

Dear Lord Mayor Schrinner (Adrian) and Councillor Howard (Vicki),

Thank you for your previous correspondence.

On behalf of the Mt Coot-tha Local Residents (MCLR), we congratulate you on your recent election win and note that the Cr Matic win is unconfirmed, with an 11% swing towards the Greens Donna Burns.

- We know that both Donna Burns and Jeff Eelkema definitely supported an immediate commencement of MCQ rehabilitation planning and closure - together their primary vote exceeds Peter Matic.
  - CPV is expected to apply to the 2024 local government and definitely does apply at the coming State Election which has a large number of small-margin reps.
  - Considering the large recent swing towards the Greens, it seems likely that they will control the balance of state government power after 31<sup>st</sup> October 2020.
    - Hence the decision that you make now regarding the MCQ, will have a bearing on the state election outcome.
    - With a Greens balance of power in state parliament, a parliamentary or judicial inquiry into the Mt Coot-tha Quarry and the LNP BCC becomes likely.
      - If this happens, then a legal class action against the LNP BCC becomes a certainty.
    - If in 2020 you proceed to violate the 2019 Human Rights Law (as the previous MCQ actions have done), this will immediately raise questions with the media and will look very bad to all those young greens voters.
1. We note that Cr Howard is the chair of the Field Services Committee, which controls the MCQ.
- a. Whilst we do value your work and contributions, we feel that the information from the MCQ which you rely on, is probably incorrect.
    - i. Our experience with the MCQ had led us to expect that everything that they provide, is likely to be untrue.
  - b. This is especially the case with the Blast Vibration data, which the MCLR depends upon so desperately to define and prevent blast vibration damage to their homes.
    - i. Yet the MCQ manager uses every possible trick to reduce the vibration reading amount, even at the expense of being legally inadmissible.
    - ii. Actual Best Practice (a supposed essential BCC requirement) has been totally abandoned and the blast monitoring that they do is unacceptable, non-standard, grossly inaccurate and probably legally inadmissible.
  - c. You may believe that the MCQ does and has always complied with their Environmental Authority (EA).
    - i. However, I can assure you, that the actual truth is the very opposite.
    - ii. The MCQ EA contains several noise conditions, however the MCQ does not measure operational noise and they ignored the MCLR data.
    - iii. The EA states blast vibrations "in or on any noise sensitive place", however the MCQ declined to measure on the outside of private homes.
    - iv. The MCLR were thus forced to do their own monitoring, but the MCQ refused to accept this data, even though it clearly indicated gross non-compliance.
  - d. Cr Howard proposes that the MCQ is fully compliant with their EA Schedule-F.
    - I. The MCLR believe that the MCQ has almost-never been compliant with Schedule-F.
    - II. For 600 blasts until November 2011, they "faked" (aka misrepresented) their compliance by only reporting blast vibrations from much further away locations.
    - III. In addition to this they persisted with aerated dirt soil-spike transducer mounting methods, which being grossly outlawed could be legally inadmissible.

- IV. In other ways, the MCQ manager has used every possible trick to dodge non-compliance.
  - V. For example, the forced use of Soil Spikes beside MCR, with their inverted pendulum harmonics - even after Dr Heilig specified and personally installed the concrete block - is an insult to his professional expertise.
  - VI. However, the 20 years intensive work that the MCLR has done clearly highlights the absolutely despicable MCQ actions, of which there are so many.
  - e. Hence the current and past attitude of the BCC towards the very unfortunate Mt Coot-tha Local Residents (MCLR), is one which has forced the MCLR into a full-time reactive “battle” mode.
    - VII. The MCLR have been forced to defend their homes from blast vibration and noise.
    - VIII. This has been an almost full-time job for 20 years, fundamentally because MCQ has zero separation zones to the thousands of local residents.
2. The MCLR have thus been forced into doing thousands of hours of often expensive highly-detailed totally-unpaid work.
- a. The MCLR are thus virtual BCC slaves, where they have to track everything that the MCQ says and does.
  - b. Whilst the DES is supposed to be the MCQ policeman, they only act on complaints and often these are ignored.
  - c. The three MCLR(aka MCQAG) chairpersons have worked themselves extremely hard, but when saving your home and treasured possessions from blasting damage – Failure is Never an Option.
  - d. Our website [www.SaveMtCoot-tha.org](http://www.SaveMtCoot-tha.org) currently has a massive 1,970 files in 434 Folders.
    - i. The data occupies 2.4 Gigabytes of Mt Coot-tha Quarry data.
    - ii. The MCLR is forced to create and pay for all of this.
  - e. This is **definitely modern-day-slavery**:
    - i. The MCLR are forced to protect their homes, they spend many thousands of hours and their own expense and all with zero remuneration.
    - ii. The MCLR have to do all their own research and learning.
    - iii. The MCLR have to pay for their legal and monitoring expenses.
    - iv. The MCLR have to pay to repair their home blast vibration damage.
    - v. The MCLR have to complain several times before anything gets done.
    - vi. The BCC staff are paid well to continue the MCQ operations.
3. Following 2011, the MCLR undertook a research process followed by a series of blast monitoring readings in private homes (in liaison with the Maiwar Electorate and some Mt Coot-tha Protection Alliance members).
- a. We had zero cooperation from the EHP/DES regarding our conviction that the blast vibration footprint reporting was grossly misrepresented, by only reporting blast vibrations from the much more distant Sussex St and Richer St monitoring locations. Further that these locations were non-compliant with all regulations and standards because all monitoring used a soil spike transducer mounting in aerated soil.
    - i. In November 2011, the MCLR had engaged Qld Treasurer Andrew Fraser and Assistant Steven Miles, to force the MCQ into conducting blast monitoring at the closest homes.
    - ii. (as mentioned above) Subsequent Statistician data analysis, showed that the MCQ was misrepresenting their blast vibrations by 300%.
    - iii. We reported this to LM Quirk, who immediately “disengaged us”.
    - iv. The DES disliked us for going over their heads to the State Treasurer.

- b. Whilst the outcome of this was a much-reduced internal home blast vibration, the MCLR still believed that the noise and vibration inside the homes exceeded the maximum values.
    - i. Further research showed that AS2187.2 (now redacted) plus other publications, discussed the concept of internal home vibration amplification.
    - ii. The Seismic Research Centre advised that a 10-level building should expect a 400% vibration amplification at anti-node points inside the building.
    - iii. The USA USBM standard advised that building fatigue will occur from high numbers of blasts, to reduce the building's ability to tolerate further blast vibrations by as much as 50%.
  - c. We formed a commercial client agreement with the Environmental Defenders Office (Qld) senior solicitor Mr Sean Ryan, to investigate the MCQ blast monitoring legal requirements.
    - i. They said that homes act as sensitive receptors to the blast ground vibrations.
    - ii. They said that the vibrations felt inside the home were the actual ground vibrations and thus had to comply with MCQ EA Schedule F6 "or in or on any noise sensitive place".
    - iii. The vibrations had to be measured outdoors so as to comply with DES monitoring (this was done).
  - d. The EDO also stated that all noise, which is not the atmospheric sonic boom (commonly called Overpressure), must always comply with all of the 5 noise conditions.
    - i. MCLR research clearly proved that the noise heard inside the homes is the result of ground vibrations and which clearly precedes the Overpressure (this propagates at an inaudible frequency).
    - ii. The blasting noise heard inside the MCLR homes is simultaneous with the vibrations and is "like a bomb going off inside your home".
  - e. The MCLR had thus proven that the blast vibrations measured on the outside of a home are 260% higher than those reported by the MCQ manager.
    - i. The actual noise results from the home sympathetic vibrations and is thus several times the Schedule-F allowed maximum.
4. Following 2012 the MCLR invested thousands of hours learning all about the Blasting Standards, such as the (now redacted) AS2187.2 – Appendix-J.
- f. Because the blast vibration hits the private homes causing the building to immediately vibrate and emit loud noise, some residents describe this as **"Like a Bomb going Inside Their Homes"**.
    - i. The Local Residents have thus been forced to do blast vibration and noise monitoring both inside and on the outdoor structure of their homes.
    - ii. This clearly shows that the BCC is grossly violating the operating conditions as defined in their Environmental Authority (EA) Schedule-F..
  - g. The proved beyond all reasonable doubt that the MCQ was grossly non-compliant with their blast and noise allowed maximums.
  - h. The DES saw this as a further threat and launched a personal attack on the MCLR and their chairperson.
  - i. As it stands, there are still 6 important MCQ non-compliance unanswered questions.
    - i. Does the BCC recognise the validity of their own blast vibration data which our statistician reported as a 300% blast vibration footprint misrepresentation?
    - ii. Does the BCC agree that the Noise inside the private homes from blasting, is more than the Mt Coot-tha Quarry Environmental Authority Schedule-F (MCQ-Schedule-F) conditions?
    - iii. Does the BCC agree that the Blast Vibrations Measured by attachment to the outside of the Private Homes, comprises "in or on any noise sensitive place" do not comply with the MCQ-Schedule-F6?

- iv. Does the BCC agree that the Blast Vibration Measurements recorded in the Quarry Office are also relevant to Botanical Gardens commercial and non-commercial buildings either up to 250 metres from that location, or actually closer to the blast vibration and noise source?
    - a. Additionally, that these Quarry Office blast vibration and noise recordings are also relevant to nearby private residents, when no other data is available.
  - j. Regarding the commercial decisions made by the Environmental Defenders Office:
    - v. Does the BCC agree with the EDO Decision that Blast Vibration Measurements on the outdoors of Private Homes, are valid for consideration under Schedule-F?
    - vi. Does the BCC agree with the EDO Decision that Blast Decibel Noise Levels measured inside Private Homes, before the arrival of the Overpressure generally inaudible frequency noise, are valid for consideration under Schedule-F?
5. The Brisbane City Council is solely responsible for their actions.
- a. Decisions reached by the current Labor State government are not relevant to the BCC actions.
  - b. However the DES director (Mr Andrew Connor) twice wrote to your aggregates department ask them to reduce their operations to comply with contemporary standards (eg: ERA-16).
    - i. The BCC response from both Ms Julien and Mr Bird was no.
    - ii. They clearly stated a blatant refusal, even though these are the regulations that all Australian mines and quarry have to comply with.
    - iii. As you can see in the attached document from Mr Karle, the BCC has no defined blasting limit on every 10<sup>th</sup> blast.
  - c. We are advised that Qld Labor receives political donations from the organisation that uses a large proportion of the MCQ produced gravel.
    - i. Hence it could be argued that they have an ulterior motive in supporting the continued operation of the MCQ.
    - ii. It may be that the LNP receives similar political donations.

**In 2019 and 2020, the MCLR have focussed on the Financial and Economic data, which has Established some Despicable MCQ Financial and Economic Concepts:**

**1. \$500 Million Rehabilitation Costs:**

- a. We have checked and triple-checked our previously estimated MCQ Rehab Cost as \$370 Million in 2020, and increasing to \$500 million in 2032 (current BCC Published MCQ closure date).
  - i. \$500 million = 16% of the Entire Annual BCC budget.
- b. Roma St final cost was \$72 million in 2001:
  - i. Use CPI Inflation to annualise the Roma St Parklands Rehab cost to the year 2020 = \$117 Million.
  - ii. Upsize this amount by the surface area difference 16ha up to 39ha -> add 30% Contingency -> Allow for further blast damage and CPI.
- c. Further 20-year average CPI -> annualise to 2032, plus allow for further blasting damage.
- d. So, the longer that you delay the rehab, the more that the rehab will cost.
  - i. Plus, the relatively smaller amounts supposedly saved by conducting their own extraction decades ago, is quickly swamped by the rehab CPI inflation.
  - ii. However, if the Cordell RP-data CHIP index was used instead of the CPI, then the rehabilitation costs would be much higher.
- e. Please note that road gravel is an abundant material. It is normally inexpensive (at the mine gate).

- i. There are several southside quarries who can provide the gravel directly to the southside asphalt factories (such as Downer/RPG).
- ii. Plus, with no urban truck movements.
- iii. MCQ gravel-truck drivers advise that virtually all of the MCQ output goes to distant private commercial facilities.

## 2. **\$2.5 BILLION Lost Benefit from “Blasting Tourism”, increasing to \$5 BILLION by 2032:**

- a. Eden Project Cornwall Case Study, Employment and Education has provided adequate examples of the lost benefit:
  - i. In consideration of the facts, such as Eden Cornwall being on a county road which is connected to relatively small highway traffic numbers.
  - ii. By comparison a Rehabilitated MCQ is surrounded by urbanisation, adjacent to a major highway and surrounded by very popular tourism venues.
  - iii. Hence, we believe that MCQ would exceed the Eden Cornwall Gross Value Added (GVA).
  - iv. Eden Project International believe that their Eden Project Anglesea near Geelong, will also exceed the Eden Project Cornwall GVA.
  - v. Butchart Gardens and Gardens BC revenue information are staggering, when compared to blasting tourism at Mt Coot-tha.
- b. During the Cr Matic several years reign over Toowong Ward, the Eden Cornwall was providing £100 million every year (continuing and increasing forever).
  - i. So, while Cr Matic saved \$30 million, Eden Cornwall created almost \$2 Billion GVA (see case study for details).
- c. Plus, Eden Cornwall continues to provide £100 million every year – indefinitely, forever.
  - i. Significant additional employment numbers are yet another benefit. (Eden Anglesea says 1300 new jobs, including 500 permanents.)
  - ii. So, the longer that the BCC delays, the more that Eden Project vastly draws away from the gross MCQ damage and relatively minor sales of common road gravel.

## 3. **Total lack of any BCC MCQ Rehabilitation Planning or Costings:**

- a. This was verified to us by Brisbane RTI in May 2019, and also we believe to Maiwar.
- b. It thus appears that **the BCC is “Flying Blind”**, by regularly creating severe tourism damage, simply for a common inexpensive road-gravel product.
- c. The 2019 MCPA + Maiwar joint forum workshop speaker (UQ Corinne Unger) advised that rehabilitation planning should commence 5-years before closure, to avoid large additional costs (see attached).
- d. Eden Project Anglesea timeline shows that the planning stage can take several years.

Thank you for reading this information.

**I cannot overstate the extreme seriousness** of the destruction that the LNP BCC has done to tourism income at Mt Coot-tha.

- Everybody knew in their hearts that both blasting tourism and creating a commercial Zipline at the much-loved Mt Coot-tha was and is totally the wrong thing to do there.
- We have now been able to measure how bad this really is and the precious tourism income at Mt Coot-tha the has been damaged to the extent of several BILLION dollars, of DESPERATELY needed income.

**We insist in the strongest possible terms**, that you immediately declare the final closure and urgent commencement of rehabilitation of the Mt Coot-tha Quarry.

- There are several other southside quarries, who state that they can directly supply southside asphalt factories.

- This would include Downer RPQ south of Ipswich, to which the MCLR followed the MCQ gravel trucks.

All 2020 blasting will come under severe scrutiny from the 2019 Human Rights Act (QLD), of which there are several relevant conditions.

- We expect legal advice from law companies eager to gain the first successful prosecution, which is bad for the QLD LNP.
- Additionally, the above economic data (which we did not release to the general media before the local government election), is extremely bad for the LNP.

We attach relevant items, plus a longer more-detailed letter to LM Adrian Schinnerer will soon follow.

**Please do NOT recommence blasting operations at Mt Coot-tha.**

**We believe that there is a Scandalous & Gross Lack of Honest Financial and Operational Accountability at the Mt Coot-tha Quarry.**

Our request for a meeting with you still stands.

Kind Regards, Phil Best.

Philip Best - Electrical Engineer  
ABN: 64 056 607 713  
3 Sir Samuel Griffith Drive  
Mt Coot-tha  
Toowong Qld 4066  
Australia

p: 0411 123400  
e: [PhilBest313@gmail.com](mailto:PhilBest313@gmail.com)  
L: <https://www.linkedin.com/in/philbest/>  
<https://www.StrategyKpi.com/PhilBestLinkedIn.pdf>  
W: [www.StrategyKpi.com](http://www.StrategyKpi.com)