

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 | 4 | 7 |
| 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