

Main Document - Mt Coot-tha Local Residents Complaint To QLD-DES-DG October-2018

To the Director General, QLD Dept Environment & Science. directorgeneral@des.qld.gov.au

Dear Director General,

On behalf of the Mt Coot-tha Local Residents (MCLR) (LR), and after a battle spanning 2 decades and 3 MCLR chairpersons, we (the MCLR authors and residents) lodge a Serious Formal and Enduring Complaint to your EPA/DERM/EHP/DES (DES) department and the DES Complaint Management System, against the Brisbane City Council (BCC) Mt Coot-tha Quarry (MCQ), for Non-Compliance of the BCC MCQ [Environmental Authority \(EA\) Schedule-F](#), over a sustained period of 20 years.

Main Document Contents

List of Report Documents - On www.BanTheBlasting.org website	2
The MCLR Beliefs and Rights plus the DES & BCC Systemic Failure.....	2
MCLR Forced Response.....	3
MCLR have a right to know what MCQ had earlier been done to their homes	3
The MCLR has limited funds:	4
MCLR Forced to do Transducer Self-Placement	4
Unacceptable BCC MCQ Operational and Communication Factors:	4
MCLR repeatedly ignored by the BCC Mr Bird.....	4
MCLR repeatedly ignored by DES	4
The DES was once an EPA or Environmental Protection Department.....	5
The BCC MCQ is a Commercial Gravel Sales Operator	6
The MCLR Should be Treated More Kindly	6
The MCLR Complaint Submission	7
USBM Defined Gross Fatigue Conditions Ignored and The Blasting Continues	7
EPA (now DES) "Guideline System" Misrepresentation 3X or 300% Upsize Ignored	7
Proposed AS2187.2 Appendix J non-compulsory Changes were Rejected	8
Extreme Internal Home Noise Monitoring Data was Disallowed	8
Schedule F6 Monitoring "In or on any noise sensitive place" Disallowed.....	9
The 2.6X or 260% Internal Home Blast Vibration Upsize Factor Disallowed	9
Statistician Misreporting and Upsize Factors Ignored.	9
MCLR Life:	10
MCLR always act Truthfully and Legally (no reason to do otherwise).....	10
BCC 24 th Feb 2010 Asphalt and Aggregates Manager Assurance was Invalid	10
The MCLR Never Deserved this Fearful Treatment	10
The June-2018 MKL Arrived with the Junk in the Mail and was a huge shock	10
Proposed Outcomes:.....	11
BCC long-term Non-compliance must be Advised and Enforced	11
Independent Departmental and Parliamentary Enquiry Request	11
The Departmental and Parliamentary Enquiry is Absolutely Essential	11

List of Report Documents - On www.BanTheBlasting.org website

Item No	Contents <i>(Note: These documents contain embedded website hyperlinks).</i>
Main Document	The Mt Coot-tha Local Residents (MCLR) (LR) Complaint to QLD DES Director General
Appendix A	MCLR Response to DES MK Case Closure Letter.
Appendix B	MCLR Response to 18-018 DES internal emails.
Appendix C	MCLR response to BCC Asphalt & Aggregates Manager 10th Nov 2017 letter to the DES.
Appendix D	About the MCLR, History of Work Done.
Appendix E	MCLR BCC RTI Application October-2018 RTI 2018/19-144
Appendix F	BCC Mr Lange 24th Feb 2010 Confirmation of MCQ Blast strength safety to MCLR
Appendix G	DES Director Mr Connor 26th July 2016 Blast strength reduction Request to BCC
Appendix H	BCC Ms Julien 14th Sept 2016 Blast Strength Reduction Refusal to DES
Appendix I	BCC Mr Bird 10th Nov 2017 Blast Strength Reduction Refusal to DES
Appendix J	DES Mr Lato 3rd April 2018 MCQ Legal Operations to MCLR
Appendix K	DES Mr Karle 22nd June 2018 Case Closure to MCLR
Appendix L	First Statistician Report
Appendix M	Second Statistician Report
Appendix N	EDO Legal Advice 1 (Schedule F6 Blast Monitoring)
Appendix O	EDO Legal Advice 2 (Schedule F2 & F3 Noise Monitoring)
Appendix P	Qld Crime & Corruption Act 2001 [s15] Meaning of Corrupt Conduct
Appendix Q	Psychiatrist Mental Health Report
Appendix R	MCLR Statutory Declarations
Appendix S	Mt Coot-tha Quarry Advisory Committee Proposal 13.11.1
Appendix T	Appendix I: Philip Best Initial 2017 Blasting Analysis Report
Appendix U	Appendix II: Cr Magub MCQ Letters and Faxes
Appendix V	Appendix III: MCLR Personal Statements (Phil Best – others available upon request)
Appendix W	MCLR 16th Sept 2016 AS2187.2 Appendix J Amendment Project Proposal

The MCLR Beliefs and Rights plus the DES & BCC Systemic Failure

1. It is clearly a failure of the DES Environmental Protection system that the MCLR were forced into the situation, where for 20 years they had no alternative other than to become the MCQ policeman to defend their homes and health against the seemingly illegal, callous ([Cr Magub](#)) and possibly corrupt activities of the Mt Coot-tha Quarry (MCQ).
 - a. We estimate that for approximately 2 decades the MCLR were forced into doing several thousand hours of reactive and proactive work.
 - The records and website comprise 92 folders.
 - These contain more than 800MB of data in more than 1200 files.
 - This is but one of several numeric measures of the DES failure.
 - Another is the blatant misrepresentation of their true blast vibration footprint by using DES “guidelines”.
 - b. By ignoring the MCLR concerns for such a long period, the situation has grown to the extent of a several MCLR reports and an independent enquiry request, which will proceed in liaison with the QLD State Ombudsman.
 - c. During this long and somewhat arduous period, the MCLR achieved large reductions in dust omissions, operational hours and blast vibrations.
 - If not for their extensive investigatory work the reductions would not have happened.
 - d. Thousands of hours of meetings, creating documents, interviews and press releases.
 - e. L M Quirk ignored all their work and evidence on multiple occasions:
 - Face to face meetings with Cr Matic and later with LM Quirk where both people were interpedently shown clear photographic evidence of damage to their homes, with MCLR members desperately begging for a blast strength reduction.
 - All the MCLR evidence and pleading was totally ignored.

- f. After many attempts, the MCLR were able to force the BCC into providing notice of blast emails.
- g. The BCC ignored at least 16 requests “to be provided with the planned or estimated blast strength”,
 - o We asked for almost any kind of planned blast information.
 - o But every email request was ignored.
- h. The [10th November 2017 response by BCC Mr Bird \(TB\)](#) to the two DES requests for the MCQ to reduce their blasting limits, is yet one clear written example of the callous BCC attitude towards the MCLR.
 - o TB states clearly some items which are not at all true.
 - o TB states the BCC position, which is that the BCC considers that cracks may occur in light framed buildings above 75mm/sec (this means almost nothing).
 - o Using the [MCLR internal home monitoring](#), 75mm/sec on the ground equates to 195mm/sec or 40 times the Australian and State Maximums and 100 times the Historic Maximum.
 - o Using the [Seismology Research Centre](#) internal [monitoring example](#), this indicates 300mm/sec or 60 times and 150 times the historic maximum in a common 10-level building.

MCLR Forced Response

- 2. The MCLR were forced to study and self-learn about Noise, Mining, Blasting, Vibration, Shot Firing, Mine Planning, DES Noise Measurement (NMM), Acoustics, etc.
 - a. The MCLR were able to investigate and uncover the fact that MCQ, only had to report data to the DES from the much further way locations. The MCQ was also conducting blast monitoring near their office & weighbridge on DOGIT land, but kept this data secret.
 - b. The MCLR also had to research and learn all about blast vibration amplifications inside homes and other buildings.
 - c. They studied and analysed all the standards, discovering that the USBM describes the cumulative blast vibration effects as “Fatigue”.
 - o The USBM rates Fatigue as reducing a building’s strength and hence resistance to vibrations by up to 50%.

MCLR have a right to know what MCQ had earlier been done to their homes

- 3. The MCLR believe that they have a right to know what the MCQ had done and exactly what happened inside and to their homes.
 - a. What damage was done before blast 600?
 - o The MCQ did not provide the blast vibration measurements done near their office and weighbridge, which would have given a clear indication.
 - b. What damage was being done, due to the vibration amplification effects inside their homes?
 - o How loud was the internal home noise?
 - o What were the psychological effect on shift workers?

The MCLR has limited funds:

4. The MCLR were unable to fund lengthy and repeated attendances by Blast Vibration Professionals.
 - a. Because the MCLR were never once told what the estimated blast strength would be, they have to rely on their own observations from Scenic Drive.
 - b. Using this approximate prediction method, they were able to afford the hiring of industry standard expensive equipment on the basis that the supplier did the technical work and we only placed and returned the equipment, according to their instructions.
 - c. If as requested (that MCLR were advised by the MCQ of each estimated blast strength), then the MCLR could have done selective fully-paid monitoring, but this was impossible due to the MCQ policy.

MCLR Forced to do Transducer Self-Placement

5. The MCLR were thus forced by the MCQ into doing their own monitor self-placement.
 - a. They provide a Statutory Declaration regarding the honesty & accuracy of this work.
 - b. There are also other markers such as date and time, subsequent monitor waveform similarity and low variance which all indicate honest monitoring.
 - c. Accuracy concerns of this method are addressed in the MCLR Statutory Declarations.

Unacceptable BCC MCQ Operational and Communication Factors:

6. The [MCQ EA Schedule-F6 rule](#) does not define any maximum blast vibration on every 10th blast.
 - a. This regulation thus allows the MCQ to do 9 quick small blasts followed by a massive blast, the strength of which they have done many times in the past.
 - b. The BCC is quick to advise the MCLR about this amazing undefined maximum, when the residents complain.

MCLR repeatedly ignored by the BCC Mr Bird.

7. When approached by the MCLR during the Steven Miles DES site meeting, Mr Bird turned and abruptly departed the meeting.
 - a. The BCC ignores all our written email reports and requests, except for the Lord Mayor who typically replies with generalities or irrelevant responses.
 - b. The [MCLR have asked 16 times to be advised of each estimated blast strength](#)
 - o A primary blast design factor which the MCQ knows, but always hides from the LR.
 - o The MCLR have never once received a reply to this request, except on one occasion when BCC Mr Bird replied simply stating only their EA Schedule-F conditions.
 - o Because the blast strength and effects are variable, this effectively prevents us from performing monitoring at a reasonable cost, unless we monitor every blast.

MCLR repeatedly ignored by DES

8. The DES has repeatedly ignored the MCLR requests for MCQ regulatory assistance and has left [the MCQ vibration and noise policeman task almost entirely to the MCLR](#) to perform.
 - c. This task is impossible for most of the non-engineer and/or elderly residents.
 - d. The DES and MCQ has never once even considered monitoring any blast vibration or noise on primary noise sensitive dwelling locations such as the Mt Coot-tha Rd residential properties. DES advised this practice was unacceptable using reasons which were all untrue.
 - e. Hence there is a strong perception by the MCLR that the DES is strongly biased against them and ignores their MCQ blasting-caused health and damage problems.
9. Hence the [27th June 2018 DES Mr Karle Letter \(MKL\) is one of many examples](#) where the DES department is attempting to shield the BCC from the local resident's action.

- f. The MKL used ambiguous and untrue generalised statements in an attempt to deter the MCLR from further complaints.
- g. The MKL states that “The department has formed the view that AS2187.2 is adequate...”
 - o The MCLR provided submissions to Standards Australia for some non-compulsory considerations, which the DES opposed thereby defeating the 3 change projects.
 - o The DES did agree that blast counts greater (than the currently AS2187.2 defined 20 blasts) be considered as well as the effects on taller buildings.
 - o However, it now appears that the DES has redacted this former position.
- h. The MKL states further that AS2187.2 is adequate in the context of defining blast levels to protect human comfort.
 - o [AS2187.2 Appendix J Front page clearly states](#) that their standard defines the levels which will cause human discomfort.
 - o It says that damage can be caused by forces that humans cannot hear.
 - o It does **not** say that human discomfort and/or damage does not occur at lower levels.
 - o Our text search in Appendix J on the word “protect” does not find any match.
 - o So where is MK getting the “protection” concept from, when Industry.gov.au clearly states that there is no such Australian standard?
- i. In September 2018 the MCLR obtained 311 pages of RTI data and have analysed 3 years of DES correspondence.
 - o This appears to have several examples of grossly inaccurate assumptions.
 - o These are untrue and possibly corrupted or colluded statements.
- j. This reinforces the belief by the MCLR that the DES continues to be strongly biased against them and that they have never been fairly treated.
 - o We have provided a multi-page response document based on this 2016-2018 RTI document request. (See our Complaint Document Appendix B).

The DES was once an EPA or Environmental Protection Department

- 10. As a Public Environmental Regulatory Service, the MCLR believe that the DES job is to shield the MCLR Public from all illegal & harmful BCC MCQ operations. They also have to enforce the “Environmental Protection Act 1994”.
 - k. But instead of this, the DES appears to have decided to use their policy, to invert their role polarity and block or alter the MCLR complaints from reaching the MCQ.
 - o This allowed the BCC to totally gut the DOGIT Trust land whilst grossly misrepresenting the true count and strength level of their MCQ blast vibrations.
 - l. The DES appears to be providing the BCC with a policy pretence:
 - o The MCQ is not legally responsible to the MCLR and the Qld Legal system for their sustained EA Schedule-F violations.
 - o Their decision to use departmental policy to override the fundamental science regarding [the cause of noise inside the homes](#), is just one example.

The BCC MCQ is a Commercial Gravel Sales Operator

11. Whilst the DES defines the MCQ as a Quarry and not a Mine, the size of the MCQ operations, life-span, environmental-destruction and cash flow exceeds that of many defined mines, plus MCQ exists in a very special and highly popular inner Brisbane DOGIT defined area.
 - m. The MCQ is known to be a broad commercial operation, which [provides gravel to external companies](#).
 - o It is/was not uncommon at 6am in the mornings to see a long queue of trucks waiting on Mt Coot-tha Rd to be filled with gravel from the DOGIT "Public Park" quarry mine area.
 - o If the BCC were accruing for the massive rehabilitation costs, then the cost of their gravel would be financially unviable.
 - n. The DES stated position, where the quarry is not required to commit to any rehabilitation, closure planning or site-damage compensation by the BCC MCQ, ignores their environmental responsibilities.
 - o Many Brisbane residents would expect that this should have a much higher priority in a very popular Brisbane DOGIT area.

The MCLR Should be Treated More Kindly

12. Instead of being ignored, the MCLR should be treated kindly and fairly because of their location specific financial costs and losses - instead of as just a discarded public nuisance.
 - o. It well known to all resource companies, that success comes through effective liaison with the local residents and inhabitants.
 - o Cr Judy Magub did this for some years, but the [major quarry operational date extension](#) destroyed her trusted local residential liaison.
 - p. If the [MCQ Commercial Gravel Mining](#) operations are so vital, that it is essential to extend the MCQ closure date multiple times (currently until 2032),
 - o Enabling the [BCC MCQ to permanently gut](#) one of Australia's most-loved, accessible, precious and nature-based tourist areas,
 - o which will then face an (MCLR estimated & unfunded) \$200 million rehabilitation cost,
 - o Then at least the MCLR should not be ignored.
 - q. Yet the damage reports that the MCLR had worked very hard on during 2017, in their own time and at their own cost, to totally truthfully document and provide to the DES & BCC, have been totally ignored.
 - r. In the light of the new [BCC Mega-Zipline Joy-Ride Proposal](#), where the BCC is in reality trying to steal ownership of the much-loved lookout and botanical gardens from the general public, we fear for the future of both the Botanical Gardens and the MCQ DOGIT land.

The MCLR Complaint Submission

1. We believe that the QLD DES department has grossly failed and/or opposed the MCLR, on several primary factors, for 2 decades.
 - a. The MCLR believe that the DES was originally involved in the creation of [KRA-42 with zero separation zone to the local homes and monuments](#). The lack of consideration towards the MCLR was and is a critical and crucial mistake.
 - b. The DES (as the EPA) allowed the creation of the Perpetual [MCQ SR0041 Schedule-F](#), with no defined maximum blast strength on every 10th blast (we are unable to find any similar urban blasting conditions which effectively permits any 9 quick small blasts to be followed by one massive unlimited blast).

USBM Defined Gross Fatigue Conditions Ignored and The Blasting Continues

2. There is no consideration of and notice to MCQ, regarding the [USBM Fatigue defined thousands of blasts for several decades \(especially strong in the last 2 decades\)](#), on the adjacent homes and historic buildings, plus the thousands of world war service personnel graves and other monuments.
 - a. The USBM defines [high blast count effects as "Fatigue" which reduces the strength of a home by 50%](#). This effect, plus the home styles and footing strata effectively excludes Mt Coot-tha style homes from their test data.
 - b. At some stage c1997, the DES (as the EPA) allowed the blast count to be reset to zero, whilst the real count is at least several thousand.
 - c. No world standard that we can find considers several thousand blasts.
 - d. We cannot find any quarry in the developed world which has done that many blasts for 100 years in the middle of an urban and popular tourist area.
 - o Certainly, this appears to be a far greater number, than what which was considered by the USBM as Fatigue.
 - o The MCQ closure date was repeatedly extended and the blast strength increased dramatically.
 - e. The BCC operating conditions were imported into the State Government regulatory system without any major changes.
 - o Yet even those which were obviously included for the protection of the MCLR, the DES now ignores or opposes.
 - f. Some agencies such as [the QLD TMR](#), & [Engineers Australia](#) define [2mm/second as the maximum for historic homes and monuments and a 10mm/sec maximum](#).
 - o The ANZEC [recommends 2mm/sec as the long-term regulatory goal](#).
 - o Yet the DES ignores the TMR values and in their recent letter attempted to overrule this by stating that they had "consulted with the TMR".
 - g. It appears that the DES and MCQ was even unaware that the [60inch SEQ Water Grid pipeline](#) passes right [under the Botanic Gardens, only 100m from KRA-42](#) and only 300m from the current blast zone.
 - o What might the USMB fatigue estimates have on this highly somewhat old but valued pipeline?

EPA (now DES) "Guideline System" Misrepresentation 3X or 300% Upsize Ignored

3. Creation of an MCQ blast vibration measurement "guideline system", which only required blast vibration monitor reporting from much further away distances.
 - a. This misreporting almost guaranteed invalid BCC blast vibration compliance, by reporting only the misrepresented and considerably weaker values, for more than a decade.
 - b. Whilst the BCC MCQ did more local higher value measurements near their office and weighbridge, which as confirmed by the [DES NMM Attenuation data](#) would have clearly

indicated the much stronger levels which were being inflicted to the local homes, the DES never required that these ever be considered.

- c. The [subsequent approx. 3X upsize vibration parameter was defined](#) by the MCLR Statistician as between 2.6X and 3.6X.

Proposed AS2187.2 Appendix J non-compulsory Changes were Rejected

4. The DES opposed the MCLR (somewhat anaemic) [proposed changes to the Standards Australia AS2187.2 Appendix J](#).
 - a. The MCLR simply wanted that “It be non-compulsory and only advisory that some consideration be given to the effects of blast vibrations on Historic Buildings, Electronic Equipment, Tall Building Vibration Amplification, Blast Counts Higher than 20”.
 - b. Also, that “Human Comfort should be changed to Human Health”.
 - c. The DES never provided any reasons to the MCLR or their chairman (John Higgins) or engineer (Philip Best) for their opposition to our important Appendix-J Changes.
 - d. After countless hours of work and 3 attempts, the Standards Project Coordinator advised that our submission could not proceed because the DES has not approved it.
 - e. However, the DES did advise that the Appendix-J Table J4.5(a) does not include blasting effects greater than 20 blasts and [recommended that long term blasting effects plus the amplification effects on upper building levels be considered](#).

Extreme Internal Home Noise Monitoring Data was Disallowed

5. At the 2013 residents & MCQ meeting (the only), the DES used departmental policy to overrule the MCLR internal home noise complaint.
 - a. They stated that the noise generated inside the homes from sensitive receptor blast vibration amplification, would only ever be considered as overpressure noise.
 - b. This is [scientifically not at all correct because the overpressure sonic boom arrives later](#).
 - With much slower propagation speed and a longer transmission path the atmospheric overpressure sonic boom attenuates quicker. It has to [diffract up over the ridge and down through the trees](#).
 - c. Looking at any Mt Coot-tha Instantel Trace, [you can clearly see the ground \(& home\) vibration noise before the overpressure arrives](#) , plus it [is Vibration Phase Coherent](#).
 - d. On the much stronger blasts, [the internal house vibration noise is stronger and lasts much longer](#), however the atmospheric overpressure noise does not increase greatly.
 - e. When an innocent resident is located inside their home, the actual home vibration noise that they hear can be much louder and also coincident with the actual vibration feel.
 - This greatly increases the perceived blast strength.
 - It gives the impression of “a bomb going off inside their home”.
 - It is totally and technically illegal and the DES is wrong to state otherwise.
 - The MCLR believe that this was originally written by the BCC into their EA Schedule F conditions, to specifically protect all local residents.

Schedule F6 Monitoring "In or on any noise sensitive place" Disallowed

6. The DES totally ignored any need for blast vibration and noise monitoring inside the local resident's properties and homes, even though the [MCQ EA Schedule-F clearly states that measurement "in or on any other noise sensitive place" is required.](#)
 - a. The MCLR believe there has never been a defined engineering study of the required blast monitoring program necessary to ensure full MCQ EA Schedule-F compliance.
 - o Originally this condition would have been written into the EA Schedule F conditions by the BCC, to specifically protect all local residents.
 - b. The MCQ claims that their monitoring program is independently done by consultants, yet the MCQ manager tells them where and to monitor using spikes. (This is not independent monitoring).
 - c. The DES NMM requires concrete block mounted transducers, but MCQ specifies to the monitoring contractors to use soil spikes and hence generally does not follow this process.

The 2.6X or 260% Internal Home Blast Vibration Upsize Factor Disallowed

7. When the local residents completed a costly and self-funded series of blast vibrations inside their own homes (which provided [an additional numeric Statistician Verified 2.6X upsize parameter](#)), the [MK Letter then arrived advising that these results were invalid.](#)
 - a. The letter stated reasons that are scientifically incorrect.
 - o Our Appendix A and B documents describe this in more detail.
 - b. It claimed that monitoring inside buildings is not consistent with recognised methods.
 - o This is not true, at least [two Australian companies specialise](#) in measuring ground vibration in buildings, plus many others do it on occasions.
 - o The [SRC advised](#) that a common 10-level building should expect a 4x vibration amplification or the ground measured values.
 - o [10mm/sec on the ground = 40mm/sec](#) at the higher internal antinode points.
 - o SRC also advises that building vibration monitoring is done in other countries thousands of times every year.
 - o The only way that this can be measured is by fastening a tri-axial transducer to the building. They either use a drilled hole, epoxy fastened plate or clamp to a horizontal surface.
 - o It is also common to use Epoxy or clamps when fastening to rocky areas.

Statistician Misreporting and Upsize Factors Ignored.

8. When the [two Statistician's upsize parameters were combined together](#), this provided a massive blast vibration footprint monitoring failure to the extent of approximately 7.5X or more than 700% upsize, between the reported and real measurements.
 - a. It is well known that immediately opposite the BCC MCQ [there is a well-known historic building.](#)
 - b. There are [thousands of memorial and grave sites.](#)
 - c. Plus, [Stuartholme school is within the non-existent 500m](#) KRA-42 separation zone.
 - d. Also [more than 350 residents live in this same ignored separation zone](#) distance.

MCLR Life:

All the MCLR want is simply to get on with their lives like ordinary happy Brisbane people.

MCLR always act Truthfully and Legally (no reason to do otherwise).

9. The MCLR believe that they have not done anything untruthful or unlawful, plus all their buildings were correctly and fully approved within the BCC Land Change of Use, Development Approval, Construction Approval and BCC Certification Frameworks.
 - a. They were forced into having to do their own transducer placement, which (as mentioned above), was not what their desired outcome.
 - b. In doing so, they have done their best to be entirely honest and fully complied with the device suppliers' instructions.
 - c. In Appendix Q, they created a series of Statutory Declarations to reinforce their honesty.

BCC 24th Feb 2010 Asphalt and Aggregates Manager Assurance was Invalid

10. Before beginning home design and construction, the MCLR were provided with a [signed letter from BCC Aggregates Manager Chris Lange](#) which provided an assurance that the blasting levels at MCQ were far lower than what could ever damage a private home.
 - d. In consideration of the fact that the level of blast vibrations at and inside the closest homes were unknown to the DES, BCC and MCQ staff until blast 600:
 - o Plus, a dangerous seismic-level compounded blast vibration misreporting factor of more than 700% has now been uncovered.
 - o This assurance and maximum values provided by both BCC Chris Lange and other MCQ management staff directly to the MCLR, appears to be grossly invalid, incorrect, and possibly illegal.

The MCLR Never Deserved this Fearful Treatment

11. The MCLR never deserved to be fearful of the quarry blasts or wanted to spend their precious time and money defending their homes, plus they never wanted to contact Standards Australia to run 3 Change Project Proposals and then follow up with multiple RTI data requests.
 - a. The MCLR have a very important job to do and that is to look after their mental health instead of constantly living in battle mode, to protect their homes and life for the past 20 years.
 - b. Not since the era of [Cr Judy Magub](#), have the MCLR ever been able to talk respectfully with their elected BCC Councillor. (We have never once received any response from our local Cr Peter Matic.)
 - c. The MCLR believe that they have done their best to ensure that the text and concepts in all our documents are entirely truthful.

The June-2018 MKL Arrived with the Junk in the Mail and was a huge shock

12. [The MKL to the MCLR June-2018 letter](#) is but one of many examples why the MCLR have been forced into conducting their own self-funded activities and devote massive blocks of their own precious time and money.
 - e. This could all have been avoided if only the residents were able to effectively liaise with Cr Matic or LM Quirk.
 - f. However, the MCLR believes that this failed because of the incorrect policy advice that the DES MCQ Schedule-F compliance department provided to the BCC.

Proposed Outcomes:

BCC long-term Non-compliance must be Advised and Enforced

13. The MCLR demand that the BCC MCQ be advised that:
 - a. The MCQ has failed to fully comply with their EA Schedule-F conditions for 17 years (or longer).
 - b. The MCQ must comply with both the [2016 request from EHP Director Andrew Connor](#), as well as the 2017 request which the MCLR considers of full of reply errors.
 - c. The MCQ is required to conduct meaningful community consultation, it ignores this and instead ignores multiple resident's complaints.
 - d. Review of possible damage to all local resident's homes, especially the historic homes and monuments.
 - e. All homes in Mt Coot-tha that contain any asbestos fibre materials should be rigorously inspected and tested for loose fibres caused by strong blasting.
 - f. The situation over the past 20 years, has got to the stage that the BCC and MCQ can say almost anything that they like and there is never any concern shown, or follow-up action done by the DES and State Government.

Independent Departmental and Parliamentary Enquiry Request

In order to fully evaluate this highly complex issue, we request a Fully Independent Parliamentary Enquiry into:

1. The Past and Current operations of BCC MCQ Mt Coot-tha Quarry.
2. The Damage Done to the MCLR Homes and Mental Health.
3. The Future of the land and the DOGIT Trust Land Status.
4. The Likely Rehabilitation Costs.

Because our reports seriously question the professionalism and accuracy of individual DES and TMR Staff members mentioned in this report, it is inappropriate that these staff members be called upon to review or comment on this complaint and/or the contents.

The Departmental and Parliamentary Enquiry is Absolutely Essential

1. The State Government and the DES should conduct an independent enquiry into the Mt Coot-tha Quarry.
 - a. Not only is there a huge amount of complex technical MCLR data on the MCQ to consider, there is the aspect of the DOGIT Trust Public Park land to consider.
 - b. Overall this a very complex system of misuse and damage with extremely expensive downstream outcomes.
 - o As mentioned above in simply trying to protect our homes and mental health, we have generated 92 data folders.
 - o More than 800MB of data.
 - o More than 1200 separate files.
 - c. Including how the MCLR were mis-treated by the BCC for 2 decades?
 - d. The likelihood of free asbestos fibres being released due to several thousand strong blast vibrations.
 - e. When viewing the MCQ it is apparent that the blasting has almost reached the crushing and screening equipment:
 - o It appears that the primary MCQ extractive phase has almost run out of prime rock.
 - f. Hence the future usage questions become relevant.
 - o When and how does the DOGIT Trust Land (pre-existence) exemption end?
 - o How much will the very expensive rehabilitation cost?

- What kind of rubbish dump will the Big Hole become?
- What is the proposed final product outcome?
- Who will pay to rehabilitate this massive hole back to part of the Botanical Gardens?
- g. If the current BCC Mega-Zipline project on DOGIT land change of use is approved by the DMRN Minister, how will the MCQ affect the Zipline Operations.
 - The MCQ is a huge expensive eyesore and will become more visible from the proposed Zipline facilities.
 - The MCQ emits huge clouds of very abrasive dust, which will settle on and in the zipline cables and components, causing much increased wear.
 - Tourists do not travel from far away places, to look at a dirty, dusty, blasting, gravel mines.
 - For a Chinese person, mostly they earn a quarter of Australian wages.
 - This is equivalent to us spending \$400 for a 2-minute ride, that they can see from Scenic Drive.
 - We know that the Chinese are not stupid, for that money they can fly to Cairns.

Yours Sincerely,



Philip Best, on behalf of David Hassall and all of the MCLR.