

# MT COTTON QUARRY COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP



MT COTTON  
QUARRY

## MEETING #6 SUMMARY

**Date and time:** Monday 28 April 2025, 5:00pm – 7pm

**Venue:** Mt Cotton Quarry office, 1513 Mt Cotton Road, Mt Cotton

**Chairperson:** Richard Lemon

**Attending CRG members:**, Anthony Moloney, Richard Lemon, Ewen Thomson, Peter Spencer, Jacob Carlyle

**Attending observers:** None

**Attending Barro Group team:** Harry Clark, Chris Downing, John Taylor, Kate Thomas (note taker)

**Apologies:** Christine Melling, Liza'l and Scott Textor, Beverley Lemon, Sue Panuccio, Rodney Powell, Cr Julie Talty, Hon Mick de Brenni MP

Items discussed	Action
<b>A. Welcome</b>  Chairperson Richard Lemon opened the meeting and ran through the agenda.	Noted
<b>Update on commencement of quarry extension</b>  Harry Clark provided an update on the operation of Stage 1 of the quarry extension including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A large volume of rain had fallen on the site since the start of 2025 – approximately one metre. There had been about 250mm of rain alone during the four days of Cyclone Alfred (March 2025).</li><li>• Additional drainage works had been undertaken to manage stormwater flows down the hill and haul road on site. The aim was to retain stormwater on site and manage any sediment before discharging water to the environment. The works had included improving the culvert crossing at the 'farm dam' area, and constructing new sediment collection basins.</li><li>• There were some wet weather stormwater releases at the SW2 location (to California Creek), and these were not compliant with environmental licence conditions. The releases were reported to the Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation (DETSI) and Barro Group was working with the Department to review and track stormwater management improvements. The Department has been supportive of Barro Group's approach to date.</li><li>• The major rain events in 2025 including Cyclone Alfred had enabled Barro Group and its consultants to remodel stormwater flows on the site, and this had led to increased capture of stormwater on the site.</li><li>• There was no processing of quarry materials in the lower extraction area at present. Barro was processing remaining materials (such as Class A fill and drainage aggregates) in the upper area, some of which is being sourced from the main haul road construction.</li><li>• Once processing was underway in the lower extraction area, a trial blast would be conducted for aggregates production.</li><li>• Due to the weather, the Barro Group action to install barriers near Gramzow Road to prevent motorcycle riders from entering the quarry and accessing adjoining properties had not occurred. However, this was still planned.</li></ul>	Noted  Barro Group to install barriers near

Items discussed	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some trees were being removed for safety along the entry driveway, so chainsaws may be heard by local residents in early May 2025.</li> <li>The offset planting area (re-vegetation) was growing well, and the trees had handled the very wet conditions. Some maintenance and replanting had been undertaken as needed.</li> <li>The planned site tour for Christine Melling, Cr Talty and Mick de Brenni was postponed due to wet weather. It will be rescheduled for June 2025.</li> </ul>	Gramzow Road  Kate Thomas to reschedule site tour
<b>Questions and actions arising:</b>	
<p><i>Qu: Has the stormwater flow path changed on site now?</i></p> <p>A: No. It still generally follows the natural flow paths through the site. Stormwater falling on the existing hill (upstream areas) to the west of the haul road on site is channelled to the holding pond ('farm dam'). It passes under the haul road via a number of culverts and then follows the historical creek path to the lower part of the site. Barro checks that the bottom basin (upstream of monitoring point SW7) doesn't spill over during wet weather. If spilling appears possible, water is pumped out of the bottom basin to the top site treatment pond (pond 1).</p> <p><i>Qu. How are the water pumps used on site powered?</i></p> <p>A. The pumps use diesel fuel. They only operate in the daytime to limit noise impacts on residents.</p> <p><i>Qu. What is the capacity for holding stormwater within the bunded lower catchment area?</i></p> <p>A. The area is designed to retain stormwater from a 1 in 5 year event.</p> <p><i>Qu. A resident bordering the lower part of the site (Gramzow Road) has lived in the area for 12 years and has only recently seen mud on the road after heavy rain, and damaged fencing. Was this due to changes at the quarry?</i></p> <p>A. During the major wet weather events in 2025, including Cyclone Alfred, a lot of water flowed into California Creek. While the stormwater catchment on the quarry site has been increased, the sheer volume of water running downhill to the creek had a significant impact. Barro Group's Chris Downing has been in contact with the resident, and the matter was discussed with them. Barro Group had agreed with the resident to maintain the fencing.</p> <p><i>Qu. Is it mainly motorcycle riders who are accessing the quarry site via Gramzow Road?</i></p> <p>A. No. It's also 4WD motorists who are accessing the site. One CRG member advised he allows a group of motorcyclists to ride at his property but did not believe they were moving beyond the boundaries (but could speak with them if needed).</p>	
<b>C. Action items from previous meeting</b> <p>The group reviewed action items from the previous meeting. The following comments were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Barro Group to supply a copy of the maps displayed on the wall of the project office (showing locations of environmental monitoring locations) digitally</i> This was not addressed at the meeting but copies will be provided to CRG members.</li> <li><i>Barro Group to check monitoring data on blasts in early November 2024 and report on vibration levels / impact data at the meeting.</i> Data on blasting was provided at the meeting.</li> </ol>	Barro Group to supply maps with meeting notes

Items discussed	Action
<p>3. <i>Barro Group to share the latest environmental monitoring (eg. water quality, dust) data with the CRG.</i>  Data was provided at the meeting.</p> <p>4. <i>Barro Group to review areas where motorcycle riders are accessing the quarry from Gramzow road and install preventative measures.</i>  As noted above, this was not completed due to wet weather but works are still planned.</p> <p>5. <i>Barro Group to clarify the basis of noise modelling in the development application for the extension as it relates to the modelled number of trucks on the internal haul road. A member of the CRG and adjoining resident added that this matter had not been adequately addressed to date, and that the original development application identified movement of quarry product via a conveyor system, and not a haul road. This was considered a substantial design change and the active haul road created noise impacts for adjoining residents.</i>  Barro Group noted the internal road was always to be used for haulage in the first stage of the quarry extension. However, the first stage was to be in place much longer than expected. The conveyor line installation was not envisaged until the fixed processing plant was installed, which is still a number of years away.  The CRG member further responded that they believed the use of the internal road for haulage in the first stage of the extension had not been previously disclosed in approved plans and was a significant change to the State approved plan. They felt there was no operational provision for the internal road to be used for haulage in the first stage. Further there was no noise or dust modelling in the plan reflecting this.</p> <p>6. <i>Barro to provide a quarterly calendar of activities at the quarry</i>  Noted that this had not yet been produced (as updates had been verbal) but it would be provided at the next meeting.</p> <p>7. <i>Barro Group to present wind roses at the meeting to show the main prevailing wind directions on site.</i>  Provided at the meeting.</p> <p>8. <i>Barro Group to provide clarification about its stormwater management plan and whether treatment of stormwater should include sand filtration and a sedge filter system.</i>  Design certification documents for the tiered sediment ponds showed that gravel and sand were in place for filtration. Water coming from the sediment ponds was clean, which indicated that the system was working. Most stormwater was captured on site (inside the quarry area) and this was considered a primary management method, with the sediment ponds forming a secondary process. A CRG member queried if the design was implemented as intended, including the filtration system and pipework (as the certification did not demonstrate this). Barro Group noted that DETSI was satisfied with the operation of the ponds but would take the CRG member's comments on notice.</p> <p>9. <i>Barro Group to provide slides from previous meeting and update to show compliance limits for environmental data.</i>  Completed before the meeting.</p> <p>10. <i>Barro Group to invite an MWA Environmental representative to the meeting to facilitate a discussion about environmental monitoring, and particularly noise data.</i>  MWA Environmental Senior Environmental Engineer, Ben Hyde, will be invited to the next meeting. It was noted that he was not invited to the April 2025 meeting as additional noise data needed to be collected first (including from an adjoining resident's property if they consented).</p>	Barro Group to provide quarterly calendar of activities

Items discussed	Action
<p><b>a. Presentation of environmental monitoring data and discussion</b></p> <p>John Taylor provided an overview of recent data from the quarry's weather station, dust monitoring and water quality monitoring. It was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water quality testing from samples taken from California Creek demonstrated some exceedance of conditions (turbidity and total suspended solids) on occasions during significant wet weather events (ie days of about 40mm of rain). DETSI had been notified of these events.</li> <li>• Barro Group was expecting notable further improvements in water quality data once disturbed areas of the site (for infrastructure) were fully grassed and/or stabilised.</li> <li>• Data on blasting since October 2024 demonstrated compliance.</li> <li>• Air quality data was compliant, noting there had been a loss of power on site during Cyclone Alfred which temporarily affected dust monitoring. About a week prior to the CRG meeting, the dust monitoring device had experienced a problem which was being addressed by the supplier. DETSI had been informed about this, and a report from the supplier would be provided to DETSI.</li> <li>• Silica readings on site were very low and well inside the set limits. A previous EPA study on silica and quarrying was discussed.</li> <li>• Wind roses showed that winds are mostly from the south east but could be from the north in November.</li> <li>• A review of noise data by MWA Environmental showed that apparent spikes in noise on weekends / times when the quarry was not operating were due to overhead aircraft (up to 70db). Blasting by Barro Group could result in readings of 60 - 80db and this was allowed by the site's EA conditions, as the noise was short in duration.</li> <li>• Additional noise monitoring was planned, as was further interpretation of noise data (eg. to filter out background noise).</li> <li>• Noise data showed that Barro Group was operating beyond its 35db compliance limit for the western boundary at times. It was noted that compliance with this limit was being investigated, however it appears to be very difficult to achieve.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions and actions arising:</b></p> <p><i>Qu. Can the data presented (presentation) be provided to CRG members. Please add the compliance limits to the slides.</i></p> <p>A. Yes. These will be provided with the meeting notes.</p> <p><i>Qu. Was monitoring of the blasting in late 2024 at the start or end part of the blast zone?</i></p> <p>A. Monitoring occurs at the edges of the blasting zone.</p> <p><i>Qu. A CRG member commented on the dust haze evident on the horizon at about 2pm each work day from other quarries in the region. This was of concern to local residents. Compliance with current legislation by these quarries was questioned.</i></p> <p>A. Other CRG members suggested that the CRG member / concerned residents direct the matter to DETSI as the environmental regulator.</p> <p><i>Qu. Is there a dust deposition gauge on the north west side of the quarry?</i></p> <p>No. This is due to the topography of the site and the need to empty gauges regularly.</p> <p><i>Qu. Does Barro Group add flocculants to the water in sediment / other holding ponds?</i></p> <p>A. No. Chemicals aren't used at present to achieve water quality compliance.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Barro Group to update slides and provide to the CRG</p>

Items discussed	Action
<p>Qu. Did Barro Group test water at the SW2 location (at California Creek) on 9 or 10 March 2025?</p> <p>A. No. it was too dangerous for personnel to attend site during the cyclone to take water samples.</p> <p>Qu. If the wind across the site is mostly from the south east, aren't the locations of the dust monitors in the wrong places and won't measure dust levels accurately (as they are not downwind)?</p> <p>A. The locations of dust monitors were selected by technical expert MWA Environmental and approved by DETSI. These were considered the most suitable and practical locations for monitoring dust. The CRG discussed the matter and noted that the response was inadequate (in terms of addressing potential impacts on residents) but that DETSI had supported the monitoring locations. The CRG suggested Barro Group consider a powered dust monitor at the company's property on the ridgeline.</p>	
<p>Qu. Noise experts engaged by local residents previously showed that the background noise levels in the area were between 27db and 30db. Can Barro Group filter data to remove cicada and other similar background noise, and take out third octaves to obtain a more relevant data set?</p> <p>A. MWA Environmental continues to review the data. Further 'attended monitoring' is planned to add to the data collected to date and help check its validity. Updates will be provided to the CRG.</p> <p>Qu. A CRG member noted there was significant highway noise experienced in the local area around the quarry. Was it possible some highway noise was being picked up by the quarry noise monitoring?</p> <p>A. Yes it is possible highway noise is being picked up. As noted, more work is needed to collect and analyse noise data.</p>	Update on noise monitoring and data review to be provided at next meeting
<p><b>b. Next steps / general business</b></p> <p>The CRG agreed on the next meeting timing:</p> <p><b>Monday 18 August 2025 at 5:00pm</b> on site (note: 11 August was initially suggested by CRG members but it was subsequently noted that this was a public holiday in the Redlands).</p> <p>No meeting topic was suggested.</p>	Barro Group to issue meeting invitation and agenda