



**ERA** Energy Resources of Australia Ltd

## **Ranger Mine Closure Plan**

### **Table of Contents**



**ERA****Document Details (ERA)**

Department	Approvals		
Status	Final	Project Reference	Closure
Unique Reference	PLN007		

**Document Details (Co-author)**

Company	Eco Logical Australia		
Status	Final	Project Reference	12272

**Approvals Table**

	Name	Position	Signed	Date
Originator	Gay Landwehr	Approvals Lead	<a href="#">Gay Landwehr</a>	24 September 2019
Checked	Lesley Bryce	General Manager	<a href="#">Lesley Bryce</a>	25 September 2019
Approved	Paul Arnold	Chief Executive Officer	<a href="#">Paul Arnold</a>	25 September 2019

**Revision History**

Revision	Issued date	Description	By (initials)	Checked (initials)	Approved
1.19.0	October 2019	2019 Ranger Mine Closure Plan	GL	SP	PA
0.18.0	May 2018	Revisions to draft mine closure plan issued December 2016 Issue of final mine closure plan	LP, SI	SP, JO'C	PA
0.16.0	21 December 2016	Review and update of 2013 Plan	LP	SP	TE
Rev C	23 August 2013	61808 ITWC PFS Report – Draft Closure Plan for Internal Distribution only	JC	-	GS
0.10.0	March 2010	2-016 Ranger Model	PP, LP	SS, RM, MC	AP



**ERA**

**eco**  
**logical**  
AUSTRALIA

### Revision History

Revision	Issued date	Description	By (initials)	Checked (initials)	Approved
0.09.0	2009	2-016 Draft Ranger Closure Model	PP, LP, AP	RF, MF, JS, PL, MD, JC	TM
0.07.0	November 2007	2-185 Ranger Closure Model	LP, AP	DB, JD, LF, MG, IH, DK, PL, PQ, CS	TM
0.06.0	March 2006	806 Revised Ranger Mine Draft Closure Model – First Pass	EM	AB, JD, MG, DG, MH, IH, DK, KM	TM
0.05.0	June 2005	677 Ranger Mine Draft Closure Model – First Pass	DJ, CS, EM	AB, LC, CD, DK, DK, PR	TM
0.03.0	Feb 2003	296 Closure Plan for Ranger Mine	EM	AP, DS	TM

Cover photograph: Magpie Goose (*Anseranas semipalmata*)

# CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1 SCOPE AND PURPOSE

1.1	Background .....	1-1
1.2	Purpose of this MCP .....	1-4
1.2.1	Ranger Authorisation and <i>Mining Management Act</i> .....	1-4
1.2.2	Section 41 Authority and ERs .....	1-5
1.2.3	Government Agreement .....	1-5
1.3	Scope of this MCP .....	1-6
1.4	Review and updates .....	1-7
1.5	Content and structure of this MCP .....	1-8
1.6	References .....	1-10

### 2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

2	PROJECT OVERVIEW .....	2-1
2.1	History .....	2-1
2.1.1	Ranger Mine EIS assessment .....	2-2
2.2	Overview of operations .....	2-3
2.2.1	Mining .....	2-7
2.2.2	Processing .....	2-7
2.2.3	Ranger 3 Deeps exploration decline .....	2-8
2.2.4	Tailings storage .....	2-8
2.2.5	TSF .....	2-10
2.2.6	Pit 1 .....	2-10
2.2.7	Pit 3 .....	2-11
2.2.8	Stockpiles .....	2-12
2.2.9	Water management .....	2-12
2.2.9.1	Retention ponds .....	2-14
2.2.9.2	Water treatment plants .....	2-14
2.2.9.3	Wetland filters .....	2-14
2.2.9.4	Land application areas .....	2-19
2.2.9.5	Brine concentrator .....	2-20
2.2.9.6	Brine Squeezer .....	2-21
2.2.9.7	Site water model .....	2-21
2.2.10	Jabiru Airport .....	2-22
2.3	References .....	2-24

### 3 CLOSURE OBLIGATIONS AND COMMITMENTS

3.1	Legislative framework .....	3-1
3.1.1	Applicable legislation and agreements .....	3-1
3.1.2	Commonwealth .....	3-6
3.1.3	Northern Territory .....	3-7
3.1.4	Land and tenure .....	3-7
3.1.5	Post-closure tenure and land access .....	3-9
3.2	Standards, codes of practice and guidelines .....	3-9



3.2.1	Corporate policies and standards .....	3-10
3.2.2	Supervising Scientific Branch (SSB) Rehabilitation Standards .....	3-11
3.3	Western Australia Mine Closure Plan Guidelines.....	3-11
3.3.1	Other closure and rehabilitation resources .....	3-14
3.4	Closure permits and approvals.....	3-14
3.5	References.....	3-16

**4 ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SETTING**

4.1	Land use .....	4-1
4.1.1	Historical overview of the Magela catchment.....	4-1
4.2	Physical environment.....	4-2
4.2.1	Climate .....	4-2
4.2.2	Land systems .....	4-3
4.2.2.1	Soils .....	4-3
4.2.2.2	Topography .....	4-7
4.2.2.3	Geology and mineralisation.....	4-9
4.2.2.4	Geomorphology.....	4-10
4.2.3	Surface water resources .....	4-11
4.2.3.1	Surface water hydrology .....	4-11
4.2.3.2	Surface water chemistry .....	4-16
4.2.4	Groundwater .....	4-18
4.2.5	Radiation .....	4-21
4.3	Biological environment setting.....	4-23
4.3.1	Bioregions .....	4-23
4.3.2	National parks and protected areas.....	4-23
4.3.2.1	Kakadu National Park.....	4-23
4.3.2.2	Wetlands and sensitive habitats.....	4-25
4.3.2.3	World Heritage listing attributes .....	4-26
4.3.3	Terrestrial ecosystems.....	4-27
4.3.3.1	Vegetation communities.....	4-27
4.3.3.2	Flora species .....	4-31
4.3.3.3	Fauna species .....	4-33
4.3.3.4	Bushfires .....	4-37
4.3.4	Aquatic fauna and ecosystems.....	4-38
4.4	Social setting.....	4-39
4.4.1	Aboriginal culture and heritage.....	4-39
4.4.2	World Heritage listing attributes.....	4-39
4.5	References.....	4-40

**5 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

5.1	ERA stakeholder engagement principles.....	5-4
5.2	Managing socio-economic impacts .....	5-8
5.3	Ranger Mine closure.....	5-8
5.5	References.....	5-10

**6 POST-MINING LAND USE AND CLOSURE OBJECTIVES**

6.1	Post-mining land use .....	6-1
6.2	Closure objectives .....	6-2
6.3	References.....	6-6



## 7 SUPPORTING STUDIES

7.1	Tailings consolidation modelling.....	7-2
7.1.1	Tailings consolidation model .....	7-2
7.1.1.1	Method of handling variable basin geometry .....	7-3
7.1.1.2	Underdrainage.....	7-3
7.1.1.3	Outputs .....	7-3
7.1.1.4	Validation .....	7-6
7.1.2	Pit 1 tailings consolidation.....	7-6
7.1.3	Pit 3 tailings consolidation.....	7-10
7.2	Tailings properties .....	7-16
7.2.1	Bathymetric surveys.....	7-17
7.3	Trial landform .....	7-20
7.3.1	Introduction.....	7-20
7.3.2	Infiltration, runoff, soil erosion and solute loss .....	7-22
7.3.2.1	Infiltration.....	7-24
7.3.2.2	Runoff .....	7-26
7.3.2.3	Soil erosion .....	7-26
7.3.2.4	Solute loss.....	7-27
7.3.3	Radon exhalation.....	7-29
7.3.4	Revegetation trials.....	7-30
7.3.4.1	Revegetation establishment.....	7-30
7.3.4.2	Vegetation monitoring and performance.....	7-32
7.3.4.3	Overstorey and midstorey performance .....	7-34
7.3.4.4	Understorey establishment .....	7-40
7.3.4.5	Root excavation trial 2019 .....	7-42
7.3.5	Plant available water studies.....	7-44
7.3.5.1	Volumetric soil moisture content .....	7-45
7.3.5.2	Estimated and actual potential plant available water .....	7-52
7.3.5.3	Modelled plant available water .....	7-53
7.4	Environmental protection .....	7-59
7.4.1	Pre-mining radiation baseline.....	7-59
7.4.1.1	Baseline terrestrial radiation.....	7-59
7.4.1.2	Baseline water radiation.....	7-60
7.4.1.3	Bushfood radiation baseline.....	7-61
7.4.2	Contamination investigations .....	7-63
7.4.2.1	Investigations into potential contamination in LAAs .....	7-63
7.4.2.2	Effective dose estimate.....	7-66
7.4.2.3	Assessment of acid sulfate sediments (ASS) and development of a preliminary site wide ASS conceptual model .....	7-67
7.4.3	Water and sediment studies.....	7-70
7.4.3.1	Water and sediment baseline.....	7-70
7.4.3.3	Surface water and sediment monitoring .....	7-82
7.4.3.4	Constituents of potential concern .....	7-87
7.4.3.5	Fate of chemicals in the Magela Creek system .....	7-87
7.4.3.6	Prediction of existing groundwater contamination.....	7-88
7.4.4	Secondary uranium and magnesium minerals associated with the waste rock landform .....	7-89
7.4.5	Vegetation reference sites.....	7-90



- 7.4.6 Long-term flora and fauna baseline monitoring.....7-94
- 7.4.7 Reference site ecohydrological studies .....7-98
  - 7.4.7.1 Plant responses to water stress in the wet-dry tropics .....7-98
  - 7.4.7.2 Whole-tree sap flow .....7-102
  - 7.4.7.3 Stand transpiration .....7-103
  - 7.4.7.4 Stand evapotranspiration .....7-104
  - 7.4.7.5 Canopy cover dynamics.....7-104
  - 7.4.7.6 Total water requirements of the vegetation.....7-106
  - 7.4.7.7 Shallow groundwater table and soil water dynamics.....7-107
- 7.5 Landform design and performance.....7-110
  - 7.5.1 Final landform material properties .....7-116
    - 7.5.1.1 Weathering and soil development .....7-120
    - 7.5.1.2 Chemical characteristics and nutritional processes .....7-123
  - 7.5.2 Landform flood study .....7-127
- 7.6 Ecosystem establishment .....7-130
  - 7.6.1 Revegetation trials (1982 – 1999).....7-130
  - 7.6.2 Seed provenance.....7-135
  - 7.6.3 Flora species composition and community structure.....7-137
    - 7.6.3.1 Species selection.....7-137
    - 7.6.3.2 Species establishment program .....7-141
  - 7.6.4 Emergent vegetative features in constructed waterbodies .....7-146
- 7.7 Groundwater modelling.....7-147
  - 7.7.1 Ranger Mine conceptual model.....7-147
  - 7.7.2 Ranger Mine conceptual model future work.....7-155
  - 7.7.3 Ranger Mine conceptual and model solute transport areas of interest/concern..7-157
    - 7.7.3.1 Ranger Mine conceptual model Pit 3.....7-160
    - 7.7.3.2 Ranger Mine conceptual model Pit 1.....7-162
    - 7.7.3.3 TSF conceptual model.....7-162
    - 7.7.3.4 Processing plant area conceptual model.....7-163
    - 7.7.3.5 LAAs conceptual model .....7-169
    - 7.7.3.6 Ranger 3 Deeps conceptual model .....7-171
    - 7.7.3.7 Landform waste rock conceptual model .....7-171
    - 7.7.3.8 Conclusion .....7-172
  - 7.7.4 Pit 1 Solute Egress Modelling – Conclusions.....7-172
  - 7.7.5 Pit 3 Solute transport modelling.....7-173
    - 7.7.5.1 Study objectives .....7-176
    - 7.7.5.2 System conceptualisation .....7-176
    - 7.7.5.3 Model development and approach .....7-177
    - 7.7.5.4 Reactive transport modelling.....7-178
    - 7.7.5.5 Secondary uranium and magnesium minerals associated with the waste rock landform.....7-179
  - 7.7.6 Peer review of solute modelling.....7-180
  - 7.7.7 Further Work.....7-182
  - 7.7.8 Assessment of post-closure Mg loading to Magela Creek from Pit 3 tailings .....7-182
  - 7.7.9 Evaluation of extent and hydraulic properties of the MBL zone near Ranger Pit 1 .....7-183
  - 7.7.10 Assessment of effect of tailings deposition on flow from Pit 3 .....7-183
  - 7.7.11 Evaluation of hydrological conditions after halt of pumping in the Ranger 3 Deeps decline.....7-184



- 7.7.12 Preliminary approach for predicting post-closure groundwater solute loading to creeks using uncertainty analysis .....7-185
- 7.7.13 Sed2B assessment of groundwater levels and quality .....7-187
- 7.7.14 Drilling and installation of monitoring bores in the waste rock stock piles .....7-187
- 7.7.15 Aquatic ecosystem assessment & framework development .....7-187
- 7.8 Surface water modelling .....7-189
  - 7.8.1 Background .....7-189
  - 7.8.2 Method .....7-190
  - 7.8.3 Model results .....7-191
  - 7.8.4 Discussion .....7-194
  - 7.8.5 Conclusion.....7-195
- 7.9 Future studies.....7-195
  - 7.9.1 Radiation dose assessment (uranium) .....7-200
  - 7.9.2 Source characterisation: actinium.....7-201
  - 7.9.3 Dose assessment: actinium .....7-201
  - 7.9.4 Gamma and radon flux surveys Pit 1.....7-202
  - 7.9.5 Rock particle size distribution on Pit 1 .....7-202
  - 7.9.6 Monitoring of Pit 1 landform shape, stability and consolidation .....7-202
  - 7.9.7 Pit 1 monitoring of sediment discharge.....7-202
  - 7.9.8 Waste rock particle size distribution .....7-202
  - 7.9.9 Contaminated sites .....7-204
    - 7.9.9.1 Plumes .....7-211
    - 7.9.9.2 Soil assessment .....7-211
    - 7.9.9.3 Remedial action plan .....7-211
    - 7.9.9.4 Validation .....7-212
  - 7.9.10 Conceptual site water modelling.....7-213
  - 7.9.11 Surface water modelling.....7-213
  - 7.9.12 Surface water pathway risk assessments.....7-214
- 7.10 References.....7-216

**8 CLOSURE COMPLETION CRITERIA**

- 8.1 Introduction .....8-1
- 8.2 Landform .....8-4
  - 8.2.1 Justification for outcome, parameter and criteria.....8-7
    - 8.2.1.1 Isolation of tailings .....8-7
    - 8.2.1.2 Erosion characteristics.....8-8
- 8.3 Water and sediment.....8-8
  - 8.3.1 Water quality management framework .....8-8
  - 8.3.2 Management objectives and outcomes .....8-9
  - 8.3.3 Justification for outcome, parameter and criteria.....8-14
    - 8.3.3.1 Step 1. Examine current understanding .....8-15
    - 8.3.3.2 Step 2. Define community values and management goal .....8-15
    - 8.3.3.3 Step 3. Define relevant indicators .....8-16
    - 8.3.3.4 Step 4. Determine water/sediment quality guideline values .....8-17
    - 8.3.3.5 Step 5. Define draft water/sediment quality objectives.....8-19
    - 8.3.3.6 Step 6. Assess whether draft water/sediment quality objectives are met .....8-20
    - 8.3.3.7 Step 7. Consider additional indicators or refine the water/sediment quality objectives .....8-20





	8.3.3.8	Step 8. Consider alternative management strategies.....	8-21
	8.3.3.9	Step 9. Assess whether water/sediment quality objectives are achievable .....	8-22
	8.3.3.10	Step 10. Implement agreed management strategies.....	8-23
8.4		Radiation.....	8-23
	8.4.1	Justification for outcome, parameter and criteria.....	8-26
		8.4.1.1 Radiation doses to members of the public.....	8-26
		8.4.1.2 Radiation effects on biota .....	8-29
8.5		Soils .....	8-30
	8.5.1	Justification for outcome, parameter and criteria.....	8-31
8.6		Flora and fauna .....	8-33
	8.6.1	Justification for outcome, parameter and criteria.....	8-35
		8.6.1.1 Local native plant species.....	8-36
		8.6.1.2 Community composition.....	8-36
		8.6.1.3 Long term viability of the ecosystem .....	8-37
8.7		Cultural.....	8-40
	8.7.1	Justification for outcome, parameter and criteria.....	8-42
8.8		Status of closure criteria .....	8-44
	8.8.1	Landform .....	8-46
	8.8.2	Water and sediment.....	8-46
	8.8.3	Radiation .....	8-46
	8.8.4	Soils .....	8-47
	8.8.5	Flora and fauna.....	8-47
	8.8.6	Cultural.....	8-47
8.9		References.....	8-48

**9 BEST PRACTICABLE TECHNOLOGY**

9.1		Introduction .....	9-1
	9.1.1	BPT assessment criteria .....	9-3
	9.1.2	BPT ranking, weighting and scoring .....	9-5
9.2		Completed closure-related BPT assessments .....	9-7
	9.2.1	Subaqueous tailings deposition into Pit 3 .....	9-7
	9.2.2	Progress of Pit 1 to final landform.....	9-8
	9.2.3	Brine Squeezer.....	9-10
	9.2.4	Ranger 3 Deeps.....	9-12
		9.2.4.1 Decline closure.....	9-14
		9.2.4.2 Portal closure .....	9-15
		9.2.4.3 Ventilation shaft closure.....	9-15
		9.2.4.4 Outcome.....	9-15
	9.2.5	Integrated tailings, water and closure prefeasibility study one technical options assessment .....	9-15
		9.2.5.1 Tailings management .....	9-16
		9.2.5.2 Salt treatment and disposal.....	9-18
		9.2.5.3 Final landform construction, revegetation and ecosystem rehabilitation .....	9-18
	9.2.6	Prefeasibility study two closure strategy and plan.....	9-19
		9.2.6.1 Stage 1 assessment .....	9-20
		9.2.6.2 Stage 2 assessment .....	9-21



9.2.7	Supplementary integrated tailings, water and closure prefeasibility study BPT assessment .....	9-22
9.2.7.1	Thickened tailings (A1) .....	9-23
9.2.7.2	Unthickened tailings (A2).....	9-24
9.2.7.3	Unthickened tailings with wicks (A3) .....	9-24
9.2.7.4	Unthickened tailings with extended water treatment (A4).....	9-25
9.2.7.5	Unthickened tailings, with inline agglomeration and wicks (A5).....	9-25
9.2.7.6	Unthickened tailings with neutralisation and wicks (A6).....	9-26
9.2.7.7	Thickened and filtered tailings (A7).....	9-27
9.2.7.8	Thickened, filtered and cemented tailings (A8).....	9-28
9.2.7.9	BPT analysis of tailings treatment options.....	9-29
9.2.7.10	Conclusions.....	9-31
9.3	Future BPT assessments.....	9-31
9.4	References.....	9-32

**10 RISK ASSESSMENTS AND MANAGEMENT**

10.1	Risk assessment methodology overview.....	10-1
10.2	Previous risk assessments.....	10-3
10.3	Closure risk assessment.....	10-4
10.4	Establishing the context and scope.....	10-4
10.4.1	Scope of the closure risk assessment .....	10-5
10.4.2	Purpose and objectives of the closure risk assessment .....	10-5
10.4.3	Assumptions of the closure risk assessment .....	10-5
10.4.4	Risk identification and analysis.....	10-6
10.5	Discussion of class IV risks.....	10-20
10.5.1	Insufficient volume or quality of viable seed stock available for whole of site revegetation.....	10-20
10.6	Discussion of class III risks .....	10-21
10.6.1	Site condition at 8 January 2026 does not meet stakeholder expectations.....	10-21
10.6.2	Actual consolidation of tailings (Pit 1 and Pit 3) does not match consolidation modelling and associated closure schedule leading to longer than planned process water treatment.....	10-22
10.6.3	No disposal option for high density sludge post tailings deposition (end of 2020) .....	10-23
10.6.4	TSF wall breached during deconstruction works.....	10-23
10.6.5	Low plant survival rates in the field during establishment and vegetation decline after/at establishment.....	10-24
10.6.6	Exposed land surface contributes to increased weed recruitment, decreasing revegetation success and spread into Kakadu NP.....	10-24
10.6.7	Groundwater solute transport outcomes do not match modelled behaviour breaching closure criteria .....	10-25
10.6.8	Cannot achieve the desired tailings surface for post-deposition activities in Pit 3 .....	10-25
10.6.9	Large scale fire or natural disaster destroys immature vegetation.....	10-26
10.6.10	Closure activities may introduce new health and safety risks to workforce .....	10-26
10.6.11	Tailings or process water exceeds MOL in Pit 3 .....	10-27
10.6.12	Damage occurs to cultural heritage site during rehabilitation works .....	10-27
10.7	References.....	10-28



**11 CLOSURE IMPLEMENTATION**

11.1 Introduction ..... 11-1

11.2 Pit 1..... 11-6

    11.2.1 Closure activities..... 11-6

        11.2.1.1 Pit 1 tailings consolidation and removal of pit tailings flux ..... 11-10

        11.2.1.2 Placement of 2s waste rock ..... 11-12

        11.2.1.3 Final landform construction..... 11-13

    11.2.2 Schedule of progressive tasks..... 11-14

    11.2.3 Contingency plans ..... 11-14

    11.2.4 Current and planned research..... 11-15

        11.2.4.1 Quantification of available contaminant loads in the final landform ... 11-15

        11.2.4.2 Ecological studies..... 11-16

11.3 Pit 3..... 11-16

    11.3.1 Closure Activities ..... 11-16

        11.3.1.1 Tailings deposition..... 11-19

        11.3.1.2 Consolidation modelling..... 11-31

        11.3.1.3 Long-term tailings permeability estimates..... 11-35

        11.3.1.4 Groundwater and contaminant transport modelling ..... 11-37

        11.3.1.5 Underdrain ..... 11-40

        11.3.1.6 Wick drains and placement of geotextile ..... 11-41

        11.3.1.7 Initial capping ..... 11-44

        11.3.1.8 Secondary capping..... 11-44

        11.3.1.9 Decant installation ..... 11-46

        11.3.1.10 Bulk backfill ..... 11-47

    11.3.2 Schedule of progressive tasks..... 11-48

    11.3.3 Contingency plans ..... 11-49

        11.3.3.1 Brine injection..... 11-49

    11.3.4 Current and planned research..... 11-50

11.4 TSF ..... 11-50

    11.4.1 Closure activities..... 11-50

        11.4.1.1 Tailings reclamation..... 11-51

        11.4.1.2 Tailings transfer..... 11-52

        11.4.1.3 Process water return Pit 3 to TSF ..... 11-52

        11.4.1.4 TSF cleaning ..... 11-53

        11.4.1.5 TSF contaminated material recovery and transfer ..... 11-56

        11.4.1.6 Dredgers removal and disposal..... 11-57

        11.4.1.7 Foreign material removal ..... 11-59

        11.4.1.8 Process water storage ..... 11-61

        11.4.1.9 TSF deconstruction..... 11-61

    11.4.2 Schedule of progressive tasks..... 11-64

    11.4.3 Contingency plans ..... 11-64

    11.4.4 Current and planned research..... 11-64

11.5 Water treatment..... 11-65

    11.5.1 Closure activities..... 11-65

        11.5.1.1 Brine Concentrator ..... 11-66

    11.5.2 HDS Plant..... 11-70

        11.5.2.1 Osmoflo Brine Squeezer..... 11-72

        11.5.2.2 Pond water treatment ..... 11-73



11.5.3	Schedule of progressive plans .....	11-74
11.5.4	Contingency plans .....	11-74
11.5.4.1	Carry additional process water inventory post TSF deconstruction ...	11-75
11.5.4.2	Extend HDS plant operation.....	11-75
11.5.4.3	Additional evaporator.....	11-75
11.5.5	Post-closure water treatment .....	11-76
11.6	Processing plant and administration buildings.....	11-76
11.6.1	Closure Activities .....	11-76
11.6.1.1	Decontamination and decommissioning .....	11-76
11.6.1.2	Demolition and disposal.....	11-81
11.6.1.3	Continuity of services.....	11-87
11.6.1.4	Exclusions.....	11-88
11.6.2	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-89
11.7	Ranger 3 Deeps exploration decline .....	11-89
11.7.1	Closure activities.....	11-89
11.7.1.1	Ongoing care and maintenance .....	11-92
11.7.1.2	Ventilation shaft closure.....	11-92
11.7.1.3	Portal closure .....	11-93
11.7.1.4	Decline closure.....	11-94
11.7.1.5	Geotechnical considerations.....	11-94
11.7.1.6	Hydrological conditions .....	11-97
11.7.2	Contingency plans .....	11-99
11.7.3	Current and planned research.....	11-99
11.8	Stockpiles and overall bulk material movement plan.....	11-100
11.9	Water management .....	11-108
11.9.1	Catchment management.....	11-108
11.9.1.1	Pond water storage.....	11-111
11.9.1.2	LAAs .....	11-112
11.9.1.3	Release water storage.....	11-112
11.9.1.4	Wetland filters.....	11-112
11.9.1.5	Water management sumps.....	11-113
11.9.1.6	Onsite billabongs .....	11-113
11.9.2	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-113
11.9.3	Contingency plans .....	11-113
11.9.4	Current and planned research.....	11-113
11.10	Waste and hazardous material management .....	11-114
11.11	Linear infrastructure.....	11-116
11.11.1	Closure activities.....	11-116
11.11.2	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-116
11.12	Ranger Mine Village and offsite workshops.....	11-117
11.12.1	Closure activities.....	11-117
11.12.2	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-117
11.12.3	Contingency plans .....	11-117
11.13	Nursery and core yard .....	11-117
11.13.1	Closure activities.....	11-117
11.14	Jabiru east airport and other infrastructure.....	11-118
11.15	Contaminated sites.....	11-118
11.15.1	Closure activities.....	11-118
11.15.1.1	Contaminated land and plume management.....	11-118



11.15.2	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-124
11.15.3	Contingency plans .....	11-124
11.15.4	Current and planned research.....	11-124
11.16	Final landform.....	11-124
11.16.1	Plant available water.....	11-125
11.16.2	Surface layer heterogeneity .....	11-127
11.16.3	Chemical characteristics and nutrient cycling .....	11-129
11.16.4	Source of waste rock for surface layer.....	11-129
11.16.5	Surface layer construction.....	11-130
11.16.6	Erosion and sediment controls .....	11-130
	11.16.6.1 Component 1 – surface treatment.....	11-135
	11.16.6.2 Component 2 – drainage channel treatment.....	11-137
	11.16.6.3 Component 3 & 4 – sediment basins.....	11-139
11.16.7	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-140
11.17	Revegetation Strategy and implementation .....	11-140
11.17.1	Species selection and plant distribution.....	11-141
11.17.2	Provision of seeds and seedlings .....	11-141
11.17.3	Site preparation .....	11-141
	11.17.3.1 Irrigation installation.....	11-142
11.17.4	Planting site cultivation.....	11-142
11.17.5	Tree and shrub planting, and establishment of understorey.....	11-145
11.17.6	Schedule of progressive tasks.....	11-145
11.17.7	Contingency plans .....	11-146
	11.17.7.1 Tubestock production .....	11-146
11.18	Overall closure implementation schedule .....	11-147
11.19	References.....	11-148

**12 CLOSURE MONITORING**

12.1	Closure monitoring program.....	12-1
12.2	Post-closure monitoring program .....	12-3
12.3	Maintenance.....	12-3
12.4	Landform monitoring.....	12-5
12.5	Water and sediment monitoring .....	12-11
	12.5.1 Surface water and sediments.....	12-11
	12.5.2 Groundwater .....	12-17
12.6	Radiation monitoring.....	12-28
	12.6.1 Closure monitoring.....	12-28
	12.6.2 Post-closure monitoring .....	12-28
12.7	Soils monitoring.....	12-32
12.8	Flora and fauna monitoring .....	12-32
	12.8.1 Native flora and fauna monitoring.....	12-33
	12.8.2 Feral animal monitoring.....	12-35
	12.8.3 Weed monitoring.....	12-35
12.9	Cultural monitoring .....	12-40
12.10	Trigger, action, response plan (TARP).....	12-41
12.11	References.....	12-45

<b>13</b>	<b>FINANCIAL PROVISION FOR CLOSURE</b>	
13.1	Rehabilitation provision.....	13-1
13.2	Government agreement.....	13-2
<b>14</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION AND DATA</b>	
14.1	Data Collection and Management.....	14-1

## FIGURES

Figure 1-1:	Oblique view of Ranger Mine 2019.....	1-1
Figure 1-2:	Regional location of Ranger Project Area .....	1-2
Figure 1-3:	Ranger Mine Project Area .....	1-3
Figure 2-1:	Oblique views of the Ranger Mine site (2015 top, 2019 bottom).....	2-4
Figure 2-2:	Ranger Mine site (aerial 2019).....	2-5
Figure 2-3:	Ranger Mine plant layout.....	2-6
Figure 2-4:	Spatial extent of the Ranger 3 Deeps exploration decline .....	2-9
Figure 2-5:	Surface water release points on the RPA (Deacon 2017).....	2-16
Figure 2-6:	General arrangement of water class catchments on the RPA (Deacon 2017).....	2-17
Figure 2-7:	Current Ranger Mine water circuit .....	2-18
Figure 2-8:	Land Application Areas.....	2-20
Figure 2-9:	Site water model free process water inventory forecast (June 2019).....	2-22
Figure 3-1:	External and internal bodies and written requirements impacting Ranger Mine closure ...	3-4
Figure 3-2:	Commonwealth and NT State legislation relevant to Ranger Mine closure .....	3-5
Figure 3-3:	Land portions relevant to the RPA.....	3-8
Figure 3-4:	Mine closure planning process (DMP & EPA 2015) .....	3-13
Figure 4-1:	Regional location of the Ranger Mine .....	4-2
Figure 4-2:	Dominant soil types in areas surrounding the Ranger Mine.....	4-4
Figure 4-3:	Elevation of RPA and the surrounding region.....	4-8
Figure 4-4:	Stratigraphic sequence from regional to mine scale and corresponding geological map of the immediate area of the Ranger Mine orebodies.....	4-10
Figure 4-5:	Regional extent of Magela catchment.....	4-12
Figure 4-6:	Magela catchment showing government agency gauging stations .....	4-14
Figure 4-7:	Pre-mining catchments in relation to Ranger Mine (coloured in dark grey) .....	4-16
Figure 4-8:	Seasonal groundwater head contours .....	4-22
Figure 4-9:	Location of protected areas in the vicinity of the RPA.....	4-24
Figure 4-10:	Vegetation of the RPA and surrounding Kakadu NP (Schodde et al. 1987) .....	4-29
Figure 4-11:	Vegetation habitat map of the RPA (based on Brady et al. 2007).....	4-30
Figure 5-1:	Stakeholder communication pathway .....	5-2

Figure 7-1: Pit 3 as excavated and as modelled .....	7-4
Figure 7-2: Pit 3 density profile - end of filling .....	7-5
Figure 7-3: Predicted final tailings level (m) across Pit 1 .....	7-7
Figure 7-4: Predicted flow of process water from Pit 1 during consolidation (Fitton 2015, 2017; Figure 5).....	7-8
Figure 7-5: Predicted versus measured average tailings settlements in Pit 1 .....	7-9
Figure 7-6: Cumulative magnesium flows .....	7-10
Figure 7-7: Measured versus predicted excess pore pressure profile.....	7-12
Figure 7-8: Indicative conceptual cross-section of Pit 3 at the end of consolidation, as at 2014 (INTERA 2014a).....	7-14
Figure 7-9: Predicted flow of process water from Pit 3 during consolidation .....	7-14
Figure 7-10: Mill tailings deposition locations.....	7-15
Figure 7-11: Diffuser locations.....	7-16
Figure 7-12: TSF topography (blue: low elevation; green: high elevation) (Fugro 2018) .....	7-17
Figure 7-13: April 2019 Magnetic Anomaly Map (left frame) comparison with the 2012 Magnetic Anomaly Map (right frame) .....	7-18
Figure 7-14: Cone penetration locations (Shackleton 2013).....	7-19
Figure 7-15: Location of the trial landform, north-west of the TSF (Pugh <i>et al.</i> , 2008).....	7-20
Figure 7-16: Trial landform – treatment design and associated infrastructure.....	7-21
Figure 7-17: Layout of the erosion plots on the trial landform (Boyden <i>et al.</i> , 2016, Saynor <i>et al.</i> , 2016) .....	7-22
Figure 7-18: Runoff through the flume on the trial landform erosion plot 3 during a storm event (Saynor <i>et al.</i> , 2014).....	7-23
Figure 7-19: Relationship between total event rainfall and runoff for erosion plot 1 for 156 runoff events in the 2013–14 wet season (Saynor <i>et al.</i> 2015) .....	7-26
Figure 7-20: Exponential decrease in mean annual bedload yield with time since construction for the four plots on the trial landform. Data represent annual mean and standard error of estimate for all plots (Lowry & Saynor 2015).....	7-27
Figure 7-21: Trial landform and contour plot of the terrestrial gamma dose rates measured across the trial landform in June 2012 (Bollhöfer & Doering 2013; p 136).....	7-29
Figure 7-22: Ecosystem development and fauna visitations on the TLF .....	7-33
Figure 7-23: Dr Ping Lu (1.8 m tall, ERA) in the foreground of the TLF (waste rock only, tubestock section), seven years after tubestock planting.....	7-34
Figure 7-24: Plant density (stems per ha-1) of tubestock and direct seeding areas on the trial landform, not including recruits .....	7-36
Figure 7-25: Growth of tubestock and direct seeded vegetation on the trial landform substrates by year planted.....	7-37
Figure 7-26: Recovery of the revegetation from a prescribed burn in May 2016. View of the burnt vegetation on the trial landform 12 days post fire (left) and 6 months post fire (right)...	7-38
Figure 7-27: Height and DBH ranges and associated health classes after the 2016 burn on laterite mix areas of the TLF (unpublished data) .....	7-39
Figure 7-28: Directly seeded <i>Galactica tenuiflora</i> in mixed treatment plot with fallen tree .....	7-41
Figure 7-29: A visual comparison of the root mass and waste rock materials from a bulk sample taken at different depths in the pit 1A of the TLF .....	7-43
Figure 7-30: Presence of roots of 1-2 mm in diameter visible at 3.0 m deep in the Pit 1A and at 3.7 m deep in the pit 1B of the TLF .....	7-44

Figure 7-31: Seasonal dynamics in soil volumetric water content at depths 5 to 60 cm in the waste rock only substrate in the TLF 1A section .....	7-46
Figure 7-32: Seasonal dynamics in soil volumetric water content at depths 120 to 400 cm in the waste rock only substrate in the TLF 1A section .....	7-47
Figure 7-33: Long-term dynamics of the soil water contents in the TLF 1A soil profile from immediately after landform construction until 5 years later.....	7-48
Figure 7-34: Measured volumetric water content and estimated average field capacity and permanent wilting point for TLF growth substrate .....	7-49
Figure 7-35: Wetting front progression as shown by soil volumetric water content dynamics in the waste rock only substrate in the TLF 1A section .....	7-50
Figure 7-36: Soil water content and water potential monitoring for Horizon 2 (0.5 to 1.0 m) in an experimental waste rock cover established on the Ranger Mine waste rock pile.....	7-51
Figure 7-37: PAWobs scaled from observations of TLF water content dynamics and predicted PAW dynamics on the TLF .....	7-55
Figure 7-38: Simulated landform PAW versus observed PAW in the trial landform.....	7-56
Figure 7-39: Net PAW balance within four metre waste TLF growth substrate at the end of each dry season over 117 years .....	7-57
Figure 7-40: Extent of radiation field investigations in LAAs 2008 – 2011 .....	7-65
Figure 7-41: Electrical conductivity Magela Creek downstream of Ranger Mine, comparison of 2018-19 wet season with historical data (ERA 2019b) .....	7-73
Figure 7-42: Bores used to represent groundwater background thresholds in colluvium and alluvium .....	7-78
Figure 7-43: Bores used to represent groundwater background thresholds in weathered bedrock...7-79	7-79
Figure 7-44: Bores used to represent groundwater background thresholds in unweathered bedrock .....	7-80
Figure 7-45: Sample location map and multivariate statistics showing the Na, Cl, K groundwater type (blue squares), Mg, Ca, HCO <sub>3</sub> groundwater type (yellow triangles) and the general groundwater type (orange circles).....	7-81
Figure 7-46: Location of RPA statutory (yellow) and operational surface water monitoring sites.....	7-84
Figure 7-47: Maps of plant analogue sites surveyed by Brennan (2005) (top and bottom) and (Hollingsworth <i>et al.</i> 2003a) (bottom) (source Humphrey <i>et al.</i> 2006). .....	7-91
Figure 7-48: Cluster analysis (group average linkage) of trees and shrubs data for Alligator Rivers Region vegetation analogue sites. [Vegetation data log transformed density/ha units (Humphrey <i>et al.</i> , 2012).].....	7-92
Figure 7-49: Mean intra-classification (C1-trial landform) and inter-classification (X vs Y) Bray-Curtis similarity. Error bars are standard deviations (Humphrey, 2016) .....	7-94
Figure 7-50: Survey sites .....	7-96
Figure 7-51: Rooting pattern of the savanna woodland trees in the Top-End.....	7-99
Figure 7-52: Key features of savanna vegetation water-use and carbon allocation strategies adapted to the Top-End seasonality.....	7-100
Figure 7-53: Root ball of a Eucalyptus glomericaessis excavated from a trial rehabilitation site.....	7-101
Figure 7-54: Evapotranspiration and its components .....	7-102
Figure 7-55: General view of an instrumented study site.....	7-103
Figure 7-56: LAI dynamics at the four ecohydrological study sites .....	7-105
Figure 7-57: Seasonal change in leaf area index at the Georgetown Creek Reference Area.....	7-106
Figure 7-58: Annual dynamics of over storey tree transpiration at Site 21 .....	7-107



Figure 7-59: Temporal dynamics of the groundwater depth measured with pressure sensors and also manual dipping at Site 21 .....	7-108
Figure 7-60: Relative extractable water contents measured at different depths and ground water table depth (GWT, in Red) at Site 21.....	7-109
Figure 7-61: Preliminary slope analysis looking at the steepest slopes .....	7-111
Figure 7-62: Catchment areas – Ranger Mine conceptual landform (Lowry & Saynor 2015) .....	7-113
Figure 7-63: Corridor Creek catchment – extent of erosion/deposition zones after simulated period of 10,000 years (Supervising Scientist 2016d).....	7-114
Figure 7-64: Djalkmara catchment – extent of erosion/deposition zones after simulated period of 10,000 years (Supervising Scientist 2016d).....	7-115
Figure 7-65: Particle size distribution for waste rock in stockpiles (by fragmentation software) .....	7-117
Figure 7-66: Changes in PSD on TLF from 2009 to 2014 inclusive .....	7-121
Figure 7-67: Changes in PSD on TLF1 (including 2018 surface soil samples) at 5 cm depth.....	7-122
Figure 7-68: Cumulative percentage of particle size for waste rock on TLF (from Saynor 2019)....	7-123
Figure 7-69: Watershed bounded network model sub-catchments.....	7-128
Figure 7-70: Revegetation conducted on Ranger Mine (1982 – 1998).....	7-134
Figure 7-71: Proposed conservative provenance zone (bordered by the red line) and the GAC approved provenance zone within Kakadu NP (bordered by the blue line) .....	7-136
Figure 7-72 Spatial domain of the hydrogeological Ranger Mine conceptual model relative to the domain of the calibrated groundwater flow model. ....	7-148
Figure 7-73 Indicative flowchart showing various numerical and solute transport model development for the RPA .....	7-156
Figure 7-74: Mg solute loads at monitoring stations MCUS and MG009 and derived from the mine (INTERA 2016).....	7-158
Figure 7-75: Operational groundwater flow (left) compared to post-closure groundwater flow (right) (INTERA 2016).....	7-159
Figure 7-76: Schematic west to east cross-section through the TSF for the current configuration and the final landform waste rock (INTERA 2016) .....	7-162
Figure 7-77: Schematic south to north cross-section through the TSF for the current configuration and the final (INTERA 2016) .....	7-163
Figure 7-78: Groundwater flow pathways from the processing plant area towards Pit 1, Pit 3, Georgetown Billabong and Corridor Creek tributary (INTERA 2016) .....	7-166
Figure 7-79: Uranium and manganese soil concentration versus depth; generally decreasing over depth (INTERA 2016).....	7-167
Figure 7-80: Maximum uranium in groundwater (data from 2006 – 2015) (INTERA 2016).....	7-168
Figure 7-81: Maximum magnesium in groundwater (data from 2006 – 2015) (INTERA 2016) .....	7-168
Figure 7-82: Location of LAAs and associated monitoring bores.....	7-169
Figure 7-83: Magnesium observed in groundwater where irrigated with pond water (bore DJ2).....	7-170
Figure 7-84: Surface water sulfate concentrations in bores OB27, MC27, and MC27 Deep (top) and bores MC12, MC12 Deep, 23562, and 83/1 Deep (bottom).....	7-170
Figure 7-85: Pit 3 cross-section (not to scale).....	7-175
Figure 7-86: Flow chart for Null-Space Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis of post-closure groundwater solute loading to creeks.....	7-186
Figure 7-87: Represented reach downstream of Gulungul Creek (orange arrow).....	7-190

Figure 7-88: Drainage conduits and nodes (yellow lines with blue nodes), contoured topography at 2 m and 5 m intervals. (The waste rock boundary area is colour coded with respect to sub-catchment area and waste rock thickness.) .....	7-191
Figure 7-89: Modelled calcium concentrations downstream of the RPA .....	7-192
Figure 7-90: Modelled magnesium concentrations downstream of the RPA .....	7-192
Figure 7-91: Modelled magnesium:calcium laboratory toxicity value ratios downstream of RPA ....	7-192
Figure 7-92: Modelled manganese concentrations downstream of the RPA (log scale y-axis).....	7-193
Figure 7-93: Modelled uranium concentrations downstream of the RPA (log scale y-axis).....	7-193
Figure 7-94: Modelled TAN concentrations downstream of the RPA (log scale y-axis) .....	7-193
Figure 7-95: Modelled nitrate concentrations downstream of the RPA .....	7-194
Figure 7-96: Surface grain size distribution for waste rock samples from sections 1 and 2 of the trial landform.....	7-203
Figure 7-97: Mine area boundaries – contaminated sites register .....	7-205
Figure 7-98: Processing plant area – contaminated sites register .....	7-206
Figure 7-99: Major site area boundaries – contaminated sites register.....	7-207
Figure 8-1: Framework for the closure criteria working group, and subsequent closure criteria development and approvals pathway .....	8-3
Figure 8-2: The water quality management framework (ANZG 2018).....	8-14
Figure 8-3: The main features of the ALARA procedure (Oudiz <i>et al.</i> 1986) .....	8-22
Figure 8-4: Constrained optimisation and regions of effective dose for members of the critical group in the release of sites (IAEA 2006).....	8-28
Figure 8-5: Current status of closure criteria based on SSB MCP Assessment Report (SSB 2018a).....	8-45
Figure 9-1: Brine Squeezer process flow diagram (source: <a href="http://www.osmoflo.com/">http://www.osmoflo.com/</a> ).....	9-11
Figure 9-2: Plan view of the decline.....	9-12
Figure 9-3: Aerial view of the ventilation shaft and underground infrastructure .....	9-13
Figure 9-4: Outcomes of the stage 1 assessment.....	9-20
Figure 9-5: Thickened tailings flow sheet.....	9-23
Figure 9-6: Pit 1 after the installation of vertical drains across the surface (2012).....	9-25
Figure 9-7: Inline agglomeration flow sheet .....	9-26
Figure 9-8: Tailings neutralisation flow sheet .....	9-27
Figure 9-9: Tailings filtration flow sheet.....	9-28
Figure 9-10: Thickened, filtered and cemented tailings flow sheet.....	9-29
Figure 10-1: The ERA HSEQ risk framework (adapted from: AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009) .....	10-2
Figure 10-2: Risk class distribution .....	10-12
Figure 10-3: Threat risk-profile by non-economic consequence area .....	10-12
Figure 11-1: Ranger Mine Closure Domains (aerial 2019) .....	11-4
Figure 11-2: Ranger Mine Closure Domains Outline (aerial 2019) .....	11-5
Figure 11-3: Pit 1 in 2012, showing the installation of 7,554 vertical wick drains.....	11-8

Figure 11-4: Locations of the settlement monitoring plates (source: Fitton 2015a) .....	11-9
Figure 11-5: Pit 1 water balance schematic .....	11-10
Figure 11-6: Pit 1 average settlement depth vs consolidation model prediction .....	11-11
Figure 11-7: Cross-section of Pit 3 before tailings deposition .....	11-18
Figure 11-8: Cross section of Pit 3 after tailings deposition .....	11-19
Figure 11-9: Pit 3 showing the location of mill and dredge tailings deposition points.....	11-21
Figure 11-10: Tailings surface April 2019 (Source: Fitton 2019).....	11-22
Figure 11-11: Location of trial subaqueous deposition .....	11-23
Figure 11-12: Novel subaqueous diffuser design .....	11-23
Figure 11-13: Subaqueous deposition of tailings into Pit 3 (2019).....	11-24
Figure 11-14: Proposed subaqueous deposition of dredge tailings via floating pipelines and diffusers .....	11-25
Figure 11-15: Proposed subaerial deposition of mill tailings from multiple spigot points.....	11-26
Figure 11-16: Winch and discharge locations (yellow- winch location, white & green – discharge points, red – historic discharge points) .....	11-28
Figure 11-17: Plan and section view of tailings surface at end of deposition .....	11-30
Figure 11-18: Pit 3 maximum probable water level forecast .....	11-31
Figure 11-19: Tailings deposition concept .....	11-33
Figure 11-20: Contour plan of settled tailings surface .....	11-34
Figure 11-21: Isopath of fill depths over tailings – end of consolidation .....	11-34
Figure 11-22: Conceptual end of Pit 3 deposition tailings surface .....	11-37
Figure 11-23: West-northwest to east-southeast cross-section along model row 197 through Pit 3. ....	11-38
Figure 11-24: South-southwest to north-northeast cross-section along model column 221 through Pit 3 .....	11-39
Figure 11-25: Comparison of predicted post-closure Mg peak loading from Pit 3 tailings to Magela Creek to that for all waste rock and historical mine-derived and natural Magela Creek Mg loadings .....	11-40
Figure 11-26: Pit 3 Underdrain system water flows .....	11-40
Figure 11-27: Schematic of wick drain installation.....	11-42
Figure 11-28: Schematic of geotextile installation .....	11-43
Figure 11-29: Schematic of secondary capping placement .....	11-45
Figure 11-30: Schematic of bulk fill placement.....	11-45
Figure 11-31: Schematic of the decant sump in Pit 3 .....	11-46
Figure 11-32: Nominal allocation of area of operation per dredge .....	11-52
Figure 11-33: Process water return from Pit 3 to the TSF .....	11-53
Figure 11-34: Typical residual tailings on TSF wall after dredging.....	11-54
Figure 11-35: Mapping of water levels from the dredge plan.....	11-55
Figure 11-36: Aerial image of the North Eastern ramp .....	11-56
Figure 11-37: The Jabiru dredge .....	11-57
Figure 11-38: The Brolga 1 dredge.....	11-58
Figure 11-39: The Mudskipper .....	11-58
Figure 11-40: April 2019 Magnetic Anomaly Map (left frame) comparison with the 2012 Magnetic Anomaly Map (right frame).....	11-60

Figure 11-41: TSF wall deconstruction sequence .....	11-63
Figure 11-42: Process water flow diagram for the current water model .....	11-66
Figure 11-43: OPSIM median forecast of total dissolved solids concentration in process water .....	11-68
Figure 11-44: Block flow diagram for BC3 fan upgrade .....	11-69
Figure 11-45: HDS Plant Block Flow Diagram .....	11-70
Figure 11-46: Pond water treatment block flow diagram .....	11-73
Figure 11-47: Decommissioning stages .....	11-77
Figure 11-48: Plant decommissioning sequencing .....	11-78
Figure 11-49: Phase 1 (red) and 2 (blue) of demolition .....	11-83
Figure 11-50: Ranger Mine demolition disposal areas .....	11-86
Figure 11-51: Plan view of the decline .....	11-90
Figure 11-52: Oblique view of R3D decline and main closure elements .....	11-91
Figure 11-53: Backfilled shaft with waste rock plug (orange), crushed waste rock (purple); cemented rock fill layer (pink) with a crushed rock "cover" for the last 20 m of the weathered zone; and, concrete collar removed .....	11-93
Figure 11-54: Schematic of backfilling detail to below weathered zone .....	11-94
Figure 11-55: Dismantling and cutting gradient of the steel portal to ground level .....	11-94
Figure 11-56: Box-cut and portal, completed in December 2012 .....	11-95
Figure 11-57: Potential structurally controlled wedge failures (ERA GCMP 2017) .....	11-96
Figure 11-58: Cross-sections of decline and possible ultimate progressive failure. The left picture shows the rock structure for the first decline leg and the right picture shows the progression of failures and caved material height .....	11-97
Figure 11-59: Observed groundwater inflows, which are colour coded according to dampness .....	11-98
Figure 11-60: Comparison of simulated and observed decline inflow .....	11-99
Figure 11-61: Material movement excavation areas .....	11-101
Figure 11-62: Material movement placement areas .....	11-102
Figure 11-63: Bulk material movement scheduled monthly rates .....	11-103
Figure 11-64: Bulk material placement rates .....	11-106
Figure 11-65: Stockpile material grades variance .....	11-107
Figure 11-66: Ranger Minesite final landform areas .....	11-109
Figure 11-67: Contaminated site areas .....	11-121
Figure 11-68: Final landform contour plan .....	11-126
Figure 11-69: Georgetown Creek Reference Area vegetation type variation across monitoring sites .....	11-128
Figure 11-70: Surface of Corridor Creek after a simulated period of 1,000 years .....	11-133
Figure 11-71: Modelled denudation rate to 1,000 years for Corridor Creek with predicted rate to 10,000 years .....	11-134
Figure 11-72: Contour ripping on trial landform .....	11-136
Figure 11-73: Footprint of RPA embankments requiring contour ripping .....	11-137
Figure 11-74: Environmental rock bars along main channels .....	11-138
Figure 11-75: Environmental rock bars – section view .....	11-139
Figure 11-76: Boundary sediment control structure – section view .....	11-140
Figure 11-77: "Rotree" cultivator attached to a 20 tonne excavator (image shows similar equipment in use at Jabiluka) .....	11-143

Figure 11-78: View of the tree distribution and also the flat ground space among trees at Jabiluka revegetation site, Feb 2016. (Note that the surface at Ranger Project Area will be rougher due to waste rock substrate) ..... 11-144

Figure 11-79: Photos (a, b) of erosion plot 1 (dry) and plot 2 (wet) on Trial Landform. With larger spacing between rip lines, there will be more flat area for traversing than shown above ..... 11-144

Figure 11-80: Cumulative handover of completed final landforms ..... 11-146

Figure 12-1: Location of RPA statutory (yellow) and operational surface water monitoring sites .... 12-15

Figure 12-2: Proposed location of Pit 1 monitoring bores ..... 12-20

Figure 12-3: Location of Pit 3 monitoring bores ..... 12-24

## TABLES

Table 1-1: Timelines of the operations and closure phases of the Ranger Mine ..... 1-7

Table 1-2: Structure and content of this MCP ..... 1-8

Table 2-1: Indicative ore grades and mineral type ..... 2-7

Table 2-2: Water classes and their management ..... 2-13

Table 2-3: LAA description of generalised water management ..... 2-19

Table 3-1: SSB rehabilitation standards for the Ranger Project Area ..... 3-11

Table 4-1: Historical weather data, Jabiru Airport ..... 4-3

Table 4-2: Brief description of soil characteristics around the Ranger Mine (Figure 4 2) ..... 4-5

Table 4-3: Soil hydraulic conductivity ..... 4-6

Table 4-4: Typical erosion susceptibility of soils ..... 4-7

Table 4-5: Background threshold concentrations of COPC (Esslemont 2017) ..... 4-19

Table 4-6: Area and proportion of vegetation communities on the RPA and Kakadu NP ..... 4-28

Table 4-7: Actively Managed Weeds in the RPA ..... 4-32

Table 4-8: Conservation listed species known to occur on the RPA (adapted from Firth 2012) ..... 4-34

Table 4-9: Feral fauna species known to occur in Kakadu NP and the RPA ..... 4-37

Table 5-1: Ranger Mine closure stakeholders ..... 5-3

Table 5-2: Engagement forums ..... 5-6

Table 6-1: Post-mining land uses ..... 6-2

Table 6-2: Closure objectives ..... 6-3

Table 7-1: Consolidation model results, comparison of 2014 and current ..... 7-13

Table 7-2: Statistical values for the observed rainfall events in the four wet seasons (water years) from 2009 to 2013 ..... 7-25

Table 7-3: Summary of field infiltration parameters for the TLF ..... 7-25

Table 7-4: Plot 1 annual rainfall, runoff volume and total dissolved solids load data from 2009 to 2012 (Saynor <i>et al.</i> 2014) .....	7-28
Table 7-5: Annual mean concentrations in trial landform surface runoff and Magela and Gulungul Creeks (standard error) (Saynor <i>et al.</i> 2014) .....	7-28
Table 7-6: Vegetation establishment activities conducted on the Ranger Mine TLF, 2009 – 2019 ...	7-31
Table 7-7: Tree and shrub species successfully established on the TLF .....	7-35
Table 7-8: Understorey species used in 2018 trials.....	7-40
Table 7-9: The dry weight percentage of waste rock and roots at different depths of pit 1A and pit 1B of the TLF .....	7-42
Table 7-10: Potential PAW in the layers of the growth substrate of the TLF section 1A 4 m profile..	7-52
Table 7-11: Observed plant available water at the TLF for seven consecutive dry seasons.....	7-53
Table 7-12: Percentage of years with a net negative PAW balance .....	7-57
Table 7-13: Pre-mining radiological baseline determined by the Supervising Scientist (Bollhöfer <i>et al.</i> , 2014) .....	7-60
Table 7-14: Estimated baseline groundwater radionuclide concentrations (Esslemont, 2015) .....	7-61
Table 7-15: Magela Creek upstream radionuclide concentrations (2010 – 2014 average).....	7-61
Table 7-16: Radionuclide concentrations in local bush foods .....	7-62
Table 7-17: Effective dose rate estimate during future occupancy of the LAAs for an adult (Akber & Lu, 2012) .....	7-67
Table 7-18: Baseline values from Klessa (2000) and ERA Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) database 1992-2018; results are for filtered fraction except for 226Ra	7-72
Table 7-19: Background threshold concentrations of COPC (Esslemont 2015).....	7-76
Table 7-20: Magnesium and sulfate loads (tonnes) in Magela Creek .....	7-87
Table 7-21: Descriptions of the Ranger Mine analogue communities .....	7-93
Table 7-22: Particle size distribution for waste rock landform (by sieve analysis) .....	7-117
Table 7-23: Rehabilitated waste rock landform properties.....	7-119
Table 7-24: Analogue landscape properties.....	7-120
Table 7-25: 2010 Chemical analysis of TLF waste rock samples compared to natural soils (source Gellert 2014) .....	7-124
Table 7-26: Key findings of 2018 nutrient cycling study.....	7-126
Table 7-27: Design flow rates at selected locations (m <sup>3</sup> /s) – long-term (LT) scenario.....	7-130
Table 7-28: Design flow rates at selected locations (m <sup>3</sup> /s) – ST scenario .....	7-131
Table 7-29: Small-scale revegetation trials conducted on the RPA (1982 – 1998).....	7-132
Table 7-30: Target revegetation species listed with framework status and potential introduction strategy .....	7-139
Table 7-31: Summary of differences in name/geometry between the updated HLU and previous HLUs in INTERA (2014a, b, c; 2016) .....	7-150
Table 7-32: Calibration statistics for the transient groundwater flow model.....	7-153
Table 7-33: Comparison of estimated post-closure Mg loading from all waste rock, all tailings, Pit 1 pit tailings flux, Pit 3 brine, and Ranger 3 Deeps backfill to historical mine-derived and natural Magela Creek Mg loading (INTERA 2016) .....	7-162
Table 7-34: Peak annual magnesium loadings from Pit 3 sources with and without low permeability caps .....	7-162
Table 7-35: Contaminated sites located in or near the processing plant area (INTERA 2016) .....	7-165



Table 7-36: Comparison of average annual loadings of COPC to Magela Creek – with and without low permeability caps .....	7-180
Table 7-37: KKN projects for closure .....	7-196
Table 7-38: Particle size distribution data from TLF 1A section at construction in 2009 .....	7-204
Table 7-39: Proposed contaminated site remediation .....	7-209
Table 8-1: Closure criteria – landform.....	8-6
Table 8-2: Closure criteria – water and sediment.....	8-12
Table 8-3: Closure criteria – radiation.....	8-25
Table 8-4: Closure criteria – soils .....	8-32
Table 8-5: Closure criteria – flora and fauna .....	8-34
Table 8-6: Closure criteria – cultural .....	8-41
Table 8-7: Suggested indicators of cultural health of rehabilitated site (Garde 2015).....	8-42
Table 8-8: Example of scalar measurement tool for cultural criteria monitoring .....	8-43
Table 8-9: SSB acceptance of ERA draft criteria in the 2016 MCP versus the 2018 MCP .....	8-44
Table 8-10: Rehabilitation standards for Ranger Mine, developed by the Supervising Scientist.....	8-46
Table 9-1: Explanation of relevant matters/criteria to be included in BPT assessment.....	9-1
Table 9-2: BPT technology and ranking system.....	9-6
Table 9-3: Tailings deposition options and best practicable technology assessment summary .....	9-7
Table 9-4: Decline options and best practicable technology assessment summary .....	9-14
Table 9-5: Tailings reclamation options .....	9-16
Table 9-6: Salt treatment and disposal options .....	9-18
Table 9-7: Initial closure strategies to be assessed.....	9-20
Table 9-8: Final closure strategies assessed .....	9-21
Table 9-9: Tailings neutralisation advantages and disadvantages.....	9-26
Table 9-10: Supplementary tailings treatment assessment .....	9-29
Table 10-1: Likelihood classification .....	10-7
Table 10-2: Risk assessment matrix.....	10-7
Table 10-3: Consequence classes .....	10-8
Table 10-4: Risk breakdown structure .....	10-11
Table 10-5: Summary of class III and IV risks.....	10-13
Table 11-1: Land Disturbance Domains.....	11-2
Table 11-2: Backfill quantities required for construction of the Pit 1 surface layer.....	11-14
Table 11-3: Pit 3 Maximum Operating Level .....	11-29
Table 11-4: Backfill specifications for Pit 3.....	11-47
Table 11-5: Bulk material movements to Pit 3.....	11-48
Table 11-6: Progressive tasks for closure of Pit 3 .....	11-48
Table 11-7: TSF deconstruction material quantities .....	11-62
Table 11-8: Progressive tasks for closure of the TSF .....	11-64

Table 11-9: Void volume of Pit 3 underfill – actual compared to ITWC prefeasibility study calculated .....	11-68
Table 11-10: Demolition phases .....	11-82
Table 11-11: Phase 1 demolition areas .....	11-84
Table 11-12: Phase 2 demolition areas .....	11-85
Table 11-13: Demolition disposal location details .....	11-86
Table 11-14: Schedule key milestones for completion of demolition.....	11-89
Table 11-15: Geological conditions, decline reinforcement methodology.....	11-95
Table 11-16: Bulk material movements to Pit 3.....	11-104
Table 11-17: Final landform dozing site wide.....	11-105
Table 11-18: Ore grades and material type.....	11-106
Table 11-19: Final landform catchment areas.....	11-110
Table 11-20: Waste materials for management and/or disposal at closure.....	11-114
Table 11-21: Proposed management of contaminated land .....	11-122
Table 11-22: Environmental rock bar design features .....	11-138
Table 11-23: Sediment control structure design features .....	11-139
Table 11-24: Major closure works requiring approval.....	11-147
Table 11-25: Key milestones for completion of demolition.....	11-147
Table 12-1: Examples of maintenance work that may be required during the closure and/or post-closure phases .....	12-4
Table 12-2: Landform closure monitoring .....	12-7
Table 12-3: Landform post-closure monitoring.....	12-10
Table 12-4: Parameters and locations for surface water monitoring to assess compliance with closure criteria.....	12-16
Table 12-5: Generally identified hydrolithological units on the RPA.....	12-18
Table 12-6: Parameters for proposed and existing monitoring bores for Pit 1 and Pit 3 closure.....	12-21
Table 12-7: General background groundwater chemistry for the RPA.....	12-26
Table 12-8: Groundwater closure and post-closure monitoring .....	12-27
Table 12-9: Radiation closure and post-closure monitoring.....	12-30
Table 12-10: Flora and fauna closure & post-closure monitoring.....	12-36
Table 12-11: Suggested indicators of cultural health of rehabilitated site (Garde 2015).....	12-39
Table 12-12: An example of a bilingual, scalar cultural index score for cultural criteria monitoring.	12-40
Table 12-13: Trigger, action, response plan.....	12-41
Table 14-1: Indicative data collection types .....	14-2





## **APPENDICES**

A: ERA response to stakeholder feedback on the 2018 Ranger Mine Closure Plan

1.1: Ranger 2019 Mine Closure Plan stakeholder feedback form

3.1: Overview of primary legislation, agreements and authorisations

3.2: Closure Legal Obligations Register

5.1: Ranger Mine Closure Stakeholder Consultation Register

7.1: ERA key knowledge needs projects

7.2: Consolidation model A

7.3: Consolidation model B

9.1: Best practicable technology assessment matrices

10.1: Ranger Mine closure risk assessment

11.1: Schedule of activities for closure

11.2: Flood modelling

11.3: Final landform drawings

11.4: Revegetation strategy

12.1: Pit 1 Progressive Rehabilitation Monitoring Framework

12.2: Plume and Contaminated Site Management Plan

### **Reference List**

### **Glossary**

### **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

### **Chemical Symbols and Formulae**

### **Symbols / Units of Measurements**

### **Contributors**