

MT COTTON QUARRY COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP



**MT COTTON
QUARRY**

MEETING #8 SUMMARY

Date and time: Monday 16 February 2026, 5:00pm – 6:30pm

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

Chairperson: Harry Clark

Attending CRG members: Ewen Thomson, Anthony Moloney, Christine Melling, Jacob Carlyle, Rodney Powell

Attending observers: None

Attending Barro Group team: Lawrence Fahey, Harry Clark, John Taylor, Kate Thomas (note taker)

Apologies: Sue Panuccio, Peter Spencer, Liza'l and Scott Textor, Richard and Beverley Lemon, Cr Julie Talty, Hon Mick de Brenni MP, Chris Downing

Items discussed	Action
<p>A. Welcome and meeting overview</p> <p>Harry Clark opened the meeting and ran through the agenda.</p> <p>He advised the group that Richard Lemon had resigned as Chairperson of the community reference group (CRG) and he and Beverley would not be attending many meetings going forward due to other commitments. On behalf of the group, Harry thanked Richard and Beverley for their contributions and wished them well. He noted that Barro Group would speak with other member(s) of the CRG to appoint a new Chairperson ahead of the next meeting.</p> <p>Harry welcomed Lawrence (Lawrie) Fahey to the meeting and advised that Lawrie had accepted the role of General Manager – Concrete & Quarries Qld for Barro Group. Lawrie was previously the owner and operator of quarries in North Queensland and these had been acquired by Barro Group. Harry was stepping down from the General Manager role as he was retiring, but would provide interim support to Lawrie for several months.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>B. Update on quarry activities</p> <p>Harry Clark and Lawrie Fahey provided an update on the operation of Stage 1 of the quarry extension including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All fauna fencing on the internal haul road had been completed. There had been a delay in finishing the fencing due to liaison with the Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation (DETSI) about road drainage. • Environmental monitoring was continuing across the site, and issues with some monitoring equipment experienced in late 2025 had been fixed by the supplier. • Barro Group had engaged frequently with DETSI and other government agencies in recent months about environmental monitoring and compliance, and DETSI has acknowledged Barro Group's actions. 	<p>Noted</p>

Items discussed	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Processing of quarry materials in the lower extraction area started in late 2025. The first blast in the stage 1 pit area was in October 2025 and the second would be in or around late March 2026. Processing of extracted overburden material was being conducted using the mobile crushing plant on site. Materials being sold at present included low grade road base and fill. Greywacke material was not yet being processed but was becoming visible in the pit. 	
<p>D. Presentation of environmental monitoring data and discussion</p> <p>John Taylor provided an update on data available from the quarry’s weather station, dust monitoring and water quality monitoring (August 2025 to January 2026 results). It was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The October 2025 blast event in the lower quarry pit was the first significant blast for the new lower extraction area. There were nine monitors in place and physical observation by Harry and John (from Gramzow Road) and others. Blasting specialist, Dr John Heilig, was engaged to assist with the blast design and reporting of outcomes. Vibration and airblast overpressure levels were compliant. Barro Group received several enquiries about the October 2025 blast including from DETSI, the Planning Minister’s office and Queensland Police on behalf of a local resident. All enquiries were responded to, and no further action was required. <i>A CRG member provided additional feedback about the resident’s enquiry including that they had been at home with family, and were concerned about vibration, dust and an acrid smell after the blast. The resident had declined Barro Group’s offer to receive advanced notice of blasts via SMS.</i> <p><i>CRG members who had registered for SMS blast notifications reported they did not receive the SMS. Members unanimously agreed that all CRG members were to be placed on the blast notification register and that their consent to receive SMS messages ahead of planned blasts should be recorded in these meeting notes. CRG members now on the blast notification register were:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scott and Liza’l Textor Ewen Thomson Sue Panuccio Anthony Maloney Rod Powell Richard and Bev Lemon Jacob Carlyle Christine Melling Peter Spencer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality (dust and silica) results demonstrated compliance. <i>CRG members discussed how to read dust monitoring data (graphs) presented and the apparently ‘normal’ rise and fall of dust levels on site.</i> Water quality results were generally compliant apart from some smaller scale non-compliances with water turbidity and total suspended solids at the southern site release point (SW7) in November 2025. These exceedances related to a final component of work to further stabilize the western clean water diversion drain at its lowest point on the site (work requested by DETSI from earlier site visits). The exceedances were reported to DETSI as required. In October 2025, in consultation with DETSI, Barro applied to amend its Environmental Authority for the quarry extension to tidy up and formalize water quality monitoring requirements. These requirements used to refer to Redland City Council’s water quality limits which no longer exist in the Council 	<p>Barro Group to attach slides on monitoring data to meeting summary for the CRG (done)</p> <p>Barro Group to add all CRG members to the blast notification register, and send a test message to them ahead of the next notice period</p>

Items discussed	Action
<p>documents. Measures in the updated Environmental Authority revert to the <i>Environmental Protection Policy – Water Quality limits</i> for the Logan Catchment Area and were tabled at the meeting. It was noted that from Barro Group’s point of view, the limits relating to total suspended solids and turbidity were still relatively low, compared with industry standards. However, Barro Group was confident that the work completed on site, as it further stabilizes, will enable the company to consistently comply with the water quality limits.</p> <p>Questions and actions arising:</p> <p><i>Qu. Blast data shown (at the meeting) is from three monitors and not the nine described. Why is this?</i></p> <p>A. The results are from monitors at the property boundaries which is where compliance is measured. The other monitors were located within the site.</p> <p><i>Qu. Does Barro Group still sound a siren before a blast occurs?</i></p> <p>A. Yes this is a legal requirement.</p> <p><i>Qu. Should surrounding residents receive a letter ahead of each blast to let them know it’s happening? This could be a good idea.</i></p> <p>A. Barro Group has a blast notification register and issues information to registered people via SMS. SMS is more efficient than a letter as updates can be given if a blast is rescheduled. However, a letter could be sent to surrounding residents in March 2026 ahead of the next blast to invite them to register for SMS notifications.</p> <p><i>Qu. Why is the CRG not provided with access to live environmental monitoring data? Open sharing of this data with the CRG would seem appropriate. It would also help us to see if perceived exceedances of noise limits (by an adjoining resident for example) are occurring.</i></p> <p>A. Barro Group is happy to share data with the CRG at meetings but is only required to share data directly with DETSI (particularly regarding any expected or actual exceedance of compliance limits). Barro Group welcomes, and has responded to, enquiries from CRG members about concerns with compliance with noise or other measures.</p> <p><i>Qu. What was the wind direction on the day of the October 2025 main blast? We are interested in whether the dust monitor was down wind of the blast or not so that results are relevant?</i></p> <p>A. The wind was from the north east and the ambient dust monitor was down wind. It may not always be down wind as it is a fixed unit. There are also five dust deposition gauges around the site and these are manually checked each month. <u>Note:</u> a copy of the 9 October 2025 wind rose from the on-site weather station is included below which confirms the north-easterly wind direction:</p>	<p>Barro Group to write to adjacent residents and businesses about blasting notifications</p>

Items discussed	Action
<p><i>Qu. If there are no significant increases in dust levels after a blast, are the dust monitoring devices working?</i></p> <p>A. The dust plume from a well-designed blast is very controlled, and dust doesn't always leave the site. Wind conditions on the day will have a major bearing on this. As such, it is possible that the dust monitors could show minimal to no 'spikes' in their readings for (or following) a blast event.</p> <p><i>Qu. Who conducts blasting on site?</i></p> <p>A. Barro Group uses an experienced external contractor to design and conduct blasts.</p> <p><i>Qu. Does Barro Group try to measure water quality before any release of stormwater from site is expected (eg from a major storm)?</i></p> <p>A. Yes, if it safe to conduct the monitoring then this occurs. Stormwater runoff from areas on site that are exposed all ultimately drain into the quarry sump (behind the amenity bund). This enables it to be treated. Reprofiling and installing rock material was undertaken at the end of the western clean water quarry diversion drains in November 2025 to assist with stormwater conveyance and quality.</p> <p><i>Qu. Is all stormwater on site captured for treatment?</i></p> <p>A. No. There are parts of the site (eg western side) where stormwater follows its natural paths. However, as the active quarry area expands in a westerly direction, a 'clean water bund' is required to be moved to help divert clean stormwater around the quarry pit.</p> <p><i>Qu. What about stormwater that runs toward residents on Mt Cotton Road. Is that monitored and treated?</i></p> <p>Yes. That water is captured by two sediment basins and that area is a monitored release point on the site's Environmental Authority (SW5).</p> <p><i>Qu. Does Barro Group measure dissolved oxygen (DO) or dissolved oxygen demand (DOD) as part of water quality monitoring?</i></p> <p>A. While the water quality monitoring results show the percentage of dissolved oxygen (DO) in the samples, John Taylor advised he would check the measure. <u>Note:</u> Under the <i>Environmental Protection (Water and Wetland Biodiversity) Policy 2019</i> (EPP Water), DO is a water quality indicator used to assess ecosystem health. Typical water quality objectives (WQOs) for extractive industry operations that have runoff or potential runoff to aquatic ecosystems require DO levels to remain between 85% and 110% saturation. This requirement is one of the WQOs listed on the sites Environmental Authority (condition WA2 (copied below):</p>	<p>John Taylor to check on DO / DOD measure (done)</p>

Items discussed					Action
Release Points (GDA94)	Quality characteristic	Release limit		Minimum monitoring frequency	
		limit	type		
SW2 522,039 / 6,941,902	Dissolved Oxygen (DO)	85-110	Range	Prior to release, then daily until release ceases	
	pH	6.5 – 8.0 pH units	Range		
SW5 522,987 / 6,942,996	Electrical Conductivity (EC)	500 µS/cm	Maximum		
	Turbidity	35 NTU	Maximum		
SW7 521,916 / 6,941,884	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	35 mg/L	Maximum	Prior to release, then weekly until release ceases	
	Total Nitrogen	-	For monitoring purposes		
	Oil, Grease and Scum	-	For monitoring purposes.	Prior to release, then daily until release ceases	

Qu. How active is the internal haul road at present?
A. There are movements on all work days between about 8am and 3pm, with roughly four loads of material being moved per hour.

C. Action items from previous meeting

The group reviewed action items from the previous meeting. The following comments were made:

Item: Barro Group to review areas where motorcycle riders are accessing the quarry from Gramzow road and install preventative measures.
CRG members noted that motorbikes were heard in the area around Christmas 2025. In January 2026, people were seen trying to access the quarry site after a nearby hill climb event. Barro Group to visit the area to see if tracks were visible and take steps as appropriate.

Item: Barro Group to schedule site tour for CRG members.
As CRG observers had not identified their preferred site tour dates, the CRG nominated March in 2026 on a Saturday for the tour.

Item: Barro Group to provide a calendar of activities at the quarry for the CRG.
This was completed in December 2025.

Item: Barro Group to provide an update on noise monitoring and the MWA Environmental review.
Completed.

D. General business

Item: A CRG member and resident of West Mt Cotton Road advised that delivery truck drivers were driving into their property thinking they could access the quarry.
Barro Group agreed to contact suppliers to advise them of the best way to access the quarry.

Item: A CRG member and resident of Mt Cotton Road advised that some further repairs were needed to the dam on the property after 2025 stormwater runoff from the quarry.

Items discussed	Action
Barro Group agreed to visit the property to review work required.	member's property about dam repairs
<p>E. Next meeting</p> <p>The CRG agreed that the next meeting would occur in June 2026. The suggested time is:</p> <p>Wednesday 17 June 2026 at 5:00pm on site. Note that the meeting night was changed to suit CRG members' commitments.</p> <p>No meeting topic was requested.</p>	Barro Group to issue meeting invitation and agenda