

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
AT WELLINGTON**

IN THE MATTER of the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf
(Environmental Effects) Act 2012 (“the Act”)

AND

IN THE MATTER of the applications by Trans Tasman Resources Limited
(TTR) for marine and discharge consents to recover
iron sand under sections 20 and 87B of the Act and

IN THE MATTER of an application under section 158 of the Act

BETWEEN **Trans- Tasman Resources Limited**

Applicant

AND **The Environmental Protection Authority**

EPA

AND **Kiwis Against Seabed Mining Incorporated (KASM)**

Respondent

**SECOND MEMORANDUM ON BEHALF OF KASM
Dated 10 October 2016**

Duncan Currie/Ruby Haazen
21 Shaddock Street
Eden Terrace
AUCKLAND
rghaazen@gmail.com
Ph: 021-144-3457

To: the Decision-Making Committee

MAY IT PLEASE THE DECISION-MAKING COMMITTEE:

1. This memorandum responds to the minute of the Decision-Making Committee (DMC) dated 7 October 2016 whereby the DMC published the Memorandum of [Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Ruanui](#) dated 5 October 2016.
2. KASM supports the request of Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Ruanui for an extension for a period of 20 further working days, for the reasons given but also for the following reasons:
 - a. KASM has filed a Memorandum asking the DMC to reconsider its direction to redact extensive information relevant to the environmental effects by the Applicant. Following the decision of the DMC to decline to reconsider its direction, KASM filed an application to the Environment Court. That application is currently due to be heard on November 2 and 3. A 20 day extension would at least mean that if there is a change in the redacted information, it could most likely be seen by the public during the submission period.
 - b. There is an enormous amount of information to be processed and understood by the public. An extension would give the public a better opportunity to do so.
 - c. An extension would assist the DMC to gain the best available information as is required by section 61(1)(b) of the Act. The DMC in the first TTR application renotified the application, as some documents were not available on the EPA website for the entire first submission period. The DMC said on page 188 of its [decision](#) that “The effective consequence of having two notification periods was that would-be submitters had additional time to consider the application documentation. Given the very short timeframe (20 working days) the EEZ Act allows for submissions, we consider the renotification period has enabled greater participation in the process by the public and has likely assisted in the quality and depth of information that has come before us.”
 - d. KASM therefore submits that the DMC should grant the requested 20 day extension.

Respectfully submitted

Duncan Currie/ Ruby Haazen

10 October 2016