From:
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Cc:

Subject: Mangoola Coal Contd Op SSD 8642 Add. Mat"l

Date: Monday, 12 April 2021 3:18:06 PM

To IPCN Inquiry, re Mangoola Coal Continued Operations, SSD 8642, Added Material.

Thank you for this opportunity.

There is a quantity of information newly available to responders; I cannot see it all. But it is clear that a review is appropriate.

I have focussed on **two pieces** of the displayed material in particular, and I request **refusal** of the project on the basis of both.

1) Marg McLean provided a map showing the Biodiversity Corridors in the locality. It is clear that the Mine's extended area does not just impinge on the corridor network. It severs and entirely destroys, forever, a full section of an essential part of the eastern corridor.

Her arguments are strong and factual, in support of retaining and protecting this corridor, which itself is a mere remnant of the original continuum in this area. The only pristine and complete ecosystem zone left in this Valley, was around the Anvil Hill. This mine has taken all of it already. That should never have been allowed.

The greed now being shown is excessive and destructive, unworthy of the nation. No royalties, no jobs, warrant this crime.

Do not give the go-ahead to destroy this corridor, a local part of the authoritative, and expensive, national effort to retain a remnant of our threatened species.

2) I am not an Economist. So I had to read **the Australia Institute's economic analysis** quite carefully. It was possible for me however to comprehend all the points made, and to see that they were based not on the emotion of a "biased view" as implied by Government protesters, but on hard fact, diverse research, and established Court findings; particularly the Rocky Hill case. So who's biased then?

I have observed over 2 decades the effect of mining jobs on the local economies. They scour out the towns of workers in all fields, wasting costly training and experience, as well as community services, to fill their mines. They do it by offering higher salaries, but not that high; and not to people earning low pay. Therefore I could see for myself, some of the faults in the assumptions made by Cadence for the client Glencore. Mines never emphasise the backgrounds of their workers, or the losses to family life.. even the losses of life.

The \$ benefits claimed are indeed reduced, as Australia Institute spells out. I agree that Revenue 'benefit' must drop with any honest prediction of the losses in terms of society, health, environment, habitat and ambience, the risks to water and to farming. We all know up here, that the claims made for 'rehabilitation' restoration and coexistence etc, are just pictures in the sand.

Today's Sydney Morning Herald, 12.4.21, gives a report of NSW's impending situation from Carbon emissions. It is quite appalling, and it would support the Al's call for honesty in assessing true impacts both world wide and locally. The Cadence assessment for Glencore actually chose

to ignore the mine's total \$ impact on everyone in the world, aside from those living in NSW! And Scope 3 emissions are not taken into account at all. The State responders displayed the only true bias in the room by their woolly replies quoted.

Using facts from a bias towards planet and species survival is one thing. Being biased against survival to the extent of denying facts for short term money, is another.

We need a State Government/ public service which is prepared to govern for the benefit and survival of land and people.

In the end, Companies and Money are figments, and they will not help us avoid the fate Mangoola Mine is pushing us towards.

Please refuse the expansion of this already excessive mine, which has already taken the last pure ecology, and with others, has made a skills shortage and a health hazard, in the regions around it.

Thank you.

Bev Atkinson , Scone NSW 2337

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software. www.avast.com