

Maximizing our Mineral Potential – removing Schedule 4 protections

Mick Strack

School of Surveying

Schedule 4 of Crown Minerals Act

- 40% of our mineral potential is within Schedule 4 land (13% of all NZ)
- that means 60% is not.
- Is it implicit that the report suggests that the concentrations of minerals (and therefore the ease of extraction) is higher in Schedule 4 land?

Our image?

- The report recognises that we don't want “our clean, green image sacrificed”
- I think that mining on land that would otherwise be protected must necessarily sacrifice our image

Mining Permits

Mineral potential is established progressively:

- Prospecting Permit – minimum impact activities – 2 years
- Exploration Permit – drilling for feasibility – 5 years
- Mining Permit – extraction – 40 years

Access must be negotiated separately

Consents under the RMA must be obtained:

supposedly, environmental effects can be managed by consent conditions

Government support

The government wants to show the industry that it is prepared to actively support mining

- it can do this by funding (investing in) investigative surveys, R&D, etc.

Catching Australia

but

- Australia is a big country,
- much of it is out of sight,
and in a peculiarly Australian way,
- they can ignore the environmental impact
 - it is just waste land anyway,
- and ignore any human relationships with place
 - it is sparsely populated, and anyway the people don't matter

Conservation land

- The point of conservation land is that human productive land uses should be avoided.
- The environmental values are protected (this still allows passive human use).

Schedule 4 land

- The very point of Schedule 4 in the Crown Minerals Act is to provide **additional** protection above what is provided for in other conservation legislation.
- It seems bizarre to undo what has been specifically identified as land worthy of **additional** protection.

Too much Conservation land?

- The government thinks there is enough conservation land there to allow some to be used for mining.
- Why should mining be different?
- Next there may be suggestions that it may revert to farming? or urbanization?

Providing more Schedule 4 land

- This is proposed.
- Is it conditional upon removing the designated s4 land?
- If it has been identified for additional protection, then it should be included, whether the rest of this policy is implemented anyway
- Is this just another sweetener?
- Like the \$10m conservation fund?