

Appendix 1

Issue	Likelihood of occurrence	Community concern	Summed score
1. Water Management System			
1.1 Release of mine site water	3	4	7
Retention Ponds (stop RP4 releases)	1	3	4
RRZ	2	2	4
1.2 Tailings Dam	1	4	5
Pipeline corridor	2	2	4
Seepage	2	2	4
Seepage collection system	1	1	2
1.3 Impacts on surface waters	2	4	6
2. Air Quality			
SO ₂	1	1	2
Yellowcake dust	1	1	2
Subaerial vs subaqueous tailings	2	2	4
3. Radiation			
Employee	1	2	2
Members of the public	1	3	4
Off-site exposure	1	3	4
4. Accidents			
4.1 Explosive magazine blows up	1	2	3
4.2 Tailings dam collapse	1	4	5
4.3 Human injury due to road transport	1	1	2
4.4 Fuel/U carrying road trains crash	1	1	2
4.5 Ammonia tanks crack	1	1	2
4.6 4.1 and 4.5 together	1	4 (ondamage)	5
4.7 Green terrorists	1	1	2
4.8 Trucks collide (OH&S)	1	1	2
4.9 Accidental chemical release into waterways	2	2	4
5. Determine BPT			
Rehabilitation	3	2	5
tailings in pit	2	1	3
tailings in dam	2	3	5
6. Water management			
Enhanced evaporation			
Filtration			
Boiling off			
Irrigate in bush	2	2	4
16 other options			
RUEI ok'd release strategy versus subsequent veto by traditional owners			
Robustness of water management plan	2	2	4

Determine beneficial uses	2	2	4
7 Radiology			
Hazard analysis assumptions incorrect	2	1	3
Radiation level at high exposure	1	3	4
8 Societal concerns			
Unacceptability of uranium	3	3	6
Linkage of non-causal events (eg. a death and an RP4 release)	2	2	4
Western Arnhem Land open to exploration	3	2	5
Sacred sites preservation	3	2	5
Health preservation (human and ecosystem)	2	3	5
Ecosystems preservation How to measure Biodiversity, productivity, sustainability, resilience	2	3	5
9 Terrestrial ecosystem			
White crust	2	1	3
Measures of ecological health	2	1	3
Alien weed introduction	2	2	4
Impacts on fish communities due to vegetation change	2	1	3
10 Extreme events			
Earthquake	1	2	3
Tropical cyclones	1	3	4
Inadequate design criteria	1	2	3
climatic variability	1	1	2
11 Form of the EPR			
Needs joint development with Company	2	2	4
Questions must focus on performance guidelines	2	2	4
Assess preparedness in absence of a problem	2	2	4
12 Rehabilitation (after decommissioned)			
Response of encapsulated tailings (protect groundwater from contamination)	2	2	4
Company will want rapid release	3	3	6
Water releases from abandoned mine site	2	2	4
Stop erosion of waste-rock	2	2	4
surface run-off	2	2	4
maintain Kakadu ecosystem	3	3	6
13 Monitoring System			
Adequacy of sampling	2	2	4
Correct variables being measured	2	2	4
14 Legislative and consultative framework			
Are key groups involved	2	3	5
Does this set decommissioning procedure	2	2	4

Appendix 2

Scoring Risk

The summed score of Appendix 1 adds together the likelihood of occurrence and the community concern. The definitions of risk given in Chapter 2 imply that risk involves a multiplication of factors rather than an addition. Yet the Asian Development Bank framework given in Figure 3.5 sets boundaries that correspond to linear combinations of the axes. Which should it be?

The answer depends on whether the scoring system being used is linear or logarithmic. Notice in Figure 3.5 that the monetary damage scale increases by a factor of ten between each of the four boxes. Now, one of the characteristics of logarithms is that the addition of logarithms corresponds to the multiplication of the numbers represented by logarithms. For example:

$$(1/10) \times 1000 = 10^{-1} \times 10^3 = 10^{-1+3} = 10^2 = 100$$

where the logarithm of 1/10 is -1 and the logarithm of 1000 is 3.

We may thus infer that the frequency of occurrence scale in Figure 3.5 must also represent a logarithmic scale of probabilities. We may thus infer probabilities and likely numbers of concerned people represented in the rows of Table 5.1 as given in Table A.2.1.

Table A.2.1 Quantified probabilities and concerned population implied in rankings of Table 5.1

Likelihood of occurrence	Inferred probability	Community concern	Inferred numbers
Remote, but possible	0.0005	negligible	5
Occasional, sometime occurs	0.005	marginal	50
Reasonably probable, several times	0.05	critical	500
Frequent, repeatable	0.5	unanimous	5000

This method of taking descriptive terms, and assigning quantitative values to them, forms one of the bases of quantitative risk assessment.

Index

Aboriginal lifestyles 74
absorbed dose 69
acceptable daily intake (ADI) 38
acceptable risk 8, 9, 51, 54
actual risk 5, 15, 38
adaptability 95
adaptive assessment 52
agricultural and veterinary chemicals 80, 86
aircraft noise 60
Alligator Rivers Region 8, 49, 65, 106
analysis of chemicals 7
analytical chemistry 18
Argonne National Laboratory 29
Asian Development Bank 25, 31, 48, 51, 59
Atrazine 82, 88, 90
AUSPLUME 113
AUSPUFF 113
Australian/Commonwealth environmental practice 8
Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council 79
Australian Centre of Advanced Risk and Reliability Engineering (ACARRE) 56, 110
Australian Drinking Water Guidelines 88
Australian National Parks & Wildlife Service 107
Australian Noise Exposure Forecast 61
Australian Radiation Laboratory 38
Battelle 29
Bayesian statistics 46
biological diversity 94
Bureau of Air Safety Investigation 15
Bureau of Meteorology 92
bushfire management 21
business risk 14
Canadian Environmental Protection Act 29
cancer risk 13-14
Centre for Integrated Environmental Risk Assessment (CIERA) 35, 116
Centre for Resources and Environmental Studies (CRES) 87-88
chemical fate models 87, 88, 90
Ciba-Geigy 83-84
Civil Aviation Authority 15
clean-up 12
climate change 92-96
Commission for the Future 116
community accepted baselines 105
comparative risk assessment 7, 13, 26, 28, 39, 43, 113
computer modelling 7, 10, 33, 96, 113
consequence analysis 24
contaminated sites 8, 12, 29, 81
Coronation Hill 13, 105- 108
cost effectiveness 93
cost-benefit analysis 7-8, 28, 93-94, 100, 102, 108, 115
credibility 5
CSIRO 107-108
cumulative impacts 6, 9, 109, 114
DASETT 108
decision making process 44, 105, 113, 117
decision support systems 114
decision tree 44-45
definition of risk 21
Delaney clause 28
Department of Defence 82
Department of Energy 29
Department of Human Services and Health 79-80
detection methods 18
determining premiums 21
discount rate 100
Diuron 83
documentation 7
dose-equivalent 69

due diligence 40
Dutch National Environmental Plan 9, 31, 32, 57, 89
earthquake risk 21
ecological effects 14
ecological integrity 94
ecological response indicators 68
ecological risk assessment 7, 13, 25, 26, 27, 30, 65-66
ecologically sustainable development 56, 109
economic analysis 100
effects of industrial, agricultural and veterinary chemicals 8
engineering risk assessment 60
Environment Protection (Alligator Rivers Region) Act 67
Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act 65, 108
Environment Protection Agency (EPA) 8, 12, 38-39, 79, 86, 89, 115
environmental acceptability 8
environmental assessment of chemicals 86
environmental conservatism 78
environmental health 65
environmental impact analysis 8, 113
environmental impact assessment (EIA) 4, 41
environmental impact statement 4, 45, 59, 108, 110
environmental integrity 100
environmental management systems 7
environmental performance reviews 48, 49
environmental policy 14, 93
environmental priorities 26
environmental protection 7, 12, 29, 65
Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) 13, 25, 116
Environmental Research Institute 65
Environmental Research Institute of the Supervising Scientist (ERISS) 9, 67, 116
Environmental Resources Information Network (ERIN) 114, 116
environmental risk 4, 13, 24, 40, 48, 65, 113, 115
environmental standards 6
equity 100
ERA 5, 75
estimating risk 9, 15
European Community 33
EXAMS 87
expected environmental concentration (EEC) 86
expected monetary value 44
fatality risk 54
Federal Airports Corporation 59
Federal Office of Road Safety 38
Fenner Conference 116
field trials 7, 90
financial risk 20
fire risk 21
Food and Drug Agency (FDA) 18
food irradiation 38
forecasting 6
Fox Commission 114
Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) 95
frequency 5
future risk 51
generic framework 4, 9, 42, 113-115
Geographic Information System (GIS) 89
Georgetown Creek 51
GLEAMS 87
global warming 94
Glyphosate 83
Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA) 97
greenhouse effect 93
hardware 11
hazard 4, 10, 13, 18, 22, 42
hazard quotient (Q) 32, 40, 87, 89
hazard reduction 12
hazardous air pollutants 13
hazardous facilities 8, 54
hazardous waste sites 13

human health risk assessment 18, 25-27, 65-66,
impact of proposals 9
incremental risk 57, 61
individual risk 56
industrial chemicals 79, 86
Industrial Chemicals (Notification and Assessment) Act 79
Industry Commission 38
information technology 11
informed decision-making 6
insurance 21
intergenerational equity 94, 98, 100
Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment (IGAE) 93, 97
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 93, 95, 101
international best practice 7
International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) 69
international competitiveness 14
International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) 114
interpersonal trust 75
ionising radiation 18
Industrial Source Complex — Short Term (ISCST) 113
Kakadu National Park 106
laboratory tests 7
LEACHM 87
liability 8, 12, 40, 82, 92
likelihood of occurrence 49
Mackay fugacity model 87
Magela Creek 5, 46, 51, 75
Management Advisory Board 9
managing risk 9
Maximum Residue Limit (MRL) 80
mitigation 95
modelling 87
Monte-carlo modelling 10, 66, 73
National Academy of Sciences 116
National Food Authority (NFA) 38
National Health & Medical Research Council (NHMRC) 65, 79, 83
National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS) 79
National Registration Authority (NRA) 79-80, 83
National Research Council 18, 25-27
national soil quality objectives 82
Netherlands 31
Netherlands National Environmental Policy Plan 9, 31, 32, 57, 89
New South Wales 54
New South Wales Department of Planning 41, 56, 116
New Zealand 33
NOEL (no observable effect level) 38
noise assessment 61
non-cancer health risks 14
Northern Land Council 5, 74-75
Northern Territory Department of Mines and Energy 49
objective risk 5-6
OECD 33, 79
Office of the Supervising Scientist (OSS) 9, 12, 49, 67, 75
opinions of the public 15
outrage 26
Pacific Small Island States 96
perceived needs 38
perceived risk 5, 15, 38, 51, 75, 96, 110
policy analysis 16, 26
political drawbacks 115
polluter pays 94
precautionary principle 94, 95, 97, 100
prevention 95
priorities 12-14
priority setting 27, 48, 67, 117
priority substances list 30
probabilistic modelling 67, 90
probability 5, 19
probability distribution 68, 73, 92
probability distribution function 20

probability/frequency Analysis 24
professional negligence 114
quality management systems 7, 9
quantitative risk assessment 6, 13, 24, 28
Queensland Nickel 98
quotient method (Q) 32, 40, 87, 89
radiological pathways 67, 69
Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry 43, 48, 67
Ranger Uranium Mine 5, 6, 67, 69, 97
rankings of the experts 14
rankings of the public 14
reconciling viewpoints 6
reduce costs 7
regulating risk 8
regulatory controls 9, 27, 105
residual risk tolerances 7
Resource Assessment Commission (RAC) 107, 109, 114
Resource Assessment Inquiry 107
risk 4, 8, 18, 23, 41, 92, 108
risk acceptability 41
risk analysts 14
Risk Assessment and Cost/Benefit Act 28
risk assessment framework 7, 8, 9, 25-26, 82, 92
risk assessment unit 11, 116
risk associated with political decision making 12, 105
risk aversion 45, 75
risk communication 13, 26, 75
risk estimate 15
risk evaluation 5
risk factor 38
risk from contaminated sites 12
risk from individual chemicals 12
risk in financial management 19
risk in toxicology 22
risk management 4, 5, 8, 92
risk minimisation 20
risk neutral 45, 75
risk profiles 44
risk prone 45, 75
risk space 16
risk to people 12, 54
risk to the natural environment 12, 56, 65, 108
risk-based approach 20, 82
risk-benefit analysis 44, 102, 105, 116-117
risk-free strategy 21
risk-screening 50
risk-weighted approach 97
risk-weighted consequences 95, 101
risk/benefit curves 68
risks of the uncertainty of nature 12, 92
Royal Society 13
sacred sites 108
SAFETI 56
safety risk 38
Science Advisory Board (SAB) 116
scientific certainty 96
sea level rise 96
setting priorities 6, 13, 43
severity of consequences 49
Simazine 83
social impacts 108
social trust 75
societal risk 56, 61
software 11, 114
soil criteria 82
sovereign risk 12, 105, 110
spray drift 87
standards 8, 18, 38, 78, 92
State of the Environment (SoE) 116
strategic analysis 39
strategic risk assessment 6, 109, 114
strategic role 116
subjective risk 5, 15
Superfund 29, 96
Supervising Scientist 12, 49, 65, 97
surface runoff 87
Sydney Third Runway 15, 56, 59

tactical risk assessment 6
taxes and charges 93
Technica-DNV 116
theory of extreme events 92
TOXST (TOXic modelling system — Short Term) 113
transparency of process 7, 117
uncertainty 4, 10, 16, 21, 42, 66, 32, 73, 89, 97, 113
Uniform System for the Evaluation of Substances (USES 1.0) 8, 32, 89, 114
United Kingdom 33
United States approach 27
United States Congress 105
United States National Research Council (NRC) 13, 59, 116
uranium mining 5, 8, 43, 49, 65, 114-115
US Society of Risk Analysts 21
US EPA 13, 25, 116
utility curves 45, 48
utility function 45, 48, 75
valuation of assets 94
volatility 20
welfare effects 14
Wesley Vale pulp mill 13
Western Australia 54
WHO 83
withholding period 80
Worksafe Australia 79, 80
worst case scenarios 32, 40, 63, 86, 89-90, 105