

Further submission ORC Omnibus - Plan Change 8

Submission Reference no: █

Richard Allen, **Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd (Richard Grant Allen)**

19 Home Straight, Te Rapa,
PO Box 9045, Hamilton 3240

New Zealand

Ph: 021786334

richard.allen2@fonterra.com

Submitter Type: Not specified

Source: Web Form

Overall Notes:

Clause

Only persons that come under the following categories may make further submissions.

Position

I am a person who has an interest in the WPPC that is greater than the interest the general public has. The grounds for saying why I come within this category are explained below.

Notes

Clause

Please specify the grounds for saying why you come within the category above

Notes

Fonterra represents the interests of supplying dairy farmers in the Otago region and was a submitter on the notified PC8

Clause

Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission?

Position

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

Notes

Clause

If others make a similar submission, will you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing?

Position

If others make a similar submission I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Notes

Clause

1.1 Name of original submitter?

Notes

Otago Fish and Game Council

Clause

1.2 Particular parts of the submission you support/ oppose? Please indicate whole submission or Submitter point ID (e.g. 70005).

Notes

Glossary Definition "intensive grazing"

Clause

1.3 Are you in support of or in opposition to the particular whole/part of the submission as identified above?

Position

I oppose the submission in whole/part.

Notes

Clause

1.4 What are your reasons for your support or opposition?

Notes

oppose the inclusion of grazing of pasture and cereal crops in the definition

Clause

1.5 Do you seek for the whole/part of the submission to be allowed or disallowed? (select one)

Position

I seek for the whole/part of the submission to be disallowed.

Notes

Clause

1.6 Is there another submission you would like to make a further submission on?

Position

Yes - I have other further submission points to make.

Notes

Clause

2.1 Name of original submitter?

Notes

Otago Fish and Game Council

Clause

2.2 Particular parts of the submission you support/ oppose? Please indicate whole submission or Submitter point ID (e.g. 70005)

Notes

Policy 7D9, Rule 14.6.1.1

Clause

2.3 Are you in support of or in opposition to the particular whole/part of the submission as identified above?

Position

I support the submission in whole/part.

Notes

Clause

2.4 What are your reasons for your support or opposition?

Notes

Fonterra supports the use of a range of tools, including "remote sensing technologies" to better understand and manage sediment loss risk. While the submission is not entirely clear as to intended application of mapping data, we do not support the use of remote mapping as an appropriate way to identify critical source areas that would then have different practice standards (or a resource consent requirement) applied to them. It is our view that high risk areas on farms (actual sources of contaminant and actual linkages to water) are best assessed through the development of a Farm Environment Plan which may well be supported by the use of high quality maps (slope, soils, LUC, cultural overlay etc)

Clause

2.6 Is there another submission you would like to make a further submission on?

Position

Yes - I have other further submission points to make.

Notes

Clause

3.1 Name of original submitter?

Notes

Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society

Clause

3.2 Particular parts of the submission you support/ oppose. Please indicate whole submission or Submitter point ID (e.g. 70005)

Notes

Policy 7.D.9, Rule 14.6.1.1

Clause

3.3 Are you in support of or in opposition to the particular whole/part of the submission as identified above?

Position

I oppose the submission in whole/part.

Notes

Clause

3.4 What are your reasons for your support or opposition?

Notes

Fonterra supports the use of a range of tools, including "remote sensing technologies" to better understand and manage sediment loss risk. While the submission is not entirely clear as to intended application of mapping data, we do not support the use of remote mapping as an appropriate way to identify critical source areas that would then have different practice standards (or a resource consent requirement) applied to them. It is our view that high risk areas on farms (actual sources of contaminant and actual linkages to water) are best assessed through the development of a Farm Environment Plan which may well be supported by the use of high quality maps (slope, soils, LUC, cultural overlay etc). Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society seek that any grazing of a CSA (with a very broad definition of what that is) is to be "avoided" with the area to be left as ungrazed vegetation. Fonterra opposes this change.

Clause

3.5 Do you seek for the whole/part of the submission to be allowed or disallowed? (select one)

Position

I seek for the whole/part of the submission to be disallowed.

Notes

Clause

3.6 Is there another submission you would like to make a further submission on?

Position

No - I have no further submission points to make.

Notes