

**From:**  
**To:** [Hearings](#)  
**Subject:** Bathhurst coal resource consents  
**Date:** Friday, 15 May 2020 2:30:12 PM

---

My submission of Bathhurst coal application to expand mining operations.

CRC184166: 20 years;  
CRC200500: 35 years;  
CRC201366, CRC201367, CRC201368: 20 years; and  
CRC203016: 20 years.

Given the council recognition of a global climate emergency, New Zealand's commitments to reducing carbon emissions and that coal is THE WORST offender for climate emissions, why would Ecan allow resource consents for these activities for 20, 35, 20 and 20 years respectively.

The fact is, Fonterra can find alternate methods of drying milk powder, even moving to natural gas would halve their greenhouse emissions.

Fonterra could invest in hydro infrastructure in collaboration with the govt in the same way Rio Tinto collaborates with power from the Manapouri power station.

I agree, dairy cant move from coal in the next years, but neither can Ecan or Fonterra continue to ignore the environmental damage being caused by global climate emissions.

If Ecan does not reject these requests to expand coal mining out of hand, the period in which coal mining is consented should be limited to 5 years, to force Fonterra to consider alternatives.

Continued granting of permits to Fonterra to continue to use coal just keeps the environmental issue of global carbon emissions out of the board room. No profit making business will change until forced to change.

What legacy do the members of Ecan want to leave behind for their children?

Michael Barraclough