

# Austral Bricks: Cardup Stakeholder Community Group

## Special Meeting Minutes

Monday 10 May 2021, 2.30pm to 4.00pm

Dome Cafe, 829 South Western Highway, Byford

Agenda, minutes and tabled documents available via  
[www.australbricks.com.au/environmental-documentation#](http://www.australbricks.com.au/environmental-documentation#)

Once you click on the link, you need to also **click on the 'Cardup (WA)' tab** along the top of the webpage to be directed to the correct page.

### Attendees

<b>Alan Clarkson</b>	Serpentine-Jarrahdale Ratepayers Association
<b>Tom Dyer</b>	Serpentine-Jarrahdale Ratepayers Association
<b>Stephen White</b>	Byford on the Scarp Association
<b>Tony Harrison</b>	Byford on the Scarp Association
<b>Colleen Rankin</b>	Byford Progress Association
<b>Max Erskine</b>	Byford Progress Association
<b>Peter Edmiston</b>	Local resident
<b>Ann Dyer</b>	Local resident
<b>Vanessa Slater</b>	Coordinator Natural Reserves; Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale
<b>Andrew Mack</b>	Consultant
<b>Tanya Gilders</b>	WA Property & Compliance Manager; Austral Bricks
<b>Maria Nguyen</b>	Manager of Occupational Hygiene; Austral Bricks
<b>David Johnson</b>	General Manager; Austral Bricks
<b>Lenda Oshalem</b>	Chairperson; Newgate
<b>Cale Black</b>	Newgate

### Apologies

<b>Kevin Radford</b>	Local Resident
----------------------	----------------

## Agenda

Item	Topic	Reporting
1	Welcome / Introductions	Newgate
2	Apologies	Newgate
3	Minutes and Terms of Reference	Newgate
4	Report on action register	Newgate
5	Update on dust management	Austral Bricks
6	Dust monitoring proposal	Austral Bricks
7	Other business	Discussion led by Newgate
8	Next meeting	Newgate

Item	Topic	Action Items
<p><b>1.0</b></p> <p><b>1.1</b></p> <p><b>1.2</b></p> <p><b>1.3</b></p>	<p><b>Welcome / Introductions</b></p> <p>Lenda Oshalem opened the meeting at 2:30pm and introduced new attendees.</p> <p>Lenda Oshalem noted that meetings are recorded by Newgate in order to make it easier to write up meeting minutes. The recording is destroyed once meeting minutes are confirmed. Alan Clarkson asked if other members of the group would be able to record audio from the SCG. Following discussion, it was agreed that only Newgate will record the meeting and to formally note in the meeting minutes that the recording will be used solely for the purpose of writing up the minutes and that recordings will be destroyed following the confirmation of meeting minutes. Lenda Oshalem also undertook to call SCG member Tom Dyer when email communications are distributed.</p> <p>Colleen Rankin asked to number the pages of meeting minutes. This was agreed.</p>	<p><b>ACTION 15</b> Lenda Oshalem to contact SCG member Tom Dyer via phone call to confirm receipt of items emailed.</p> <p><b>ACTION 16</b> Note in the minutes that Newgate's recording of the meeting will be destroyed when minutes are confirmed.</p> <p><b>ACTION 17</b> Number pages of meeting minutes going forward.</p>
<p><b>2.0</b></p> <p><b>2.1</b></p>	<p><b>Apologies</b></p> <p>Kevin Radford</p>	
<p><b>3.0</b></p> <p><b>3.1</b></p> <p><b>3.2</b></p>	<p><b>Minutes and Terms of Reference</b></p> <p>Lenda Oshalem circulated Terms of Reference and previous meeting minutes and noted that SCG feedback has been incorporated.</p> <p>Lenda Oshalem explained the purpose of this special meeting being on dust management and dust monitoring. Lenda Oshalem said the next meeting, which will likely be in June, will be a regular meeting.</p>	
<p><b>4.0</b></p> <p><b>4.1</b></p>	<p><b>Report on action register</b></p> <p>Lenda Oshalem noted progress on outstanding action items.</p>	
<p><b>5.0</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b></p>	<p><b>Update on dust management</b></p> <p>Lenda Oshalem noted dust management was an issue raised at the last SCG meeting and that the action item was for</p>	

Item	Topic	Action Items
	Austral Bricks to further consider what action it could take in response to community feedback.	
5.2	Tanya Gilders distributed a document (attached) listing dust management issues at the Cardup site and talked through the items to the SCG.	
5.A	<b>Dust generated from trucks on the roads in, out and around operations</b>	
5.A1	Peter Edmiston asked about the timeframe and processes of sealing of the shoulder on the in-road to the site and said that he would have expected this to be completed by now. Tanya Gilders explained Austral Bricks is somewhat constrained due to Shire ownership, which restrains what they can do. Peter Edmiston replied this is in relation to the weighbridge road and trucks cutting the corner of the road where it is unsealed. He said a post was installed on the corner, which was run over by the second day, and that the road is not designed for B-Double trucks. Peter Edmiston referenced his experience with getting quotes for an asphalted driveway, taking three days to receive and around a month to complete the works, and noted that Austral Bricks at the last meeting said that they were receiving quotes for the sealing of the road and asked about the change of language to 'consideration of sealing'. Tanya Gilders replied Austral Bricks is still in the process of receiving quotes and gaining approval for the sealing of a Shire road. Peter Edmiston responded that the issue is trucks being forced to cross over onto the wrong side of the road as they pull out of the site, as well as dust being generated from the crossover. David Johnson explained that Austral Bricks is trying to counteract the carrying of dust from both sides of the road.	
5.A2	Stephen White said the issue was that the road is not designed to current standards for trucks and turning circles. Stephen White explained his experience in the process of obtaining Shire approval for two lots of three car bays, required a day to arrange a meeting and engineering drawings approved that afternoon by email, with works completed within approximately three weeks. Tony Harrison agreed with the issue of truck turning circles and the specifications of the road. Lenda Oshalem committed to tabling this item for follow up and discussion for the next SCG meeting.	<b>ACTION 18</b> Note item for next meeting of SCG.
5.B	<b>Dust generated on site and visible to neighbours</b>	
5.B1	Colleen Rankin asked when the camera was due to be installed. Tanya Gilders responded it is due to be installed this week. Vanessa Slater asked where the camera will be installed. Tanya Gilders responded it will be at the raw material exit as a priority, but the camera will be mobile and can be moved around to areas where required.	

Item	Topic	Action Items
5.B2	Peter Edmiston asked about photos provided to the SCG that showed dust being generated on site by a crusher. Tanya Gilders replied that the photos do not identify the crusher but the clay prep area, which includes a small loader that runs between two areas to move materials as and when needed.	
5.B3	Max Erskine said the video, shared with Austral Bricks, showed the location of the dust was in close proximity to a flag on site. Tanya Gilders clarified that this was not the primary crusher. David Johnson said that the operation and movement of a small loader in the area has increased the amount of dust generated. David Johnson said that he has spoken to both loader drivers to be aware of the amount of dust generated from their operations and said that the wetting down of the road by water carters has contributed towards less dust generated by these operations.	
5.B4	Alan Clarkson mentioned that there was a large degree of dust on site on the Sunday before and the morning of the SCG meeting.	
5.C	<b>Dust make-up (what is contributed by Cardup operations, what is from external sources)</b>	
5.C1	Tanya Gilders reiterated that Austral Bricks undertakes direct point source monitoring of total particulates from the stack and does not speciate between PM2.5 and PM10. Point source monitoring is publicly available through the annual environment report on the website.	
5.C2	Tony Harrison asked why in the national pollution index are Austral Bricks showing both PM10 and PM2.5. Tanya Gilders replied in the NPI that it does speciate in the reporting of fugitive dust, not point source emissions.	
5.C3	Colleen Rankin asked about the makeup of the dust and if an independent expert could analyse the dust to determine if the dust is hazardous to health for report back to the SCG. David Johnson said that Austral Bricks is currently developing a dust monitoring plan and this is being considered. Lenda Oshalem said the purpose of this special meeting is to provide this feedback to Austral Bricks Occupational Hygienist Maria Nguyen, who is leading the work on developing the plan.	
5.D	<b>Weather monitoring; dust being generated in periods of strong winds; compliance with dust mitigation plans</b>	
5.D1	Tanya Gilders noted recent weather monitoring had caused the cessation of some operations due to inclement weather.	
5.D2	Peter Edmiston asked about the definition of strong winds. Tanya Gilders said that the definition is taken from the Bureau of Meteorology. Max Erskine raised concerns with taking wind monitoring from Perth Airport readings being not accurate to the local conditions in Cardup and not reflective of katabatic winds. Tom Dyer and Max Erskine agreed with this sentiment.	

Item	Topic	Action Items
5.D3	Stephen White said with the build-up of residential dwellings in the area has caused issues with what was once a non-issue historically and acknowledged that not producing during those strong winds would drive Austral Bricks to financial unviability due to the significant cut of production, and would require drastic action or relocate to rectify this issue.	
5.D4	Tony Harrison explained the katabatic wind effect from the Scarp and the difficulty of the Scarp geography, which causes issues with swirling winds.	
5.D5	Colleen Rankin reiterated the need for a local anemometer on site and the misrepresentation of using data from the airport, and cited historical reasons why this was the case.	
5.D6	Alan Clarkson asked if it were possible that harm has already been made on the community due to the amount of dust. Tom Dyer expressed similar concern, saying that community members are reporting health issues.	
5.D7	David Johnson clarified that stopping dust generating activities includes things such as truck movements and turning clay, and does not include kiln operations. David Johnson made a correction to comments made in the last meeting and clarified that certain operations have previously been ceased due to inclement weather or winds. This did not cease the whole site operations, but ceased dust generating activities.	
5.D8	David Johnson and Tanya Gilders clarified that regulatory authority requirements specify the use of certain regulated meteorological data, which includes the use of Perth Airport and Jandakot Airport. The Serpentine site is not classified and a local anemometer on site does not comply either and would not meet standards required.	
5.D9	Peter Edmiston said that the community was looking for outcomes, not processes. David Johnson said that Maria Nguyen is here to assist with the determining dust management moving forward.	
5.D10	Stephen White noted that dust management in the State's north west is being legislated for workers safety.	
5.D11	Tom Dyer mentioned the design of site and wind speeds, and previous structures for other sites being built to a high specification for strong winds.	
5.D12	Colleen Rankin said there were two issues – having dust suppression to regulatory requirements, and dust suppression issues with the community – and said the community wants Austral Bricks to have someone on site for dust and wind monitoring for community purposes. David Johnson replied that the dust management plan is Cardup-specific and part of the review of the dust management plan includes identifying the triggers for actions to take place.	

Item	Topic	Action Items
<p><b>5.D13</b></p> <p><b>5.D14</b></p> <p><b>5.E</b></p> <p><b>5.E1</b></p> <p><b>5.E2</b></p>	<p>Tanya Gilders said the point of the review is acknowledging the current dust management plan is not specific enough to the site and making amendments to the plan to cover certain activities that take place to address community concerns, and the plan would have to go to DWER for approval.</p> <p>Tom Dyer asked for clarification on referring an amended dust management plan for regulatory approval. Tanya Gilders and David Johnson said that going above what is required for regulatory approval does not need to be approved by regulators, but an alteration to a previously approved dust management plan is required to be approved by regulators under the licence.</p> <p><b>Employees impacted by dust</b></p> <p>In response to Stephen White's comment (see 5.20), David Johnson mentioned that employees wear dust monitoring to determine the level of PPE required, and that historically no triggers have been reached that has necessitated the wearing of PPE. David Johnson also stated that PPE is available to any staff should they require.</p> <p>Max Erskine asked about receptors for gaseous emissions referred to in a report by JBS&amp;G Strategen. Tanya Gilders clarified that this refers to the nearest sensitive receptors which are the nearest residents to the site from all directions and are not physical devices or objects that are placed for measurement or monitoring.</p>	
<p><b>6.0</b></p> <p><b>6.1</b></p> <p><b>6.2</b></p> <p><b>6.3</b></p>	<p><b>Dust monitoring proposal</b></p> <p>Maria Nguyen explained her role at Austral Bricks as Manager of Occupational Hygiene, and her task of developing a proposal for dust monitoring at Austral Bricks' Cardup site.</p> <p>Peter Edmiston asked who Maria Nguyen reports to. Maria Nguyen said that she does not report to David Johnson and reports to the Melbourne office as part of the Health and Safety team. Peter Edmiston asked if there is an WHS representative in Western Australia. Maria Nguyen said that there is an WHS representative in Western Australia. David Johnson clarified that the WHS representative are part of the team for all intents and purposes, but they do not report to David Johnson.</p> <p>Maria Nguyen further explained her role in dust monitoring, assessing employee exposure to dust monitoring, and sending samples to the laboratory for analysis as part of a three-yearly dust monitoring program conducted by Austral Bricks and required under legislation, with the three-year timings determined by Austral Bricks internal processes.</p>	

Item	Topic	Action Items
6.4	Stephen White asked how long the monitoring will be taking place, and what would happen if monitoring took place on days when it is raining. Maria Nguyen said that testing takes place over two days and explained the benefit of undertaking monitoring internally is to come back on site a few times a year to run further assessments, using methods similar to averaging but more scientific, to mitigate those circumstances.	
6.5	Alan Clarkson asked if employees wear protective gear on site. Maria Nguyen replied that equipment is provided on site but is dependent on the activities undertaken by the employee on a case-by-case basis. Alan Clarkson asked if the protective equipment should be mandatory given the risk of dust in regards to amount and make up. Maria Nguyen explained the types of dust monitoring that is undertaken and the most recent tests undertaken were below the threshold for OH&S by Safe Work Australia, and in addition did not exceed 50% of this threshold.	
6.6	Stephen White asked if Maria Nguyen has reviewed the videos that was sent to Austral Bricks. Maria Nguyen has not. David Johnson undertook to show Maria Nguyen the videos. Maria Nguyen explained the difference between dust that is visible, and dust exposed to a worker.	
6.7	Max Erskine asked what percentages of PM2.5 and PM10 are considered hazardous. Andrew Mack clarified that national environmental protection standards are different to what is defined under OH&S requirements. Maria Nguyen said that they are monitoring under OH&S standards, which monitor for inhalable dust and respirable dust. Maria Nguyen said inhalable dust is considered to be under PM100, and respirable dust being under PM10.	
6.8	Tony Harrison cited changes to exposure to silica dust by the State Government and expressed concerns with workers' general exposure to dust. Stephen White shared these concerns. Maria Nguyen replied that employees are not exposed to unsafe levels of either respiratory dust, inhalable dust, or crystalline silica.	
6.9	Maria Nguyen explained the different reasons for assessing risk when it comes to dust.	
6.10	Alan Clarkson expressed concern with the information provided to the SCG by Austral Bricks' representatives.	<b>ACTION 19</b> Lenda Oshalem to provide photographs and video from SCG members to Maria Nguyen.
6.11	Lenda Oshalem undertook to provide photographs and videos that have previously been provided by SCG members to Maria Nguyen.	
6.12	Tony Harrison expressed concerns with building residential and community areas near the site and future health concerns on local residents in the long term that may not be possible to measure or assess in the short term.	

Item	Topic	Action Items
<p><b>6.13</b></p> <p><b>6.14</b></p> <p><b>6.15</b></p> <p><b>6.16</b></p> <p><b>6.17</b></p> <p><b>6.18</b></p> <p><b>6.19</b></p> <p><b>6.20</b></p>	<p>Colleen Rankin said it would be beneficial for Maria Nguyen to watch the videos captured by members of the SCG and to provide some commentary for the next SCG meeting.</p> <p>Peter Edmiston asked about other hazardous chemicals that may be included as part of OH&amp;S monitoring. Maria Nguyen clarified that the priority of monitoring is for contaminants that are likely to present the highest risk, which does not include aluminium or lead as other chemicals were not present in previous monitoring tests at other Brickworks sites. Peter Edmiston asked if dangerous chemicals would be present in monitoring. Maria Nguyen said those chemicals were not included in the testing regime as these chemicals are not part of Austral Bricks processes and are unlikely to be present on site, however if they were, it would likely be negligible or very low levels in results.</p> <p>Tanya Gilders clarified that the site maintains a list of chemicals that are used on site, and the site is not allowed to receive any other chemicals on site or materials outside of the approved list without the provision of a safety data sheet detailing the exact makeup of the material, or with a full suite analysis on the raw clay materials where a safety data sheet is not possible to produce.</p> <p>Peter Edmiston asked if anyone has looked at the full suite analyses and have considered if the levels are considered dangerous or not. Tanya Gilders said they have been advised that these results are all considered to be background levels.</p> <p>Alan Clarkson asked how many quarries are bringing in material into Cardup, and if Austral Bricks knew the makeup of the material from each of these quarries. Tanya Gilders replied that there are nine active quarries, but not all are feeding into the Cardup plant. A full suite analysis of Austral Bricks' quarries is undertaken each year, as well as internal testing for each campaign.</p> <p>Alan Clarkson asked if the State Government held the data on the full suite analysis of the quarries. Tanya Gilders said that quarries are not regulated by DWER, and clay, shale or sand quarries on private land are exempt from the requirements of the Mining Act.</p> <p>Alan Clarkson asked if Tanya Gilders would go on record to say that it's not harmful. Tanya Gilders said she would go on record that it is representative of a baseline raw material.</p> <p>Tony Harrison cited the reduction of emissions including lead, mercury and copper.</p>	<p><b>ACTION 20</b> Maria Nguyen to provide comment on photographs and videos for the next SCG meeting.</p>
<p><b>7.0</b></p>	<p><b>Other business</b></p>	

Item	Topic	Action Items
<p><b>7.1</b></p> <p><b>7.2</b></p> <p><b>7.3</b></p> <p><b>7.4</b></p>	<p>Lenda Oshalem highlighted the location of information relating to the SCG on Austral Bricks' website.</p> <p>Tom Dyer asked a question regarding sensor points citing an example from Midland. Tanya Gilders indicated that she cannot comment on the example because she was not familiar with it but that sensors are generally placed within modelling, and there is a difference between modelling and monitoring. DWER would ask for modelling as part of planning, with monitoring to confirm that the modelling scenario is correct.</p> <p>Max Erskine asked if the Armadale Brickworks is closed. David Johnson confirmed that the Armadale Brickworks is not currently operating. Max Erskine asked if this site would be operating again. David Johnson said that it was possible.</p> <p>Tony Harrison asked the status of the EPA application. Tanya Gilders indicated that there has not been an update since the last meeting, and undertook to arrange an update for the next SCG.</p>	<p><b>ACTION 21</b> Tanya Gilders to provide an update of the EPA application at the next SCG meeting.</p>
<p><b>8.0</b></p> <p><b>8.1</b></p> <p><b>8.2</b></p>	<p><b>Next meeting</b></p> <p>Lenda Oshalem said that she would email members of the SCG for the next meeting date which is likely to be in June to allow for further updates to be provided by Austral Bricks.</p> <p>SCG meeting closed 4:08pm.</p>	<p><b>ACTION 22</b> Lenda Oshalem to inform SCG members via email of the date of the next SCG meeting.</p>