



Brett Tennent-Brown

BSc, DipSc, BVSc, MS

Diplomate ACVIM

Diplomate ACVECC

Andrew Van Eps

BVSc, PhD

MACVSc

Diplomate ACVIM



- EHIS is deficient
- Too much emphasis on irrelevant material
- Air quality methodology is inadequate



- EHIS contains no directly relevant information on the effects of coal mining dust on horse health
 - No one would consider placing a horse stud next to a mine
 - The EHIS does not consider:
 - Relevant published information in horses
 - Extensive information in the human literature
 - Difficult to determine if a health risk for horses exists



- Inflammatory Airway Disease (IAD)
 - Condition typically affecting (young) horses maintained in barns or stables
 - Exposed to high concentrations of organic dust from feed and bedding
 - Likened to allergies in humans
 - Affects the respiratory health of horses and impairs performance
-



- Inflammatory Airway Disease (IAD)
 - IAD is largely irrelevant to this discussion
 - Equine airways are inherently sensitive to inhaled particulate material



- Methods used to determine air quality are almost certainly insufficient:
 - Horses spend much of their day grazing
 - Underestimate the dust burden on equine respiratory tract
 - Thoroughbred horses in the Hunter Valley are bred and raised solely to perform as elite athletes
 - Respiratory function is critical to performance
-



- Equine health monitoring regimen has been suggested:
 - No information has been provided detailing an appropriate monitoring protocol
 - Previous PAC has stated that the suggested monitoring approach was unacceptable
 - Once changes in equine health become apparent, it will be too late



- Insufficient information provided by the EHIS to determine that there is ***no*** risk to equine health
 - Can ***not*** conclude that horses will not be adversely affected just because human air quality criteria are met
 - Extremely cautious approach is taken when assessing the potential risks of coal mining activities
 - “...if an action or policy has a ***suspected*** risk of causing harm to the public or the ***environment***, in the ***absence of scientific consensus*** that the action or policy is ***not*** harmful, the burden of proof that it is ***not*** harmful falls on ***those taking the action...***”
-