

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JARED PETTERSSON (MANAGEMENT PLANS)

This summary statement of evidence provides an overview of my Evidence in Chief and Rebuttal Statement of Evidence.

To manage the potential environmental effects during construction of the reclamation/wharf and marine aspects of the project, an Environmental Management Framework has been developed. The framework comprises a series of management plans:

- (a) Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) – covering the reclamation and wharf construction.
- (b) Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) – covering environmental effects of the capital dredging operation.
- (c) Marine Mammal Management Plan (MMMP) – covering management of effects on marine mammals from all project parts/phases.

Several secondary plans are also to be prepared by the contractor, once appointed. These secondary plans will either document how the contractor will implement the primary management plans or detail how specific risks of their equipment (or methodology) will be managed.

Based on my review of the expert assessments and experience with implementing management plans (CEMP, MMMP and EMMP) on similar marine projects, I consider that the proposed management plan framework represents best practice for this type of project.

I have reviewed the findings of the Section 42A report with respect to the environmental management framework and whilst no specific review of the management plans was undertaken, several experts' made recommendations relevant to the plans.

All the recommendations on the CEMP have been accepted, as set out in my Evidence in Chief, and will be incorporated when the plans are updated. The proposed conditions attached to Mr Brett Hood's rebuttal evidence require these updates to occur.

Ms McConnell provided comment on the MMMP in her evidence and via a subsequent memo (in lieu of expert conferencing). As set out in my Evidence in Chief and Rebuttal Evidence, I agreed with most of Ms McConnell's recommendations, aside from the following:

- (a) The requirement for bubble curtains as a methodology for noise reduction. I consider that Northport should be able to achieve noise reduction via several methods, not solely bubble curtains.

- (b) Restrictions to prevent piling across successive winter seasons. I agree Northport should be motivated to minimise the duration of the piling programme. However, I consider a noise compliance limit with a noise reduction penalty for successive seasons as a preferable approach that manages impacts whilst still providing for the project timeframes.
- (c) Cease piling when any marine mammal is anywhere west of the port. I initially disagreed with Ms McConnel on this matter, but after Dr Deanna Clement discussed the matter with Ms McConnell, I accept that additional controls are needed for mammals west of the port, particularly for baleen whales. The updated conditions attached to Brett Hoods Rebuttal Evidence include changes to conditions 61-66 to account for these additional controls, including a requirement to review dolphin behaviour west of the port.

I confirm that nothing in submitter evidence has caused me to amend my fundamental position or conclusions, besides as set out above.

Jared Pettersson
Enviser

9 October 2023