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STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND

1  My full name is Michael Campbell Copeland.

2  I am a consulting economist and am currently joint managing director of Brown, Copeland and Company Limited, a firm of consulting economists which has undertaken a wide range of studies for public and private sector clients in New Zealand and overseas. During the period July 1990 to July 1994, I was a member of the Commerce Commission and between 2002 and 2008 I was a lay member of the High Court under the Commerce Act. Prior to establishing Brown, Copeland and Company Limited in 1982, I spent six years at the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research and three years at the Confederation of British Industry.

3  I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics and a Master of Commerce degree in economics. A summary of my curriculum vitae is attached as Appendix 1.

4  With respect to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), I have prepared evidence for clients covering a number of development projects and policies. A selection of these is listed in my curriculum vitae in Appendix 1.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

5  In my evidence I provide:

   5.1  a review of the relevance of economic effects under the RMA; and

   5.2  a description of the economic significance and economic efficiency benefits of Fonterra's:

          (a) existing milk processing plants located within the Canterbury region; and

          (b) proposed expansion of these plants and creation of new milk processing plants within the Canterbury region.

6  I note that although this is a Council hearing I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014. I have complied with the code in preparing this evidence and I agree to comply with it while giving oral evidence. Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.
ECONOMICS AND THE RMA

Community Economic Wellbeing

Economic considerations are intertwined with the concept of the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, which is embodied in the RMA. In particular, Part II section 5(2) refers to enabling “people and communities to provide for their ... economic ... well being” as a part of the meaning of “sustainable management”, the promotion of which is the purpose of the RMA.

As well as indicating the relevance of economic effects in considerations under the RMA, this section also refers to "people and communities", which highlights that in assessing the impacts of a proposal it is the impacts on the community and not just the applicant or particular individuals or organisations, that must be taken into account. This is underpinned by the definition of “environment” which also extends to include people and communities.

Economic Efficiency

Part II section 7(b) of the RMA notes that in achieving the purpose of the Act, all persons "shall have particular regard to ... the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources” which include the economic concept of efficiency. Economic efficiency can be defined as:

"the effectiveness of resource allocation in the economy as a whole such that outputs of goods and services fully reflect consumer preferences for these goods and services as well as individual goods and services being produced at minimum cost through appropriate mixes of factor inputs.”

More generally economic efficiency can be considered in terms of:

10.1 maximising the value of outputs divided by the cost of inputs;
10.2 maximising the value of outputs for a given cost of inputs;
10.3 minimising the cost of inputs for a given value of outputs;
10.4 improving the utilisation of existing assets; and
10.5 minimising waste.

---

1See, for example, in Marlborough Ridge Ltd v Marlborough District Council [1998] NZRMA 73, the Court noted that all aspects of efficiency are “economic” by definition because economics is about the use of resources generally.
Viewpoint

An essential first step in carrying out an evaluation of the economic effects of a plan is to define the appropriate viewpoint that is to be adopted. This helps to define which economic effects are relevant to the analysis. Typically a district or wider regional viewpoint is adopted, however, sometimes even a nationwide viewpoint might be considered appropriate.

Fonterra’s Canterbury milk processing plants primarily impact on the region’s farmers, residents and businesses and therefore a Canterbury regional perspective is appropriate in analysing their economic effects. Given Fonterra’s national average pricing model there are also national economic efficiency implications if the plants’ costs are increased and/or its processing capacity is compromised.

There are also private or financial benefits associated with Fonterra’s Canterbury milk processing plants. Generally these benefits are not relevant under the RMA and the main focus is therefore on the wider economic effects on parties other than Fonterra and its customers. Economists refer to such effects as “externalities”.

However, Fonterra is owned by its farmer shareholders and financial benefits to Fonterra impact on the "economic (and social) well-being” of these farmer shareholders (including those within the Canterbury region) and ultimately on the "economic (and social) well-being” of the owners and employees of local businesses, which supply goods and services to Fonterra, Fonterra’s employees and Fonterra’s farmer suppliers and their employees. Also financial benefits to Fonterra are relevant with respect to the "efficient use and development of natural and physical resources” and New Zealand’s export competitiveness, given the importance of dairy product exports to the New Zealand economy.

Intangible or Non-monetarised Effects

In economics, ‘intangible’ costs and benefits are defined as those which cannot be quantified in monetary terms. For any development such effects may include amenity effects, landscape effects, ecological effects, Māori cultural and relationship effects and recreational effects. Such effects may be positive or negative – i.e. a benefit or a cost for a particular community of interest.

Sometimes attempts can be made to estimate monetary values for so-called ‘intangibles’ using techniques such as willingness to pay surveys or inferring values on the basis of differences in property values.

---

3Defined as the side effects of the production or use of a good or service, which affects third parties, other than just the buyer and seller.
values. However these techniques are frequently subject to uncertainty and criticism.

17 It is generally better not to attempt to estimate monetary values for these effects but to leave them to be part of the overall judgment under section 5 of the RMA. This also avoids the danger of 'double-counting' – i.e. including them within an assessment of economic effects and treating them as a separate consideration in the overall judgement under section 5. An assessment of the 'intangible' effects of Fonterra’s Canterbury milk processing plants including air quality effects, are considered in the evidence of other witnesses for Fonterra.

THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF FONTERA’S CANTERBURY MILK PROCESSING PLANTS

The Canterbury Regional Economy

18 Statistics New Zealand’s June 2014 population estimate for the Canterbury region is 574,300 or 12.7% of New Zealand’s total population. It is the second largest region in New Zealand in terms of population. The Canterbury region’s population is estimated to have declined between June 2010 and June 2012 by 11,700 (2.1%) due to Christchurch City’s population falling by 21,200 (5.6%) after the earthquakes and only some of the consequent out-migration relocating to neighbouring districts within the Canterbury region. The region’s population over the period 2009 to 2014 has grown by 2.4%. Statistics New Zealand’s ‘medium’ population projections have the region’s population increasing at an average rate of 0.8% per annum to 729,200 over the period 2014-43.

19 Statistics New Zealand estimate total employment in the Canterbury region in February 2014 at 275,210, which represents 13.8% of the total persons employed in New Zealand. The agriculture, forestry and fishing industry group employed 15,300 persons, of which 14,380 were engaged in agriculture (including 93% of agriculture and fishing support industry employees based on the proportionate shares in agriculture and fishing). Other significant sectors are manufacturing employing 34,140 (of which the most significant subsectors are food products manufacturing (11,600), machinery and equipment manufacturing (5,390), fabricated metal products manufacturing (3,170) and transport equipment manufacturing (2,350)), health care and social assistance (30,350), construction (29,830), retail trade (28,090), education and training (20,640), professional, scientific and technical services (19,120) and

---

4This view appears to be consistent with that of the Board of Inquiry for the MacKays to PekaPeka Expressway Project. See paragraph 1,137 of Final Report and Decision of the Board of Inquiry; April 2013.

5Including meat and meat products (4,800), seafood (1,080) and dairy products (1,690).
accommodation and food services (17,490). Besides the tourism related aspects of sectors such as retail trade, education and training and accommodation and food services, the key drivers of the Canterbury regional economy remain largely agriculture and manufacturing.

There are important economic linkages between rural areas within the Canterbury region and the region’s metropolitan and commercial centres, which include Christchurch, Timaru, Waimate, Kaikoura, Darfield and Ashburton. The Fonterra milk processing plants and their employees, the dairy farm suppliers and their employees, and the local suppliers of goods and services to the milk processing plants, the dairy farm suppliers and their employees all purchase goods and services from businesses in these centres providing incomes and employment for business owners and local residents. For example, Lincoln University’s Agribusiness and Economic Research Unit (AERU)\(^6\) has estimated farms in the Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts spend $306 million per annum\(^7\) in Christchurch, whilst rural businesses (which will include Fonterra’s plant at Darfield) within the two Districts account for a further $511 million of expenditure in Christchurch City per annum. Combining these expenditure flows with the indirect (“multiplier”) expenditure flows raises this to $2.2 billion, and this is estimated to generate around 10% of the City’s gross domestic product (GDP) and more than 12,500 fulltime equivalent jobs for Greater Christchurch residents.\(^8\)

**Fonterra’s Milk Processing Plants in Canterbury**\(^9\)

Fonterra has five milk processing plants in Canterbury – the Clandeboye plant on the outskirts of Timaru, the Darfield plant in the Selwyn District, the Studholme plant in the Waimate District, the Kaikoura cheese manufacturing plant and the Culverden milk concentration plant.

Clandeboye is the largest of the plants processing up to 12.4 million litres per day and producing 400,000 tonnes of milk powder, cream, cheese and protein products per annum. It employs 825 permanent staff (including 216 tanker drivers) as well as a number of contractors and temporary staff. Wages and salaries paid to its permanent staff are estimated at $61.2 million.\(^10\) In addition the

---


\(^7\)Of which dairy farm expenditure is $68 million.

\(^9\)The analysis is conservative in that it excludes the activity associated with agricultural product processing plants within Christchurch City and it only focuses on Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts and not districts further south within the Canterbury region.

\(^9\)Data in this section provided by Fonterra unless stated otherwise.

\(^10\)Assumes average salary per permanent employee of $75,000 per annum.
plant purchases a range of goods and services from local Timaru firms and from other firms located elsewhere within the Canterbury region.\textsuperscript{11}

23 Fonterra’s Darfield milk processing plant processes up to 7.5 million litres of milk per day and produces 220,000 tonnes of regular and instant whole milk powder per annum. The plant employs 200 permanent staff as well as a number of contractors and temporary staff. Wages and salaries paid to its permanent staff total $15.0 million per annum. The plant also purchases a range of goods and services from local Darfield suppliers as well as from those located elsewhere within the Canterbury region, especially Christchurch City.

24 Fonterra’s Studholme plant currently processes an average of 0.9 million litres of milk per day and produces 30,000 tonnes of whole milk powder per annum. It employs 48 staff. Of the current staff approximately 45% live in the Waimate District and 55% live in Timaru. Total wages and salaries of $3.8 million per annum are paid to these staff. The plant also purchases a range of goods and services from local Waimate and Timaru businesses.

25 Fonterra is currently in the process of seeking resource consents to substantially increase the processing capacity at its Studholme site. Fonterra proposes to build two further milk powder dryers and associated facilities at the site to keep pace with growing milk production. The expansion of capacity at the site will take place in two stages\textsuperscript{12} with each of the additional dryers adding 4.5 million litres per day of milk processing capacity and additional whole milk powder production of approximately 160,000 tonnes per annum. With the completion of both new dryers, production of whole milk powder at the Studholme site will increase from the current 30,000 tonnes per annum to 350,000 tonnes per annum, and permanent employment at the plant (including milk tanker drivers) will increase from the current 48 to about 250. Wages and salaries are expected to increase by $15.2 million per annum, whilst there will also be additional purchases of goods and services from local businesses. During the two construction phases, each of around two years’ duration, there will be considerable additional expenditure, employment and incomes generated for local (principally Waimate, Timaru and Christchurch) businesses and residents.

\textsuperscript{11}The Fonterra also make payments for milk supplied by its farmer shareholders to its Clandeboye and other plants located within the Canterbury region. However these payments and the volume of milk production within the Canterbury region will continue even if existing or new milk processing capacity has to be located outside the region.

\textsuperscript{12}With the period between each new dryer being constructed being a minimum of 24 months. A land use consent period of 10 years is being sought.
Taking only the permanent current employees and wages and salaries paid at these 3 plants, Fonterra directly employ 1,081 staff in the Canterbury region and pay these staff $80 million per annum in wages and salaries. This excludes employees and wages paid to staff at the smaller Kaikoura plant\textsuperscript{13}, temporary staff and contractors and future increases in employment and incomes as a consequence of milk processing capacity increases in Canterbury.

The Additional Indirect Effects

As already alluded to in my evidence, in addition to these so called "direct" economic effects of expenditure, employment and incomes by these dairy plants, there are also indirect impacts arising from:

27.1 the effects on suppliers of goods and services provided to the site from within the local regional economy (i.e. the "forward and backward linkage" effects); and

27.2 the supply of goods and services to employees at the site and to those engaged in supplying goods and services to the site (i.e. the "induced" effects). For example, there will be additional jobs and incomes for employees of supermarkets, restaurants and bars as a consequence of the additional expenditure by employees directly employed at the plants.

Multipliers can be estimated to gauge the size of these indirect effects. The size of the multipliers is a function of the extent to which a local economy is self-sufficient in the provision of a full range of goods and services and the area's proximity to alternative sources of supply. For the Canterbury region, 2.0 is a conservative multiplier, given the self-sufficiency of the region, which includes Christchurch City.\textsuperscript{14} A conservative estimate for the direct plus indirect impacts for the Canterbury region from Fonterra’s three largest Canterbury plants’ current operations are therefore estimated as:

28.1 2,162 jobs for Canterbury residents; and

28.2 $160 million per annum in wages and salaries for Canterbury residents.

\textsuperscript{13}The Culverden plant employees are included within the Clandeboye employee numbers.

\textsuperscript{14}Work undertaken for the Christchurch City Council and the Canterbury Regional Council by Mr. Geoffrey Butcher estimated employment and household income (i.e. wages and salaries) multipliers for the Canterbury region of around 2.5. (See Appendix 8 of evidence of Mr. Geoffrey Butcher (dated 27 August 2010) for the Christchurch City Council and for the Canterbury Regional Council Regional Council, in the matter of appeals pursuant to Clause 14 of the First Schedule to the RMA in relation to Proposed Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.)
As indicators of levels of economic activity, economic impacts in terms of increased expenditure, incomes and employment within the local and regional economies are not in themselves measures of improvements in economic welfare or economic wellbeing. However, there are economic welfare enhancing benefits associated with increased levels of economic activity. These relate to one or more of:

29.1 **Increased economies of scale**: Businesses and public sector agencies are able to provide increased amounts of outputs with lower unit costs, hence increasing profitability or lowering prices;

29.2 **Increased competition**: Increases in the demand for goods and services allow a greater number of providers of goods and services to enter markets and there are efficiency benefits from increased levels of competition;

29.3 **Reduced unemployment and underemployment**\(^{15}\) of resources: To the extent resources (including labour) would be otherwise unemployed or underemployed, increases in economic activity can bring efficiency benefits when there is a reduction in unemployment and underemployment. The extent of such gains is of course a function of the extent of underutilized resources at the time and the match of resource requirements of a project and those resources unemployed or underemployed; and

29.4 **Increased quality of central government provided services**: Sometimes the quality of services provided by central government such as education and health care are a function of population levels and the quality of such services in a community can be increased if increased economic activity maintains or enhances population levels.

It is reasonable to presume that increases in economic activity (i.e. expenditures, incomes and employment) within the Canterbury regional economy economies as a consequence of the location of the 5 milk plants within the region will give rise to one or more of these four welfare enhancing economic benefits for the local community. Constraints imposed on their future operation or expansion (or the optimal location of any new greenfields milk processing plant) will see some of Fonterra’s milk processing capacity forced to relocate outside the Canterbury region with a consequent reduction in expenditure, employment and incomes for Canterbury businesses and residents.

---

\(^{15}\)Underemployment differs from unemployment in that resources are employed but not at their maximum worth; e.g. in the case of labour, it can be employed at a higher skill and/or productivity level, reflected in higher wage rates.
**Future Plant Expansions**

31 Under section 73 of the Dairy Industry Restructuring Act (DIRA) Fonterra is required to accept all new applications to become Fonterra shareholder farmers and all applications to increase the volume of milk supplied by shareholding farmers. Therefore Fonterra is required to maintain and expand processing capacity to meet future growth in the supply of milk from existing and new Fonterra farmer suppliers.

32 As discussed previously in my evidence, Fonterra has a proposal to expand capacity at its Studholme site. Almost inevitably, it will need to look at further expansion of its other sites (or new “greenfields” proposals) in the future. Such expansions will give rise to additional direct and indirect expenditure, employment and incomes within the Canterbury region during the construction and operational phases of the plant expansions.

33 Restrictions imposed on Fonterra’s future expansion of its milk processing plants within the Canterbury region will force new capacity to be located outside the region with the consequent loss of revenues, employment and incomes for the region’s businesses and residents.

**THE ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY BENEFITS OF FONTERRA’S CANTERBURY MILK PROCESSING PLANTS**

34 Fonterra, in choosing to locate its milk processing plants at the five locations within the Canterbury region sought to minimise milk collection costs having regard to the existing and likely future pattern of milk production throughout the Canterbury region. For example, Fonterra’s development of new milk processing capacity at its Darfield site was estimated to save some 30,000 vehicle kilometres per day travelled by milk tankers and associated supply trucks.

35 More recently, transport modelling undertaken by Fonterra has shown that the Studholme site is the most efficient manufacturing site to expand plant capacity to process existing and future growth in milk supply in South Canterbury and North Otago. Already the Studholme plant site is used to tranship milk, which is collected from farms within the local catchment area, for processing at

---

16 In some exceptional circumstances, Fonterra can refuse to accept additional volumes of milk for processing. These circumstances relate to minimum volumes of milk solids and where transport costs for a new applicant exceed those of its highest transport cost existing supplier.

17 Assuming the alternative to the new plant at Darfield was the expansion of the existing Clandeboye plant. For alternate new capacity being located outside the Canterbury region the tanker kilometre savings would have been even more significant.
Fonterra’s next closest plant at Clandeboye some 75 kilometres to the north, and at times at the Darfield plant, which is even further to the north. With the proposed addition of the first new dryer at the Studholme site, this transhipment of milk will no longer be required and the plant’s milk collection catchment will expand further north and south and milk passing the site’s gate on SH1 on its way to being processed at Clandeboye will cease.

36 The Studholme plant Stage 1 expansion involving the first additional dryer is estimated to save 8,879 kilometres of milk tanker travel each peak day, whilst the Stage 1 plus Stage 2 developments (i.e. the addition of two new dryers) will save 29,266 kilometres of milk tanker travel per peak day.

37 These transport cost savings from Fonterra continuing to be able to use and expand its existing milk processing plants at its five sites within the Canterbury region are significant economic benefits for Fonterra and its farmer suppliers. They also contribute to a reduction in Fonterra’s carbon footprint and reduce road congestion and accident costs involving other road users.

38 In addition, there are a number of other economic efficiency benefits from Fonterra being able to maintain and expand milk processing capacity at its five existing Canterbury sites as compared to potential new sites and/or the expansion of other existing plants outside the Canterbury region. The key economic benefits are:

38.1 the continued utilisation of existing "sunk" assets, which otherwise would be largely "stranded" – i.e. the continued use of plant, machinery and buildings with significant remaining economic life but which would have little if any residual value if the plants ceased operating and these assets had to be sold or relocated to other sites;

38.2 the availability of sufficient milk production capacity in the immediate area and wider surrounding catchment;

38.3 the optimised location from the perspective of milk and dairy products transportation;

38.4 the proximity of a skilled workforce;

38.5 the proximity of supplier businesses with appropriate expertise and experience;

38.6 the proximity of good road and rail networks for plant inputs and outputs;
38.7 the ability to minimise and mitigate adverse environmental effects for neighbours and the wider community;

38.8 the absence of reverse sensitivity effects;

38.9 in the case of Studholme, Clandeboye and Darfield plants, their sites are large enough for future expansion of processing capacity;

38.10 economies of scale and scope as compared to relocating existing processing capacity to a number of alternative sites or meeting the need for new capacity at new “greenfield” sites;

38.11 sufficient water to run the plants and reuse systems; and

38.12 suitable wastewater disposal options.

39 Restrictions on the future operation or expansion of Fonterra’s milk processing plants in the Canterbury region (or constraints which prevent Fonterra from selecting the most optimal sites for new “greenfields” plants) will increase costs for Fonterra, its farmer shareholders and the wider Canterbury regional economy and would not be consistent with “the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources”. Also local communities such as Timaru, Waimate and Darfield and the region’s main commercial centre, Christchurch, will miss out on the additional economic activity associated with the continued operation and expansion of Fonterra’s Canterbury milk processing plants. This will also have a negative effect on resource use efficiency within the Canterbury region from reductions in economies of scale and capacity utilisation.

**CONCLUSIONS**

40 Fonterra’s milk processing plants at Clandeboye, Darfield, Studholme, Kaikoura and Culverden are significant contributors to the economic and social wellbeing of the Canterbury region’s dairy farmers, businesses and residents. In particular, these 5 plants are very important to the local communities near the plant sites (e.g. Timaru, Darfield, Waimate and Kaikoura) and metropolitan Christchurch. Restrictions placed on the operation or expansion of Fonterra’s Canterbury milk processing plants, will impact negatively not just on Fonterra and its shareholder farm suppliers but also other businesses and residents throughout the Canterbury region.

41 The continued operation and expansion of Fonterra’s 5 Canterbury plants enables the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources.
Dated: September 2015

________________________
Michael Campbell Copeland
APPENDIX 1:

CURRICULUM VITAE OF MICHAEL CAMPBELL COPELAND

DATE OF BIRTH 3 October 1950
NATIONALITY New Zealand
EDUCATIONAL Bachelor of Science (Mathematics) 1971
QUALIFICATIONS Master of Commerce (Economics) 1972

PRESENT POSITIONS

(Since 1982) Economic Consultant, Brown, Copeland & Co Ltd
(Since 2010) Director, Healthcare New Zealand Holdings Limited
(Since 2012) Director, Healthcare Rehabilitation Limited

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

1978-82 NZ Institute of Economic Research
Contracts Manager/Senior Economist
1975-78 Confederation of British Industry
Industrial Economist
1972-75 NZ Institute of Economic Research
Research Economist
1990-94 Member, Commerce Commission
2001-06 West Coast Regional Council Trustee, West Coast
Development Trust
2002-08 Lay Member of the High Court under the Commerce
Act 1986
2003-11 Director, Wellington Rugby Union
2010-13 Director, Southern Pastures

GEOGRAPHICAL EXPERIENCE

- New Zealand
- Australia
• Asia (Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, People's Republic of China, Philippines, Tajikistan, Sri Lanka, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam)
• South Pacific (Cook Islands, Fiji, Tokelau, Tonga, Vanuatu, Western Samoa)
• United Kingdom

AREAS OF PRIMARY EXPERTISE

• Agriculture and Resource Use Economics (including Resource Management Act)
• Commercial Law and Economics (including Commerce Act)
• Development Programme Management
• Energy Economics
• Industry Economics
• Transport Economics

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT SPECIFIC PROJECTS

• Port storage facilities at Westport;
• The proposed Clifford Bay ferry terminal;
• The proposed pipeline and related facilities to utilise water from the Waikato River for metropolitan Auckland;
• A container terminal expansion by the Ports of Auckland;
• The proposed Variation No. 8 to the Wellington City District Plan covering height and other controls on development of the airspace above the Wellington railway yards;
• Proposed expansion of Paraparaumu town centre within the Kapiti Coast District;
• Wellington City Council's heritage preservation policy;
• Solid Energy's proposed West Coast Coal Terminal at Granity;
• Solid Energy's Mt William North coal mine at Stockton in the Buller District;
• The proposed Waimakariri Employment Park;
• The designation of land for a proposed motorway extension in the Hawke's Bay;
• The Hastings District Council's Ocean Outfall – two consent renewal applications;
• A proposed new shopping and entertainment centre in Upper Hutt;
• Rezoning of land in Upper Hutt from Business Industrial to Residential;
• New regional correctional facilities in Northland, South Auckland, Waikato and Otago;
• Proposed controls on wake generation by vessels travelling within the waterways of the Marlborough Sounds;
• The expansion of marina facilities within the Marlborough Sounds;
• Southern Capital's proposed new township at Pegasus Bay, north of Christchurch;
• Renewal of water resource consents for the Tongariro Power Development Scheme;
• Economic analysis inputs to a Section 32 report for the Waitaki Water Allocation Board;
• The imposition of land use restrictions within noise contours surrounding Christchurch International Airport;
• The expansion of the Whangaripo Quarry in Rodney District;
• The economic significance of Winstone’s proposed quarry at Wainui, in the north of Auckland City;
• A proposed five star hotel development for Wanaka;
• Holcim’s proposed new cement plant near Weston in the Waitaki District;
• TrustPower’s proposed new wind farm at Mahinerangi in Central Otago;
• TrustPower’s proposed new Arnold hydroelectric power scheme on the West Coast;
• McCallum Bros and Sea Tow Limited’s appeal before the Environment Court regarding extraction of sand from the Mangawhai-Pakiri embayment north of Auckland;
• The development of the Symonds Hill pit at Winstones’ Hunua Quarry;
• The rezoning of land for residential development at Peninsula Bay, Wanaka;
• The rezoning of land for more intensive residential development at PekaPeka on the Kapiti Coast;
• A gondola development for the Treble Cone skifield;
• A gondola development for the Snow Farm and Snow Park skiing and snowboarding facilities;
• The extraction of gravel from the bed of the Shotover River;
• The proposed Hilton hotel development on Wellington’s Queen's Wharf;
• Land use restrictions in relation to the Runway Extension Protection Areas for Christchurch International Airport;
• A new residential and commercial development by Apple Fields at Belfast on the outskirts of Christchurch;
• A proposed business park development on land at Paraparaumu Airport;
• The proposed redevelopment of Wellington’s Overseas Passenger Terminal;
• The proposed Central Plains irrigation scheme in Canterbury;
• The staging of residential and business development at Silverdale North in the Rodney District;
• The redevelopment of the Johnsonville Shopping Centre;
• A Plan Change enabling the relocation of existing development rights for a residential and commercial development on Mount Cardrona Station in the Queenstown Lakes District;
• A new Pak’n Save supermarket at Rangiora;
• New supermarkets at Kaiapoi, Whitby, Silverstream and Havelock North;
• The extension of the TeRereHau wind farm in the Tararua District;
• MainPower’s proposed new wind farm at Mount Cass;
• Fonterra’s proposed new milk processing plant at Darfield and its subsequent expansion;
• Fonterra Pahiatua milk powder plant expansion;
• Fonterra’s proposed new coal mine in the Waikato District;
• Assessment of the economic significance of ANZCO’s Canterbury operations to the Canterbury regional economy;
• Resource consent extensions for Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited’s gold mining operations at Macraes Flat in north-east Otago, the Globe Mine at Reefton and a proposed underground gold mine at Blackwater on the West Coast;
• Designation of land for NZTA’s Waterview motorway project in Auckland;
• Designation of land and resource consents for NZTA’s Transmission Gully motorway project in Wellington;
• Designation of land and resource consents for NZTA’s MacKays to PekaPeka Expressway;
• Designation of land and resource consents for NZTA’s PekaPeka to Otaki Expressway;
• Resource consents for NZTA’s Basin Reserve Bridge Project;
• Resource consents for NZTA’s Puhoi to Warkworth motorway extension;
• Resource consents for the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme;
• Assessment of the economic effects of a Queenstown Airport Corporation’s proposed Notice of Requirement for the designation of additional land for aerodrome purposes;
• Assessment of the retail effects of proposed Plan Change 19 to the Queenstown Lakes District’s District Plan;
• Assessment of the regional and national economic significance of Lyttelton Port;
• The economic benefits of utilising a Recovery Plan under the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act for the rehabilitation and enhancement of facilities at Lyttelton Port;
• The economic effects of the Lyttelton Port Company’s Capital Dredging Project;
• Meridian’s proposed new Mokihinui hydro scheme;
• Assessment of the economic effects of alternative wreck recovery options for the MV Rena;
• Assessment of the economic benefits and costs of Transpower’s corridor management approach to giving effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission in District and City Plans;
• Assessment of economic effects of a proposed extension to Arrowtown’s urban boundary;
- Assessment of the economic benefits of overhead deployment of ultrafast broadband infrastructure;
- Assessment of the economic benefits of the proposed Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme;
- Preparation of evidence for Transpower in relation to the proposed Ruakura development on the outskirts of Hamilton City;
- Preparation of two reports reviewing the economic benefits of the Hobbiton movie set at Matamata;
- Assessment of the economic benefits of renewal of a water discharge consent for Silver Fern Farm’s Belfast meat processing plant;
- Preparation of evidence for Transpower in relation to the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan;