

Overall operational phase effects

- 7.5 Based on the best practice criteria for describing magnitude of effect, in the absence mitigation, the operational phase effects are deemed to be “negligible” to potential positive, “high”. With the Project area being of “moderate” ecological value, the overall effect of the operational phase will be “high/moderate” based on the best practice ecological value- magnitude of effect matrix of Roper-Lindsay *et al.* (2018), before mitigation.
- 7.6 Provided the proposed mitigation measures outlined in Section 10 of my evidence are adequately implemented, the adverse operational effects (i.e. the longer term effects after construction is complete) based on the ecological value-magnitude of effect matrix (Table 10) of Roper-Lindsay *et al.* (2018) can be reduced to a “very low” to “net gain” level. In the context of the RMA, this would be considered to be “less than minor adverse effects” to “nil effects” and potentially a positive level of impact to aquatic ecology.

14 Conclusions

- 14.3 Based on the best practice criteria for describing magnitude of effect, in the absence mitigation, the operational phase effects are deemed to be “negligible” to potential positive, “high”. With the Project area being of “moderate” ecological value, the overall effect of the operational phase will be “high/moderate” based on the best practice ecological value- magnitude of effect matrix of Roper-Lindsay *et al.* (2018), before mitigation. The magnitude of operational phase effects was deemed to be “negligible” to potential positive. Based on the best practice ecological value- magnitude of effect matrix of Roper-Lindsay *et al.* (2018), will be “very low” to “net gain”. Provided the recommended mitigation measures are adequately implemented, the adverse operational effects can be reduced to a “less than minor adverse effects” or “nil effects” level of impact to aquatic ecology, in the context of the RMA. The Project may potentially have positive effects on aquatic ecology.