

From: Jim
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] "ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au."
Subject: 210223 - Submissions aposed to the Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445)
Date: Tuesday, 23 February 2021 8:55:59 PM
Attachments: [How many times do you think they will modify the Tahmoor South proposal.msg](#)
[Last night on ABC 7pm News - Contamination fears from Tahmoor mine run-off.msg](#)
[Shocking-levels-of-toxins-from-mines-in-our-beautiful-rivers-and-creeks.pdf](#)
[Tahmoor South Coal Project \(SSD 8445\).pdf](#)
[Independent Planning Commission presontation.docx](#)
[200401in-applicant-letter-regarding-submissionsredacted Bargo Campain.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Chair - Independent Planning Commission

23 February 2021

Independent Planning Commission NSW

Re: Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445)

Dear Professor O'Kane

I thank you for this opportunity to present to the Independent Planning Commission,

I wish to lodge my strong objection to the abovementioned mine expansion from going ahead.

I am a retired veteran having served for over 30 years in the RAAF and have deployed on several campaign's including East Timor and the Middle East. Now in our 70s we have settled in Bargo, my wife has just had a knee replacement and now more stress with a mine under the house, although a mine subsidence area we were under the impression that the mine was closing, we had a mail drop from the mine stating that they were mining in the area but not expecting to affect property's, so we nether gave it a second thought. Never in our wildest dreams did we think that Long Wall Mining would happen under a township. I am well aware of constant moving and the stress it brings. We have spent many months apart and looking forward to finally settling down. The thought of large cracks and a leaning house bewilders me, how could this be approved. We were totally unaware of this impending disaster until we received a note in the litterbox. If not for this we would be oblivious until the ground went from under us. In my apposing submission I have attached several documents in support and below is the submission from a Mine representative, that infers a developer is inciting locals for personal gain. I believe that this is the way forward and future growth for Bargo, It is far better to billed than destroy. Bargo is only 90 minutes from the CBD and was destined to grow, with new developments comes more people and infrastructure. I feel sorry for the 400 jobs but over 500 homes risk subsidence. All I hear is that the town will die if the mine closes, this is total rubbish. If this mine was to close the town wound grow and flourish with market gardens and new houses. This a tiny group wanting to profit from the destruction of the township of Bargo. I believe the mine has run a brilliantly organised and executed clandestine operation. Bargo residents were unaware of this proposal until this intervention.

I would bring to your attention the Applicant submission, "200401IN Applicant Letter Regarding Submissions Related"

I have copied and highlighted the planning report below with some comments. I hope this is acceptable.

Please note attachment "Planning Industry & Environment" Witch I have copied below in segments and maid cement as part of my oppression to this mining activity.

Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445)

The Department has completed its assessment of the merits of the Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445).

The application is referred to the Independent Planning Commission (the Commission) for determination as the Minister has requested the Commission hold a public hearing into the carrying out of the project and determine the development application. The Commission is therefore the delegated consent authority under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

The project involves new long wall mining domains to the south of the existing Tahmoor Mine to extract an additional 33 million tonnes of run of mine coal over a 10-year period. The existing mining pit top area would continue to be used with upgrades to existing facilities. The new mining area is located within the Bargo Mine Subsidence District which was declared in 1975. The Department publicly exhibited the application from 23 January to 5 March 2019 (42 days) and received 83 submissions from the community and special interest groups. Most of these (87%) supported the project because of the ongoing and additional employment and business opportunities.

This appears to have been a sum what of a privet exhibition, for the Citizens that work for or profit from the mine. As the general public (the residents)living in Bargo were not invited, totally unaware of this proposal to damage or destroy their Holmes. Apparently it was advertised in the local paper, you think the Council would have sent a notice to all the residents to be affected.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Following the exhibition period, the Department received an additional 134 representations on the project, mostly from members of the general public. The majority of the representations (84%) objected to the project.

Calling the miners that support, citizens of Bargo and the residents that object, the general public is misleading at best. But that seems to be a theme regarding information. They had good cause to be concerned as the real citizens of Bargo are disappointed at this lack transparency. If they received 83 submissions with 87% in favour, then how does 134 more opposing take it to 84% opposing? Seems like creative accounting,

The main issues raised in submissions relate to the potential subsidence impacts of the project on built and natural features in and around Bargo, along with concerns about impacts on water resources, biodiversity and greenhouse gas emissions.

This is not subsidence as we know, but subsidence around a meter deep. This is far more than any home could survive. They intend to dig a hole over 10mtrs deep the size of Sydney harbour. Their track record regarding house repairs are questionable or hidden in confidence agreements and as for the rivers and creeks are concerned there is a lot to be desired, they will propose rehabilitation action to get the approval, if the dust from there conveys is anything to go by. This dust blows across the road straight into the school, showing total disregard for the children or the environment. All they have to abide by is best mining practice. If approved they will follow best mine practice as it is more profitable.

In February 2020, the Applicant, Tahmoor Coal Pty Ltd (Tahmoor Coal) amended the mine plan to reduce subsidence impacts, with the removal of one longwall panel, and the Rv footprint of the reject emplacement area to minimise biodiversity and noise impacts.

Just a diversion to gain approval after the backlash from the residents of Bargo.

In August 2020, Tahmoor Coal lodged a second amendment to the project removing a further two longwall panels from the mine plan to significantly reduce the extent and scale of subsidence impacts on built features (particularly within the township of Bargo).

More changes to gain approval, If you approve this application, I believe once they start, their intent is to revert to the original plan and undermine the township and beyond. Please see attachment of minutes from a meeting which infers future plan is to recover as much coal as possible.

While the amendments to the project have resulted in the significant reduction of potential impacts to both built and natural features, the Department has also recommended another longwall be shortened to reduce impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage sites and a local creek.

This paragraph seems to line up with the deputy manager's statement, let's reduce the footprint and all will be good to approve. My opinion is if approved they will revert to the original plan. Because once the 2 new ventilation shafts are complete, who would ever know we're there are digging? Won't they collapse the tunnel all the evidence is be rid and total deniability.

The Department's detailed assessment of the project has been informed by expert advice from Government agencies, independent experts and the Commonwealth Independent Expert Scientific Committee. Based on this assessment, the Department considers that with these changes to the mine plan, the project now achieves a reasonable balance between maximising the recovery of a coal resource of State significance and minimising the potential environmental and amenity impacts.

The expert advice is subject to your preference of scientist and is questionable at best, please see attachment with a different opinion. In order to justify and squeas it through the approval process, they have reduced the impact, and a resizable balance "really". Have the fox look after the chiackings, they will still be there in the morning. Not.

The Department has recommended conditions to ensure that the project complies with contemporary criteria and standards, that the impacts are consistent with those predicted, and that residual impacts are effectively minimised, managed and compensated for.

What is Contemporary Criteria? This mine according to expert reports has polluted and damaged waterways, its arsenic levels are above wild standards for rivers but within permitted levels for mines. they will agree to anything to have the approval but as there track record stands, can you really trust this proposal.

On balance, the Department considers that the significant economic and social benefits of the project outweigh its potential impacts, and that the project is approvable subject to the recommended conditions.

I have attached a copy of the Department's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent for the Commission's consideration.

On balance? There is no way you could call this a balance there are no enforceable conditions just proposals and requests. Once the mine clams a loss they will cry Wolf and do as they won't. Just follow best mine practice.

Name	Role
Attendees	
Michael Muston (MM)	Independent Chairperson
David Auchterlonie (DA)	Community Representative
Bob Clayton (BC)	Community Representative
Ana Gracanin (AG)	Community Representative (attended via Teams online)
Col Mitchell (CM)	Community Representative
David Henry (DH)	Wollondilly Shire Council Representative (attended via Teams online)
Peter Vale (PV)	Tahmoor Coal Representative
Zina Ainsworth (ZA)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
Invitees	
David Talbert (DT)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
April Hudson (AH)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
Andrew Stuart (AS)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
Alex Parro (AP)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
Natalie Brumby (NB)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
Charlie Wheatley (CW)	Tahmoor Coal Representative (attended via Teams online)
Amanda Francis (AF)	Tahmoor Coal Representative
Apologies	
Greg Kininmonth (GK)	Resources Regulator
Robert Khan (RK)	Wollondilly Shire Council Representative
Virginia Fairley (VF)	Community Representative
James Johnson (JJ)	Community Representative
Matt Montgomery (MMt)	Subsidence Advisory NSW

Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF
		Who	When Req'd	
1. Welcome and Introductions				
1.1.	Michael Muston is the Independent Chairperson. He would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the land on which we are meeting and pay respects to their Elders, past and present.	NOTE		03/09/20
2. Declarations of Interest				
2.1.	Michael Muston is paid by Tahmoor Coal.	NOTE		03/09/20
2.2.	VF is a member of the Shafted Action Group.			
2.3.	Tahmoor Coal Apprentice Engagement Program purchase barbecue items from Khan Supa IGA Picton, which is owned and operated by RK.			
3. Apologies				
3.1.	As per list above.	NOTE		03/09/20
4. Confirmation of Minutes of Previous Meeting				
4.1.	Confirmation of Minutes from 4 June 2020 accepted. Note: Q2 minutes have been added to the Tahmoor Website	NOTE		03/09/20
5. Business Arising from Previous Minutes				
5.1.	No outstanding actions from the previous minutes.	NOTE		03/09/20
6. Correspondence - update as per the agenda				
6.1.	James Johnson advising action on No Mine in Bargo Facebook Page – Emailed by James Johnson 8 May 2020	NOTE		03/09/20
6.2.	Tahmoor LW W1-W2 Six Monthly Subsidence Impact Report – Emailed by April Hudson 15 May 2020			
6.3.	Notification of new Community Liaison Specialist – Emailed by Amanda Fitzgerald 5 June 2020			
6.4.	BC report from the March 2020 TCCCC – Emailed by Michael Muston 6 June 2020			
6.5.	TCCCC Q2 Meeting Minutes and Finalised TOR – Emailed by Michael Muston 23 June 2020			
6.6.	TCCCC Q3 Meeting Request – Emailed by Amanda Fitzgerald 27 July 2020			
6.7.	DPIE report from CCC Chairperson training – Emailed by Michael Muston 27 July 2020			
6.8.	SMP approval notification for MILL HILL – Emailed by Amanda Francis 28 July 2020			
6.9.	SIMEC Mining – Tahmoor South Media Release – Emailed by Amanda Francis 4 August 2020			
6.10.	SIMEC Mining - Tahmoor South Mine Plan – Emailed by Amanda Francis 7 August 2020			
6.11.	Tahmoor Coal Mine Independent Environmental Audit Consultation Requirements – Emailed by Michael Muston to committee 26 August 2020			
7. Committee Members Reports				
7.1.	David Auchterlonie <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DA asked if mine plans have been pulled back from west of Bargo. • PV advised that further information on Tahmoor South will be provided in the Mine Operations presentation. If Tahmoor Coal seeks to mine further west of the proposed plan, a new approval process will be required. 	DA		03/09/20

Tahmoor Colliery Community Consultative Committee
 Minutes of Meeting – Microsoft Teams (COVID 19)
 Thursday 3 September 2020



Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF
		Who	When Req'd	
7.2. Col Mitchell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CM asked if the new mine plan submitted includes the removal of the longwalls. PV confirmed that it does include removal of two longwalls and more information will be provided. CM queried the application to rezone Tesrol Clearview being on hold until after mining. PV advised of the potential to start early prep works is in discussion with groups. 	CM		03/09/20
7.3. David Henry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DH advised he would wait for the Tahmoor South presentation update. 	DH		03/09/20
7.4. Virginia Fairley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies. 	VF		03/09/20
7.5. Robert Khan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies. 	RK		03/09/20
7.6. Bob Clayton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BC advised he would wait for the Tahmoor South presentation update. 	BC		03/09/20
7.7. Ana Gracanin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AG advised she would wait for the Tahmoor South presentation update. 	AG		03/09/20
7.8. James Johnson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apologies. 	JJ		03/09/20
8. Mining Operations Update – Mine Update (presented by Peter Vale)				
8.1. Mine Update:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covid-19 situation is fairly stable. Continue to monitor available information and respond accordingly. The recent Picton Hotel incident was responded to promptly following Tahmoor Coal's trigger action response plan (TARP) and controls in place. LW W1 production consistent, recent performance on par with best. Longwall relocation planned for November/December to commence LW W2 in December 2020. Coking Coal price continues to be challenged by Covid-19 related global effects. Tahmoor Coal is running at a loss. A plan is being put in place to ensure recovery from this. 			
8.2. Tahmoor South:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second amended Tahmoor South mine plan submitted on 3 August 2020, including the removal of two longwalls from beneath the township of Bargo. Original plan was submitted in January 2019. Very positive outcome for the local community and people of Bargo. Reduced the number of homes located directly above the longwalls from 751 to 143. The removal of the longwalls has shortened proposed mining by 3 years. Without project approval, Tahmoor Coal will cease mining in 2 years. Next step in the approval process is for Department of Planning to review our submission and provide a recommendation to the Independent Planning Commission (IPC). There will likely be a public hearing on the project, with a determination made early next year. 	NOTE		03/09/20

Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF
		Who	When Req'd	
9. Mining Operations Update - PIA Update (presented by David Talbert)				
9.1. Picton Industrial Area update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 of 102 business/properties have lodged a subsidence claim with SA NSW. • Assessment of properties in the PIA carried out as per SA NSW guidelines. • Inspection of properties by independent engineers for damage to structures, overhead cranes, mechanical hoists and sensitive equipment. • As of August 2020: 65% of the properties have been inspected for structural damage, remaining properties to be inspected and assessed in September 2020. • 10 claim determinations have been issued to date with one claim accepted and finalised. 			
10. Mining Operations Update - Western Domain Update (presented by David Talbert and April Hudson)				
10.1. Western Domain update - LW W1 Progress:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LW W1 mining commenced 15 November 2019. • 1439.2m extracted as of 30 August 2020. • 474m to completion of longwall. • Longwall approaching Attunga Close in Stonequarry Estate. 			
10.2. Subsidence Monitoring Observations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observed subsidence movements less than predicted. • 198 mm maximum observed vertical subsidence along the Picton-Mittagong Loop Line. • Observed ground strains are generally small. • Observed GNSS unit movements are at the lower end of the observed range in the survey database for the Southern Coalfields at similar depths of cover. • GNSS units above or close to LW W1 are generally moving towards the extracted panel. 			
10.3. Monitoring of Environmental Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No observed subsidence-related impacts to dams, cliffs, steep slopes, agricultural land, ecology, or Aboriginal and historical heritage. • Surface water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ No mining-related impacts to creeks such as creek bed cracking or increased iron hydroxide precipitation. ◦ Dissolved zinc levels higher than usual in one pool – under observation. ◦ Slight water level reduction in one pool – under observation. ◦ Previously reported gas bubbling has ceased at MR45. • Groundwater: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Water level in the deeper intakes of two groundwater bores (P12 & TNC36) have recorded a reduced water level below baseline range (less than 5m), however remain within predictions. ◦ Level 3 TARP triggered, discussed at ERG – agreement that no additional monitoring required. <i>TARP stands for Triggered Action Response Plan.</i> ◦ Likely to be attributed to mining induced regional depressurization of deeper aquifers. ◦ No influence to shallower aquifers or surface water system. 	NOTE	03/09/20	
10.4. Monitoring of Built Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weekly ground surveys and visual inspections being conducted along Stonequarry Creek Road, Booyong Close, Attunga Close, and Carramar Close. • Weekly surveys and inspections have been conducted around Sewage Pumping Stations. 			

Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF
		Who	When Req'd	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No impacts observed to date for gas, electrical, telecommunications, potable water or sewer infrastructure. Local roads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small cracks have been observed at a stormwater drain location at the northern end of Stonequarry Creek Rd. Loose concrete has been broken out and patched. <p>10.5. Heritage Rail Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LW W1 has now passed directly beneath the Loop-line Railway and continues to move away. Subsidence half of predicted, no impacts to operations. New drains installed to improve track drainage. <p>10.6. Rail Possession Work (Far Field)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Picton Tunnel – installation of inclinometer at top of Tunnel. Internal inspection by structural engineer. Picton Viaduct – installation of laser distance meters. <p>10.7. Adaptive Management Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Determination whether additional setbacks of the commencing end of LW W2 is required in light of the current subsidence monitoring observations for LW W1. Modification of the starting position of LW W2 not proposed. Approval of report required prior to commencement of LW W2. Report currently being reviewed by DPIE. <p>10.8. Modification 5 for DA 67/98:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeking a modification of DA 67/98 for low level subsidence within rail corridor under Section 4.55 (2) of EP&A Act. Public exhibition period has finished. Six submissions received from Government Agencies, with no objections. DPIE preparing conditions of consent. <p>10.9. LW W3-W4 Extraction Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document preparation has commenced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extraction Plan main document Water Management Plan Land Management Plan Biodiversity Management Plan Heritage Management Plan Built Features Management Plan Public Safety Management Plan Subsidence Monitoring Program Government Agency consultation commencing soon. Letter to community next week. Submission of LW W3-W4 Extraction Plan following modification approval (anticipated December 2020). 			
	11. Environment Update (presented by Natalie Brumby)			

Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF								
		Who	When Req'd									
11.1. Environmental Incidents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were no Environmental Incidents reported since the previous meeting. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Month</th><th>Environmental Incidents</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>June 2020</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>July 2020</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 2020</td><td>0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Month	Environmental Incidents	June 2020	0	July 2020	0	August 2020	0	NOTE		03/09/20
Month	Environmental Incidents											
June 2020	0											
July 2020	0											
August 2020	0											
11.2. Community Complaints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were three (3) community complaints reported since the previous meeting. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Month</th><th>Community Complaints</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>June 2020</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>July 2020</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>August 2020</td><td>2</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Month	Community Complaints	June 2020	1	July 2020	0	August 2020	2	NOTE		03/09/20
Month	Community Complaints											
June 2020	1											
July 2020	0											
August 2020	2											
11.3. Depositional Dust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deposited dust levels continue to be well below EPA target levels of 4mg/m² per month. 	NOTE		03/09/20								
11.4. Water – License Discharge Point 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were nil exceedances since the last meeting. 	NOTE		03/09/20								
11.5. Waste Water Treatment Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RO Plant Tender complete. RO Plant Tenders have been short-listed to three. Proposal for pilot plant prior to installation. RO Plant is designed to treat EC, Ni, As, Zn, Cu, N, Al to ANZECC Guidelines. Presentations from tenders underway. Further bench-testing being undertaken. Assigned a Project Manager – Lou Lingurovski. 	NOTE		03/09/20								
11.6. Questions regarding RO Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DH asked when will the pilot plant take place? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ZA advised the pilot plant is planned for early next year. MM asked what is planned for the brine? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ZA advised the current proposal is for brine to be trucked away. 	NOTE		03/09/20								
12. Myrtle and Redbank Creek Remediation Plan Update (presented by Andrew Stuart)												
12.1. Success at Pool 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Polyurethane Resin (PUR) grout curtain wall at Pool 23 has been observed to be successful in returning pool holding capacity. Since rain in January and February Pool 23 has filled and continuously overflowed its rock bar – no decrease in pool height. Long term monitoring ongoing. 	NOTE		03/09/20								
12.2. Myrtle Creek Stage 2:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works plan was attached to the Mining Operations Plan following approval from the Resources Regulator. Works include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigation drilling to determine grout curtain using sand and colloidal silica. 	NOTE		03/09/20								

Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF
		Who	When Req'd	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 5 more grout curtain walls. • Currently out to tender. • Works anticipated to commence October 2020. 			
12.3. Redbank Creek – Pool 26 / Weir 27, 28 and 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grout curtain wall at Pool 26 / Weir using PUR to 12m. Approximately 40m wide but varies with pools. • Results show improvements and look promising. • A camera is inserted into boreholes to determine fractures in pool. • Pattern grouting to 1m at Pools 27, 28 and 29 • Works are due for completion in October 2020. • The Resources Regulator visited the creeks recently and positive feedback was received. 			
12.4. Questions regarding creeks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DH commented that aquatic ecology was done for Pool 23 but not at Pool 26. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AH to provide feedback on creek ecology at next meeting. 	NOTE / AH	03/12/20	03/09/20
13. Tahmoor South Project (presented by Charlie Wheatley)				
13.1. Tahmoor South revised mine plan submitted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longwalls 107B & 108B have been removed from the proposed plan. • This equates to an 80% reduction in properties directly mined beneath. • It has reduced the mine plan timeframe from 13 years to 10 years. • Completely eliminated the REA extension footprint. Initially 43 hectares was required to be cleared. No extension is now required as the height of the existing footprint has been increased by a maximum of 10m. 	NOTE		03/09/20
13.2. Questions/comments regarding Tahmoor South Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM asked if the increase in height at the REA proposes any risk for combustion? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CW advised that as the refuse is mainly stone, the risk doesn't change. • DA asked where the mining lease is for Bargo? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PV demonstrated the lease boundaries on the mine plan image. ○ CW to show the three Tahmoor South mining domains at the next meeting. • MM asked is there intention to mine the other domains in the future? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PV confirmed there will be. • MM asked has there been any feedback on the revised EIS yet? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PV advised not at this stage. DPIE send it to their own experts and we work with them to address any concerns. IPC has 12 weeks to decide on the revised EIS. The IPC hearing is expected to take place Nov/Dec 2020. • DH made the following comments regarding the revised mine plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The mine plan has been considered at council level. ○ Council recognise the amendments, welcome the REA change and thank SIMEC for the meeting. ○ Council has raised waterway concerns to be investigated as part of the IPC review. ○ Council has lodged a letter seeking further clarification on the process for managing potential subsidence impacts to the Bargo Waste Management Centre (to be mined beneath). 	NOTE / CW	03/12/20	03/09/20

Tahmoor Colliery Community Consultative Committee
 Minutes of Meeting – Microsoft Teams (COVID 19)
 Thursday 3 September 2020



Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF																																								
		Who	When Req'd																																									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ZA advised Tahmoor Coal is working with both Department of Planning and Wollondilly Council on this. 																																												
14. Community Update (Presented by Amanda Francis)																																												
14.1. Community Investment – Buxton RFS – Memorial Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tahmoor Coal committed \$25K to assist with a \$240k park upgrade at Telopea Park Buxton in July 2020. • Buxton RFS worked hard to gain local business and community donations to honour Mr Andrew O'Dwyer and Mr Geoffrey Keaton of Horsley Park RFB who lost their lives protecting the area in the Bushfires late last year. • The park is due for completion late October 2020. • There will be a private viewing for the families in early November 2020. • Pending Covid-19 restrictions, there is a planned televised media event for the Grand Opening on 5 December 2020. 	NOTE		03/09/20																																								
14.2. Community – Western Domain Newsletter 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributed to landowners in the LWW1 and LWW2 area. • 72% of residents had PMIs completed. • Resident survey marker installation completed. 																																											
14.3. Community – Resident Information Pack LW W3 & W4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be distributed next week to landowners in the LW W3 & W4 area. • Notification letter of proposed extraction will also be distributed. 	NOTE		03/09/20																																								
14.4. Community – Tahmoor South Flyer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter box drop in Bargo and Tahmoor area August 2020. • Met with most business owners in Bargo to discuss new proposed mine plan. • Positive feedback received to date. • No feedback received from the Bargo Action Group to date. 																																											
15. Subsidence Advisory NSW Update																																												
15.1. Residential Claim Status	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="background-color: #8B4513; color: white;">Residential Claim Status</th><th style="background-color: #8B4513; color: white;">1961 Act claims (pre-2018)</th><th style="background-color: #8B4513; color: white;">Non-Active mining claims (SA NSW)</th><th style="background-color: #8B4513; color: white;">Active mining claims (TCCO)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Claims being determined</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Claims finalised - with claimant for response</td><td>10</td><td>12</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr> <td>Review requested by claimant:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>• Review by Determining Body</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Review by DCS Secretary</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>• Review by L&EC</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Repairs being managed by SA NSW</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>On hold - active subsidence</td><td>0</td><td>2</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>Claims finalised since 1/1/2020</td><td>4</td><td>13</td><td>4</td></tr> </tbody> </table>			Residential Claim Status	1961 Act claims (pre-2018)	Non-Active mining claims (SA NSW)	Active mining claims (TCCO)	Claims being determined	0	3	2	Claims finalised - with claimant for response	10	12	4	Review requested by claimant:				• Review by Determining Body	1	1	2	• Review by DCS Secretary	0	1	1	• Review by L&EC	0	0	0	Repairs being managed by SA NSW	0	1	0	On hold - active subsidence	0	2	2	Claims finalised since 1/1/2020	4	13	4	03/09/20
Residential Claim Status	1961 Act claims (pre-2018)	Non-Active mining claims (SA NSW)	Active mining claims (TCCO)																																									
Claims being determined	0	3	2																																									
Claims finalised - with claimant for response	10	12	4																																									
Review requested by claimant:																																												
• Review by Determining Body	1	1	2																																									
• Review by DCS Secretary	0	1	1																																									
• Review by L&EC	0	0	0																																									
Repairs being managed by SA NSW	0	1	0																																									
On hold - active subsidence	0	2	2																																									
Claims finalised since 1/1/2020	4	13	4																																									

Tahmoor Colliery Community Consultative Committee
 Minutes of Meeting – Microsoft Teams (COVID 19)
 Thursday 3 September 2020



Time Location Date	5.00pm to 6.30pm (approx.) Teams Meeting (COVID -19) 3 September 2020	Minute Taker		AF
		Who	When Req'd	
15.2. Picton Industrial Area	Picton Light Industrial Area			
Number of claims	31			
Structural Investigations carried out to date	19			
Equipment inspections carried out to date	10			
Claim accepted and finalised	1			
16. TCCCC Finance				
16.1. The TCCCC bank balance is currently \$27,004.12, statement end 31 July 2020		NOTE		03/09/20
17. General Business				
17.1. MM raised the Tahmoor Coal Mine Independent Environmental Audit consultation requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The audit occurs every three years. Please email through any items or issues that the committee wants the auditors to investigate. AP to provide Audit Report update at next meeting. 	NOTE / AP	03/12/20	03/09/20
17.2. MM formally acknowledged Amanda Francis to be added as a member of the TCCCC.				
17.3. MM advised that the bank account signatures still need to be updated.		NOTE		03/09/20
17.4. MM advised that the annual payment is due to be processed soon.				
17.5. DH raised concerns about the tip truck pathway to the REA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under current consent, the mine can truck refuse offsite up to a certain amount. NB to investigate truck pathway options to REA. 	NOTE / NB	03/12/20	03/09/20
Meeting Closed	6:30 pm	Next Meeting	Thursday 3 December 2020	Time 5:00pm
				Location Tahmoor Coal/Teams Online - TBC

From: [No mine at Bargo](#)
To: [No mine at Bargo](#)
Subject: Last night on ABC 7pm News - Contamination fears from Tahmoor mine run-off
Date: Friday, 5 June 2020 9:49:58 AM

Last night ABC News reported fears that run-off from the Tahmoor coal mine could be contaminating a major Sydney river system.

Bargo River intersects the Nepean River which forms part of the Hawkesbury-Nepean catchment, a major source of Sydney's drinking water.

It was revealed that researchers from Western Sydney University have been closely monitoring the water quality and have found an alarming "cocktail of metals" in the Tahmoor coal mine's run-off.

You can access the news segment here (available until 7:30pm, 11 June 2020):

ABC News: <https://iview.abc.net.au/show/abc-news-nsw> (20:58 - 22:52)

As you may be aware, SIMEC is seeking to extend its mine under Bargo, and to continue mining until at least 2035. We must all work together in order to hold SIMEC accountable and save our local waterways.

The NSW Department of Planning is currently assessing the application and they need to know that the community does not support this project, the damage it has already done and will do into the future.

To make sure your concerns are heard, it is **vital that you submit an official objection** to Mike Young (Director of Resource Assessments, NSW Department of Planning and Environment) at mike.young@planning.nsw.gov.au and tell him you oppose the Tahmoor South Coal Project.

Be sure to copy in your local State MP, Nathaniel Smith - Member for Wollondilly at wollondilly@parliament.nsw.gov.au and Wollondilly Council at council@wollondilly.nsw.gov.au and let them know what you think about this plan.

If you oppose inappropriate mining activity, join us and stand up for Bargo.

No Mine at Bargo

<https://bargo.net.au/>

It's enough to make you sick of it all!

**Shocking levels of ARSENIC, URANIUM,
NITROGEN, ALUMINIUM, ZINC.**

These are just some of the chemical pollutants from mines which have turned our beautiful rivers and creeks **from this...**

Beautiful Mermaids Pool in better, cleaner days (Dec 2015, Chilby Photography). A popular local tourist attraction on the Bargo River.

...to this

Scientist measuring pollution levels from recent mine wastewater discharge into Bargo River (April 2020)

The once pristine Bargo River is choking in mining waste.

Independent lab results have revealed soaring levels of water pollution in the popular swimming spots.¹ Now Tahmoor Coal, owned by foreign mining company SIMEC, wants to expand and mine under the historic township of Bargo - a project known as the Tahmoor South Project (SSD 8445) - which is set to cause even more environmental destruction.

Tahmoor Colliery waste discharge is causing major pollution in the Bargo River and flowing into the Nepean River. The contaminated plume contains a hazardous cocktail of metals for both human and aquatic life in both rivers including dangerous concentrations of toxins (arsenic, aluminium, nickel, zinc and salt)² well above recommended guidelines.³

The results of independent laboratory testing from samples taken found **Tahmoor Colliery discharging above the Environmental Protection Authority's (EPA) allowance of its wastewater to Bargo River** via Tea Tree Hollow in April 2020.⁴ The water quality tests by Western Sydney University researchers⁵ found that the colliery waste were twice the permitted levels of turbidity⁶ discharge allowed by the EPA.

There is also evidence⁷ of exceedances of limits on Total Suspended Solids⁸ in March as set out in Tahmoor Colliery's Environmental Protection Licence.

SIMEC's Tahmoor Colliery is now looking to massively expand their existing mine by undermining Bargo. The previous owner deemed the project uneconomic. If successful, expect more environmental damage to waterways and more subsidence under houses.

After significant issues about the project were raised by the local community and public authorities, SIMEC recently amended its proposal. However, the community has not been given the opportunity to comment on these amendments. The application is being assessed **now** by the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.



Pictures above were taken in April 2020 and show the effect on Potholes Reserve from wastewater discharge

The only way to stop the mine from going ahead is to email [MIKE YOUNG](mailto:MIKE.YOUNG@planning.nsw.gov.au), Director of Resource Assessments, NSW Department of Planning and Environment, at mike.young@planning.nsw.gov.au now and tell him you oppose the Tahmoor South Coal Project because you want Bargo River to survive.

Copy in your State MP, Nathaniel Smith - Member for Wollondilly - at wollondilly@parliament.nsw.gov.au and Wollondilly Council at council@wollondilly.nsw.gov.au and let them know what you think about this plan.

If you oppose inappropriate mining activity, join us and stand up for Bargo. For the latest information, visit our website bargo.net.au or our Facebook page 'No Mine at Bargo'.

DO NOT UNDER MINE BARGO



Hover your phone's camera over the QR code to contact
NO MINE AT BARGO

1. Envirolab Services (16 March 2020), 11 samples collected from Bargo River (6 water, 4 soil and 1 foliage) were analysed 2. Envirolab Services (16 March 2020), 11 samples collected from Bargo River (6 water, 4 soil and 1 foliage) were analysed 3. Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) & Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand (ARMCANZ) (2000) water quality guidelines 4. Dr Ian Wright, Western Sydney University - School of Science and Health (17 April 2020) Bargo River field data 5. Dr Ian Wright, Western Sydney University - School of Science and Health (17 April 2020) Bargo River field data 6. Turbidity is the cloudiness or haziness of a fluid caused by large numbers of individual particles that are generally invisible to the naked eye, similar to smoke in air. The measurement of turbidity is a key test of water quality 7. Envirolab Services (16 March 2020), 11 samples collected from Bargo River (6 water, 4 soil and 1 foliage) were analysed 8. Total suspended solids (TSS) are defined as solids that are not dissolved in water that can be trapped by a filter



Professor Mary O'Kane AC
Chair - Independent Planning Commission
Via email: [REDACTED]

17 December 2020

Dear Professor O'Kane

Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445)

The Department has completed its assessment of the merits of the Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445).

The application is referred to the Independent Planning Commission (the Commission) for determination as the Minister has requested the Commission hold a public hearing into the carrying out of the project and determine the development application. The Commission is therefore the delegated consent authority under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

The project involves new longwall mining domains to the south of the existing Tahmoor Mine to extract an additional 33 million tonnes of run of mine coal over a 10-year period. The existing mining pit top area would continue to be used with upgrades to existing facilities. The new mining area is located within the Bargo Mine Subsidence District which was declared in 1975.

The Department publicly exhibited the application from 23 January to 5 March 2019 (42 days) and received 83 submissions from the community and special interest groups. Most of these (87%) supported the project because of the ongoing and additional employment and business opportunities.

Following the exhibition period, the Department received an additional 134 representations on the project, mostly from members of the general public. The majority of the representations (84%) objected to the project.

The main issues raised in submissions relate to the potential subsidence impacts of the project on built and natural features in and around Bargo, along with concerns about impacts on water resources, biodiversity and greenhouse gas emissions.

In February 2020, the Applicant, Tahmoor Coal Pty Ltd (Tahmoor Coal) amended the mine plan to reduce subsidence impacts, with the removal of one longwall panel, and the footprint of the reject emplacement area to minimise biodiversity and noise impacts.

In August 2020, Tahmoor Coal lodged made a second amendment to the project removing a further two longwall panels from the mine plan to significantly reduce the extent and scale of subsidence impacts on built features (particularly within the township of Bargo).

While the amendments to the project have resulted in the significant reduction of potential impacts to both built and natural features, the Department has also recommended another longwall be shortened to reduce impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage sites and a local creek.

The Department's detailed assessment of the project has been informed by expert advice from Government agencies, independent experts and the Commonwealth Independent Expert Scientific Committee.

Based on this assessment, the Department considers that with these changes to the mine plan, the project now achieves a reasonable balance between maximising the recovery of a coal resource of State significance and minimising the potential environmental and amenity impacts.

The Department has recommended conditions to ensure that the project complies with contemporary criteria and standards, that the impacts are consistent with those predicted, and that residual impacts are effectively minimised, managed and compensated for.

On balance, the Department considers that the significant economic and social benefits of the project outweigh its potential impacts, and that the project is approvable subject to the recommended conditions.

I have attached a copy of the Department's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent for the Commission's consideration.

If you have any questions or wish to arrange a briefing, please contact Mike Young on 8217 2091 or by email at mike.young@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



17/12/2020

Marcus Ray
Group Deputy Secretary
Planning and Assessment

Professor Mary O’Kane AC
Chair - Independent Planning Commission
Via email: [REDACTED]

23 February 2021

Dear Professor O’Kane

I thank you for this opportunity to present to the Independent Planning Commission,

Thank you so much for your time, but we are in a fight to protect our homes, the township of Bargo and the water supply to people of Sydney, from the Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445). I am led to believe that this long wall mining project will dig a 10 meter hole the size of Sydney harbour under the township. As I listen to the presentations to the independent mining committee, I have a concern regarding support for residents as their homes are destroyed. There are many cases on the internet, which states that this claim system will refute any and all claims. It has expensive lawyers and engineers. Please do not abandon us, as my pension will not cover challenging them in court.

The mine stated a reduction of 80% in mining so fewer houses will be affected. However at a recent meeting it was stated in the minuets, that the intent is to mine the whole of Bargo and beyond. If this mine then closed there would be no recourse for property owners, as the company may cut and run.

I have attached email reference,

How many times do you think they will modify the tahmoor south proposal?

It was disappointing when a union rep inferred that Mr Taylor Federal Member for Hume was in support of this mine and found the time to meet with them but nether asked or met with residents or his constituency, that live here, what their thoughts ore concerns were.

There is no doubt that this is a very generous mine, they donate to local schools, the men’s shed, the rural fire brigade and make political donations, like the Mayor’s personal fund. But there is no such thing as a free lunch and it appears many of the people benefiting from the mining have answered the call with submissions of support. There are far more supporting than opposing.

During the 2020 fires we watched the flames from the back paddock. To close so we evacuated but was stopped at the mine by the RFS who closed the road. So we turned back and took different route.

They were setup in wait to defend the mine from the fires. They had good reason as there was a grave concern, that if the coal caught fire they would never control it and god forbid if it got underground it would burn for years. (We won’t consider the gas risk).

Vital resources were tied up at the mine. Should we have such a risk in town?

During the debate there was a statement on how they monitored the subsidence so they knew first; one statement was that there were calls in the middle of the night regarding the railway. I assume so repairs could be made before a derailment. (What if they missed, and who monitors when the mine closes). The vibration from these heavy trains shake the ground increasing the risk as the ground subsides under the rails.

They intend to build more exhaust stacks to draw the poisonous dust, chemicals and gasses from the mine. This will be detrimental health and a hazard to livestock, crops and people down wind, I have no confidence in believing they will have an effective filter systems or any compulsion to, considering the costs. I make this statement after observing the coal dropping from the large conveyer, you watch the dust drift in to the school about 150 metres across the road from the mine. When I asked the council in regard the dust I was informed that they had no control or responsibility over the mine. All the mine has to do is best practice. I suppose this covers all their contamination responsibilities. It is inconceivable that a term called best mining practice is a get out of jail free card.

I had a look at the field trip by the committee, there were plenty attending but not a local who lives in the area. I would assume you were informed of all the good points. Was there any dust or gases coming from the vent stack, was there any coal failing from the conveyer, did you have a look at the dust on the cars or breath in the dust. Were there any large trucks in and out of the site, as around half is to go by rail the rest by road?

Bargo is part of the Sydney basin water catchment area and sits between the Avon Dam and Warragamba Dam, if this mine is approved many moor streams and rivers could suffer irreversible damage and pollution and could contaminate the drinking water. There are many reports on line from highly qualified scientists, stating that this type of mining will cause significant and irreversible damage and pollution to the waterways and drinking water for the Sydney basin.

We also have the Hume motorway, the southern rail, the main gas and water pipes running through this area of which all would be at risk. The Southern Highlands Rail Line passes through Bargo.

There will be significant damage done to the rail line from subsidence. This line carries passengers and cargo from Melbourne and Canberra travel to Sydney. The large freight trains that create their own resonance due to the extra carriages, like troops marching over a bridge. By mining under this rail line, there is the risk to the tracks that could cause a passenger train or a freight train to derail. This could result in serious injuries.

I implore you to reject the Long Wall mining application under the township of Bargo. Having read the report regarding the first public viewing, I was somewhat surprised.

The report stated that it had been advertised in the local papers with only one objection and over a dozen in support of the mine. Perhaps the 12+ had prior notice and all the local papers were suddenly in short supply for Bargo residents.

My understanding is that, if I was to have a planning application, the Council would send a letter to the affected properties either side. Not just advertise in a local paper. Where was the notification regarding the massive 10 metre hole the size of Sydney harbour under our homes?

Why was the legislation changed to permit mining under the township of Bargo? The only information arrives as a door drop from the mining corporation or the mining opponents, nothing from the government.

There are many reports but I assume you already know how destructive this is. We can forget about requesting approval to build, because there are no construction methods that can survive this type of mining which make property in Bargo worthless.

I understand the miners fighting for their jobs, but there is only 5 to 10 years at best and the mine owner had no problem in sacking 160 workers a short time ago with a phone call.
You consider this a company that cares?

I was intrigued with the green steel v black steel surely this is not the last coal in the country?
I suggest they go where there are no towns or infrastructure they can destroy.

The meeting transcript with Wingecarribee Shire Council was interesting as they completely oppose mining; they also referred to train and road movement of coal. Just for the record it is proposed that 3/5th will go by train if available the rest will go by road along with equipment, so a lot of extra large trucks on the road.

James Chapman
[REDACTED]



1 April 2020

The Secretariat
Office of the Independent Planning Commission of NSW
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth St
SYDNEY NSW 2000

The Secretariat

Re: Tahmoor South Coal Project [SSD 8445]: No Mine at Bargo campaign

I wish to you make you aware of some information that we think is relevant to the Tahmoor South Coal Project.

To date, there has been a ‘No Mine at Bargo’ campaign (“Campaign”) that appeared to be created and run by anonymous individual(s) that we believe was aimed at influencing community sentiment unfavourably towards SIMEC’s proposal for Tahmoor South. This proposal is the subject of a public hearing by the NSW Independent Planning Commission.

The Campaign has generated correspondence and petitions which we understand have been sent to Members of Parliament and Ministers as well as the distribution of contact details of officers in the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment to the Tahmoor community.

Our view, is that the person or persons behind the Campaign has deployed considerable funds signposting and letterboxing the community with what we believe to be unsupportable claims. These claims, on a plain reading and certainly in our view, are highly critical of the project, SIMEC and the NSW Government.

Since the campaign established a digital footprint¹, we now understand that one or more of the Campaign’s proponent(s) includes a holding company known as Ironlaw Pty Ltd. Our understanding is that Ironlaw Pty Ltd is owner of a parcel of land in Bargo that is currently the subject of an application to re-zone the land for residential development². This entity has previously lodged a submission³ opposing the project to the Secretary of the Department of Planning in March 2019.

We are concerned that the proponents may be seeking to advance a private commercial opportunity by purporting to consist predominantly of a group of local inhabitants concerned about local amenity.

It is our understanding that development interests and developers have the opportunity to make submissions via the IPC process which will also afford them the opportunity to do so again.

In considering statements from the ‘No Mine at Bargo’ campaign we would ask you to keep this information (as we understand it) in mind and are of the view that bringing this information to your attention will assist the public IPC process to remain robust and transparent.

¹ ‘No Mine at Bargo’ website: <https://bargo.net.au/>

² <http://leptracking.planning.nsw.gov.au/proposaldetails.php?rid=5247>

³ Tahmoor South Coal Project -SSID 17_8445 Ironlaw Pty Ltd submission

<https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/prweb/PRRestService/mp/01/getContent?AttachRef=EXH-897%2120190404T044716.228%20GMT>



Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that appears to read "Peter Vale".

Peter Vale
General Manager
SIMEC Mining – Tahmoor

Appendix 1: Domain name details for bargo.net.au⁴

Domain Name: BARGO.NET.AU

Registry Domain ID: [REDACTED]

Registrar WHOIS Server: [REDACTED]

Registrar URL:

Last Modified: [REDACTED]

Registrar Name: [REDACTED]

Registrar Abuse Contact Email:

Registrar Abuse Contact Phone:

Reseller Name:

Status: [REDACTED]

Registrant Contact ID: [REDACTED]

Registrant Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Registrant Contact Email: [REDACTED]

Tech Contact ID: [REDACTED]

Tech Contact Name: [REDACTED]

Tech Contact Email: [REDACTED]

Name Server: [REDACTED]

Name Server: [REDACTED]

Name Server: [REDACTED]

DNSSEC: [REDACTED]

Registrant: IRONLAW PTY. LIMITED

Registrant ID: [REDACTED]

Eligibility Type: Company

>>> Last update of WHOIS database: [REDACTED] <<<

⁴ This information was obtained by SIMEC Mining via a free domain name look up named WHOIS, the URL is <https://whois.auda.org.au/> and we understand the search could be replicated.

Appendix 2: Ironlaw Pty Ltd ABN Record

Historical details for ABN [REDACTED][Current details](#) [Historical details](#)[PDF](#) [Print](#)**ABN details**

Entity name	From	To
IRONLAW PTY. LIMITED	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
IRONLAW PTY LIMITED	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
ABN Status	From	To
Active	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Entity type	From	To
Australian Private Company	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Goods & Services Tax (GST)	From	To
Registered	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Main business location	From	To
NSW 2575	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
NSW 2573	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Business name(s)

Business name	From	To
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Trading name(s)

From 1 November 2013, ABN Lookup will not display trading names and will only display registered business names. For more information, click [Help](#).

Trading name	From	To
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

ASIC registration - ACN or ARBN

[REDACTED]
