

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445) - Second Referral - Additional Information  
**Date:** Tuesday, 20 April 2021 4:39:31 PM

---

Hi , second version email with a few spelling mistakes corrected. Please accept and amend.

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 20 April 2021 4:16 PM  
**To:** 'ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au' <ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Tahmoor South Coal Project (SSD 8445) - Second Referral - Additional Information

Hi, to the Commissioner and panel.

I disagree with the views of SIMEC in their letter to DPIE concerning the handlings about Scope 1 GHGE and their gross inadequacies shown in addressing the important issues Scope 1 and scope 2 GHGE and with no focus on reducing the amounts as requested by the government , and their gross mishandling of and straight dodging of any responsibility for these Scope 1 GHGE. Even when SIMEC show there are solutions to deal with this type of GHGE - Ventilation Air Methane, Commercial systems are available they say, but they don't want to spend \$100 Million to develop and operate a VAM treatment system.

**For that reason the IPCN needs to reject this project**, it is appalling that SIMEC won't spend the necessary infrastructure to deal with GHGE, when they are going to make so much money out of this project (billion \$ plus) and maybe including future projects (Tahmoor South Coal Project) and/or amendments to these projects ( i.e. the 3 known Bargo domains), they are just bluffing the government and the people of NSW and going for the maximum profit without giving any reasonable reason other than costs too much. If they want it, they have to do this, nothing comes for free!!.

The DPIE is using a poor measuring stick when comparing them to other mines (all bad comparisons, no green options at all) , the government needs to wake up and be serious about reducing and eliminating Scope 1 and scope 2 GHGE. Additionally a lot of these mine projects were approved prior to current GHGE understandings and the effects they have globally.

It is acknowledged by SIMEC and DPIE that Tahmoor mine is a “**relatively gassy mine**”, with a total of 19.31 million tonnes carbon dioxide equivalent (Mt CO<sub>2</sub>-e) Scope 1 GHGE predicted (estimated???) over the life of the Project. **So mine somewhere else and mine responsibly or don't mine at all.**

The life of the Project pushes them past 2030, to 2032, how is SIMEC supposed to back up their statement below that *SIMEC GFG is actively committed to, to achieve net-zero GHGE from the business by 2030 (next line) , **IMPOSSIBLE!***

“, it should also be acknowledged that the Project is a carefully considered and vital part of the transition to GREENSTEEL production, which SIMEC GFG is actively committed to, to achieve net-zero GHGE from the business by 2030”.

**How is the government showing** that they are also reducing the greenhouse gas emissions directly associated with coal mining in NSW? also quoted below from Additional Information emails to and NSW objectives.

“to state (with reference to reducing the impacts of coal mining) that the NSW government will work to: reduce the greenhouse gas emissions directly associated with coal mining in NSW (fugitive emissions) (page 9)”

These mine approval examples in table below of projects occurred between 2004 and 2015, there was not a much understanding about climate change issues, not even six years ago in 2015, let alone projects approved back in 2004, the total effects of Scope 1 GHGE on climate change is disastrous for all.

**THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO CHANGE IT UP, STARTING WITH THIS PROJECT**, considering we are going past 2030, **a line in the sand is needed for this project!!**

**The government needs to change this view** “It should be recognised that it does not: • provide any support for the refusal of a project on the basis of Scope 1 GHGE, there being no NSW policy document that would do that”; **THIS NEEDS TO CHANGE AND BE DOCUMENTED NOW for this proposed project and future projects** that cause **GHGE !!!!**

**THEY NEED to provide a cap on Scope 1 GHGE** or place a limit on Scope 1 GHGE from any particular mine and fines in place, also ASK SIMEC for controlling systems and VAM treatment systems as part of the project or **not approve** it unless these and other issues with the project are considered. Not just let the mines police themselves by monitoring it and hoping for the best. We can see this does not work (monitoring) for the water treatment systems that is now 12 years overdue and nothing is built (treatment systems etc). They keep on harping with “*ongoing investigation*” with no physical actions to fix anything!.

They say (SIMEC) “It can be seen that GHG emissions from the Project are *insignificant* with regard to the scale of emissions across Australia”. Their comparing themselves to across Australia. **I disagree They are not insignificant!**, how can 1 company (SIMEC) be allowed by the *government* to produce so much GHGE? Without doing practically anything to fix it! The SIMEC 0.93% GHGE usage value is disgraceful for 1 company, that leaves only close to 99% GHGE total to be divided up for all other companies - 2.4 million trading businesses across Australia. MINING is the worst and most destructive of all!

This is a contradiction and make no sense backed by providing no figures or stats to justify this! -

“ The Australian Government has committed to a reduction of GHGE by 26 to 28% below 2005 levels by 2030. It should be noted that GHGE from coal production are accounted for in these projections, with emissions from coal mining projected to increase to 2030 to meet energy and steelmaking demands. The latest estimates indicate that Australia is on track to achieve these targets” – this is an *unbelievable* statement!, it would not stand up in a backyard conversation / argument, let alone in a court of law.

How can Australia be on track to achieve these targets “with emissions from coal mining projected to **increase to 2030**” While the NSW Government has committed to achieving net-zero GHGE by 2050, this project goes to year 2032 anyway and where are the figures 2030 to

2050 to back this up.

In conclusion the SIMEC email showed , they wrote a whole lot of stuff, then said they can't or won't fix the GHGE issues, will do nothing more than what they have already done and then bought some electricity for day time use only.

Talk about being irresponsible, no wonder they don't care about BARGO either.

**The IPCN needs to reject this project, and this is just one of a multitude of issues with this proposed project.**

Additional information below,

"Table 1 – Comparable Scope 1 GHGE with other NSW coal mines Mine Status Mine Life Scope 1 (t CO<sub>2</sub>-e) Bulga Coal Mine Optimisation Approved 01/12/2014 2035 19,160,000 Integra Underground Mine Approved 26/11/2010 2035 18,190,274 Bulga Underground Mine Approved 23/02/2004 2031 37,356,650 Mandalong Mine Extension Approved 12/10/2015 2040 34,000,000\* Dendrobium Refused (not on GHGE grounds) 2048 17,000,000-22,000,000

\*estimated based on average Scope 1 GHGE/year As shown, there are a number of other mines in NSW approved to emit a total Scope 1 GHGE comparable to, or greater than, that proposed for Tahmoor South". **ALL BAD examples of GHGE, comparing a rotten apple to rotten apples. AND producing the equivalent high levels of GHGE in such a short time span of 10years is terrible.**

Regards Bruce Beard.

Previous video presenter and invitation email received about Additional Information, to comment on.