

Department of Defence Verbal Responses to submission re Talisman Sabre 2007 Joint Exercise with U.S Military

Below in blue are answers to the 48 questions I posed in my submission about the exercise in Shoal Water Bay, Central Queensland, mainly concerning its potential environmental impacts. I received these responses in a three-hour meeting I had with eight Department of Defence (DOD) officials with different areas of expertise, in late April 2007. I was given this opportunity subsequent to contacting Rockhampton ABC radio about the lack of the promised feedback to public submissions. I was also given a full-day tour of the Shoal Water Bay Training Area. I thank the Department of Defence staff for their time.

Obviously my focus is narrower than many fellow activists or residents; but environmental management is an area in which I can make some meaningful contribution, as I used to be an environmental scientist. It does not touch on the wider aspects of peace, militarisation or political alliances. Public servants are unable to comment on these matters, which we need to address to their political masters, so I didn't bring them up. However, the answers may alleviate some of the environmental concerns of local residents, as they provide more information than we have received to date; while unfortunately leaving a few of our anxieties alive and well.

After receiving this briefing I was partly reassured that at least there were systems in place to minimise harm and manage this sensitive and precious environment. However, as anyone with government experience knows, policies and plans may bear little resemblance to what actually occurs on the ground. But seeing is believing. Subsequent to my visit to the eastern sector of the Shoal Water Bay Training Area (ie the most environmentally sensitive area), I now believe that the military's impact on the area is much less than we fear and is probably better managed than the impact we residents have outside the training area. I also believe this is at least partly due to the continued interest and actions by concerned locals over the years, as some aspects of this high level of monitoring and management appear to be relatively new.

However, I still am very concerned about the issue of emergency and evacuation procedures in the unlikely but possible event of an accident on a nuclear powered vessel that releases radiation. This concern is based on the lack of coordinated action in the recent tsunami alert. Most people living and working close to the coast in CQ were unaware of the morning alert until they watched the evening news. It has become obvious there are no public warning systems in place or any effective coordinated emergency evacuation procedures. So if nuclear materials are released in an accident during the exercise, we could be in the same position as the Ukrainians after Chernobyl – that is, downwind and in the dark.

I have reported the answers as accurately as memory and notes allow. My own comments to some DOD answers are in italics.

Julie Davies (Livingstone Shire Resident, Central Queensland)

Email: virago@westnet.com.au

Talisman Sabre 2007 – Response to Public Environment Report

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Statement of Environment and Heritage Principles	i		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the principles binding on the US government? Yes. Statement is signed off by Chief of Defence of both governments and is a commitment adhered to for all joint training exercises. 2. Does the "lead role" the ADF takes mean that Australian Government decisions on the way in which war games are conducted and matériel used are binding on the US Government? Yes. It doesn't matter who's involved in the exercise; this is always done in accordance with Australian government standards and Australia always has lead planning role, regardless of which country is involved.
Public Environment Report	i	<p>The PER is not annotated as a draft document, although it states that it will be finalised after public feedback is considered.</p> <p>There is no indication on the document about when feedback is due. You may need to extend any deadline for responses if other respondents don't know it.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Will those providing feedback receive responses to specific issues raised? Yes, only one document will be provided as individual answers to respondents were deemed not possible. This will be released soon. <p><i>(There appears to have been few submissions, so individual responses should not have been onerous. The single formal response turned out to be a new appendix to the final PER, the rest of which was simply a slightly tweaked version of the original document that raised the specific questions in the first place. I cannot speak for others who made submissions but it doesn't provide the details I sought, so I am grateful for the time the DOD staff gave me to remedy this.)</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Unmanned aerial & marine vehicles	ii	An unmanned drone from a previous exercise was recently found on a local beach.	4. Will any of these vehicles that malfunction or are lost during the exercise be searched for and retrieved and any not able to be retrieved notified to the relevant Queensland state/local authorities? Yes, there is considerable effort to recover these items as they are very expensive. One was previously recovered in CQ but it had actually floated there from Jervis Bay 2000kms away. Each drone has failsafe systems and is monitored by the Civil Aviation Authority and local airport air traffic controllers. They contain no explosive or dangerous materials, simply electronic surveying and recording equipment. The unmanned vehicles to be used in SWBTA have a limited amount of fuel on board (around 4L).

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Rapid construction of airfield at Bradshaw Field Training Area	ii	<p>External environmental impact assessment under the EB&C Act is required for non-routine training (and a joint international exercise involving tens of thousands of personnel is hardly routine)</p> <p>Constructing an airfield would surely have more predictable and less overall impacts than FTX and LFX.</p>	<p>5. The report states there is an environmental impact assessment process for this activity at Bradshaw. Is this a full Environmental Impact Assessment within the meaning of the Environment Biodiversity & Conservation Act 1999? The Bradshaw airfield was included in an EIS done in the early 1990s under previous legislation for all exercises such as TS2007. Construction of the airfield will occur under its own environmental management plan, which is very rigorous as there are Native Title issues at this site.</p> <p>6. By what criterion is TS2007 determined to only need a PER, rather than a full EIA? <i>It is substantially the same as previous exercises, such as Tandem Thrust 97 and 01 and Crocodile 99 and 03 and is thus a continuation of the same exercises, not a new exercise. Therefore DOD and DEH consider the PER process adequate. Defence has strictly adhered to the policy guidance “Significant Impact Guidelines for Actions on, or Impacting upon Commonwealth Land, and Actions by Commonwealth Agencies 2006”. Also, requirements are different under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act implemented in 2000. (Is the unspoken part of the response that we don’t have the same level of protection now that we had under the old legislation in the eventuality that the nature or scale of the exercises changes?)</i></p> <p>7.</p> <p>8. Was this a political or military decision? Neither, it was a bureaucratic/administrative decision based on the fact that TS2007 is not materially different from previous exercises and considered a repeat activity, not new activity. Approval given by DEH (Fed Dept of Environment & Heritage) under ADF Standard Operating Procedures. It is subject to a self-assessment report to DEH and DOD.</p>
			<p>9. Why is there no external EIA for activities in the Shoalwater Bay Training Area during TS2007? As above.</p> <p>10. How does the existing risk assessment process for TS2007 differ from an environmental impact assessment within the meaning of the EB&C Act? There is no difference. It is still an environmental risk management tool, and also used for occupational health and safety. It uses Australian Standards for risk management, and these are assessed by staff from Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Fed DEH and Qld Environmental Protection Agency.</p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Inappropriate disposal of wastes	iii	<p>I understand that the camp areas have package sewage treatment plants that utilise wetlands. Also that waste consumables are taken off site for disposal by waste contractors.</p> <p>Is the ADF aware, when selecting waste disposal contractors, that the Rockhampton landfill is right on the Fitzroy River that flows to the marine park and is adjacent to mangroves?</p> <p>The site also has a very high water table and therefore, is extremely environmentally sensitive. It is also near capacity and waste mounds are rising upwards rapidly.</p> <p>The Yeppoon landfill is both nearer to the training area (reducing use of fossil fuels for transporting waste) and better located and designed to minimise risk of environmental harm.</p>	<p>11. Are the STP wetlands constructed or natural? Constructed and extensively bunded to prevent contamination of rainfall flow over land into sensitive areas. <i>(The sewage treatment facilities are fairly basic but then sewage treatment isn't rocket science. Rather, it is the facilitation of natural processes. These facilities are no worse or better than your average country council plant and are situated to protect sensitive areas.)</i></p> <p>12. Is there any water quality monitoring before or after disposal to wetlands and, if so, what indicators are monitored? Quality is monitored going into artificial wetland for usual STP indicators such as faecal coliforms (germs from faeces) nitrates, nitrites, total N, dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, turbidity, phosphate etc. N and P sometimes high in ponds <i>(but this is what wetlands are for, to remove these nutrients by uptake in vegetation, so no cause for concern.)</i> ANZECC water quality guidelines are general and the base monitoring done around military training areas will go towards providing local baseline data that have been lacking to date. In future water quality inside and immediately outside training area boundaries will also be monitored for residue from explosives and general military usage, such as aluminium, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, copper, nickel, lead, zinc, mercury etc.</p> <p>13. Do the STP wetlands drain into Ramsar Wetlands? There are two STPs with artificial wetlands draining to non-RAMSAR areas and also the whole system is designed to not drain into Water Park Creek catchment area that provides water to Yeppoon.</p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
			<p>14. Due to the intermittent no-use/high use pattern of the site, are STP wetlands monitored for overall health and are they replanted before an exercise if there has been die-off of vegetation? This has not occurred to date as there is natural die-off and regeneration anyway over time due to climatic variation. Also, numbers using STPs are never more than 5000 at any given time, as troops are deployed all over the place, including in the air and at sea and at other locations. Ponds and wetlands are large enough to cope with this volume of effluent.</p> <p>15. Defence personnel logically must also defecate in the field. What are the instructions to reduce the impact of such large numbers at once? Defence Force personnel are subject to such strict standards on this they do their best to hold on till they get back to camp or use a field latrine. They have to bury their human waste at >300mm, first removing the topsoil and vegetation to replace in situ, and then put up a marker notifying of its presence. DOD Environmental staff monitor this and do not allow any unit to leave the area until everything is cleaned up to required standards. Some field latrines are constructed in main exercise areas to strict env. guidelines.</p> <p>16. Where is the waste disposal contractor for TS2007 taking the waste from Shoalwater Bay Training Area? Any non-recyclable waste is taken by the contractor to Livingstone Shire Council dump. <i>(Correct solid waste disposal is also very strictly regulated – once a troop ship left the area and the range staff discovered an illegal waste dump. The ship and its personnel had to sail back two days to collect it. Contravention of carefully monitored enviro guidelines has career-limiting consequences for the offenders and their commanding officers, from demotion, to charges, to court-marshal for serious offences.)</i></p> <p>17. Are the toxic, non-toxic and recyclable waste streams separated? There is no toxic waste. Recyclables such as metals go into waste transfer station and other hazardous materials such as batteries, hydrocarbons etc are placed in a banded area prior to removal for appropriate processing; ie same standards as municipal rubbish dump. <i>(Technically toxic waste is a subset of hazardous but this distinction is really just word games, as in common usage the two words are interchangeable. There is no doubt that waste management was poor on the site in the past, as has been the case in most council dumps until relatively recently. But old contaminated waste disposal sites are now being monitored, as are the contaminated cattle-dip sites from the grazing days before the site became a military training area). The right thing is now being done re solid and liquid waste.</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Introduction of pests in ballast water	iii	AQIS is responsible for monitoring vessels coming into Australian waters during the exercise.	<p>18. Is anyone monitoring ballast during movement of vessels between areas within Australian waters? There is no monitoring. Not all ships carry ballast; those that do must flush once in international waters, and again inside Aust. Territorial waters; which is more rigorous than for commercial shipping. They report to Aust. Quarantine Inspection Service.</p> <p>19. What is being monitored?</p>
Post-exercise report to DEH	iv		<p>20. Will this report be copied to the Qld EPA? Yes</p> <p>21. Will it be available to the public? Through the Environmental Advisory Committee, which includes CQ University, Qld Parks & Wildlife, Qld EPA, traditional owners, Fisheries – Committee has been in existence for 13 years.</p>
RAN Maritime Activities Environmental Management Plan	v		<p>22. Can the public access this? No, parts may be released to certain key stakeholders but parts relate to matters requiring security, eg radio frequencies, emergency procedures etc. <i>(These would be the same security issues for land and air-based activities presumably, which EMPs can be accessed, so this explanation is unsatisfactory).</i></p>
Environmental Management Group and EM Plan	12		<p>23. Who are the members of the TS2007 EMG? 3 defence force environmental staff, 5 civilians from DOD – report to Warfare Centre – has both 4 US and 8 Australian personnel on it. The EMG does compliance monitoring and enforcement on site during exercises. Do joint checks and each national talks to own forces.</p> <p>24. Exactly who (civilian) is developing the exercise specific EMP? Travis Collins – Environmental Officer at the ADF Warfare Centre is the project manager.</p> <p>25. Will the public have input to the draft EMP? Not directly, public submissions inform it and it mostly reflects legal obligations.</p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Extraction	14		<p>26. Does the public have access to the final EMP and any subsequent audit reports, as well as the general EMP for the training area? Not generally but those who specifically ask can access it.</p> <p>27. Are designated live firing areas part of the "footprint" where remediation will occur and will this include removal of metal fragments and other toxic wastes? It was repeated there are no toxic wastes, that during live firing exercises, everything is vapourised. Impact areas are potentially contaminated, which is why they are small and restricted sites within entire training area. Periodically, demolition experts search for unexploded ordinance and other debris, depending on level of risk involved to subsequent users of site.</p> <p><i>I received a briefing from the Range Control Centre staff and was shown the approval process each proposed live firing exercise must go through. Those with technical knowledge of the weaponry calculate the potential trajectory and maximum range for each weapon. This is drawn onto a trace that is placed over various maps at the correct coordinates to see if there are any sensitive or restricted areas within the range. If there are, the potential environmental impact is assessed and the proposed exercises may be required to be modified or even refused, if risks cannot be managed. The level of control is extremely detailed and strict.</i></p> <p><i>I was taken to the largest of the three live fire ranges and was astounded to see how little damage had been done. While the live fire areas are quite large, the target areas within them are very small, which makes sense if you consider the cost of munitions, that they're training for targeting accuracy and that they want to be able to access areas without being blown away by unexploded ordinance. The Range Control staff are definitely not "Dad's army" but highly skilled professionals.</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Consultation	16	<p>I sincerely hope that those affected most by TS3007 (Livingstone Shire residents) will have a better opportunity to meet with ADF staff in our own shire, and at a more opportune time, rather than the meeting in Rockhampton at 5pm that occurred recently. Few of my fellow residents were able to attend, even if they had heard about it. If there has been a subsequent meeting, it also was so poorly publicised that I haven't heard about that. In my occupation I am better informed than average, so not many others would have either.</p> <p>As a past community engagement practitioner myself, I recommend that your community engagement team considers more than an advertisement in the paper to publicise any subsequent event. Especially, I recommend directly contacting those community organisations/individuals who have expressed an interest and any other likely interest groups for whom the shire council could easily provide contact information if you asked them. Time and location should suit those being targeted for consultation. Anything less only feeds public paranoia, which may or may not be justified; how can we know in the absence of wide notification or comprehensive information (which the PER, although well written & presented, is not)?</p>	<p>28. What further consultation with Livingstone Shire Council and the general community is planned prior to TS2007 and afterwards? There is a Defence Support Group made up of landowners, and defence forces soldiers and civilians that is consulted regularly. Also there is the SWB EAG of relevant government agencies mentioned earlier that meets monthly.</p> <p>The DOD plans to have meetings with community groups and affected neighbours closer to the exercise date in June and will have an open day, as they do with every exercise. <i>(Keep your eyes open for it, as they have not been widely publicised in the past.)</i></p> <p><i>(There was another large public meeting in Yeppoon after the poorly timed and attended one in Rockhampton. While DOD provided a large number of personnel with specific expertise to provide information, it was overly stage-managed and inflexible. This aroused much ire among residents. The refusal of DOD to take our needs on board and some people's loud, angry reactions to this meant the amount of information we were able to access was seriously reduced.</i></p> <p><i>DOD senior officers need to listen to their community engagement specialists more, or this will keep on happening. Without a greater level of openness and listening by DOD, we locals will all tend to be paranoid, not just those few actually suffering from the clinical condition.)</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Accidental fires from munitions	19		<p>29. This risk is calculated as medium and we are in the worst drought in recorded history. Please detail your fire management strategies and any fire-fighting training in place. The training area is broken into manageable-sized blocks according to topography, vegetation, geology, ecological values, use and safety issues. They have controlled burns at intervals appropriate for that block from ecological integrity and risk perspectives. DOD engages contractors for the yearly burn plan. Onsite personnel monitor for fires and back burn problem wildfires. There are firebreaks along the western boundary and other high risk areas (eg military facilities). There is a three year plan that is reviewed every year for changed weather/growing conditions.</p> <p>30. What provision is there for seeking non-ADF assistance in the event of a fire breaking away from SWBTA? DOD works with Division of Forestry and also local rural fire brigades when needed.</p>
Harm to marine fauna	21		<p>31. What happens when your spotters see cetaceans in the exercise area? There are stringent procedures in place when whales/dugong /dolphins/turtles are spotted, including keeping 500m away and using avoidance tactics.</p> <p>32. Does that alter how deployment of personnel, firing or SONAR activities occurs? Yes, actions stop if whales or are in area. Amphibious landings take place in areas that are designated not to be important breeding or habitat areas for marine mammals. Boats did test run over sea grass beds to see if there was any impact, which was negligible.</p> <p><i>(The areas for amphibious landings are very small and strictly controlled, with matting placed on the beach to prevent damage from repeated landings – presumably it's similar to the geofabric used to stabilise road bases and banks.</i></p> <p><i>I understand that some people believe the public is being deliberately misled by DoD and that I have been, but this would require the long-term collusion of hundreds, perhaps even thousands of people, and I certainly have never worked in any organization with such unanimity or solidarity. Silence on such a scale is only possible in countries where you, your children and friends can disappear during the night if you speak out of turn. However much state and federal governments may have bastardised the democratic process in Australia in the last decade, it certainly hasn't reached that scale.)</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
			<p>No dugong/turtle deaths have ever been attributable to defence force activities, although many have been found drowned in illegal fishing nets or otherwise killed outside exercise periods.</p> <p><i>(I regularly find fresh turtle corpses on Capricornia beaches with obvious propeller wounds across their shells, so this was fair comment.</i></p> <p><i>In the training area I saw several beaches and the mangrove stands were among the healthiest I have seen on the east coast south of Cairns. There was a small amount of scum on the water at one spot that could have been degraded hydrocarbons but this could just as easily have been released by passing commercial shipping as by the military, especially considering the length of time since the last exercise with Singapore. The impact of commercial shipping is evident and collecting washed up rubbish is a regular part of the enviro officer's job. Its source is evident from the fact that the language on the packaging varies from tide to tide.</i></p> <p><i>I was very surprised at the health of the environment within the training area. I can only wish our national parks had the same level of financial and human resources available for their management as Shoal Water Bay Training Area has. What does this say about our elected government's priorities for our tax dollars?)</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Nuclear powered/armed vessels	21		<p>33. As there will be nuclear powered ships/submarines involved in the exercise, what local emergency provisions, public alert and evacuation processes are in place in Central Queensland in the event of an accident that releases fissile materials? This is regulated by the Visiting Ships Panel. Local committees of emergency response agencies are responsible through the federal agency Emergency Australia. <i>(DOD was unable to say what DOD's relationship to them was or if there is any coordination between DOD and EA and the local agencies.)</i></p> <p>34. Have local state and municipal government emergency services personnel been included in planning/training for such an event? Same response repeated. <i>(Later, after I expressed my dissatisfaction with this answer, I was provided with the following additional information.)</i></p> <p>All visits by Nuclear Powered Warships (NPWs) to Australia associated with TALISMAN SABRE 2007 will comply with the normal procedures for visits of NPWs that have been adopted to ensure that the safety of the general public is maintained during visits by such vessels. These procedures include conditions of entry and port safety arrangements for visits, as well as contingency emergency arrangements for dealing with accidents. Visits of NPWs to Australian ports are permitted only to berths and anchorages that have been assessed as suitable by the Visiting Ships Panel (VSP). The primary means for judging the suitability of ports for NPW visits has been radiological port assessment performed by the Nuclear Safety Bureau, and port validations performed by the VSP. The publications 'OPSMAN 1' and 'Reference Accident' deal with visits by NPW's to Australian ports and give very clear guidance on the reactions required by Australian Government agencies and State Emergency Services supporting these visits. <i>(So, over to our emergency services, which is why I am so concerned, considering the debacle of the tsunami alert.)</i></p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
			<p>35. Can the US forces still carry depleted uranium rounds or nuclear munitions within Australian territory (land or marine), even if not used in this exercise? I presume you can't answer "will they be?". Yes they can carry them but they cannot be used in Australia.</p> <p><i>(In earlier conversations with two senior DOD staff, I was advised depleted uranium had been used in Australian waters in the 1990s, not by the American military as supposed, but by our own defence force. They purchased and test-fired 43,000 rounds of depleted uranium shells in waters to the north, south, east and west of Australia, out to sea; although I do not know if this was beyond the continental shelf or not. However, the DU rounds were never used in Shoal Water Bay because they were shells used in gattling guns fired from surface to air to bring down missiles and for that sort of testing, air clearance is required. This cannot be obtained off Shoal Water Bay. Some small comfort to CQ residents, if not to others.)</i></p>
Mine shape laying	21		36. Will any live mines be deployed or exploded? No, permission to use them was cleared earlier just in case they were going to be used but now they are not.
Air to Air refuelling	22		37. Is fuel or water used in this exercise? Fuel, the same as occurs with commercial refuelling barges.

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
Wilderness area	31	SWBTA is our largest wilderness area left in a relatively undisturbed state. Only 7% had been cleared for grazing when ADF took over.	<p>38. What proportion of the land remains undisturbed today? When Defence took over the land, all of it had been affected by grazing, to a greater or lesser extent. Since taking over in 1965, natural cover has increased and improved. Less than 1% has been impacted by defence force activity.</p> <p>39. What proportion of major activities for TS2007 (camp, LFX, FTX) will occur in existing undisturbed wilderness areas and what proportion in previously disturbed areas? Exact proportion unknown. There is greater vegetated area now than pre-1965. Any soil impacted by trucks and tanks is remediated.</p> <p><i>(I understand there will be scepticism about just how much of this huge training area I was able to see in one day but I was asked what I wanted to see, not told. I was also offered a second day's tour to see the western sector but I had work commitments and couldn't.</i></p> <p><i>Even in small arms live fire and high explosive use areas the vegetation cover was good. There were also fewer invasive weed species compared to other public and private land locally, although feral pigs and horses still appear to be a problem.</i></p> <p><i>However, the photographic record of damage used for keeping track for remediation purposes in the EMP cannot account for chemical contamination [surely even vapourised material that goes up must come down in rain and wind, unless the laws of physics have changed suddenly after 13.7 billion years]. While the contaminants from the munitions will be tested for in groundwater in future, should any contamination occur, remediation would be extremely problematical, due to the huge unknowns with all underground bodies of water.)</i></p>
Sea disposal	34		<p>40. Disposal of what? Grey and black water (waste water from showers, kitchens and toilets). This is done in accordance with regulations that affect all shipping in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and MarPol (international guidelines) outside GBRMP.</p> <p>41. Will any waste or containers be left behind post-exercise? None.</p>
Port nuclear classification	b1		<p>42. Are Port Alma and Gladstone port classified as suitable for nuclear powered vessels? Yes, Gladstone is approved for submarines but not surface ships.</p>

Issues	PER Page	Comments	Questions
New weapons	b2		43. What new weapons are currently approved for in-service use and what are currently being assessed that are likely to be approved by May 2007? <i>None for 2007. There are some new unmanned aerial surveillance (like model aeroplanes) with new electronics but no weapons.</i>
Title "likelihood of event occurring in requested funding period"	c2	Strange title! The period over which the risk is calculated is important to the likelihood of occurrence.	44. Does this equate with the period of TS2007 or over some larger period that includes non-exercise periods? <i>Not sure, likely to be linked to actual exercise funding and budget periods.</i>
Risk of damage to flora and fauna though use of high explosive	d1	Risk assessments include both likelihood and impact/consequence of an occurrence. The likelihood of explosives being used on designated live firing areas is certain, the impact of high explosives would presumably be high at the time of the exercise and possibly subsequently, with groundwater implications if metal fragments and other toxins are not removed.	45. How did you reduce this to rare likelihood, low risk, which implies a negligible (that is, reversible within one month) impact according to the risk assessment matrix. <i>The impact areas are very limited and are chosen for their low environmental sensitivity and ability to sustain usage. (This is consistent with what I saw.) Impacts are also assessed for the species population, not individuals within the population. (We need to also remember that each one of us who uses road transport also has an impact on individuals within the wildlife population, as evidenced by the bird and marsupial corpses littering virtually every road in the country.)</i>
Damage to third parties (property, people)	d2	The risk of being involved in a road accident at any given time is quite low but consequences on the individual involved can be catastrophic.	46. Please explain how you evaluated the likelihood as almost certain (what happened to ADF driver training?) but with minor consequences, which is the reverse of common experience? <i>This is not the consequence to an individual but to the Defence Force as a whole. Also, there are numerous small bingles during a training exercise with usually minor consequences even to the individual.</i>
Other		Large military exercises can have significant social and economic impacts, both positive and negative.	47. How have these been assessed? <i>CQU did a socio-economic impact study in 2004. I only glanced at the study report during the meeting but it appears to be mainly economic impacts that were assessed. It is available on the Defence force website.</i> 48. What are those social and economic impacts? <i>See ADF website. I haven't had time to read this, nor do I have the expertise to analyse it if I did – hopefully someone else reading this report does have.</i> 49. How are the negative ones being mitigated? <i>Most impacts are positive – negative ones were anecdotal. ADF has liaison officers and military police who work with local organizations and police. Military personnel have restricted hours in town, enforced by shore patrols. Consequences of misbehaviour on leave are catastrophic for individuals involved.</i>