



**ERA** Energy Resources of Australia Ltd

## **Ranger Mine Closure Plan**

### **Table of Contents**

Issued Date: May 2018

Revision #: 0.18.0


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

Department	Closure and Projects		
Status	Final	Project Reference	1400 Approvals
Unique Reference	1400 Ranger Mine Closure Plan		

**Document Details (Co-author)**

Company	Eco Logical Australia		
Status	Final	Project Reference	4720

**Approvals Table**

	Name	Position	Signed	Date
Originator	Linda Pugh	Specialist Approvals	<u>L Pugh</u>	<u>23 May 2018</u>
Checked	Sharon Paulka	Manager Closure and Projects	<u>Sharon Paulka</u>	<u>23 May 2018</u>
Approved	Paul Arnold	Chief Executive Officer		<u>23 May 2018</u>

**Revision History**

Revision	Issued date	Description	By (initials)	Checked (initials)	Approved
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**



### 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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION PURPOSE AND SCOPE 1-1

1.1	Background	1-3
1.2	Purpose of this MCP	1-4
1.2.1	Ranger Authorisation and Mining Management Act	1-5
1.2.2	Section 41 Authority and ERs	1-5
1.2.3	Government Agreement	1-6
1.3	Scope of this MCP	1-8
1.4	Mine Closure Guidelines and Standards	1-8
1.4.1	Rio Tinto Closure Standard and Sustainable Development	1-8
1.4.2	Western Australian Mine Closure Plan Guidelines	1-9
1.4.3	Review and Updates	1-11
1.4.4	Content and Structure of this MCP	1-11
1.5	References	1-13

### CHAPTER 2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING 2-1

2.1	Land Tenure, Land Use and Governance	2-1
2.1.1	Historical Overview of the Magela Catchment	2-1
2.1.2	Governance History	2-3
2.2	Social Setting	2-4
2.2.1	Aboriginal Culture and Heritage	2-4
2.3	Physical Environment	2-4
2.3.1	Climate	2-5
2.3.2	Land Systems	2-5
2.3.2.1	Topsoil and Subsoil	2-5
2.3.2.2	Topography	2-9
2.3.2.3	Geology and Mineralisation	2-9
2.3.2.4	Geomorphology	2-10
2.3.3	Surface Water Resources	2-11
2.3.3.1	Surface Water Hydrology	2-11
2.3.3.2	Surface Water Chemistry	2-15
2.3.4	Groundwater	2-17
2.3.5	Radiation	2-21
2.4	Biological Environment Setting	2-23
2.4.1	National Parks and Protected Areas	2-23
2.4.2	Sensitive Habitats	2-23
2.4.3	Terrestrial Ecosystems	2-26
2.4.3.1	Vegetation Communities	2-26
2.4.3.2	Flora Species	2-30
2.4.3.3	Fauna Species	2-31
2.4.3.4	Bushfires	2-36
2.4.4	Aquatic Fauna and Ecosystems	2-37
2.5	References	2-39



**ERA**

**eco**  
**logical**  
AUSTRALIA

<b>3</b>	<b>PROJECT OVERVIEW</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1	History	3-1
3.1.1	Overview of Ranger Mine EIS Assessment and Recommendations	3-2
3.2	Overview of Operations	3-3
3.2.1	Mining	3-6
3.2.2	Processing	3-6
3.2.3	Ranger 3 Deeps Exploration Decline	3-7
3.2.4	Tailings Storage	3-9
3.2.5	Tailings Dam	3-9
3.2.6	Pit 1	3-10
3.2.7	Pit 3	3-10
3.2.8	Stockpiles	3-11
3.2.9	Water Management	3-13
3.2.9.1	Retention Ponds	3-14
3.2.9.2	Water Treatment Plants	3-14
3.2.9.3	Wetland Filters	3-15
3.2.9.4	Land Application Areas	3-19
3.2.9.5	Brine Concentrator	3-20
3.2.9.6	Site Water Model	3-21
3.2.10	Jabiru Airport	3-22
3.3	References	3-25
<b>4</b>	<b>FINAL LAND USE AND CLOSURE OBJECTIVES</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1	Final Land Use	4-1
4.2	Culturally Important Flora and Fauna	4-3
4.3	Closure Objectives	4-3
4.4	References	4-6
<b>5</b>	<b>STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Project Stakeholders	5-1
5.2	ERA Engagement Principles	5-3
5.3	Managing Socio-Economic Impacts	5-7
5.4	Cultural Heritage Management on the RPA during Closure	5-7
5.4.1	Interim Protocol Regarding Cultural Heritage on the RPA	5-8
5.4.2	Northern Territory and Commonwealth Heritage Legislation	5-8
5.4.3	HSE Management System	5-8
5.4.4	Land Disturbance Permitting (EVP019)	5-8
5.4.5	Rio Tinto Communities and Social Performance Standard	5-8
5.4.6	ERA Cultural Heritage Standard Operating Procedures	5-8
5.4.7	Cultural Heritage Work Instructions	5-9
5.4.8	Cultural Heritage GIS	5-9
5.4.9	Business Conformance Audits and Risk Assessments	5-9
5.4.10	Cultural Heritage Site Management Plans	5-9
5.4.11	Cultural Heritage Field Surveys	5-9
5.5	ERA's Contribution to Addressing the Socio-economic Risks	5-9
5.5.1	Ranger Closure	5-10
5.5.2	Jabiru Transition	5-10

5.6	References	5-13
<b>6</b>	<b>DEVELOPMENT OF CLOSURE CRITERIA</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Landform	6-3
6.2.1	Justification for Outcome, Parameter and Criteria	6-6
6.2.1.1	Infrastructure	6-6
6.2.1.2	Isolation of Tailings	6-6
6.2.1.3	Erosion Characteristics	6-6
6.3	Radiation	6-8
6.3.1	Justification for Outcome, Parameter and Criteria	6-11
6.3.1.1	Radiation Doses to Members of the Public	6-11
6.3.1.2	Radiation Effects on Biota	6-14
6.4	Water and Sediment	6-15
6.4.1	Justification for Outcome, Parameter and Criteria	6-21
6.4.1.1	Risk Based Tiered Approach to Water and Sediment Closure Criteria and ALARA	6-21
6.5	Flora and Fauna	6-28
6.5.1	Justification for Outcome, Parameter and Criteria	6-30
6.5.1.1	Local Native Plant Species	6-30
6.5.1.2	Community Composition	6-31
6.5.1.3	Long Term Viability of the Ecosystem	6-32
6.6	Soils	6-34
6.6.1	Justification for Outcome, Parameter and Criteria	6-35
6.7	Cultural	6-37
6.7.1	Justification for Outcome, Parameter and Criteria	6-39
6.8	Status of Closure Criteria	6-41
6.8.1	Landform	6-43
6.8.2	Radiation	6-43
6.8.3	Water and Sediment	6-43
6.8.4	Flora and Fauna	6-44
6.8.5	Soils	6-44
6.8.6	Cultural	6-45
6.9	References	6-46
<b>7</b>	<b>SUPPORTING STUDIES</b>	<b>7-1</b>
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	7-2
7.1.1.2	Underdrainage	7-3
7.1.1.3	Outputs	7-3
7.1.1.4	Validation	7-3
7.1.2	Pit 1 Tailings Consolidation	7-3
7.1.3	Pit 3 Tailings Consolidation	7-6
7.2	Tailings Properties	7-8
7.3	Trial Landform	7-12
7.3.1	Introduction	7-12
7.3.2	Runoff, Soil Erosion and Solute Loss	7-14



7.3.2.1	Runoff	7-16
7.3.2.2	Soil Erosion	7-17
7.3.2.3	Solute Loss	7-18
7.3.3	Radon Exhalation	7-20
7.3.4	Revegetation Trials	7-21
7.3.5	Plant Available Water Studies	7-25
7.4	Environmental Protection	7-31
7.4.1	Pre-mining Radiation Baseline	7-31
7.4.1.1	Baseline Terrestrial Radiation	7-31
7.4.1.2	Baseline Water Radiation	7-32
7.4.1.3	Bushfood Radiation Baseline	7-33
7.4.2	Contamination Investigations	7-34
7.4.2.1	Contamination Investigations in LAAs	7-35
7.4.2.2	Effective Dose Estimate	7-37
7.4.2.3	Generation of Acid Sulfate Soils in Billabongs	7-38
7.4.3	Water and Sediment Studies	7-39
7.4.3.1	Water and Sediment Baseline	7-40
7.4.3.2	Surface Water and Sediment Monitoring	7-53
7.4.3.3	Constituents of Potential Concern	7-59
7.4.3.4	Derivation of Site Specific Guideline Values	7-65
7.4.3.5	Fate of Chemicals in the Magela Creek System	7-69
7.4.3.6	Prediction of Existing Groundwater Contamination	7-70
7.4.4	Flora and Fauna Baseline Monitoring	7-71
7.5	Landform Design and Performance	7-73
7.5.1	Final Landform Material Properties	7-78
7.5.2	Landform Flood Study	7-82
7.6	Ecosystem Establishment	7-86
7.6.1	Revegetation Trials (1982 – 1999)	7-86
7.6.2	Seed Provenance	7-90
7.6.3	Flora Species Composition and Community Structure	7-92
7.6.3.1	Flora and Fauna Monitoring Sites	7-100
7.6.4	Emergent Vegetative Features in Constructed Waterbodies	7-102
7.7	Groundwater Modelling	7-102
7.7.1	Ranger Mine Conceptual Model	7-102
7.7.1.1	Background	7-105
7.7.1.2	Objective	7-105
7.7.1.3	Developing the Conceptual Model	7-105
7.7.1.4	Regional-Scale Conceptual Model	7-108
7.7.1.5	Sitewide-Scale Conceptual Model	7-108
7.7.1.6	Conceptual Models of Areas of Interest/Concern	7-112
7.7.1.7	Pit 3 Conceptual Model	7-115
7.7.1.8	Pit 1 Conceptual Mode	7-117
7.7.1.9	Tailings Dam Conceptual Model	7-117
7.7.1.10	Processing Plant Area Conceptual Model	7-118
7.7.1.11	LAAs Conceptual Model	7-124
7.7.1.12	Ranger 3 Deeps Conceptual Model	7-126
7.7.1.13	Landform Waste Rock Conceptual Model	7-126
7.7.1.14	Conclusion	7-126
7.7.2	Pit 1 Solute Egress Modelling – Conclusions	7-127



**ERA**

**eco**  
**logical**  
AUSTRALIA

7.7.3	Pit 3 Solute Transport Modelling	7-128
7.7.3.1	Study Objectives	7-130
7.7.3.2	System Conceptualisation	7-130
7.7.3.3	Model Development and Approach	7-131
7.7.3.4	Reactive Transport Modelling	7-132
7.7.3.5	Secondary Uranium and Magnesium Minerals Associated with the Waste Rock Landform	7-133
7.7.4	Peer Review	7-135
7.8	Surface Water Modelling	7-136
7.8.1	Background	7-136
7.8.2	Method	7-137
7.8.3	Model Results	7-139
7.8.4	Discussion	7-141
7.8.5	Conclusion	7-142
7.9	Brine Management	7-142
7.9.1	Pit 3 Underfill Tests	7-143
7.10	Future Studies	7-150
7.10.1	Radiation Dose Assessment	7-150
7.10.2	Evaluation of Key Attributes of Nutrient Cycling in Revegetated Waste Rock Landform of Ranger Uranium Mine	7-151
7.10.3	Conceptual Site Modelling	7-152
7.10.4	Soil Assessment	7-152
7.10.5	Surface Water Modelling	7-152
7.10.6	Surface Water Pathway Risk Assessments	7-153
7.10.7	Phase 3 Closure Criteria and Detrimental Impact Framework Development	7-153
7.11	References	7-154

<b>8</b>	<b>BEST PRACTICABLE TECHNOLOGY</b>	<b>8-1</b>
8.1	Introduction	8-1
8.1.1	BPT Assessment Criteria	8-3
8.1.2	BPT Ranking, Weighting and Scoring	8-5
8.2	ITWC PFS1 Technical Options Assessment	8-6
8.2.1	Tailings Management	8-7
8.2.2	Salt Treatment and Disposal	8-9
8.2.3	Final Landform Construction, Revegetation and Ecosystem Reconstruction	8-10
8.3	PFS 2 Closure Strategy and Plan	8-10
8.3.1	Stage 1 Assessment	8-11
8.3.2	Stage 2 Assessment	8-12
8.4	Supplementary BPT Assessment	8-13
8.4.1	Thickened Tailings (A1)	8-14
8.4.2	Unthickened Tailings (A2)	8-14
8.4.3	Unthickened Tailings with Wicks (A3)	8-15
8.4.4	Unthickened Tailings with Extended Water Treatment (A4)	8-16
8.4.5	Unthickened tailings, with Inline Agglomeration and Wicks (A5)	8-16
8.4.6	Unthickened Tailings with Neutralisation and Wicks (A6)	8-17





**ERA**



8.4.7	Thickened and Filtered Tailings (A7)	8-18
8.4.8	Thickened, Filtered and Cemented Tailings (A8)	8-19
8.4.9	BPT Analysis of Tailings Treatment Options	8-20
8.4.10	Final Conclusions	8-26
8.5	References	8-27

## **9 RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT 9-1**

9.1	Risk Assessment Methodology Overview	9-1
9.2	Previous Risk Assessments	9-2
9.3	Closure Risk Assessment	9-3
9.3.1	Establishing the Context and Scope	9-4
9.3.2	Scope of the Closure Risk Assessment	9-4
9.3.3	Purpose and Objectives of the Closure Risk Assessment	9-4
9.3.4	Assumptions of the Closure Risk Assessment	9-5
9.3.5	Risk Identification and Analysis	9-5
9.4	Risk Assessment Results	9-10
9.5	Discussion of Class III Risks	9-20
9.5.1	RPA Waterbodies (TA1)	9-20
9.5.2	Offsite Waterbodies (TA2)	9-21
9.5.3	Onsite Water and Waste Management (TA3)	9-25
9.5.4	Landform (TB1)	9-29
9.5.5	Revegetation (TB2)	9-32
9.5.6	Weeds (TB4)	9-36
9.5.7	Radiation (TC1)	9-38
9.5.8	Cultural heritage (TC3)	9-41
9.5.9	Stakeholder and legal expectations (TC4)	9-42
9.5.10	Community (TC5)	9-44
9.6	References	9-46

## **10 CLOSURE IMPLEMENTATION 10-1**

10.1	Pit 1 Closure	10-22
10.1.1	Pit 1 Closure Objectives and Risks	10-23
10.1.2	Pit 1 Backfill and Closure Design	10-25
10.2	Water Treatment	10-34
10.3	Pit 3 Closure	10-37
10.3.1	Pit 3 Closure Objectives and Risks	10-40
10.3.2	Pit 3 Backfill and Closure Design	10-41
10.4	Tailings Dam	10-43
10.4.1	Tailings Closure Objectives and Risks	10-45
10.4.2	Tailings Dam Deconstruction and Closure Design	10-46
10.5	Contaminated Sites Management	10-47
10.5.1	Contaminated Sites Closure Objectives and Risks	10-47
10.5.2	Cumulative Impacts	10-50
10.6	Demolition and Decommissioning	10-51
10.6.1	Demolition Objectives and Risks	10-51
10.6.2	Demolition methods	10-51
	10.6.2.1 Processing Plant Closure	10-52
	10.6.2.2 Water Storage	10-53



**ERA**



10.7	Final Landform	10-53
10.7.1	Landform Closure Objectives and Risks	10-54
10.7.2	Final Landform Construction	10-55
10.7.3	Pit 1 Area	10-57
10.7.4	Tailings Dam Area	10-58
10.7.5	Processing Area	10-59
10.7.6	Pit 3 Area	10-60
10.7.7	Landform Design and Bulk Backfill Techniques	10-61
	10.7.7.1 Bulk Backfill Method	10-63
10.7.8	Erosion and Sediment Control	10-67
10.8	Revegetation	10-78
10.8.1	Revegetation Closure Objectives and Risks	10-79
10.8.2	Site Preparation	10-80
	10.8.2.1 Surface Ripping and Cultivation	10-80
10.8.3	Revegetation Strategy and Implementation	10-82
	10.8.3.1 Species Selection and Plant Distribution	10-83
	10.8.3.2 Provision of Seeds and Seedlings	10-85
	10.8.3.3 Tree and Shrub Planting, and Establishment of Understorey	10-86
10.9	Contingencies	10-86
10.9.1	Water Treatment	10-86
10.9.2	Tailings Transfer	10-87
10.9.3	Brine Injection	10-87
10.9.4	Tubestock Production	10-88
10.10	References	10-89

## **11 CLOSURE MONITORING AND MAINTENANCE 11-1**

11.1	Stabilisation and Monitoring Phase Overview	11-1
11.2	Landform Monitoring	11-3
11.3	Water and Sediment Monitoring	11-4
	11.3.1 Surface Water and Sediment	11-4
	11.3.2 Groundwater Considerations	11-7
11.4	Radiation Monitoring	11-11
11.5	Flora and Fauna Monitoring	11-11
	11.5.1 Feral Animal Monitoring	11-12
	11.5.2 Weed Monitoring	11-12
11.6	Cultural Monitoring	11-12
11.7	Soils Monitoring	11-16
11.8	Trigger, Action Response Plan (TARP)	11-16
11.9	References	11-20

## **12 MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION AND DATA 12-1**

12.1	Data Collection and Management	12-1
------	--------------------------------	------

## FIGURES

Figure 1 1: Ranger uranium mine location .....	1-4
Figure 1-2: Oblique view of the current Ranger uranium mine site (2015) .....	1-4
Figure 1-3: NT and Commonwealth parallel closure approvals processes.....	1-7
Figure 1 4: Mine closure planning process (DMP & EPA 2015) .....	1-10
Figure 2 1: Geographic context for closure activities .....	2-2
Figure 2 2: Land portions relevant to the RPA .....	2-3
Figure 2 3: Dominant soil types in areas surround the Ranger mine.....	2-6
Figure 2 4: Stratigraphic sequence from regional to mine scale and corresponding geological map of the immediate area of the Ranger orebodies .....	2-10
Figure 2 5: Regional extent of Magela catchment.....	2-12
Figure 2 6: Magela catchment showing government agency gauging stations .....	2-13
Figure 2 7: Pre-mining catchments in relation to Ranger mine (coloured in dark grey).....	2-15
Figure 2 8: Seasonal groundwater head contours .....	2-22
Figure 2 9: Location of protected areas in the vicinity of the RPA .....	2-25
Figure 2 10: Vegetation of the RPA and surrounding Kakadu (Schodde et al., 1987).....	2-28
Figure 2 11: Vegetation habitat map of the RPA (based on Brady et al., 2007) .....	2-29
Figure 3-1: Ranger mine layout and infrastructure.....	3-5
Figure 3-2: Spatial extent of the Ranger 3 Deeps exploration decline.....	3-8
Figure 3-3: Ranger stockpile locations .....	3-12
Figure 3-4: Surface water release points on the RPA (Deacon, 2017) .....	3-16
Figure 3-5: General arrangement of water class catchments on the RPA (Deacon, 2017).....	3-17
Figure 3-6: Ranger mine water circuit .....	3-18
Figure 3-7: Land application areas.....	3-20
Figure 3-8: Site water model median free process water inventory forecast, as at 31 January 2018 .....	3-22
Figure 3-9: Jabiru airport and infrastructure located within the Jabiru East area.....	3-24
Figure 6 1: Framework for the closure criteria working group, and subsequent closure criteria development and approvals pathway.....	6-2
Figure 6 2: Constrained optimisation and regions of effective dose for members of the critical group in the release of sites (IAEA 2006).....	6-13
Figure 6 3: Indicative risk based tiered decision tree for drinking water outcomes.....	6-24
Figure 6 4: Indicative risk based tiered decision tree for recreation water outcomes .....	6-25
Figure 6 5: Indicative risk based tiered decision tree for ecosystem protection off the RPA .....	6-27
Figure 6 6: Stakeholder acceptance of ERA draft criteria in mid-2017 .....	6-41

Figure 7-1: Pit 3 as excavated and as modelled .....	7-1
Figure 7-2: Pit 3 density profile - end of filling .....	7-2
Figure 7-3: Predicted final tailings level (m) across Pit 1 .....	7-4
Figure 7-4: Predicted flow of process water from Pit 1 during consolidation (Fitton 2015, 2017; Figure 5).....	7-5
Figure 7-5: Indicative conceptual cross-section of Pit 3 at the end of consolidation, as at 2014 (INTERA 2014a) .....	7-7
Figure 7-6: Predicted flow of process water from Pit 3 during consolidation .....	7-8
Figure 7-7: Tailings dam topography (blue: low elevation; grey: high elevation) (Fugro 2012) .....	7-9
Figure 7-8: Tailings dam magnetometer survey (red: high magnetic response).....	7-10
Figure 7-9: Cone penetration locations (Shackleton, 2013).....	7-11
Figure 7-10: Location of the trial landform, north-west of the tailings dam (Pugh et al., 2008) .....	7-12
Figure 7-11: Trial landform – associated infrastructure and revegetation strategy (adapted from Pugh et al., 2008).....	7-14
Figure 7-12: Layout of the erosion plots on the trial landform (Boyden et al., 2016, Saynor et al., 2016). .....	7-15
Figure 7-13: Runoff through the flume on the trial landform erosion plot 3 during a storm event (Saynor et al., 2014).....	7-16
Figure 7-14: Relationship between total event rainfall and runoff for erosion plot 1 for 156 runoff events in the 2013–14 wet season (Saynor et al., 2015).....	7-17
Figure 7-15: 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).....	7-18
Figure 7-16: Trial landform and contour plot of the terrestrial gamma dose rates measured across the trial landform in June 2012 (Bollhöfer & Doering, 2013; p 136) .....	7-20
Figure 7-17: Plant survival on the trial landform to April 2014 (Gellert & Lu, 2015).....	7-22
Figure 7-18: Growth of tubestock on the trial landform substrates by year planted (Gellert & Lu, 2015) .....	7-22
Figure 7-19: Dr Ping Lu (ERA) in the foreground of the trial landform (waste rock only, tubestock section), planted in 2009 (top). Yellow oriole feeding on a grub in <i>Eucalyptus tintinnans</i> , on the trial landform (2016) (bottom).....	7-23
Figure 7-20: Recovery of the revegetation from a prescribed burn in May 2016. View of the burnt vegetation on the trial landform 12 days post fire (top) and 6 months post fire (bottom).....	7-24
Figure 7-21: Location of the Georgetown ecosystem analogue area also the location of the sites (21, 30, 64 and 65, numbers in pink) for extensive ecohydrological studies (Marshall & Toll, 2012) .....	7-25
Figure 7-22: Seasonal variation of the leaf area index of the woodland at sites 21, 30, 64 and 65 in the Georgetown ecosystem analogue area.....	7-26
Figure 7-23: Total predicted storage versus total observed storage (Segura, 2016) .....	7-28
Figure 7-24: Observed transpiration of the overstorey at analogue site 21 .....	7-29
Figure 7-25: Trial landform plant available water status (within four metre waste rock layer) at the end of each dry season determined through modelled soil evaporation and understorey transpiration plus calculated overstorey transpiration (Jill Segura 2017, pers. comm., 24 August).....	7-30
Figure 7-26: Extent of radiation field investigations in LAAs 2008 – 2011 .....	7-36
Figure 7-27: Electrical conductivity and magnesium concentrations in Magela Creek downstream of Ranger, comparison of 2015-16 wet season with historical data (Dinnen, 2016).....	7-44

Figure 7-28: Bores used to represent groundwater background thresholds in colluvium and alluvium (aquifer 1). The hydrolytic unit that underlies these bores is the Nanambu Complex gneiss with minor Biotite Schist.....	7-49
Figure 7-29: Bores used to represent groundwater background thresholds in weathered bedrock (aquifer 2). Hydrolytic units that host these bores are as for Figure 7-26, and additionally include Cahill Formation Carbonate, Cahill Formation Chlorite – Sericite Schist.....	7-50
Figure 7-30: Bores used to represent groundwater background thresholds in unweathered bedrock (aquifer 3). Hydrolytic units that host these bores are as for Figure 7 28 and Figure 7 29. ....	7-51
Figure 7-31: 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). The eight colour-groups list the hydrolytic units in which groundwater are screened, which can also be identified in Figures 7-28 – 30. ....	7-52
Figure 7-32: Location of RPA statutory (yellow) and operational surface water monitoring sites.....	7-55
Figure 7-33: Relative contribution of COPC from waste rock, tailings and the natural environment (INTERA 2016) .....	7-60
Figure 7-34: Relationship between water quality trigger value expressed as magnesium (mg/L) and electrical conductivity (µS/cm) and exposure duration.....	7-66
Figure 7-35: Preliminary slope analysis looking at the steepest slopes.....	7-74
Figure 7-36: Catchment areas – Ranger conceptual landform (Lowry & Saynor, 2015) .....	7-75
Figure 7-37: Corridor Creek catchment – extent of erosion/deposition zones after simulated period of 10,000 years (Supervising Scientist, 2016d).....	7-76
Figure 7-38: Djalkmarra catchment – extent of erosion/deposition zones after simulated period of 10,000 years (Supervising Scientist, 2016d).....	7-77
Figure 7-39: Particle size distribution for waste rock in stockpiles (by fragmentation software).....	7-79
Figure 7-40: Watershed bounded network model sub-catchments.....	7-84
Figure 7-41: Revegetation conducted on Ranger mine (1982 – 1998).....	7-89
Figure 7-42: Proposed conservative provenance zone (bordered by the red line) and the GAC approved provenance zone within KNP (bordered by the blue line).....	7-92
Figure 7-43: Maps of plant analogue sites surveyed by Brennan (2005) (top and bottom) and (Hollingsworth et al., 2003a) (bottom) (source Humphrey et al., 2006) .....	7-94
Figure 7-44: 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 et al., 2012).].....	7-98
Figure 7-45: Mean intra-classification (C1-trial landform) and inter-classification (X vs Y) Bray-Curtis similarity. Error bars are standard deviations (Humphrey, 2016).....	7-99
Figure 7-46: Survey sites (courtesy of Eco Logical Australia).....	7-101
Figure 7-47: Indicative flowchart showing various numerical and solute transport model development for the RPA .....	7-104
Figure 7-48: Ranger conceptual model spatial scales (INTERA 2016) .....	7-107
Figure 7-49: Sitewide scale conceptual model, surface water (INTERA 2016) .....	7-110
Figure 7-50: Sitewide scale conceptual model water balance (INTERA 2016) .....	7-111
Figure 7-51: Seasonal surface water flow (INTERA 2016) .....	7-111
Figure 7-52: Mg solute loads at monitoring stations MCUS and MG009 and derived from the mine (INTERA 2016) .....	7-113
Figure 7-53: Operational groundwater flow (left) compared to post-closure groundwater flow (right) (INTERA 2016) .....	7-114

Figure 7-54: Schematic west to east cross-section through the tailings dam (TSF) for the current configuration and the final landform waste rock (INTERA 2016) .....	7-117
Figure 7-55: Schematic south to north cross-section through the tailings dam (TSF) for the current configuration and the final (INTERA 2016).....	7-118
Figure 7-56: Groundwater flow pathways from the processing plant area towards Pit 1, Pit 3, Georgetown Billabong and Corridor Creek tributary (INTERA 2016) .....	7-120
Figure 7-57: Uranium and manganese soil concentration versus depth; generally decreasing over depth (INTERA 2016) .....	7-122
Figure 7-58: Maximum uranium in groundwater (data from 2006 – 2015) (INTERA 2016).....	7-123
Figure 7-59: Maximum magnesium in groundwater (data from 2006 – 2015) (INTERA 2016) .....	7-123
Figure 7-60: Location of LAAs and associated monitoring bores discussed herein .....	7-124
Figure 7-61: Magnesium observed in groundwater where irrigated with pond water (bore DJ2) ....	7-125
Figure 7-62: Surface water sulfate concentrations in bores OB27, MC27, and MC27 Deep (top) and bores MC12, MC12 Deep, 23562, and 83/1 Deep (bottom) .....	7-125
Figure 7-63: Pit 3 cross-section (not to scale).....	7-129
Figure 7-64: Represented reach downstream of Gulungul Creek (orange arrow).....	7-138
Figure 7-65: Drainage conduits and nodes (yellow lines with blue nodes), contoured topography at 2 metres and 5 metres intervals. (The waste rock boundary area is colour coded with respect to sub-catchment area and waste rock thickness.) .....	7-138
Figure 7-66: Modelled calcium concentrations downstream of the RPA .....	7-139
Figure 7-67: Modelled magnesium concentrations downstream of the RPA .....	7-139
Figure 7-68: Modelled magnesium:calcium laboratory toxicity value ratios downstream of RPA....	7-140
Figure 7-69: Modelled manganese concentrations downstream of the RPA (log scale y-axis).....	7-140
Figure 7-70: Modelled uranium concentrations downstream of the RPA (log scale y-axis) .....	7-140
Figure 7-71: Modelled TAN concentrations downstream of the RPA (log scale y-axis) .....	7-141
Figure 7-72: Modelled nitrate concentrations downstream of the RPA.....	7-141
Figure 7-73: Size distribution of underfill samples.....	7-144
Figure 7-74: Compression test results for unsaturated underfill .....	7-146
Figure 7-75: Compression test results for saturated underfill .....	7-146
Figure 7-76: Results of permeability testing (standard falling head and constant head saturated hydraulic conductivity tests).....	7-148
Figure 7-77: Forecasted brine elevation in the Pit 3 underfill (unsaturated compression voidage reduced by 20 percent).....	7-149
Figure 8-1: Outcomes of the stage 1 assessment, with strategy 1 being the preferred technology (in orange) .....	8-11
Figure 8-2 Thickened tailings flow sheet .....	8-14
Figure 8-3: Pit 1 after the installation of vertical drains across the surface (2012) .....	8-16
Figure 8-4: Inline agglomeration flow sheet .....	8-17
Figure 8-5: Tailings neutralisation flow sheet.....	8-18
Figure 8-6: Tailings filtration flow sheet.....	8-19
Figure 8-7: Thickened, filtered and cemented tailings flow sheet .....	8-20



Figure 9-1: The ERA HSEQ risk framework (adapted from: AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009) .....	9-2
Figure 9-2: Distribution of risks across category (see Table 9-5).....	9-11
Figure 9-3: Distribution of risks across subcategory (see Table 9-5).....	9-11
Figure 9-4: Threat risk profile by consequence area.....	9-12
Figure 9-5: Control effectiveness by category.....	9-12
Figure 9-6: Catchment areas – Ranger conceptual landform (Supervising Scientist, 2016c) .....	9-20
Figure 9-7: 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 loadings.....	9-22
Figure 9-8: Bowtie analysis for loss of containment of process liquor (all activities); key areas of importance to risk TA3-01 are highlighted orange .....	9-26
Figure 9-9: Cross section across Pit 1 (10x vertical exaggeration) showing the deepest portion of the gully approximately 5 m above the consolidated tailings surface .....	9-30
Figure 9-10: A kapok tree naturally recruited from seeds produced by the 4 – 5 year old revegetation plants at the Ranger trial landform. Note that the seedling has actually grown on a weathered rock (waste rock only tubestock section, trial landform, 12 Oct 2016).....	9-34
Figure 9-11: Ranger trial landform revegetation (7 year old, waste rock and tubestock section, 16/06/2016). Note the relative size of a caravan parked next to the revegetation and E. phoenicea in full bloom .....	9-35
Figure 9-12: Pathways for exposure of members of the public post closure .....	9-39
Figure 10-1: 2012 closure summary.....	10-7
Figure 10-2: 2013 closure summary.....	10-8
Figure 10-3: 2014 closure summary.....	10-9
Figure 10-4: 2015 closure summary.....	10-10
Figure 10-5: 2016 closure summary.....	10-11
Figure 10-6: 2017 closure summary.....	10-12
Figure 10-7: 2018 closure summary.....	10-13
Figure 10-8: 2019 closure summary.....	10-14
Figure 10-9: 2020 closure summary.....	10-15
Figure 10-10: 2021 closure summary.....	10-16
Figure 10-11: 2022 closure summary.....	10-17
Figure 10-12: 2023 closure summary.....	10-18
Figure 10-13: 2024 closure summary.....	10-19
Figure 10-14: 2025 closure summary.....	10-20
Figure 10-15: 2026 closure summary.....	10-21
Figure 10-16: Pit 1 in 2012, showing the installation of approximately 7,700 vertical wick drains ..	10-23
Figure 10-17: Pit 1 tailings consolidation monitoring, settlement plates A-I .....	10-27
Figure 10-18: Pit 1 tailings consolidation monitoring, settlement plates J-N .....	10-28
Figure 10-19: Pit 1 tailings consolidation monitoring, settlement plates O-U .....	10-28
Figure 10-20: Pit 1 tailings consolidation monitoring, settlement plates V-BB .....	10-29
Figure 10-21: Pit 1 average tailings level .....	10-29
Figure 10-22: Pit tailings flux volume, modelled versus measured – post 2008 .....	10-30
Figure 10-23: Pit 1 tailings surface as at September 2016 with settlement monitoring locations....	10-31

Figure 10-24: Pit 1 backfill design showing final stage of low 2s .....	10-32
Figure 10-25: Pit 1 backfill design cross section of low 2s placement .....	10-33
Figure 10-26: OPSIM forecast total dissolved solids concentration in process water.....	10-35
Figure 10-27: Flow diagram of brine injection and tailings transfer .....	10-38
Figure 10-28: Indicative Pit 3 backfill (INTERA 2014a; Figure 1.2) .....	10-42
Figure 10-29: Flow diagram of tailings transfer .....	10-43
Figure 10-30: Expressed water from Pit 3.....	10-44
Figure 10-31: Reclamation areas .....	10-56
Figure 10-32: Pit 1 area and adjacent grade 1 stockpile.....	10-58
Figure 10-33: Tailings dam area.....	10-59
Figure 10-34: Processing plant area, including ROM pad.....	10-60
Figure 10-35: Pit 3 void area and sources of fill from stockpile areas .....	10-61
Figure 10-36: Categories of backfill techniques .....	10-62
Figure 10-37: Backfill contour map.....	10-64
Figure 10-38: Bulk backfill plan view, Sections 1 and 2 .....	10-65
Figure 10-39: Bulk backfill plan view, Section 2.....	10-65
Figure 10-40: Bulk backfill plan view, Section 3.....	10-66
Figure 10-41: Bulk backfill plan view, Section 4.....	10-66
Figure 10-42: Bulk backfill plan view, Section 5.....	10-67
Figure 10-43: Key elements of the concept recessed rock check hydraulic design .....	10-71
Figure 10-44: Key elements of the concept sediment basin hydraulic design .....	10-75
Figure 10-45: Sediment basin location.....	10-77
Figure 10-46: "Rotree" cultivator attached to a 20 tonne environment excavator (at Jabiluka).....	10-81
Figure 10-47: 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 will be rougher due to waste rock substrate.).....	10-82
Figure 10-48: Photos (a, b) of the erosion plot 1 (dry) and plot 2 (wet) on the trial landform. With larger spacing between rip lines, there will be more flat area for traversing than shown above.....	10-82
Figure 11-1: Proposed surface water monitoring point (e.g. represented reach) past the Magela Creek and Gulungul Creek confluence .....	11-5
Figure 11-2: Proposed location of Pit 1 monitoring bores .....	11-9
Figure 11-3: Location of Pit 3 monitoring bores .....	11-10
Figure 11-4: Two alternatives for proposed cultural criteria monitoring sites and access roads ...	11-15



## TABLES

Table 1-1: Structure and content of this MCP .....	1-11
Table 2 1: Historical weather data, Jabiru Airport .....	2-5
Table 2 2: Brief description of characteristics of soils around the Ranger mine (refer Figure 2-3).....	2-7
Table 2 3: Soil hydraulic conductivity .....	2-8
Table 2 4: Typical erosion susceptibility of soils.....	2-8
Table 2 5: Background threshold concentrations of COPC (Esslemont, 2017) .....	2-19
Table 2 6: Area and proportion of vegetation communities on the RPA and Kakadu.....	2-27
Table 2 7: Priority weeds in the RPA.....	2-30
Table 2 8: Conservation listed species known to occur on the RPA (adapted from Firth, 2012).....	2-32
Table 2 9: Feral fauna species known to occur in Kakadu National Park and the RPA .....	2-35
Table 3-1: Indicative ore grades and mineral type .....	3-6
Table 3-2: Water classes and their management (Deacon, 2017).....	3-13
Table 3-3: LAA description of generalised water management .....	3-19
Table 4-1: Visitation purpose and frequency.....	4-2
Table 4-2: Closure objectives .....	4-3
Table 5-1: ERA's external stakeholders .....	5-1
Table 5-2: Internal stakeholders.....	5-3
Table 5-3: Engagement forums .....	5-5
Table 6 1: Closure criteria – landform .....	6-5
Table 6 2: Closure criteria – radiation .....	6-10
Table 6 3: Closure criteria – water and sediment.....	6-19
Table 6 4: Closure criteria – flora and fauna .....	6-29
Table 6 5: Closure criteria – soils .....	6-36
Table 6 6: Closure criteria – cultural.....	6-38
Table 6 7: Suggested indicators of cultural health of rehabilitated site (Garde, 2015) .....	6-39
Table 6 8: Example of scalar measurement tool for cultural criteria monitoring .....	6-40
Table 6 9: Stakeholder acceptance of ERA draft criteria in mid-2017 .....	6-41
Table 6 10: Progress of the Supervising Scientist's rehabilitation standards as at June 2017 (source: Supervising Scientist Annual Technical Report 2016-17) .....	6-42
Table 7-1: Consolidation model results, comparison of 2014 and current.....	7-6
Table 7-2: Plot 1 annual rainfall, runoff volume and total dissolved solids load data from 2009 to 2012 (Saynor et al., 2014) .....	7-19
Table 7-3: Annual mean concentrations in trial landform surface runoff and Magela and Gulungul creeks (standard error) (Saynor et al., 2014) .....	7-19
Table 7-4: Particle size distribution of the waste rock substrate of the trial landform (Lu, 2014a). Sand, silt and clay make up 100% of the fine material (particles < 2 mm).....	7-26

Table 7-5: Potential plant available water holding capacity (mm) of the waste rock substrate of the trial landform (Segura, 2016).....	7-27
Table 7-6: Observed plant available (PAWobs) at the trial landform for seven consecutive dry seasons. Additional plant available water from dry season rainfall has been added to the end of wet season maximum PAWobs. Wet season rain is the total rainfall prior to the studied dry season (Jill Segura 2017, pers. comm., 24 August).....	7-28
Table 7-7: Difference between dry season water requirements of tropical woodland based on the data from Hutley et al., (2000) and Cook et al., (1998) versus plant available water as given in Table 7-6 for each year at the trial landform.....	7-30
Table 7-8: Pre-mining radiological baseline determined by the Supervising Scientist (Bollhöfer et al., 2014).....	7-32
Table 7-9: Estimated baseline groundwater radionuclide concentrations (Esslemont, 2015) .....	7-32
Table 7-10: Magela Creek upstream radionuclide concentrations (2010 – 2014 average) .....	7-33
Table 7-11: Radionuclide concentrations in local bush foods .....	7-34
Table 7-12: Effective dose rate estimate during future occupancy of the LAAs for an adult (Akber & Lu, 2012).....	7-38
Table 7-13: Baseline values from Klessa (2000) and ERA LIMS database 1992-2017; results are for filtered fraction except for <sup>226</sup> Ra.....	7-41
Table 7-14: Background threshold concentrations of COPC (Esslemont, 2015).....	7-47
Table 7-15: Magnesium and sulfate loads (tonnes) in Magela Creek.....	7-58
Table 7-16: Predicted loads of tailings sourced COPC entering Magela and/or Corridor Creek adjacent to the pits compared to past site specific limits and/or catchment loads .....	7-61
Table 7-17: Predicted concentrations (micrograms/litre) of additional tailings sourced COPC reporting downstream of the Magela and Gulungul Creek confluence compared to guidelines.....	7-62
Table 7-18: COPC in sediment and retention sumps.....	7-63
Table 7-19: Uranium concentrations in sediment and retention sumps.....	7-64
Table 7-20: Water quality trigger values for magnesium and electrical conductivity for different exposure durations (Hogan et al., 2012) .....	7-66
Table 7-21: Particle size distribution for waste rock landform (by sieve analysis) .....	7-79
Table 7-22: Rehabilitated waste rock landform properties.....	7-81
Table 7-23: Analogue landscape properties.....	7-82
Table 7-24: Design flow rates at selected locations (m3/s) – long term (LT) scenario .....	7-84
Table 7-25: Design flow rates at selected locations (m3/s) – short term (ST) scenario .....	7-85
Table 7-26: Small-scale revegetation trials conducted on the RPA (1982 – 1998) .....	7-86
Table 7-27: Revegetation species list .....	7-95
Table 7-28: Descriptions of the Ranger analogue communities .....	7-98
Table 7-29: Select previous conceptual models related to the Ranger mine (INTERA 2016).....	7-106
Table 7-30: 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).....	7-116
Table 7-31: Peak annual magnesium loadings from Pit 3 sources with and without low permeability caps .....	7-116
Table 7-32: Contaminated sites located in or near the processing plant area (INTERA 2016) .....	7-118
Table 7-33: Comparison of average annual loadings of COPC to Magela Creek – with and without low permeability caps.....	7-133
Table 7-34: Ranger stockpile samples .....	7-143



Table 7-35: Average of Samples 1, 3 and 4 compression test work results .....	7-147
Table 7-36: Forecasted brine elevation in Pit 3 underfill (unsaturated compression voidage reduced by 20 percent) .....	7-149
Table 8-1: Explanation of relevant matters/criteria to be included in BPT assessment (SSD 2001) ...	8-1
Table 8-2: BPT technology and ranking system .....	8-5
Table 8-3: Initial closure strategies to be assessed .....	8-11
Table 8-4: Final closure strategies assessed .....	8-12
Table 8-5: Tailings neutralisation advantages and disadvantages .....	8-18
Table 8-6: Supplementary tailings treatment assessment .....	8-20
Table 8-7: BPT assessment matrix for tailings treatment for categories Culture and Heritage and Protection of People and the Environment during the operational phase .....	8-22
Table 8-8: BPT assessment matrix for tailings treatment for categories Fit for Purpose and Operational Adequacy .....	8-23
Table 8-9: BPT assessment matrix for tailings treatment for categories Rehabilitation and Closure, and Constructability .....	8-24
Table 9-1: Likelihood classification .....	9-6
Table 9-2: Risk assessment matrix .....	9-6
Table 9-3: Consequence classes .....	9-7
Table 9-4: Control effectiveness .....	9-9
Table 9-5: Risk breakdown structure .....	9-10
Table 9-6: Summary of Class III risks across subcategories .....	9-13
Table 9-7: Loads of COPC emanating from the combined sources (waste rock, tailings and brine/PTF) from Pits 1 and 3 for the years when each of these sources peaks .....	9-24
Table 10-1: Current schedule of closure tasks .....	10-2
Table 10-2: Progress toward Pit 1 closure milestones .....	10-22
Table 10-3: Progress toward water treatment milestones .....	10-35
Table 10-4: Void volume of Pit 3 underfill – actual compared to ITWC PFS calculated .....	10-36
Table 10-5: Progress toward brine management milestones .....	10-39
Table 10-6: Progress toward Pit 3 closure milestone .....	10-39
Table 10-7: Pit 3 versus Pit 1 consolidation .....	10-40
Table 10-8: Progress toward tailings management milestones .....	10-46
Table 10-9: Progress toward contaminated sites milestones .....	10-50
Table 10-10: Progress toward processing plant closure milestones .....	10-53
Table 10-11: Progress toward water storage milestones .....	10-53
Table 10-12: Summary values for reclamation areas .....	10-55
Table 10-13: Drainage channel assessment for each sub-catchment .....	10-70
Table 10-14: Drainage channels – preliminary concave slope sizing .....	10-72
Table 10-15: Sediment basin - settling pond sizing .....	10-75
Table 10-16: Sediment basin - rock sizing .....	10-76
Table 10-17: General design – species selection and plant distribution .....	10-83



Table 10-18: Potential understorey grass and legume species (Lu, 2017)..... 10-84

Table 11-1: Examples of remedial work that may be triggered during the stabilisation and monitoring phase ..... 11-2

Table 11-2: Parameters and locations for surface water monitoring to assess compliance with closure criteria for each outcome focus ..... 11-6

Table 11-3: Parameters for proposed and existing monitoring bores for Pit 1 and Pit 3 closure..... 11-8

Table 11-4: Suggested indicators of cultural health of rehabilitated site (Garde, 2015) ..... 11-13

Table 11-5: Example of scalar measurement tool for cultural criteria monitoring ..... 11-14

Table 11-6: Trigger, Action, Response Plan ..... 11-17

Table 12-1: Indicative data collection types ..... 12-2

## APPENDICES

Appendix 1.1 RPA Rehabilitation and Closure Approvals Framework .....Chapter 1

Appendix 1.2 RPA Min Closure Plan Assessment Process.....Chapter 1

Appendix 5.1 ERA Technical Fora Engagement Register .....Chapter 5

Appendix 7.1 Consolidation Model A .....Chapter 7

Appendix 7.2 Consolidation Model B .....Chapter 7

Appendix 8.1 2011-12 ITWC PFS BPT Assessment .....Chapter 8

Appendix 9.1 Ranger Closure Risk Assessment.....Chapter 9

Appendix 10.1 Schedule of Activities (Q4 2017 – 2020).....Chapter 10

Appendix 10.2 Revegetation Strategy.....Chapter 10

### Reference List

### Glossary

### Abbreviations and Acronyms

### Chemical Symbols and Formulae

### Symbols / Units of Measurements

### List of Contributors