

# MT. SHAMROCK QUARRY ENVIRONMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

www.allpossibilities.com.au

## Meeting Summary

21<sup>st</sup> May 2025 (4.10pm – 6.15pm)

### Committee Members

#### Present:

Leigh Elliott	Holcim Australia
Nathan Thomas	
Don Petty	Local Community Representatives
Neville Bassett	
Joy Carberry	
Rosemary Buczak	
Ryan Harris	Cardinia Shire Council
Barry Strong	Earth Resources Regulator

#### Apologies:

Cr Brett Owen	Cardinia Shire Council
Marcelle Bell	
Representative	Environmental Protection Authority

#### Chairperson:

Lisa Barrand	Possibilities Pty Ltd
--------------	-----------------------

## Welcome

Committee members were welcomed to the meeting, including Rosemary Buczak who has been appointed as the fourth Community Representative. Apologies were noted from Councillor Brett Owen and Marcelle Bell; and Ryan Harris (Principal Environmental Planner) was welcomed as a stand in for Marcelle. Lisa acknowledged Country. Leigh and Nathan were thanked for organising the Community Site Tour which occurred immediately prior to the meeting. About 14 people attended, most for the first time, and the group travelled by bus to the viewing point on the south rim as well as into the pit to observe the operations of the quarry which were in full swing. All agreed that the site tour was again, a great success. Members of the Community were encouraged to follow up with any questions/comments to Leigh and Nathan; and also, members of the ERC.

## Update on actions agreed at previous meetings

### Person Responsible

#### *Action 71.2. Out of cycle comprehensive EMP review and update*

*Holcim is seeking to update the content of the EMP. This will include correcting references to legislation, updating processes, making changes to the LRMP and also adapting the EMP Review Procedure to allow for the formal incorporation of minor changes emerging from audit recommendations along with other improvements without having to wait for a 5 yearly review.*

Holcim submitted their final proposed version of the EMP to Cardinia Shire Council for approval on the 23<sup>rd</sup> of December 2024. The process now sits with Council to conduct both an internal review and also to invite reviews from relevant external agencies such as the EPA. At this meeting, Ryan was able to update the Committee that referrals have now been sent to the

Marcelle  
Bell

EPA, Resources Victoria and the Minister for Planning as well as internal teams for review and comment. Although the Committee acknowledges and understands that it will take time for the referral parties to undertake the review work, it was noted that having the EMP finalised in a timely manner would be welcome. Previous EMP reviews have often taken a long time for final approval; due, in part due to delays in agencies responding to review requests from Council.

***Action 73.1 Transfer of ERC Hosting Page from Possibilities Pty Ltd to Holcim***

*All records of the ERC have historically been hosted by the Chairperson company website however it is considered appropriate that this be relocated to Holcim's website.*

Leigh updated the Committee on this topic, noting that the contents of the AllPossibilities Website has now been downloaded and that he is waiting for the IT Team to upload to the Holcim Mt Shamrock webpage. Until that takes place, all information will remain on the Lisa's webpage. Leigh Elliott

## **Resource Investigation Project Update**

Lisa set the context for today's update by noting that the last meeting, had been somewhat difficult due to the fact that the planning approvals pathway had not as yet been determined and that the mechanisms for community consultation not certain. Now that the Minister has confirmed that no EES is required, the approvals pathway is clearer in that a Workplan Variation will be involved. In terms of this and the work of the ERC, Workplan Variations are within the scope of the Terms of Reference. Holcim, as the owner/operator is entitled to work on their development plans and members of the ERC, and the community more broadly, are also entitled to ask questions and raise concerns they may have about the proposed extension to the extraction area. Lisa invited all members to continue with our 'good faith' approach in discussions.

Nathan shared that preliminary discussions regarding the extension project were now commencing with relevant authorities, and that that the process was likely to be iterative and take some time. In particular the scoping of the geotechnical components would shape other technical assessments including those with DEECA, the EPA, Southern Rural Water, Melbourne Water.

With regards to the question of community engagement and feedback within the approvals process, Barry was able to clarify that in terms of the legislation, ERR operates to the Mineral Resources (Sustainable Development) Act 1990. It provides no process for community notification in regard to applications to vary an existing Work Authority. The approvals process is technical in nature; however, the proponent is required to demonstrate how they have engaged with stakeholders, including the community, and this may include how stakeholder input had been responded to in terms of the proposal.

From a planning approvals perspective, Ryan spoke about the Local Government Planning Scheme and that there were multiple pathways to approval, depending upon which approach Holcim chose to take for their submission. These included amending permits, applying for new permits, applying for a permit directly to the minister etc. Each of these would have different implications for any formal community consultation.

Nathan expressed the view that Holcim had, he hoped, demonstrated a long-standing commitment to engaging with and communicating with the community. He also recognised that the longer-term history of the site, pre-Holcim, had meant that there were experiences for people in the community that were not necessarily positive, but that Holcim had been working to be a good neighbour since their ownership of the quarry.

There was a substantial discussion that involved sharing some of the history to the last extension application process in 2005, and the negative impact this had had for some local residents at the time. Some of these examples lead to a productive discussion about how community might bring any questions and concerns into the current process that is now underway.

In summary, the message for the community was to engage, preferably in writing, directly with Holcim noting their concerns, their questions about possible impacts, and requests that they might have for Holcim in considering their extension proposal such that these requests might give relief to community concerns.

Regardless of the ultimate planning process, these communications can be considered in almost all of the approval pathways; and importantly; will provide timely feedback to Holcim about matters of community concern that may help shape their proposal in beneficial ways that meet the needs of the community.

More specific questions were asked regarding offsets and this helped clarify that the current trees on the site that were part of the original rehabilitation plan would definitely be considered in determining what offsets might be needed. It was hoped that any required offsets would be undertaken on local Holcim land.

Another discussion that highlighted the benefit of documenting community concerns related to blast buffer zones. Speaking generally, Barry explained that the Australian Standards on blasting was long standing, well understood and aimed to prevent fly rock, minimise ground vibration and minimise air pressure impacts for sensitive receptors. In the main, sensitive receptors relate to dwellings and do include public access spaces. Without minimizing the desire of some members of the community to see reports showing blasting information, it was suggested that concerns regarding the impact of new blasting locations on sensitive locations that were now much closer to operations would be a reasonable concern of the community and that these could and should be brought forward in writing.

Finally, Rosemary offered to talk more specifically with folk involved in managing the Reserve and Pony Club regarding the project to identify any concerns that this cohort of the community might have.

As per previous discussions, Committee members are again encouraged to reach out at any time to Matt Dodd (Project Manager) with any questions or comments. Matt can be reached on 0439 381 724 or [au-mtshamrock@holcim.com](mailto:mtshamrock@holcim.com).

## **Environment Management Quarterly Report (including consultant recommendations)**

Leigh talked to the quarterly report which encouragingly showed no non-conformances or complaints. Leigh noted the following:

- Some of the waste data was missing in the report, mainly as the new contractor, Veolia, had been collecting waste early in the morning, before the weigh bridge was operational and as such, weight data had not been available. Leigh is working to resolve this.
- An additional data set has been incorporated to dust monitoring results that shows a ‘windrose’ scatter plot of the (from) wind direction at the time of any dust exceedences. This information has assisted understand whether dust exceedences are likely to have been generated by the operations of the quarry or from external sources. The distance of the dots from the centre of the windrose graph identifies increasing concentration. Using this approach, Blue Atmosphere was able to determine that all the exceedences during the reporting period originated from sources outside of the quarry operations.

There were no questions raised regarding the quarterly report.

## **Other business**

### **Groundwater and Springs Monitoring Report**

The Committee considered this report, which captures and analyses the data from calendar year 2024. It is the first such report to have been prepared by GHD following the ‘desk audit’ undertaken in 2023. Since that time, and as reported in other meeting summaries, Holcim has implemented most of the recommendations from the desk audit including new water flow data collection systems for the springs and additional reference bore monitoring from outside of the site.

There were two main questions relating to the final conclusions of the report with respect to the influence of quarry operations on both bore level trends and spring functioning. These have been captured in action 74.1 below.

### **Annual EMP Audit Report**

This report is prepared by an independent auditor and reviews Holcim’s compliance with the EMP for the previous calendar year. During the discussion about the report for 2024, the Committee noted the detail of the report and how this gives confidence to the Committee that a very thorough audit has taken place. The actual content of the report was also very positive and the Committee commended Leigh and the team on the outcome. There were only two minor non conformances and these have now been captured in the final pages of each quarterly report so that their completion can be tracked. There were also many commendations noted by the auditor in relation to Holcim’s practices on the site which Leigh spoke to as reflective of the maturity of the organisations systems.

### **Career Expo**

Nathan let the Committee know that Holcim took part in the Careers Expo with over 3000 students attending the event. From Holcim's perspective it was very successful and has led to a number of school tours being organised.

### **Community Projects**

Nathan let the Committee know that the site had been involved in a local planting project at Cannibal Creek whereby the site had assisted with watering-in plants. Nathan again invited the Community to bring forward any potential projects that Holcim could be involved in and contribute to. This included potential water projects as the site has a registered water truck and plenty of water.

### **Slope Stability Report**

This will be reviewed at the August meeting.

### **Landscape and Rehabilitation Management Report**

There was a brief discussion regarding this report however due to its substantial content, this has been held over for review at the August meeting.

### **Finalising ERC Terms of Reference**

This item needs confirmation by the Committee at the August meeting following the appointment of the fourth Community Representative, as agreed by correspondence since the February meeting. Lisa will bring to the meeting.

## **Actions arising**

### **Person Responsible**

#### ***Action 74.1 Question arising from annual Groundwater and Spring report***

*The annual Groundwater and Spring Monitoring Report is discussed in May each year.*

Holcim will seek an expanded clarification from GHD regarding their Summaries (6.3 and 8.2) that comment on their opinion regarding the influence of quarry operations on groundwater and spring functioning respectively. During the meeting, the Committees attention was drawn to the graph on Page 50 (Appendix E) whereby the groundwater levels in January 2002 are higher than they are now. Similarly, there was concern raised that the functioning of the Springs has deteriorated since that time. It was noted that the monitoring regime relates to changes since the extension was approved in 2008. The discussion also identified that a great deal of the spring data collection had, until more recently, been quite subjective, and that it is hoped that the additional monitoring equipment that has been installed will provide a more accurate picture of any changes

Leigh Elliott

### **Remaining dates for meetings and site tours in 2025**

The following dates are proposed, and calendar invites will be sent after the meeting summary is confirmed.

- 13<sup>th</sup> August 2025
  - Committee meeting (Cardinia Shire Council Office) 4pm – 6pm
- 19<sup>th</sup> November 2025
  - Site Tour for Committee members 2.30 – 4.00pm
  - Committee Meeting (Holcim Office) 4pm – 6pm

### **Items for consideration at next revision of EMP**

There are currently no items identified.