

## **Objection to Glendell Continued Operations Project (SSD 9349)**

I am writing to object to the proposed Glendell Continued Operations Project and request that consent for this project be refused. This season's catastrophic bushfires must be a turning point for Australia and the world. It is time our Governments put the safety of Australia's people and environment ahead of profits for foreign owned mining companies.

Specifically, my reasons for objecting to this proposal are as follows:

- Scientists from the IPCC have given the world until 2030 to substantially reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to restrict global warming to 1.5°C: "Global net human-caused emissions of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) would need to fall by about 45 percent from 2010 levels by 2030, reaching 'net zero' around 2050." Clearly a proposal that plans to **increase** coal production by 222% until 2044 is **contrary** to achieving this goal. Scope 3 emissions must be considered and clearly they are incompatible with the world as a whole achieving the goals of the Paris Agreement, regardless of where the coal is burnt. Pleading that emissions from export coal are the burning country's problem under the Paris Agreement is buck passing of the worst kind. It is nonsensical to keep exporting thermal coal which increases CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which in turn leads to hotter temperatures, drier conditions and worse bushfires in Australia.
- The project EIS clearly hasn't seriously considered "the feasible alternatives to the development (and its key components), including the consequences of not carrying out the development", as required by the SEARs. The sky will not fall if this development doesn't go ahead, but Glencore have only assessed this from their point of view: "If no project then economic benefit of the project will be lost". The consequences of NOT carrying out this development may not be good for Glencore, but may be good for the planet and also good for consumers of coal fired power, who can swap to cheaper renewable power - the CSIRO has told us that renewable energy is cheaper than coal! Glencore clearly has such a high expectation of consent being granted that they haven't seriously assessed the full consequences of not proceeding with the development.
- The project is clearly based on optimising Glencore's Mt Owen operations and any global considerations run a very poor second: "Glencore is committed to transitioning to a low-carbon economy, and has recently announced publicly that it will limit coal production to current approved levels. The Project fits within Glencore's production cap commitment as it is focused on sustaining current coal production." Glencore knows that the window is closing on fossil fuel extraction, but is cynically determined to maximise its take while ever our Government is stupid enough to allow it.

- Glencore tell us that “The project design has been informed by many of the studies to ensure impacts are mitigated as far as reasonably and feasibly possible.” The NSW Government/Planning Department needs to be deciding what is “reasonably and feasibly possible”, after input from its citizens, not Glencore!
- The Social Impact Assessment - SIA - “is about identifying, assessing and effectively managing the social impacts that may be associated with the Project, and identifying opportunities to enhance the benefits of the Project.” The part that is missing is the social impact of global warming: burning coal leading to higher temperatures, dryer country, more intense bushfires and in some places, rising sea levels. As we have seen recently, the Consequence Level of bushfires in Australia and inundation in the Pacific is “Catastrophic” and the Likelihood Category is “Almost certain”, leading to an “Extreme” risk. Until coal mine assessments start factoring in the impacts of global warming on the population, mining companies are getting off scot-free for the catastrophes they are causing!
- Concerning air quality, we are told that “Responses to this monitoring will include modifying operations when required, such as relocating exposed equipment to less exposed locations, slowing or stopping specific equipment during high winds or increasing dust suppression activities through increased road watering.” Is it actually possible to slow or stop the trucks from leaving the pit with the production more than doubled? Is it possible to fit enough water cart runs in between the trucks to keep the dust down? Is there even enough water available for the additional watering required for more than double the production and hence more than double the truck movements?
- Relocating the Ravensworth Homestead is problematic for a number of reasons. There simply aren’t that many buildings dating from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and it is classed as having “State Significant Heritage Value”. This property was also a significant site in the “frontier wars”, with local Indigenous people being slaughtered when they resisted white people taking what was theirs. Many white Australians know how and where their forebears died in the World Wars and have made the pilgrimage years later to visit that site. Why would we deny Indigenous Australians that same right? Clearly visiting the homestead to picture what happened would be far more meaningful than seeing it relocated somewhere else! When the coal industry finally withers, regional Australia will need every tourist attraction it can find to get people to visit and pump money into their community. I visited Ravensworth House over 30 years ago and can still remember having to stoop to get through the back door. Seeing such places is a far more effective teacher than reading about them in class.

- Just as the mines documentation asserts “the Project in isolation is unlikely to limit Australia achieving its national mitigation targets” for CO2 emissions, I would assert that refusing this mine extension in isolation is unlikely to materially impact the Australian economy. That is the thinking behind having a “Transition Plan” to move away from coal mining to renewable energy domestically and as export replacement. If this plan was in place, each mine closure would cause barely a ripple to the economy. If Governments were doing their job, they would have renewable energy projects under development and be attracting other employers to the area to absorb Glendell coal workers when the existing consent lapses. Far better to do this gradually over the next 10 years than to let the whole industry be decimated at once, at an unknown time in the future, when our customers get their renewable energy act together.

I urge you to consider my arguments in your assessment of this project. The game has changed – you can’t keep automatically consenting to coal projects! We have seen where that leads this summer and it is not acceptable that corporate profits are put before human life, property, wildlife and the environment. I urge you to reject this proposal!

Yours faithfully,

Janet Murray