order.
- Levee building occurred about 40,000 years ago with the dated sediments showing a build up of sediments over 12,000 years ranging from 37,000 to 26,000 years ago.
- Paton states that this is the oldest and best known stratified site in Tasmania and one of the oldest in Australia.
- Generally speaking the site displays a high degree of homogeneity, in that soil units are equally represented across the site at comparable depths.
- A total of 1311 artefacts have been removed from eight trenches. All 466 artefacts from Trench 2 have been analysed in detail. Further detail is presented from page 39 of the Interim report.
- Artefactual material in the top 30cm is not regarded as in situ due to soil mixing and historic disturbances.
- Historic artefacts were encountered at variable depths in all 8 trenches.
- The Ground Penetrating Radar was undertaken from 15th – 19th on February and no conclusive evidence of Aboriginal burials within the levee deposit were evident.

The archaeologist provided a Fact Sheet to present the important elements of the investigation and this is attached overleaf.

Paton provided an Addendum to the Interim report on 26th May 2010 to address questions raised by AHT Senior Archaeological Research Officer Don Ranson. This addendum addresses the definition of TASI 10757 and the levee within the site and the values associated with areas east and west of the levee deposit. The addendum is included with the Interim Report in **Appendix 4**.

