

From: [Clayton Hairs](#)
To: [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Tahmoor South Expansion
Date: Tuesday, 20 April 2021 11:59:06 AM

Dar Commissioners

Simec have released a response to the NSW IPC outlining, amongst other things, details of how it envisages reducing its CO2 and methane expulsion should an extension to the Tahmoor South mine be granted.

AT NO POINT does SIMEC indicate WHY the extension is required to being with.

At the heart of this omission is the (now antiquated and erroneous) presumption that MORE mining leads to more taxes and more jobs....and that is good....an inviolable truth.

This is the problematic thought paradigm that has lead us into the current climate emergency we face.

Coking coal is (unfortunately) currently required to produce steel - this is a reality we still need to deal with on account of delay's to in environmentally sustainable methods to do the same. What is NOT *au fait accompli* is the need to EXTEND mines which are already in existence.

The simple fact is there is sufficient coal produced (worldwide) to produce all the steel the world currently consumes. The irrefutable motivation for an extension of an existing coal mine is PROFIT. Jobs that will be created by the renewable revolution sweeping through industries worldwide that will put paid to the only other (rationality based) argument in favour of an extension to an existing coal mine.

Over the past two years global coal consumption has fallen by 7% - admittedly this was as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic and shutdowns worldwide but according to the International Energy Agency (IEA) the slight recovery in coal usage following a modicum of success with regards to COVID-19 is set to end - the IEA states "By 2025 global coal demand is forecast to flatten out...in China, coal demand is reaching a plateau....Coal's partial recovery is set to fade after 2021."

Now the question stands: is the IPC the arbiter to determine 'managerial' decisions vis a vis worldwide coal production? The answer, when looked at purely from a managerial point of view is an obvious NO. However, given the meta climate issues which the world undoubtably faces, it can quite sensibly be argued that the Independant PLANNING Commission DOES have a very surefooted position to reject coal EXPANSION of an EXISTING mine when there is no need for that coal alongside their position in exercising a 'public duty of care' for the populations which are affected by the very decisions it makes. This 'duty of care' means that decisions regarding the viability of an EXTENSION to an EXISTING mine are perfectly within the remit of the IPC, a body tasked with taking into account all data that has a bearing on the industry in question - and that, without doubt means assessing the CLIMATE consequences of extending an already (by its own admission) a "relatively gassy" mine.

That SIMEC has gone to great lengths to 'flesh out' it's commitments to decreasing its noxious gas output by no means validates WHY this expansion is required NOW and it is the IPC's duty to step up on behalf of the residents of this great state and country.

We are the world's laggards and the only rational argument available is to reject any extension to that which within the next decade we will no longer require, on account of technological advances in steel production.

Sincerely

Clayton Hairs

Berrima NSW

mob: [REDACTED]