

**BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT CHRISTCHURCH**

ENV - 2018 - CHC - 000047

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

A N D

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under cl 14(1) of Schedule 1 to the Act

BETWEEN **TE RUNANGA O NGAI TAHU & OTHERS**

Appellants

A N D **SOUTHLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Respondent

**NOTICE OF INTEREST UNDER SECTION 274
ON BEHALF OF FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LTD**

Solicitor acting:
Jason Sandford
Senior Corporate Counsel
Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd
Private Bag 92032
Auckland 1142
Email: jason.sandford@fonterra.com

Counsel instructed:
Bal Matheson
Richmond Chambers
33 Shortland Street
PO Box 1008
Auckland 1140
Email: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

**TO: THE REGISTRAR
ENVIRONMENT COURT
CHRISTCHURCH**

FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LTD (Fonterra) wishes to be a party to the appeal by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu & others (Appeal).

1. Fonterra made a submission and further submission about the subject matter of the Appeal.
2. Fonterra is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. Those parts of the Appeal in which Fonterra is interested, whether it supports or oppose those parts of the Appeal, and associated reasons, is described in Schedule 1.
4. Fonterra agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the Appeal.

FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LTD by its counsel:



Signature: BJ Matheson
Date: 20 June 2018

Address for Service: Bal Matheson
Richmond Chambers
PO Box 1008
Shortland Street
Auckland 1140

Telephone: (09) 600 5510

Email: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

TO: Registrar, Environment Court,
Christchurch

AND TO: Appellant

AND TO: All Parties

Advice to recipients of copy of notice of interest

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch.

SCHEDULE 1 - EXTENT OF INTEREST, SUPPORT/OPPOSE, AND ASSOCIATED REASONS

Extent of Interest		Support/Oppose Change	Reasons
Section of Plan	Provision to be changed		
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General water quality provisions that seek to maintain and improve - various 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining and improving water quality is supported but the appropriate baseline date for determining maintenance and improvement is the operative date for this plan (not January 2010).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Physiographic provisions - various 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of physiographic zones is supported but these are more appropriately used in the context of policies rather than rules.
Water Quantity Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 17(1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 17 appropriately provides specific guidance on the management of collected animal effluent and provides the foundation to the effluent management rules.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 25 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is appropriate that priority is assigned to 'industries that process perishable foods', given food safety requirements and the importance to human health.
Consideration of Resource Consent Applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 39A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the concept of integrated management of freshwater and land use is supported, the decisions' version of Policy 39A provided the necessary clarification as to how Policy 39A is to achieve integrated management in the context of individual resource consent applications.
Discharge rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 5 (a)(3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is inequitable to apply a discretionary activity status to discharges of raw effluent to surface waterbodies by territorial authorities, whilst applying a non-complying consent status to all other discharges of raw effluent to surface waterbodies.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Rule 20 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physiographic risk will still need to be identified and managed under the conditions of this PA rule (for example, via the preparation and implementation of Farm Environment Plans).
Appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix N 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protection of tāonga species is supported but the implications for Farm Environment Plans is uncertain as the range of expected Good Management Practices is not specified.