

From:
To: [Hearings](#)
Cc: [Edwina White](#)
Subject: Notifications Consent Submission: Group 542
Date: Thursday, 21 May 2020 9:43:40 AM

Group ID: 542

Consent name: Bathurst Coal Limited

Consent number: CRC184166, CRC200500, CRC201366, CRC201367, CRC201368, CRC203016, RC185622

Name: Jeannie Ellen Galavazi

Care of:

Mailing address 1:

Mailing address 2:

Suburb:

Town/City:

Post-code:

Country:

Mobile phone:

Work phone:

Home phone:

Email:

Contact by email: Yes

Is a trade competitor: No

Directly affected: No

Consent support/hearing details

- CRC184166: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC200500: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC201366: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC201367: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC201368: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- CRC203016: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing
- RC185622: oppose | NOT to be heard | will NOT consider joint hearing

Reasons comment:

I know that Climate Change effects cannot be considered under the RMA. But I would like

to point out that Ecan declared a Climate Crisis. How can the expansion of a coal mine, that is for low-grade coal, align with that declaration? I believe the application shows a disregard for environmental degradation and threat to biodiversity. I understand Bathurst have repeatedly breached their existing consents for discharge to local waterways, how can further consents be granted and how can Ecan be confident the mitigation proposed will be adequately adhered to. The Canterbury Mudfish is critically endangered and therefore the risk is too high. Wetland replanting and mitigation plans amount to nothing if Climate Change is not seriously addressed. I have also read that this company has a long history of discharge consent infraction. ECan's own website documents fines for 27 infractions against discharging mining effluent into the local waterways, the last such being November 2019. Again, the risk to the natural environment is surely too high and any proposed mitigation must be weighed against this company's past performance. This mining operation is very specifically a threat to the endangered Canterbury mudfish, whose habitat is now very restricted. The continual flouting of notices against discharging mining effluent into the mudfish habitat shows that this operator cannot be trusted to protect the environment they are working in .

Consent comment:

Decline in full.