

Appendix 4

Assessment of Environmental Risk

(Total No. of pages including blank pages = 14)

This page has intentionally been left blank

A4.1 ANALYSIS OF RISK

As part of a preliminary environmental risk assessment, and in accordance with Australian and International Standards HB 203:2012, HB 89:2012 and AS/ISO 310100:2009, environmental parameters that could be affected by the Proposal were identified. Risk sources, potentially affected receptors or environments, potential consequences and specific potential impacts were then identified. A review of the proposed operations, the local environment and other factors was undertaken to identify the likely consequence and likelihood of each potential environmental impact.

The determination of consequence was based on the definitions contained in **Table A4.1**. It is noted that the assigned consequence rating represents the highest level applicable, i.e. if a potential impact is assigned a level of 4 - Major based on cost of remediation and 2 - Minor based on area of impact, the consequence level assigned would be 4 - Major. The likelihood or probability of each impact occurring was then rated according to the definitions contained in **Table A4.1**.

Table A4.1
Qualitative Consequence Rating

Level	Severity Level	Consequence Types						
		Financial	Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/ Cultural Heritage	Government Regulation	Public / Community Relations	Legal
1	Negligible	<\$10,000	No injury or review required	Minor impact on biological or physical environment	Minor social issues, repairable damage	Minor incident (Non-reportable) (passes the 'no material harm' assessment)	Minor adverse local public or media attention or complaints	
2	Minor	\$20,000 - \$100,000	First aid treatment required but no lost time or restricted duties	Short-term impact not affecting ecosystem functions	Minor medium-term social impacts on local population. Mostly repairable	Reportable incident (administrative or with minimal material harm) (minimal threat of action by regulator)	Attention from media and/or heightened concern by local community	Isolated complaint / incident with a threat of legal action
3	Moderate	\$100,000 - \$1M	Medical treatment leading to lost time or restricted duties	Short term impairment of ecosystem affecting function	On-going social issues, damage to items of cultural significance	Reportable incident (notable material harm or repeat of previous incident) (real threat of action by regulator)	Adverse media / public / NGO attention	Significant level of complaints / incidents with a high threat of legal action
4	Major	\$1M-\$5M	Hospitalisation required leading to permanent injury	Medium term impairment of an ecosystem	Significant social issues, significant damage to structures / items of cultural significance	Reportable incident (major material harm) (action by regulator almost certain)	Major public embarrassment / adverse media coverage	Serious breach of regulation leading to litigation
5	Severe	>\$5.0M	Fatality	Long-term impairment of ecosystem	On-going serious social issues, major permanent impact to cultural and heritage sites	Reportable incident (extensive material harm) (severe action by regulator almost certain)	Serious public or media outcry (national coverage) /major reputation impact	Significant prosecution and fines, litigation including class action

Source: Rating modified after HB 89:2012 and HB 203:2012

The risk associated with each environmental impact was assessed **without** the inclusion of any specific operational controls or systems, mitigation measures or other safeguards in place (other than standard environmental management practices). Based on the assessment of consequence and likelihood, an overall risk ranking of Negligible, Minor, Moderate, Major or Severe was assigned to each potential impact based on the matrix of **Table A4.2**.

Table A4.2
Qualitative Likelihood Rating

Level	Descriptor	Description
A	Certain	Is an ongoing occurrence or will occur under all conditions
B	Almost Certain	Is expected to occur in most circumstances
C	Likely	Will probably occur in most circumstances
D	Possible	Will probably occur under favourable circumstances
E	Unlikely	May occur, but only under favourable circumstances
F	Rare	Not expected to occur, unless subject to exceptional circumstances
G	Very Rare	Theoretically possible but not expected to occur

Source: Rating modified after HB 89:2012 – Figure B7

The four levels of risk that have been identified for this Proposal based upon **Table A4.3** are defined as follows.

- Low (L): can be managed by routine procedures and unlikely to require specific application of resources.
- Medium (M): can be managed to minimise the potential for environmental harm by the implementation of specific monitoring programs and response procedures. Responsibility for the implementation of monitoring and management activities must be specified.
- High (H): requires the development of specific management or action plans identifying specific monitoring, trigger levels for contingency management and specification as to the roles and responsibilities of personnel to implement contingency management. Senior executive management attention is required to ensure appropriate resources are available to manage this risk.
- Very High (VH): presents a risk which may not be able to be satisfactorily managed by the development and implementation of management plans. Board attention needed to identify alternative methods of operation to reduce the risk to a level where it can be satisfactorily managed.

Table A4.3
Risk Ranking

Likelihood	Consequences				
	1 Negligible	2 Minor	3 Moderate	4 Major	5 Severe
A Certain	M	H	H	VH	VH
B Almost Certain	M	M	H	VH	VH
C Likely	M	M	H	H	VH
D Possible	L	M	M	H	H
E Unlikely	L	L	M	M	H
F Rare	L	L	L	M	M
G Very Rare	L	L	L	L	M

Source: Modified after HB 89:2012 - Figure B8

Following the identification of environmental risk sources for those parameters which could be affected by the Proposal (e.g. water resources, ecology, heritage, etc.), the likely receptor(s), potential environmental outcome and the likelihood and consequence of specific impacts of these outcomes (if not mitigated) have been reviewed. The Applicant has assumed the implementation of standard control measures and the risk for each assessed based on the classifications and definitions provided in **Tables A4.1, A4.2 and A4.3**).

The results of the risk analysis have been reviewed and confirmed by the Applicant and are presented in **Table A4.4**.

Table A4.4
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 1 of 9

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – TRAFFIC							
• Ongoing traffic levels on the public road network.	• Road users of the Hume Highway.	• Ongoing truck traffic and possible congestion.	• Inconvenience to commuters.	Minor (2)	Possible (D)	M	5.1.6
			• Increased risk of accidents occurring.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
		• Deterioration of road surface.	• Accelerated road pavement deterioration.	Minor (2)	Rare (F)	L	
	• Residences in the vicinity of the Quarry Interchange.	• Ongoing truck traffic and vehicle noise/emissions.	• Reduced amenity of local area (noting presence of nearby traffic on the Hume Highway).	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
	• Native fauna.	• Death or injury to native animals on the road network.	• Loss of species in local area.	Negligible (1)	Possible (D)	L	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – GROUNDWATER							
• Reductions in groundwater flow.	• Local groundwater users.	• Reduction in the volume of water contained within local aquifers / availability.	• Reduced yields of groundwater bores.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	5.2.7
	• Local streams, creeks and rivers.	• Reduction in base flows / spring flows.	• Reduced discharge to receiving systems.	Minor (2)	Likely (C)	M	
			• Degradation of riparian or aquatic vegetation/ecosystems.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
			• Reduced availability of water to downstream users.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	
	• Groundwater dependent ecosystems.	• Reduced availability of groundwater.	• Degradation of groundwater dependent ecosystems.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	
<div><div>Low</div><div>Medium</div><div>High</div><div>Critical</div></div>							





Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 2 of 9

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – GROUNDWATER (Cont'd)							
• Groundwater contaminated with hydrocarbons.	• Local users of groundwater for resident/business purposes.	• Reduced groundwater quality.	• Reduced availability to local users.	Minor (2)	Very Rare (G)	L	5.2.7
	• Groundwater dependent ecosystems.	• Reduced groundwater quality.	• Degradation of groundwater dependent ecosystems.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	
	• Local streams, creeks, rivers and aquatic habitat.	• Local surface water bodies become contaminated.	• Reduced availability of water to downstream users.	Minor (2)	Very Rare (G)	L	
		• Degradation of habitat quality.	• Degradation of riparian or aquatic vegetation / ecosystems.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – SURFACE WATER							
• Reduction in environmental flows through on-site capture of water.	• Long Swamp Creek.	• Reduced natural surface water flows.	• Reduced flows to Long Swamp Creek.	Minor (2)	Likely (C)	M	5.3.3
	• Downstream water users.	• Reduced natural surface water flows.	• Reduced availability of water to downstream users.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	
	• Local flora, terrestrial and aquatic fauna.	• Reduced volume of water available to local flora and fauna.	• Stress and possible reduction in viability of native vegetation.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
			• Degradation of riparian or aquatic vegetation/ecosystems.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
• Discharge of dirty or contaminated water.	• Local creeks and tributaries.	• Decreased water quality.	• Temporary sedimentation or hydrocarbon pollution of downstream waters.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	5.3.3
			• Ongoing sedimentation or major hydrocarbon pollution of downstream waters.	Major (4)	Rare (F)	M	
<div><div></div> Low<div></div> Medium<div></div> High<div></div> Critical</div>							

Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 3 of 9

Page 3 of 6

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – SURFACE WATER (Cont'd)							
• Discharge of dirty or contaminated water. (Cont'd)	• Site soils and vegetation.	• Contamination of soil resources.	• Reduced potential for future land uses.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	
	• Local and regional catchment ecosystem.	• Introduction of a toxic compound to the environment.	• Health-related impacts (people) due to consumption of contaminated water.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	
			• Pollution of local waterways resulting in detrimental effects to flora and fauna.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
	• Livestock.	• Contamination of soil and water resources.	• Health-related impacts (stock) due to consumption of contaminated water.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
• Erosive actions of water.	• Site soils.	• Loss of topsoil.	• Soil erosion and loss of agriculturally productive capacity.	Minor (2)	Possible (D)	M	
			• Decreased availability of soil for rehabilitation.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – NOISE AND VIBRATION							
• Noise from fixed and mobile plant.	• Local residents, business and land owners.	• Increased noise levels.	• Noise levels cause annoyance and/or distractions.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	5.4.5.2
		• Impacts on the health and well-being of local residents.	• Noise levels cause adverse effects on physical or mental health.	Major (4)	Unlikely (E)	M	
		• Complaints to Applicant by community.	• Community and regulatory scrutiny.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
	• Native fauna.	• Detrimental effects on local fauna.	• Relocation of and/or reduction of local native fauna species due to noise disturbance.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
			• Possible loss of species in the local area.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
<div><div></div> Low<div></div> Medium<div></div> High<div></div> Critical</div>							





Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 4 of 9

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – NOISE AND VIBRATION (Cont'd)							
• Noise from fixed and mobile plant. (Cont'd)	• Local livestock.	• Impact on livestock health and/or productivity.	• Reduced agricultural productivity.	Minor (2)	Rare (F)	L	
• Noise from trucks transporting quarry products off site.	• Local residents, business and land owners.	• Increased noise levels.	• Noise levels cause annoyance and/or distractions.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
		• Impacts on the health and well-being of local residents.	• Noise levels cause adverse effects on physical or mental health.	Major (4)	Unlikely (E)	M	
		• Complaints to Applicant by community.	• Community and regulatory scrutiny.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
• Vibration from extraction operations on site.	• Local residents, business and land owners.	• Nuisance/amenity impacts on surrounding landowners / residents.	• Reduced local amenity.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	5.4.5.3
		• Structural damage to buildings and structures.	• Structural damage to buildings and structures.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
		• Complaints to Applicant by community.	• Community and regulatory scrutiny.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY							
• Clearing of vegetation.	• Regional biota.	• Reduction in remnant native vegetation.	• Reduction in local biodiversity.	Minor (2)	Likely (C)	M	2.14, 5.5.5
		• Loss of local and regionally important threatened species (flora and fauna).	• Local or regional reduction in distribution of threatened species, populations and EECs.	Minor (2)	Likely (C)	M	
		• Reduced local and regional biodiversity.	• Loss of biodiversity and alteration to existing habitat.	Minor (2)	Likely (C))	M	
• Detrimental indirect effects of Proposal impacts, e.g. noise, dust, lighting.	• Locally occurring species, populations and communities.	• Dispersal of locally occurring species and populations away from the Site.	• Reduced biodiversity value of the Site and local setting.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
		• Reduced potential for use of the Site by threatened species, populations and EECs.	• Reduced local distribution of threatened species, populations and EECs.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
<div><div></div> Low<div></div> Medium<div></div> High<div></div> Critical</div>							

Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 5 of 9

Page 3 of 6

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – AQUATIC ECOLOGY							
• Discharge of dirty or contaminated water.	• Local creeks and tributaries.	• Decreased water quality.	• Detrimental effects to flora and fauna.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	5.6.5
			• Sedimentation or major hydrocarbon pollution event impacting on aquatic ecosystem for medium to long term.	Major (4)	Rare (F)	M	
	• Groundwater dependent ecosystems.	• Reduced groundwater quality.	• Degradation of groundwater dependent ecosystems.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	
• Detrimental indirect effects of Proposal impacts, e.g.reduced flow, changes to geomorphic function.	• Locally occurring species, populations and communities.	• Reduced potential habitat for threatened species, populations and EECs.	• Reduced local distribution of threatened species, populations and EECs.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	L	
			• Degradation of riparian or aquatic vegetation / ecosystems	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	L	
<div><div>Low</div><div>Medium</div><div>High</div><div>Critical</div></div>							





Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – ABORIGINAL CULTURAL HERITAGE							
• Removal or destruction of known Aboriginal sites and/or artefacts.	• Local archaeological setting.	• Damage or destruction of Aboriginal artefacts or site.	• Destruction of identified site.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	5.7.5
			• Cumulative reduction of the in situ archaeological record.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	
• Removal or destruction of currently unidentified Aboriginal sites and/or artefacts.	• Local archaeological setting.	• Damage or destruction of Aboriginal artefacts or site.	• Destruction of site not yet identified on archaeological record.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
			• Cumulative reduction of the in situ archaeological record.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – HISTORIC HERITAGE							
• Removal or destruction of sites of heritage significance due to proposed activities.	• Local archaeological setting.	• Loss or damage to heritage sites.	• Loss or destruction of items of heritage significance.	Moderate (3)	Very Rare (G)	L	None applicable
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS							
• Dust from extraction and processing operations, stockpiles and exposed surfaces. • Dust from vehicle movements within the Quarry Operations Area or the Quarry Access Road.	• Residences and other local buildings.	• Increased deposited dust and associated nuisance for local residents and business.	• Nuisance/amenity impacts from dust deposited on window sills, cars, etc.	Minor (2)	Possible (D)	M	5.9.6
	• Local residents, business and land owners.	• Increased particulate matter (in particular PM ₁₀) in the atmosphere.	• Adverse health impacts (if PM ₁₀ levels are excessive).	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
		• Complaints to Applicant by community.	• Community and regulatory scrutiny.	Minor (2)	Possible (D)	M	
	• Surface water bodies.	• Reduction in local water quality.	• Exceedance surface water quality.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	

Low
 Medium
 High
 Critical

Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 7 of 9

Page 7 of 8

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS (Cont'd)							
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Surrounding native vegetation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduction in vegetation or mortality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduced condition of local vegetation or value as fauna habitat.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Particulate and greenhouse emissions from vehicles and fixed and mobile plant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Local and regional air shed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increased in greenhouse gas emissions to atmosphere.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Contribution to greenhouse effect.	Negligible (1)	Certain (A)	M	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Dust from extraction and processing operations, stockpiles and exposed surfaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Residents in adjoining landholdings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increase in concentrations of respirable silica in the atmosphere.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Adverse health impacts such as a respirable disease.	Major (4)	Rare (E)	L	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – SOILS							
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of soil resources as a result of land preparation activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Site soil resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduced soil resource to undertake appropriate rehabilitation program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Rehabilitation outcomes not meeting objectives.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	5.10.9
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Degradation of soil resources as a result of stockpiling.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Site soil resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Compromised soil quality leads to poor vegetation regrowth on site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Reduced productivity on final landform.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Erosion as a result of vegetation clearing, from stockpiles or following soil replacement during rehabilitation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Site soil resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Loss of soil resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Rehabilitation outcomes not meeting objectives.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">On and off site surface water bodies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Sedimentation of on-site and local surface water bodies resulting in poor water quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increased erosion on the final landform.	Minor (2)	Possible (D)	M	
<div><div></div> Low<div></div> Medium<div></div> High<div></div> Critical</div>							





Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 6 of 8

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – VISIBILITY							
• Changes in the visual character of the locality.	• Surrounding residents.	• Visibility of the quarry from local residences.	• Decreased visual amenity of local setting.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	5.11.4
	• Motorists (Hume Highway).	• Visibility of the quarry from local roads.	• Decreased visual amenity.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – REHABILITATION							
• Rehabilitated soils and vegetation of the Site.	• Future land use.	• Soils and vegetation quality and suitability for future use is compromised or restricted.	• Rehabilitation outcomes do not meet objectives.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	2.13
	• Surrounding residences.	• Poor rehabilitation.	• Reduced amenity of the final landform.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
• Final landform and topography of the Site.	• Surrounding residences.	• Altered landforms.	• Reduced amenity of the final landform resultant from altered topography.	Minor (2)	Likely (C)	M	
	• Future land use.	• Landform unsuitable for proposed final land use.	• Final landform and land use incompatible with surrounding landscape.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – BUSH FIRE							
• Initiation of bush fire due to on Site activities.	• Local residents, business and land owners.	• Health and safety impacts to Proposal personnel.	• Loss of life, assets and property on site and in surrounding area.	Major (4)	Rare (F)	M	5.13.3
		• Reduction of operating performance for site and surrounding businesses.	• Property damage and impacts on production.	Major (4)	Rare (F)	M	
	• Native flora and fauna.	• Destruction and damage of native flora and fauna.	• Reduced biodiversity value of the Site.	Moderate (3)	Rare (F)	L	
<div><div></div> Low<div></div> Medium<div></div> High<div></div> Critical</div>							

Table A4.4 (Cont'd)
Analysis of Environmental Risk for the Sutton Forest Sand Quarry

Page 9 of 9

Risk Source(s)	Receptor / Surrounding Environment	Potential Consequence	Potential Impact	Standard Control Measures			Proposed Control Measures EIS Section Ref.
				Consequence	Likelihood	Risk	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUE – SOCIO-ECONOMIC							
• Increase in local employment.	• Local community and residents.	• Increased employment levels.	• Increase in economic well-being within the LGA.	Positive Impact			5.14.5
			• Change in local community structure as a result of income disparity.	Minor (2)	Unlikely (E)	L	
			• Inability of existing services and infrastructure to meet needs of community.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
• Proximity of quarry to local and neighbouring properties.	• Local community and residents.	• Perceived / loss of amenity at local and neighbouring properties.	• Change of social activities in local communities and impact on feelings of well-being derived from associated location.	Moderate (3)	Possible (D)	M	
	• Local tourist related business.	• Perceived loss of amenity at local service centre and winery.	• Impacts to business viability.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
• Detrimental impacts to land values.	• Local business and landowners.	• Perceived / loss of land values arising from quarry's operation.	• Reduction in land values.	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
• Detrimental impacts to agricultural resources.	• Local business and landowners.	• Loss of agricultural resources (land and water)	• Loss of income	Moderate (3)	Unlikely (E)	M	
<div><div></div> Low<div></div> Medium<div></div> High<div></div> Critical</div>							

