Proposed Milton Quarry East Extension
JART COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE – Archaeology

Please accept the following as feedback from the Milton Quarry Joint Agency Review Team (JART). Fully addressing each comment below will help expedite the potential for resolutions of the consolidated JART objections and individual agency objections. **Additional, new comments may be provided once a response has been prepared to the comments raised below and additional information provided**.

	JART Comments (September 2022)	Reference	Source of Comment	Applicant Response (October 2022)	JART Response (January 2023)
Report/Date: Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment April 30, 2021			**Author: Golder**		

1.	• Main questions:
	  • relationship of mapped study area with ARA/NEP application extents
	  ▪ Really needs the AA area to be mapped as an overlay to the ARA/NEP application boundaries
	  • Ministry sign-off for archaeological licensing requirements
	  • Archaeological site AjGx-306 recommended for Stage 3
	  • PIF P468-0060-2020 - site record status is in OASDB awaiting review
	  • Report entered in register 29/06/2021 (Report ID: 54497)
	
	Editorial: P10 - 2nd last paragraph first line - confusing text re: "two Thomas Chisholm", presume just meaning Thomas Chisholm.
		General	NEC Staff Review	• Once an Archaeological report is entered into the register (as this one was on 29/06/2021) it cannot be amended. As such we cannot include a map within the project report which shows the AA area overlaid on top of the ARA/NE application boundaries. Attached for your reference is a copy of the requested map. Re: “two Thomas Chisholm” – correct this should say “Thomas Chisholm” and two should not be in the sentence.	JART comment satisfied.

2.	Main question: Ministry sign-off for archaeological licensing requirements PIF P468-0064-2020 site record status is in OASDB awaiting review Report entered into register 02/07/2021 (Report ID: 54498)	General	NEC Staff Review	• Both the Stage 2 and Stage 3 AA Reports were accepted and entered into the register though the site record still requires review. The site record is the site summary that pops up on PastPortal when an Archaeological licensee queries the site. It’s a summary of the number of artifacts identified, whether there is further Cultural Heritage Value, etc. The Ministry often reviews the site record years after the report. If any revisions are required to the site record, they will be minor and will not impact the status of the report. Revisions could include confirming accuracy of GPS used, etc.	JART comment satisfied.