

## **10 Truthful Established Facts about the Mt Coot-tha Quarry (MCQ) - October 2019.**

***Whilst the BCC tries to prevent external people from obtaining any true facts, there is some information of which we are certain:***

1. It is clear that MCQ is in its final years, simply because it is running out of rock to mine.
  - This can be seen in both the photographs [and the blast-count chart](#).
  - The Mt Coot-tha Local Residents (MCLR) definitely know of every blast count, and this chart clearly shows that the MCQ operations are decreasing.
2. We are professionally advised that the true rehabilitation cost is always related to the surface area and not simply the map area.
  - This becomes more relevant when the total [top to bottom vertical dimension](#) is 140m & ending down at sea level.
  - Roma St Area = 16ha, MCQ Map Area = 30ha, MCQ surface area = 46ha.
3. The MCLR estimate that the [MCQ Rehabilitation will cost](#) between \$500 and \$600 million and the cost of doing nothing increases this cost by approximately \$20million every year.
  - The MCLR has compared the surface area to that of the Roma St Parklands and extrapolated the costs onto MCQ, thus providing an estimated rehabilitation cost of approximately \$472 million.
  - Adding a more-improved outcome contingency of \$128 million, brings the cost to \$600million.
4. The BCC has advised that [no MCQ Rehabilitation documents or emails exist](#) on their computer system.
  - Whilst the rehabilitation is mentioned in the BCC planning schemes, the BCC ignores and does not comply with this.
  - Confirmed rehabilitation example evidence and charts, clearly shows the large additional costs caused by not planning for rehabilitation 5-years before quarry closure.
5. The MCLR have [seen, photographed and published the total removal of mature-growth trees](#).
  - These trees would have been very valuable for any rehabilitation process, but were recently totally removed.
  - This will increase the rehabilitation revegetation costs, especially after all the topsoil is removed for blasting.
  - Silica dust is endemic to the entire area as can be seen by roadway dust sample collection.
6. The information provided by the MCQ Manager to the ABC radio, includes many statements which are definitely and obviously untrue.
  - For example, the statement where the MCQ states that the blast only lasts for 0.6 seconds.
  - The statement concerning [the quarry pre-existence](#) is not relevant when you consider the repeated cancellation of formally announced MCQ closure dates.
  - The BCC has approved residential development in the adjacent areas (for residents who believed the earlier MCQ closure date announcements).
7. The MCLR have video recorded and published [the massive silica blast-dust-cloud incidents, where the blast dust has saturated the adjacent areas](#).
  - The blast dust clouds come from silica rock and thus contain silica dust powder.
  - Asthma Australia advises that this is a known Asthma trigger, for the 11% of Asthmatic Australians.
  - The effects of respirable silica are regarded as more hazardous than Asbestos.
8. The blast dust cloud incidents are never measured, monitored or even logged by the MCQ.
  - The MCLR submitted [a major blast dust incident "whistle-blower" report to both QLD Health & DES Ministers](#).

## 10 Truthful Established Facts about the Mt Coot-tha Quarry (MCQ) - October 2019.

- The dust almost always goes [outside the MCQ Processing area fence line](#), either into [the Botanical Gardens tourist areas](#), the [Local Residential area](#), the [Scenic Drive](#), the Forest areas or the [adjacent Slaughter Falls walking tracks](#).
  - The MCQ [does ambient air sampling near Mt Coot-tha road](#), which is averaged over the month, plus the monitor location is far removed from the blast zone.
  - The ambient air monitoring [samples are directly handled by the MCQ staff](#), who could easily alter or damage the samples, this is clearly not independent monitoring.
  - No silica blast-dust health warnings are ever posted in the immediately adjacent Gardens, Residential or Scenic areas before and after a blast.
9. The MCQ deliberately misrepresented their gross blast monitoring footprint reporting to the DES for 15 years, [until the local residents \(MCLR\) created a “Whistle-Blower” event, by reporting the issue to the state government](#).
- The [professional statistician \(Mr Birrell\) measured the scale of this misrepresentation as approximately 300%](#).
  - All of this time the MCQ was [secretly recording blast monitoring data as locations much closer to the adjacent local residents](#) where the average blast vibrations were **2388% higher** than the reported Richer St readings.
  - Hence the MCQ manager would have clearly know the reality of the very strong and publicly unknown measurements of what was being imposed upon the local residents.
  - The MCLR recently created a [second Whistle-blower report event](#), regarding the totally unmeasured and never-logged silica blast dust cloud incidents.
  - The MCLR have [provided scientifically correct](#) and [legally validated decision from the EDO](#), that clearly indicates the MCQ is not compliant with their Environmental Authority conditions, regarding both the blast vibrations and also [the very loud noise - like a bomb going off inside the local resident’s homes](#).
10. The vast majority of blast vibration monitoring done by the MCQ used the “soil spike”, which does not comply with DES EM2402 requirements, AS2187.2 Blast Monitoring Appendix-J, the blast monitoring instrument user instructions and many other documents.
- Brisbane RTI advises that before 2014, [none of the MCQ blasting monitoring locations ever used the legally defined statutory transducer mounting method](#).
  - MCQ monitoring Technician Mr Russell advised that this is done as specified by the MCQ manager (Mr Bell). It is not Mr Russell’s decision or discretion.
  - Before 2015 the only statutory compliant transducer mounting method was the MCQ secret blast vibrations.
  - Hence the [#3SSGD concrete block monitoring location](#) as [established by Dr John Heilig](#) was specifically ordered not to be used.
  - The primary need of all measurements, is that the measurement device should not affect the response of the actual item being measured. Placing a heavy blast vibration measurement device mounted on top of a simple soil spike, causes an inverted pendulum effect which alters the actual measurement.
  - Blast vibration measurements recorded in this way are unlikely to be considered legally or scientifically valid. They are clearly generally not recommended, because of fundamental inconsistency, which is due to an energy transfer dependency on both the moisture and aeration properties of the upper-most topsoil surface layer.
  - This is clearly [validated by RPEQ Civil Engineer Mr Roy Saint](#).

Philip Best – Version 2 - October 2019.  
MCLR Chairperson.