

## **Submission Form 16 to the Otago Regional Council on consent applications**

**Submitter Details:** 

This is a Submission on (a) limited notified/publicly notified resource consent application/s pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991.

(please print clear	ly)		
Full Name/s:	Timothy Eason		
Postal Address:			
	Post Code:		
Phone number:	Business: Private:		
	Mobile:		
Email address:			
I/ we wish to <b>SUPF</b> of:	PORT / OPPOSE / submit a NEUTRAL submission on (circle one) the application		
Applicant's Name	Cold Gold Clutha Limited		
And/or Organisati	Cold Gold Clutha Limited		
Application Number: RM22.434			
Location:	<ul> <li>Dredging activity – Between NZTM 2000: E1305697 N5040203 (upstream) and NZTM 2000: E1307834 N5018386 (downstream), with two exclusion areas: <ul> <li>Between NZTM 2000: E1305436 N503955 and NZTM 2000: E1305651 N5039249 (Devils Nook)</li> <li>Between NZTM 2000: E131105 N503955 and NZTM 2000: E1307834 N5018386 (Delta upstream of Lake Dunstan).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Slipway 1 – NZTM 2000: E1329505 N4917655.</li> <li>Slipway 2 – NZTM 2000: E1310061 N5035771.</li> </ul>		
Purpose:	For the operation of a suction dredge and construction of a slipway (Gold Dredge on the Mata-au - Otago)		

## The specific parts of the application/s that my submission relates to are:

The initial Fresh Water Assessment by e3 Scientific from July 2022 "Suction Dredge Mining Upper Clutha River Freshwater Assessment Prepared for Cold Gold Clutha Limited July 2022"

And matters from the e3 Scientific Memo dated 19/04/2023 "Response to Cultural Impact Assessment – Suction dredge gold mining in the Clutha River"

• Matter 1: The freshwater assessment conducted by e3Scientific only included macroinvertebrate sampling in three locations in the Central Otago district. There were no



sampling sites within the Queenstown Lakes District, and the effects on ecological values in that reach of the Mata-au are unknown.

- Matter 2: The suitability of the freshwater assessment for the proposed dredging activity is questionable. The samples were taken from shallower edge habitats, while the dredging is proposed to occur at depths between 2m and 15m. It is uncertain whether the assessment is fit for purpose.
- Matter 3: While the identification of tributaries wider than 1m as exclusion zones is welcomed, it is suggested that this measure does not adequately support mana whenua values related to ecology and biodiversity. It is recommended that disturbance of the bed and sedimentation be avoided in the vicinity of all tributaries in the proposed activity area.
- Matter 7: The requirement for an ecological management plan prepared by a qualified freshwater ecologist to be included in the application and reviewed annually. It is suggested that an ecological management plan could be prepared as a condition of consent rather than being part of the initial application.

Some paint of the number approximent
<ul> <li>Matter 8: The concern about the presence of kanakana (lamprey) due to a lack of surveying Recent research indicates that kanakana have been identified nesting under large boulders More research into this is needed.</li> </ul>
My submission is:
In opposition of the application based on the concerns raised regarding the freshwater assessment by e3 Scientific, the suitability of the assessment for the proposed dredging activity, the adequacy of measures to protect Manawhenua values, the requirement for an ecological management plan, and the need for comprehensive surveying of Kanakana (lamprey) presence. I support the "Cultura Impact Assessment: Cold Gold Clutha Suction Dredging on the Mata-au" submitted by Aukaha.
I seek the following decision from the consent authority:
Denial of the application based on the concerns raised regarding the freshwater assessment, the suitability of the assessment for the proposed dredging activity, the adequacy of measures to protect Manawhenua values, the requirement for an ecological management plan, and the need for comprehensive surveying of Kanakana (lamprey) presence.

☐ Wish to be heard in support of our/my submission

I/we:



☐ Not wish to be heard in support of our/my submission	Council		
If others make a similar submission, I/we will consider presenting a jo □ Yes □ No	oint case with them at a hearing.		
I, <b>am not</b> (choose one) a trade competitor* of the applicant (for the presource Management Act 1991).	ourposes of Section 308B of the		
*If trade competitor chosen, please complete the next statement, of	herwise leave blank.		
<ul> <li>I, am not (choose one) directly affected by an effect as a result of the proposed activity in the application that:</li> <li>a) adversely affects the environment; and</li> <li>b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.</li> </ul>			
I do not (choose one) wish to be involved in any pre-hearing me application.	eeting that may be held for this		
I do request* that the local authority delegates its functions, powers the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not m			
Timothy Eason	23/06/23		
Signature/s of submitter/s (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter/s)	(Date)		



## Notes to the submitter

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B.

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

**Privacy:** Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public, including publication on the Council website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the notified resource consent process

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in <u>Part 11A</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under <u>section 100A</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.

You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

The address for service for the Consent Authority is:

Otago Regional Council, Private Bag 1954, Dunedin, 9054

or by email to submissions@orc.govt.nz