

Mount Pleasant Coal Mine 'optimisation project'.

16.3.21

To the NSW Department of Planning Industry and Environment.

Objection. from Beverley Atkinson B. Arch UNSW

67 Park Street, Scone 2337 02 6545 3005

(Previously with Travers Morgan, London, [Civ.Eng.] designing and inserting large motorway infrastructure in sensitive UK landscape.)

Reasons for objection include: Wrong economic 'justification'. Serious Precedents created by this specific application. Local cumulative impacts. Global cumulative impacts.

The label 'optimisation project' is a euphemism. But the State's time-extension of 2 weeks, rather than the months requested to approach a 2-foot thick EIS, is inadequate and just as objective.

This project affects two adjoining Shires, entering the Upper Hunter Valley by breaking through its southern wall. Thus two Shires are involved, and the future of all landuses in the area.

Photos will be enclosed, separately annotated, but with no time to cross reference.

DRAWINGS ENCLOSED: Data comes from MACH Energy's EIS, and the following:

1982 Defence Map with 20 m. contours, with data on the natural Upper Hunter topography.

My drawings: Map, Mining Interests 2020,

Vistas from Scone;

Broadcasting Impact Diagram;

Aberdeen's loss of views, Visual Effects.

Reasons for objection:

* The rationale often given, of supposed '**economic benefit**' is demonstrably untrue, from my rural town experience over 20 years. The usual 'jobs' justifications apply neither to this, nor to other new coal mine applications.

For workers, mining salaries can never buy back the healthier quality of life enjoyed in former work situations, or compensate for the lost training and personal achievement. Touted jobs which mines offer are largely stolen from local and nearby economies; (eg. hard Dartbrook Mine evidence: of jobs to be procured by inducing currently-working local community to leave work and go underground). Hence regional skills shortages. All our local towns have lost trades to the mines, even as our TAFES are being diminished by this same Government.

Workers who used to serve and teach in the community now drive trucks for bucks, for a while. Government has no idea. It should call the mines to declare what jobs/training their workers left behind; to be resumed soon for public benefit and a return to a balanced healthy economy.

Workers in the mines are told little of the project. What they support is their higher **new** salary. Revenues cannot recompense us for our qualitative losses, nor for Government's subsidising of coal. Then there's the rural jobs extinguished; a cumulative rural tragedy. *But are mines asked to confess the growing list of lost rural jobs to Government, and in their advertising?*

***The project is an unjustified new intrusion into the Upper Hunter Valley itself**, bringing irreversible change and destruction to landscape, and to natural land and water systems, as well as to the livelihoods dependent on them.

Drawing: The Broadcasting Impacts Diagram: shows a precedent of concern:

*** A serious *State-Significant Objection* to this proposal in particular:**

It raises the rock emplacement past the Approved 220m. Australian Height Datum, up to maximum 360 AHD. Every added metre would block transmission sightlines a little more, from the Rossgole TV and Radio tower, (transmitting ABC from 560m. AHD.) By the time the design heights are reached, all transmission sightlines are blocked across the whole of Muswellbrook from its lowest commercial zone to the highest homes, from its north end to its south.

This will test Government's apparent willingness to sacrifice the health and wellbeing of the people of Muswellbrook, for the financial exploitation of every possible coal reserve, for as long as possible.

This problem pertains only to Mt Pleasant Mine, that I know of. We hear recent reports of new interference experienced in and around Muswellbrook, from unknown cause/s.

Would or should, public coal royalties pay for replicating or supplementing the Hunter Valley broadcasting tower, only to gain an extra 120+ metres of rock height in aid of MACH's profits?

Telco Authority has not been informed. I asked it only if there is Commonwealth legislation that has to be used as in the UK, when a DA may affect transmission. No. (Tower security is with the Police.)

Drawing: Vistas North Sector: to investigate changes to long views from Scone direction:

* (see also Photos) Scone's natural southern horizon would change. Views of Mount Arthur and Ogilvie Hill would be diminished to vanishing, as one moves from top of **Scone at 280** AHD on the base of Scone Mountain, westward to the **Downs at 220** mid-valley. The distant views of high bushland in the very distant National Parks would vanish.

Mount Pleasant itself, gently sloped but central in the Valley, is visibly cut, and belittled. Another high view point is near historic Turanville/Invermien, on the only other central high ground.

Tripling the emplacement height cancels the touristic worth of Kyuga Road. The claustrophobic shock of the new 'hill' from the Castlerock crest, is sickening even now. Already the visual shock prompts sudden illness and possible accident for southward drivers. The touted rehabilitation will finally happen, maybe, by 2053, when many of us are dead, and will not restore what we have had.

Added viewpoints (VP's) on the Kyuga Road (see drawing) should be studied. It's magnificent countryside. These VP's are high, and near the works which are removing access to the panorama obtained from Castlerock Road. (photo-line wrap round) That ancient ridge-road is a richly spiritual trajectory from valley floor to escarpment. The loss of this road with its lookout points is a terrible loss to the whole Hunter Valley, and not only for 'Tourism'. The attitude to ancient history is already clear, in the density of aboriginal finds across the entire hillside area to be dug out for coal.

From the New England Highway too, visual impacts are worse here in this enclosed valley, than they are from the Highway north of Singleton. Whereas Singleton's fringe trees can hide vast holes, here they are meant to screen soaring barrier walls rising in front of what used to be distant views.

Drawing: Aberdeen; Loss of views, Visual Effects

This drawing illustrates points made below, see "**Precedent 2: Aberdeen**" below. It shows the views to the high cut, from Aberdeen and VP2, also the loss of Ogilvie Hill view. The wide viewing sectors occupied by the Application, and its emergence through the ridge, are clarified. It also shows the proximity and relationship of the Hunter River and Dart Brook to the mine sites.

*** Precedent 1: general visual impact, towns and countryside.**

This mine must surely be the first and largest open cut Coal Mine permitted so close to a major town in the neck of a unique and famously beautiful valley. Already this mine takes out the views of escarpment and distant horizons from thousands of people's homes in important directions.

***But the current proposal** multiplies today's impact most horribly, tripling the height of emplacement, doubling its length and presenting it to the Upper Hunter's entire valley floor.

For many it would block distant views from Scone and Aberdeen extending to 50 and 80km.

True, Mount Arthur Mine is close to Muswellbrook too; but not that close, and it cuts views only to a further minefield. Bengalla Mine also, is further than the Mount Pleasant Mine from Muswellbrook.

The fact that existing growing overburdens have wiped out views already, cannot excuse even more intrusion. It is tragic when people are so sad and sickened, that they take the jobs and don't look.

Generally, photomontages from Muswellbrook: The whole view sector taking in the whole projected emplacement is far wider than can be seen in VP 4 and VP 6.

The length of the projected emplacement edge is several times the length of the town. Already the carefully shaped hills go on and on as you drive Kyuga road from Muswellbrook, eventually confronting you nearby. This Application brings the rock dumps not only nearer, but extends them for 2km right beside the road, then turning west and spoiling the Kyuga vale entirely. (photo)

Volume, and cost-benefit: just suppose..

If one 33 storey building were proposed for a location 3 km from Muswellbrook, the Planning Departments would indeed be active. If the heights varied between one and 66 storeys, and there were say 37 of them, well, that would be a new city. It would be discussed with vigour, considering the beautiful surroundings. It would provide building and ongoing jobs though. Economic activity would continue in them, generating ongoing profits. Let's do it. However what if they were all just built stuck together with no space between, and filled with rocks?

*If my arithmetic and approximations are adequate, this proposal simulates over 30,000 such buildings of area 500 sq.m. with **average** height 33 storeys, (1 to 66) all stuck together and filled with rocks. Something in the order of 18,200 million cubic metres perhaps, above the valley floor level.*

The first up-to-20 storeys has been built already, with intention to triple that height at the central peaks. No life or economy will go on inside this volume, surrounding a deep and toxic hole sunk to maybe 80m above sea level. Previous aboriginal residence is over. Farming has been evicted.* This is next to, and up-wind of, **a town**. The dust and gases from spontaneous combustion, blasting and burning, are well dealt with by other responders. * EPA knows Sulphur gas reaches Scone noses from existing mines. We often see the dust moving down there and blowing our way.

** Yet, our State Planning Department: is it asking any questions, or politically approving more such?*

The detail and rehabilitation of outer facades of the Mount Pleasant mine may indeed, be 'best practice'. That devotion to detail and quality of design is appreciated. Thank you.

But it cannot alter the overall final impact which is sickeningly claustrophobic for 2 nearby towns, for valley dwellers and for drivers. To lose the view of far distance, so often a prime incentive for rural town property purchase, is **a bad shock, both economic and emotional**. An added disappointment, the people so affected won't even be able to wander up the new hills and view the (albeit devastated) surroundings. Too steep, too dangerous, and prohibited under Mine ownership.

This aesthetic invasion takes from every individual property sale price, every expectation of lasting beauty, every quiet enjoyment of distance. People lose, life-long. State Revenues don't help them.

*** Precedent 2: Upper Hunter invasion, and Aberdeen affected**

This proposal if Approved is **the first large overground coal mine to physically penetrate the Upper Hunter Valley**. To do that, MACH is ready to destroy the valley's only long East-West ridge. Sloping across almost to the Hunter River from Mount Pleasant itself, it borders and protects the Upper Hunter. (photos) The ridge somewhat shields us from mines and their pollution. The idea that a high rock bund can do the same while creating more pollution, is disingenuous. It may contain a little of the construction noise and dust, but what a lasting, heavy price for so little.

The ridge narrows the valley floor at this sole point, to only 2km wide; the only division in the Valley. It divides the upper from the lower Hunter Valley. For us, it separates mines from real life. It is between our Upper Hunter, and the fate which has been allowed to overtake the other side.

The high rock bund slopes from the Kyuga corner down to the west, meeting existing ground level beside Dorset Road. The VP2 photomontage cannot see this clearly because there are also emplacements beyond, softening the appearance of that north sloping ridge. Fine.

But the North East sector of the upper valley can see a sharp bite slashing down into the high ridge near Mount Pleasant itself, never to be filled, always visible as a high steep cut and a severed head. This aspect of the view is absent on VP 2 from Nandowra Road because a tree obscures that part.

* The northward push by this "SSD-10418" is viscerally like rape, as it carves through the sensitive East-West ridge leading to the summit of Mount Pleasant, in order to seed the Upper Hunter with open cut mining. What Government would do that to its land, its people?

As found in the EIS, and in my Aberdeen drawing, that unfortunate town sees across the sloping bund towards this high cut, very directly, forever. Sunrise would be particularly painful, shining upon it, and afternoon would render it a contrastingly dark shadow.

The viewing sector occupied by the project is very wide from all Aberdeen, which loses its far vistas of distant bushland high ground, and of Ogilvie Hill. The reason people bought houses there.

VP 3 is even closer to the Dorset Rd/Kyuga corner. its view sector is very wide indeed for Highway travellers. Any idea they had of the Upper Hunter as a beautiful destination is cast into doubt.

*** Precedent 3: Castlerock Road Ridge.**

This the first, and fatal, attack on the very ancient road topping the Castlerock Road ridge. It not only borders the Upper Hunter, it leads to the only road-accessible sweeping panoramic views of this part of the Hunter Valley. There has been deplorably little recent promotion of this spectacular route to the top of the escarpment. But a lack of imagination can be no justification for destruction. Tourism will be needed for mental health, when we all wake up.

But this ridge road is of permanent value for its own sake.

It is also our local road-link to the 5000 km Bicentennial National Trail, a prime future Tourism asset. The way up Castlerock Road is, or has been, beautiful. Making residents skirt the foot of the rock bund instead, on a new road, stinks. Certainly any view-seeking visitors would be repelled.

*** NB: Protect this entire ridge at all costs for the overall enduring good; the public interest.**

The Approved MOD 3 (quoted in EIS 2020) shows clearly that the approved plan for 2026 is to see this ridge and the Castlerock Road still in place and untouched (final landform plan, versus the superseded 1998 plan.)

This is a wise and careful course in the mine's plan; keep them to it.

(Some Appendix M photos don't reflect this, maybe a mistake; eg. white line VP1)

Terminating the work at 2026 thus leaves the Upper Hunter intact. it allows the flexibility of sustainable farming to continue, on its edge. * It allows MACH to exercise options for renewable industries on remaining owned land, as was explained on the Information Day by Chris Lauritzen.

Looking at the current excavation patterns from above, it seems quite possible to continue those square patterns within current approval, stopping south of the ridge. No need for a 6km pit.

Techniques must serve best outcomes only. I don't believe an assertion about vast parallel machinery 'needing' to cut north into the Upper Hunter for its own convenience; as if 4 kilometres of run isn't somehow enough to satisfy its testosterone. * *There has come a point now, where machines must be controlled by the people, their land, and their survival. Not the reverse.*

SUMMARY OF GENERAL POINTS APART FROM VISUAL IMPACT

*** Flooding:** Having cut a deep gouge through and under this protective ridge, the new mine is brought right up against Dartbrook Mine land. The mines share aquifers, and they plan to share functional water. Flooding can go overground only through the one narrow neck made by the ridge. What is to stop of overground flooding reaching Mt Pleasant Mine through Dartbrook Mine's aquifers and contaminated underground voids? Dartbrook's gas and water problems are known.

*** Broadly, we must plan a future beyond coal and shortsighted politics leaning on a 'jobs' idea.**

For success, jobs must be worthwhile, and socially responsible. Farming, and tourism are cleaner and safer than mining, more useful; they don't destroy what people come to see, eat and enjoy.

Assets and treasures yet remaining to us, we should preserve. These include air, water and growing-land, ecology, living creatures. The MACH EIS, and Government, give us no reassurance.

*** Treasures include built heritage. And the greater, longer Aboriginal heritage.**

But respect for these in the very extensive and thorough MACH Energy EIS, seems to emphasise recording rather than preservation and access. Heritage studies done for built and for Aboriginal heritage confirm that the subject area is rich in human heritage. Yet the Mine intends to dispose of most of it one way or another, with token signals indicating procedures. Respect for existing colonial heritage and the Recommendations seems patchy. Perversely, there is a deplorable history of former owners not even being allowed access to remove useful items.

*** Social Impact; this is an immense field of impact. See the 'Just Add Lime' SIA notes.**

I was grateful for Rachel Maas's perseverance and objective thoroughness in gathering the wider truths of people's experience here. Her points should be read and noted, in entirety.

To emphasise one of her points, currently the perceived impacts *just of this mine alone*, are sensitive and threatening. The more people are affected, the less they can respond. There is a pitiful helplessness, in the face of the moral abandonment seen in an apparent blind bias coming from a Government aiming at nothing but quick revenue; and the according decisions of instructed IPC panels. Integrity is felt to be absent from the process. Desperately needed long-term cost-benefit thinking seems to be off the table. But Mines offer funds for playgrounds. Thanks.

A point heard regularly from businesses is their 'dependence on mines'. We never get to know if they have other clients, at all! The *low actual number of mine workers in the national and world picture* is one indication that our businesses **do** have other clients, and often their livelihood relies on this large majority of other clients. But mines steer the newspapers we still have here. Hunter River Times is put out by COAL FACE printers, seizing the gap left by Hunter Valley News. *It's not done*, to say businesses have plenty of other clients too, and wider opportunities.

VISUAL ASSESSMENT in more detail (referring to Appendix M of the EIS)

Comments are taken from combination of my photos and observations, the EIS, and my Sections.

**** The visual catchment area** considered in the EIS needs to be more extensive, at least to the North. That's the direction I am routinely familiar with. High west-Scone's view of Mount Arthur is belittled by the project. The view from Scone's eastern Downs loses Mount Arthur entirely. So would the Invermien 'headland', (a heritage location west of Scone).

We would see the new high rock emplacement from any of the viewing points above 220m AHD, in and near Scone itself, let alone closer south. *Rehabilitation cannot restore a lost horizon.*

My Drawing: "Vistas, North Sector" identifies other Viewpoints close to the project, on Dorset Road. They are outside towns, but they have intrinsic value. Their scenic value is high, and at risk.

**** Photomontages in Appendix M, in MACH Energy's EIS. General notes**

* Designs change fluidly over time. Some photomontages may have been completed before the final landform details, resulting in apparent shape differences between final plan and pictures.

* The arrows showing extent of this project and others, are not always in accord with what I see on my sightlines using the Mining Interests 2020 map. I think the arrows can be misleading, giving an impression that the Project is smaller in a person's view, than it is.

* A white 'lost horizon' line is present on one view from Muswellbrook town, one which shows half the length of the project. I think the horizon indications should be standard on all photos.

* Height contours on the printed "final landform" drawing are helpful. The noted heights are almost illegible however, due partly to the texture of a strong forest of tree-symbols. Being much larger than scale they make the landform itself seem much smaller than it is. I have been relying mostly on this final landform indication, as printed in public hard copy.

* It was not possible to find out in the Information Day, what height the rock emplacement has currently reached. If one were to do perspectives based on that, it's necessary to know.

I think it may be already close to the 220 AHD, the height which I had sketched as the intended **peak** heights from the MOD 3 documents at that time. Why? To me it appears that the currently rising landform shapes are confidently anticipating the addition of the next phase. The emplacement must present a strongly engineered firm flat base for another zero to 140m of rock. The current skyline of the meandering bund outline is flat, now, at the 'front'.

(I don't understand why the south west area is rising even higher than that already, but I don't have time to study the Approved plan at the moment, and I'm not familiar with work plans.)

*** The main point for me, on the 'APPROVED' section of the EIS, was that on plan, the Castlerock Road is still untouched at 2026, and the north slopes to the Upper Hunter are, properly, left intact.**

Government should insist in the public interest, that no plans are permitted to reverse that.

**** Aberdeen's VP1** is taken from high on Graeme St. The authors may well be able to explain all.

Using my Mining Interests map I cannot reconcile the photomontage with the Kyuga crossroads corner point, which appears to me to be in line with Ogilvie Hill.

I cannot marry the white dotted line to the Approved plan (EIS). As said, that stopped south of Castlerock Road, delaying its traumatic destruction. (see point above)

The green line here, I can't understand yet. A perspective from close north would be useful here.

The extent, shape of final works, and landmarks on VP1, I can't yet reconcile. Bengalla is actually hidden behind Mt Pleasant mineworks from that angle, so the extent of Mount Pleasant mineworks is not conveyed as I understand it. Perhaps the arrows are used to give a general impression only.

There could be clearer labelling to identify the high cut which bounds the final void on the west. It is an important change to the view, as said. Mount Pleasant has a fatally deep gash in her throat.

PUBLICITY, ABERDEEN

Few people in Aberdeen have any idea of the extent of the impact intended for them. Few even know about the project. MACH's publicity has been through 'mine press', (all we have left), and some radio I hear, but consciously avoiding ABC. Maybe not all mine workers get a brochure as they should, with links to full EIS, before being encouraged to 'support'. It was said that schools were approached offering information but they "were not interested. " The Information Days were thinly attended. Basically, the Mine does not want its plan opposed.

** Surely all workers should be prioritised, in being shown what they will be working on, and their support should come only from fullest information, (same as is expected of objectors).*

*Whose negligence then? **Muswellbrook people** should be informed even more so, since their cumulative impact load affects health and wellbeing. (This rainy year supplies a telling contrast.)*

**** Nandowra Road VP2** is on a little ridge 12 km from the 'Central sector'.

Yes, but it's only 9km from the mine bund! *The circular central 'sector' finishing deep in the projected coal pit* instead of at the north edge of the mine as one expects, has generated this confusion. The Visual Catchment Area extends to 9, not 12km. That distortion seems to only affect the north side.

The EIS photo shows the final landform plan's northern bund. We can see the higher new hills to be raised south of it also, (through the cut?) The bunds hide Mount Arthur's top forever, from VP2.

I think the labelled 'wooded foothills' on the photo are in fact the summit of Mount Pleasant, which is not hidden by intervening wooded ridges (see my Section). The soft rise to the summit of the central Mount is visually diminished to nothing, by the high rock heap next to it.

Aberdeen and other viewpoints around the valley will see the mount's cut face to approx. 300 AHD height. (See VP1 notes) Rehabilitation is much harder on the void's extreme western slopes.

I have now come to understand that public access to this deep salty well is not likely or safe.

**** VP 3 from the N E Highway, across river just east of the Kyuga crossroads, (corner of the bund).**

I'd like to see the full length of the site on all the montages. The north parts seem to be left off the end rather. This is an example, others are the Muswellbrook town VP's.

I am trying to find all the four+ peaks on the N-S range here. Maybe this pertains to an older design?

We see how the north bund would take out the view of Mount Pleasant from here.

(Conversely, the bund blocks views down **from** the Castlerock Road lookout, around to the southern valley. * No views would ever again be seen from there, towards anywhere south of VP3).

**** VP 4 Muswellbrook above Eatons Pub.** As said, we can't see the northern part of the project.

The white dotted line fig. 6.17, shows a lost horizon.

That's useful information, shown only on one of the stages of this VP4.

The impact seen in 2019 still had the horizon visible. Even with its exposed rubble it appears therefore far less extreme than the impact of the final landform, rehabilitated to best practice. That claustrophobic shock is extreme, due to loss of views, proximity, loss of space and familiarity. The naturalistic landscaping helps. But it can't ameliorate the impact of a new high mass in the face of a town. **There's no effective "mitigation" possible. The word needs disciplined use and definition.**

This mine Application creates a new landform entirely, its vast mass and volume already described above. It is not a gift to any population. No 'salary' can buy back what is lost to all of us, including the nearby local biodiversity evolved on developing soils over eons.

**** VP6 : Muswellbrook near Big W and church, Hill Street.** (familiar place to Scone shoppers.)

Look at the horizon rising. ****SUNSETS would be later in Winter on this hillside.**

The shape of the skyline shown is as taut as a power cable. I think the updated design might look heavier, more settled in reality, and creviced by the designed creeks.

Extent of the Project shown by arrows is unclear. Surely the project extent would not move, and it would all be rehabilitated.

Showing the full length of the project with all peaks, would make the impact easier to understand. Perhaps, since the project is so extraordinarily immense in such an unlikely location, this would need a photomontage on a Google Earth aerial, or an aerial photograph.

Scope should not be limited to the worksite like the project maps generally are, but should include context, including the whole of the adjacent town it dwarfs.

Light poles on photos are useful to gauge the added height but as said, a horizon line would make it easier. The height would roughly triple from the ground up, and this should be made very clear.

**** VP's 5 and 7 and 8** could be covered if I had a more adequate extension of time.

Please refer any difficulties with drawings etc, to me. 02 6545 3005 beva4@bigpond.com

* * * * *

**** *Cumulative impacts of coal mining in the Hunter Valley have now gone so far past the tipping point, that the experience visitors used to come for, has mostly gone.***

(I wrote a recent submission to DPIE on Cumulative Impacts, to be included in this submission also.)

NSW Government, please awake or we all lose out!

**** The MACH Energy EIS is commendably thorough, and large. I hope that nobody considers its sheer quantity as any justification of the project:**

**** NB: The Risk Assessment in the EIS sends a strong signal:** It shows that of all the values held on Earth, coal mining is the highest; to do it as long as it can be got away with, is the imperative.

The major Risk feared by the writer of Summary Risk tables is that Government may see through the entire presentation at last! Clearly ***the yellow column showing low environmental effect of just about everything***, is not intentionally a joke, any more than a quaint statement on the policy of biodiversity offsets ***'which will become equal to the original given time'***. So one is as good as two?

In aiming to convince, both of these furbphies betray our peoples, our land, and the integrity of the Consultants. It mocks anyone who believes any of it.

Most assessors reading this will not be completely familiar with the lands we write about.

Many of MACH's **consultants**, living in Qld, NZ, and elsewhere may have had only a passing acquaintance at best, with the lands and peoples affected.

So we submit our experience in good faith that it will be considered as evidence.

The Application should be refused, firstly for its boldly damaging New precedents:

- * Breaking the Upper Hunter boundary ridge to impact the future of the neighbouring Shire.
- * Endangering then removing the Commonwealth broadcasting services to Muswellbrook.
- * Looming over an already visually oppressed town, and removing its valuable distant views.
- * Introducing a heavy new intrusion into the valued landscape of another town, Aberdeen.
- * Raising a new range of hills centrally in the neck of a sensitive valley famed for landscape.

**The Application should be refused, secondly, on Local Cumulative Impacts
(ref. Social Impact Assessment)**

The Application is being submitted with awareness of data about local Cumulative Impacts from all nearby mines, and of data about deteriorating health (and lives) of workers and residents. (When people get killed coming off shifts, just get another truck driver and keep the reason a bit quiet.)

Better ideas: MACH has some ideas for remediation and for Renewable Energy reuse of the finished site. So it should devote energy to that right now; to a progressive project from the start. That would provide safe jobs and a clear future, allowing many present workers to return to their previous working situations. This helps readjust the economy, and addresses rural skills shortages.

The Application should be refused, thirdly, because of Global Cumulative Impacts which are now killing our biosphere at an accelerating rate.

No 'benefits' can give joy to a dead planet. We are all responsible, if we let this happen.

This is my objection to the extension of the Mount Pleasant Mine past 2026.

B. Atkinson.