

**SUBMISSION ON
BATHURST COAL LIMITED'S
APPLICATION FOR
EXPANSION
AT
COALGATE COALMINE**

Name Frida Inta

Postal address

Email

Phone

Date 18th May 2020

I oppose the granting of all consents, including retrospective consent, for an expansion of Bathurst's Coalgate Coalmine.

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission.

I live in Seddonville in the upper Buller. I worked for a small time in 2010 as an employee of a contractor to Solid Energy at Stockton Coalmine. I have been plagued for years by the inconsiderate use of lighting at Stockton Coalmine. Very bright lights at night flood the night sky and those lights can be seen shimmering from Karamea; in Seddonville they are a bright halo against the south-western sky. As an avid night sky watcher those lights have given me no end of grief. Over the years the intensity of that light pollution has increased at least 4-fold. Bathurst refuses to address the situation, where Bathurst could be putting substantial hoods on those lights to focus the light where it is intended, not the wider Buller area.

My submission is in honour of Jeanette Fitzsimmons, who tried so hard towards the end of her life to bring awareness to the climate catastrophe we are all rushing headlong into; even in her late seventies chaining herself to the gates of Clandeboye milk evaporating factory.



The planet's pre-eminent science magazine, Nature, has just published a letter

[https://cdn.fbsbx.com/v/t59.2708-21/97329703_1133553803675648_3844487963236892672_n.pdf/committed-emissions.pdf?](https://cdn.fbsbx.com/v/t59.2708-21/97329703_1133553803675648_3844487963236892672_n.pdf/committed-emissions.pdf?_nc_cat=110&_nc_sid=0cab14&_nc_ohc=NmcRX39FOh8AX8SbWlh&_nc_ht=cdn.fbsbx.com&oh=5f23be7785f59cd2a15f1a57e7a65008&oe=5EBC35DD&dl=1&fbclid=IwAR3dJS4SMDBRDGqVoktB_Tq1xVg_JTNV6DokM0s4vBotWt3ipyauOTeFBTU)

[_nc_cat=110&_nc_sid=0cab14&_nc_ohc=NmcRX39FOh8AX8SbWlh&_nc_ht=cdn.fbsbx.com&oh=5f23be7785f59cd2a15f1a57e7a65008&oe=5EBC35DD&dl=1&fbclid=IwAR3dJS4SMDBRDGqVoktB_Tq1xVg_JTNV6DokM0s4vBotWt3ipyauOTeFBTU](https://cdn.fbsbx.com/v/t59.2708-21/97329703_1133553803675648_3844487963236892672_n.pdf/committed-emissions.pdf?_nc_cat=110&_nc_sid=0cab14&_nc_ohc=NmcRX39FOh8AX8SbWlh&_nc_ht=cdn.fbsbx.com&oh=5f23be7785f59cd2a15f1a57e7a65008&oe=5EBC35DD&dl=1&fbclid=IwAR3dJS4SMDBRDGqVoktB_Tq1xVg_JTNV6DokM0s4vBotWt3ipyauOTeFBTU)

which warns us that, globally, committed emissions from existing and proposed energy

infrastructure (about 846 gigatonnes CO₂) represent more than the entire carbon budget that remains if mean warming is to be limited to 1.5 degrees Celsius (°C), and that little or no new CO₂-emitting infrastructure can be commissioned, and that existing infrastructure may need to be retired early (or be retrofitted with carbon capture and storage technology) in order to meet the Paris Agreement climate goals. The authors go on to say,

“International efforts to limit the increase in global mean temperature to well below 2 °C, and to pursue efforts to avoid a 1.5 °C increase, entail a transition to energy systems with net zero emissions by mid-century. Yet recent decades have witnessed an unprecedented expansion of historically long-lived, fossil-fuel-based energy infrastructure”.

Many of us are well aware that Jeanette, along with West Coast Environment Network, challenged Bathurst's Denniston Coalmine proposal in the Supreme Court on the premise that its greenhouse gas emissions outweighed any benefits of the mine, but because the Resource Management Act does not consider such issues other than how the proposal itself may be affected by climate change (a classic case of the tail wagging the dog), that challenge failed. But nevertheless that challenge has helped pave the way for the present round of proposed amendments to the RMA, not least the consideration of greenhouse gas emissions. It is highly likely that by December 2021 greenhouse gas emissions will be an important consideration when resource consents are applied for. In considering my submission, you, as a representative of consenting authorities, Ecan and Selwyn District, must consider this issue deeply. You cannot allow consents to be issued for a long term such as 25 - 30 years, knowing that a very important aspect of this application is under consideration in the extant RMA review, no matter that sections 9 and 10 allow existing uses in breach of updated rules in local plans to continue.

Lest you forget, Ecan has declared a climate emergency, and therefore if you allow an activity which in no small way will contribute in one of the worst ways available to increase greenhouse gases and global warming, you must immediately ensure Ecan retracts its commitment to declaring, and acting on, a climate emergency (why would Ecan make such a declaration if it was not prepared to act on it in any way it can?).

The purpose of the RMA is to provide for the sustainable management of our resources, so the overall and most important question you must ask yourself through this application is, whether the activity is environmentally, ecologically, socially, and economically sustainable. If any of those caveats cannot be met then the proposed activity is highly questionable. In particular any proposal at all to increase greenhouse gases will further expose the human population, and in particular those of us in New Zealand (due mainly to domestic economic considerations), to increased risk of drought, excessive rain, landslides, coastal inundation, explosive outbreaks of agricultural and

human pests, and, very importantly, famine (although this last may not ever apply to New Zealand, we cannot ignore our global neighbours).

By far the main reason for the proposed expansion of Coalgate Coalmine is to provide Fonterra with coal to dry milk. The dairy algorithm in New Zealand is highly ecologically damaging, where intensity has increased, and is still increasing, to levels way beyond what our lands can ecologically sustain. We now have absolutely unacceptably increased levels of nitrates in groundwater, where we have known the consequences of nitrate leaching for so long that the levels being experienced now, and those still to be detected 10 years from now, should have been addressed many years ago; instead increasing intensity has gone unabated; this is a crime against nature and human health. The pollution of our waterways is just terrible, where rivers that should be pristine are running green with eutrophication, most notable of all, the Selwyn River.



The Selwyn/ Te Waihora catchment is one of the most polluted in NZ and water is over allocated, with Lake Ellesmere the receiver of the swathe of activities upstream of it. Millions of dollars of public money and time has been spent in ecological restoration of the maligned Te Waihora, and this Coalgate expansion would complicate that restoration further. Scarce wetland and mudfish habitat would also be impacted.

On these bases alone Coalgate expansion should be declined.

This application is also for retrospective consent. Together with considering the prosecution last

year for breaching consent conditions, it is obvious that Bathurst has no consideration for the environment in which it works, only consideration for its own profits. This latest breach is a case where Bathurst has been, for quite some time, extracting **400%** more coal than its consent allowed. Obviously the recent abatement notice from Selwyn District Council to Bathurst over excessive truck movements results from this unconsented coal extraction.

I request that this very brief outline is considered during the public submission process for Bathurst's application to expand its coal extraction process at Coalgate. I also support Forest and Bird's much more detailed submission.

Frida Inta

16th May 2020.