


SANDPIPER PROJECT

Verification Programme Report:
Mining Licence Area No. 170

SECTION B:

IMPACT ASSESSMENT VERIFICATION

- B1.1: Water Column
 - B1.2: Fish, Fisheries, Mammals and Seabirds
 - B1.3: Macrofauna
 - B1.4: Jellyfish
 - B2.0: Cumulative Effects
- 
- A decorative graphic at the bottom of the page consisting of several overlapping, wavy, light green bands that create a sense of movement and depth against the dark green background.

SECTION B

IMPACT ASSESMENT VERIFICATION

- B1.1 Water Column and Sediments
- B1.2 Fisheries Mammals and Seabirds
- B1.3 Macrofauna
- B1.4 Jellyfish
- B2.0 Cumulative Effects

Prepared for:

Namibian Marine Phosphate (Pty) Ltd.

Prepared by:

Jeremy Midgley

Jeremy Midgley and Associates

Reviewed by:

Patrick Morant

CSIR

November 2014

Primary Contributing authors:

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Dr R Carter | <i>Water Column and Sediments</i> | Lwandle Technologies (Pty) Ltd |
| Dr N Steffani | <i>Benthic Macrofauna</i> | Steffani Marine Environmental Consulting |
| Mr D Japp | <i>Fish, Mammals and Seabirds</i> | Capricorn Fisheries Monitoring (Pty) Ltd |
| Prof. M Gibbons | <i>Jellyfish</i> | University of the Western Cape |

CONDITIONS OF USE OF THIS REPORT

COPYRIGHT © NAMIBIAN MARINE PHOSPHATE (PTY) LTD 2014

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

© NMP 2014. All rights to the intellectual property and/or contents of this document remain vested in Namibian Marine Phosphate (Pty) Ltd. (NMP). This document is issued for the sole purpose for which it is supplied. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of Namibian Marine Phosphate (Pty) Ltd, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, write to Namibian Marine Phosphate (Pty) Ltd, addressed "Attention: Administration Manager," at the address below.

Email: info@namphos.com
127 Theo-Ben Gurirab Street
Walvis Bay
Namibia

contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| SUMMARY | vi |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| IMPACT CRITERIA | 3 |
| THE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE AND THE DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE | 3 |
| | |
| B1.1 VERIFIED ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS: SEDIMENTS AND WATER COLUMN | 6 |
| INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| <i>Table 1.1.1 Impact 1: Discharge to Sea of Ships Wastes: Potential impact of releasing vessel wastes into the sea.</i> | 8 |
| <i>Table 1.1.2 Impact 2: Exchange of Ballast Water: Alien marine species may displace indigenous species and reduce indigenous biodiversity.</i> | 9 |
| <i>Table 1.1.3 Impact 3: Increased Suspended Sediment Concentrations: Dredging generates plumes of suspended sediments that adversely affect organisms in the water column.</i> | 10 |
| <i>Table 1.1.4 Impact 4: Changed Biogeochemical Properties of near Surface Waters: Sulphidic sediment pore-water entrained in the dredged sediment is discharged with the over-spill water.</i> | 11 |
| <i>Table 1.1.5 Impact 5: Changed Biogeochemical Properties of Surface Waters: Potential impact of lower oxygen levels in overflow water.</i> | 12 |
| <i>Table 1.1.6 Impact 6: Changed Biogeochemical Properties of Surface Waters: Potential impact of higher nutrient levels in overflow water.</i> | 13 |
| <i>Table 1.1.7 Impact 7: Changed Biogeochemical Properties of Surface Waters: Potential impact of higher levels of heavy metals in overflow water.</i> | 14 |
| <i>Table 1.1.8 Impact 8: Changes to Biogeochemical Properties of Bottom Waters: Potential impact of exposing heavy metals on the seabed</i> | 15 |
| <i>Table 1.1.9 Impact 9: Changes to Biogeochemical Properties of Bottom Waters: Potential impact of releasing hydrogen sulphide from the seabed</i> | 17 |
| <i>Table 1.1.10 Impact 10: Changes to Biogeochemical Properties of Bottom Waters: Potential impact of exposing anoxic sediment surfaces on the seabed</i> | 18 |
| <i>Table 1.1.11 Impact 11: Changes to Biogeochemical Properties of Bottom Waters: Potential impact of removing the thio-bacteria mat</i> | 19 |
| | |
| B1.2 VERIFIED ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS: FISHERIES MAMMALS AND SEABIRDS | 20 |
| INTRODUCTION | 20 |
| <i>Table 1.2.1 Impact 1: The impact on fishing operations of the main Namibian fishing sectors by phosphate dredging.</i> | 26 |
| <i>Table 1.2.2 Impact 2: The impact of phosphate dredging on the ecologically important demersal and pelagic fish species.</i> | 33 |
| <i>Table 1.2.3 Impact 3: The impact of phosphate dredging on the recruitment of key commercial fish stocks</i> | 42 |
| <i>Table 1.2.4 Impact 4: The impact of phosphate dredging on species diversity.</i> | 50 |
| <i>Table 1.2.5 Impact 5: The impact of phosphate dredging on seabirds and marine mammals</i> | 53 |
| | |
| B1.3 VERIFIED ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS: MACROFAUNA | 56 |
| INTRODUCTION | 56 |

figures

| | | |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 1. | Illustration of zones and areas defined in the fisheries impact assessment (original EIA) (Japp 2012). | 22 |
| Figure 2. | Hake commercial data (2004-2009). Each dot represents the position per trawl relative to the MLA. n=63351 | 29 |
| Figure 3. | Hake commercial longline data. Each dot represents the position per throw relative to the MLA. n = 4553 | 29 |
| Figure 4. | Monk commercial data (2005-2010). Each dot represents the position per trawl. n=36798 | 30 |
| Figure 5. | Horse mackerel commercial data (1997-2011). Dots are the position of the last trawl per day. n=39697 | 30 |
| Figure 6. | Small pelagic commercial data (anchovy, sardine and round herring) 2000 – 2011. n=2260 | 31 |
| Figure 7. | Location of anchovy catches from commercial data (2000 – 2011). n=552 | 31 |
| Figure 8. | Location of sardine catches from commercial data (2000 – 2011). n=1099 | 32 |
| Figure 9. | Location of round herring catches from commercial data (2000-2011). n=83 | 32 |
| Figure 10. | Distribution of hake from hake-survey data (1995-2010). Dots show the cumulative weights per station. n=678 | 36 |
| Figure 11. | Horse mackerel from hake-survey data (1995-2010).). Dots show cumulative weight per station. n=78 | 36 |
| Figure 12. | Monk from hake- survey data (1995 – 2010). Dots show cumulative weight station. n=134 | 37 |
| Figure 13. | Monk from monk-survey data (2007-2010). Dots show cumulative weight per station. n=100 | 37 |
| Figure 14. | Pelagic (anchovy, sardine and round herring) weights from pelagic-survey data (2002 – 2011). n=2557 | 38 |
| Figure 15. | Total catch per station for snoek from hake-survey data (1997-2010). n=8 | 38 |
| Figure 16. | Distribution of goby from hake-survey data (1995 – 2010). n=93 | 39 |
| Figure 17. | Distribution of goby from monk-survey data (2007 – 2010). n=24 | 39 |
| Figure 18. | Total catch per station for west coast sole from hake-survey data (1997 – 2010). n=48 | 40 |
| Figure 19. | Total catch per station for west coast sole from monk- survey data (1997 – 2010). n=42 | 40 |
| Figure 20. | Distribution of orange roughy from hake-survey data (1995 – 2010). n=4 | 41 |
| Figure 21. | Distribution of orange roughy from monk-survey data (2007 – 2010). n=29 | 41 |
| Figure 22. | Hake juvenile numbers (<21cm) from length frequency hake- survey data (1995-2010). n=6649 | 45 |
| Figure 23. | Hake stage 4 represented as a percentage of the total number of all stages per station form hake-survey data (1995-2010). n=8769 | 45 |
| Figure 24. | Horse mackerel juvenile numbers (<21cm) from hake- survey data (1995-2010). n = 1368 | 46 |
| Figure 25. | Juvenile monk (<21 cm) from hake- survey data (1995-2010) represented as numbers per station. n=263 | 46 |
| Figure 26. | Pelagic (anchovy, sardine, and herring) juveniles numbers (< 8cm) from pelagic-surveys 2002-2011. n=10714 | 47 |
| Figure 27. | Distribution of anchovy eggs (grey) and Larvae (black) from Spanish survey data. n=333 | 47 |
| Figure 28. | Distribution of sardine eggs (grey) and larvae (black) from Spanish survey data. n=333 | 48 |
| Figure 29. | Horse mackerel eggs and larvae from Nansen survey data (1999-2005). n=2811 | 48 |
| Figure 30. | Distribution of sardine (grey) and anchovy (black) eggs from SWAPELS survey data (1978-1985). n=265 | 49 |
| Figure 31. | Distribution of sardine eggs (grey) and larvae (black) from Nansen survey data (1999 – 2005). n=2811 | 49 |
| Figure 32. | Dots represent number of species counted per coordinate (lat/long) from the hake-survey data, monk-survey data, and small pelagic-survey n=9116 | 52 |

tables

| | | |
|-------------------|--|----|
| Table 1.0: | Impact Criteria | 4 |
| Table 1.1: | Water Column and Sediments. Summary of impact assessment determinations: Re-evaluated following the verification assessment. | 7 |
| Table 1.2: | Fish Mammals and Seabirds. Summary of impact assessment determinations: Re-evaluated following the verification assessment. | 25 |
| Table 1.3: | Macrofauna: Summary of impact assessment determinations: Re-evaluated following the verification assessment. | 57 |
| Table 1.4: | Jellyfish. Summary of impact assessment determinations | 75 |

SUMMARY

The verification programme addresses the impacts associated with dredging within the target dredge area SP-1.

The Environmental Impact Assessment (of 2012) concluded, ***“The opinion of the specialists and the independent reviewer is that there are presently no identified issues of environmental significance to preclude the dredging of phosphate-enriched sediments from the Mining Licence Area No. 170. In order to verify these conclusions, a programme of work specified by the relevant specialists, has been included in the Environmental Management Programme that will be undertaken prior to the commencement of dredging to substantiate the findings provided in the impact assessment. Going forward, all environmental matters will need to be managed through the environmental management plan.”***

An expanded verification programme was undertaken following discussions with and information provided by external reviewers, (as commissioned by the Environmental Commissioner, MET) MFMR and I&APs) during 201 and 2014. NMP’s specialist consultants and the independent reviewing parties confirm, based on the results of the verification programme that the assessments as presented in the EIA (2012) are reliable and that these assessments now can be reported with a high degree of confidence.

The impacts assessed in the 2012 EIA are reassessed here. Details of various specialist assessments that allowed for the confirmation of the impact risk and its significance are to be found in the individual specialist reports (Section C). The content and approach to the verification programme and its findings have been subjected to:

1. Independent peer review of the specialist study reports, supporting studies and documentation;
2. Independent review by the University of Namibia of the processes followed during the undertaking of the Verification Programme; and,
3. Independent review of the Verification Programme Report by the CSIR.

The full scope of the verification programme is detailed in Section D, Appendix 4, with the specialists’ assessments reported in Section C. The programme considered three main categories of assessment, including:

- Water column and sediments;
- Fish, mammals and seabirds; and,
- Benthic fauna.

These three main categories of assessment, included a several integrated programmes. A verification programme related to jellyfish (which were assessed in the EIA of 2012) was not undertaken, primarily because of the significance of the four impacts assessed being reported as low (2) and very low (2). However, the impact tables for jellyfish are presented here, since the general outcome of the verification programme has information relevant to the impact assessment of jellyfish.

The verified impact statements of the respective specialists are presented in this section. All confirmed their original assessments with a greater degree of confidence as determined from site-specific data.

SECTION B, IMPACT ASSESMENT VERIFICATION

Overall the level of confidence in the original assessment has been raised from medium to high. Some of the original assessments are unchanged because they were deemed to be of low or no significance with the confidence level being high. A key change with respect to the assessment of fisheries impacts is the reduction of the extent (area of influence) from that of the MLA (2233 km²) to the specific site SP-1 dredge site (176 km²).

The significance ratings of the impacts re-evaluated following the completion of the verification programme are presented in the table on pages viii to xi.

Water Column and Sediments: Summary of impact assessment determinations: Re-evaluated following the verification assessment.

Reference table number refers to the individual impact table number found in the specialists section.

| Ref. Tbl No. | 1.1.1 | 1.1.2 | 1.1.3 | 1.1.4 | 1.1.5 | 1.1.6 | 1.1.7 | 1.1.8 | 1.1.9 | 1.1.10 | 1.1.11 |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Risk Area | Vessel Operation | | Overspill discharge | | | | | Seabed dredging | | | |
| Impact | Pollution from wastes | Alien spp. in ballast water | Turbid plume | H₂S toxicity at surface | Oxygen deficient water at surface | Nutrients added at surface | Trace/heavy-metal toxicity at surface | Trace-metal toxicity on seabed | H₂S toxicity on seabed | Lowered oxygen levels on seabed | Increase of H₂S flux. |
| Extent | Dredge area | National | Dredge area | Dredge area | Dredge area | Dredge area | Dredge area | Annual Mining Area | Dredge area | Annual Mining Area | Dredge area |
| Duration | Very short term | Short term to permanent | Very short term | Short term | Very short term | Short term | Short term | Short term | Medium term | Medium term | Medium term. |
| Intensity | No lasting effect | None to serious | No lasting effect | Minor effects | No lasting effect | No lasting effect | Minor effects | Minor effects | Minor effects | Minor effects | Minor effects |
| Probability | Possible | Possible | Possible | Possible | Improbable | Possible | Possible | Possible | Possible | Possible | Improbable |
| Status | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Neutral | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative |
| Significance (no mitigation) | None | Can be high | Low | Low | Low | None | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Mitigation | System maintenance | IMP guidelines | Built in | None possible | Non | None possible | None possible | None possible | None possible | Not possible | n/a |
| Significance (with mitigation) | None | None | Low | Low | Low | None | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Confidence level 2012 | High | High | High | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | Medium | High | Medium |
| Re-evaluated 2014 confidence level | High | High | High | High | High | High | High | High | High | High | High |
| Reason | MARPOL 73/78 discharge standards apply | IMO guidelines for ballast water apply | Dredge area >20mg/ℓ suspended sediment concentration. Plume disperses 1 to 2 days | Mine site sediment property data indicate low H ₂ S presence, pyrite sulphide will have low solubility | Mixing factors are therefore <1%; and dissolved oxygen concentration reductions will be negligible (<0.1ml/ℓ). | Mine site sediment pore water volumes are low | Mine area Heavy metals have low solubility and bioavailability, trophic transfers are attenuated at primary consumer level | Mine area Heavy metals have low solubility and bioavailability, dredging should not increase exposures | Mine site sediment property data indicate low H ₂ S presence | POM in sediments is relatively refractory | Mine site sediment property data indicate low H ₂ S presence and release from iron pyrites should be low. |

Fish Mammals and Seabirds: Summary of impact assessment determinations: Re-evaluated following the verification assessment.

Reference table number refers to the individual impact table number found in the specialists section.

| Ref. Tbl No. | 1.2.1 | 1.2.2 | 1.2.3 | 1.2.4 | 1.2.5 |
|---|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Risk Area | Seabed dredging: Fish Mammals and Seabirds | | | | |
| Nature of the impact | Fishing operations | Ecologically important species | Recruitment of key commercial species | Biodiversity | Seabirds and Mammals |
| Extent 2012 | MLA | MLA | MLA | MLA | MLA |
| Extent re assessed 2014 | Specific mine site | Specific mine site | MLA | Specific mine site | Specific mine site |
| Duration | Long term | Permanent | Permanent | Permanent | Long term |
| Intensity | Serious effect | Moderate effect | Minor effect | Minor effect | Minor effect |
| Probability | Definite | Highly probable | Improbable | Improbable | Probable |
| Status (- ve of + ve) | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | Medium |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Medium to low | Medium | Low | Low | Low |
| Confidence level 2012 | High | Low to medium | Low to medium | Low to medium | Medium |
| Re-evaluated 2014 confidence level | High | High | High | High | High |

Macrofauna: Summary of impact assessment determinations: Re-evaluated following the verification assessment.

Reference table number refers to the individual impact table number found in the specialists section.

| Ref. Tbl. No. | 1.3.1 | 1.3.2 | 1.3.3 | 1.3.4 | 1.3.5 | 1.3.6 | 1.3.7 | 1.3.8 | 1.3.9 |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Risk Area | Seabed dredging: Benthic Macrofauna | | | | | | | | |
| Nature of the impact | Sediment removal: benthos re establishment | Exploration activities and removal of benthos | Change of hydrographical conditions | Removal of sulphur oxidizing mats | <i>Clostridium botulinum</i> exposure | Sediment smothering benthos: Drag head | Benthos smothering: Dredge overspill plume | Nutrients added at surface: overspill plume | Increase of H ₂ S flux. |
| Extent | Dredge area | Dredge area | Specific mine site | Specific mine site | Specific mine site | Dredge area | Local to regional | Local | Local |
| Duration | Long term >20 years | Short term | Long term >20 years | Medium to long term | Sort term | Very short | Very short | Very short | Short term |
| Intensity | Moderate to serious | No lasting effects | Moderate to serious | Moderate to minor | Serious | Minor | Minor | Minor | Moderate |
| Probability | Definite | Probable | Probable | Improbable | Improbable | Highly probable | Probable | Possible | Probable |
| Status | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative | Negative |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Medium | Non | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Mitigation | Leave residual sediment layer / un mined areas | None required | Leave residual sediment layer / un mined areas | Non | Non | Non | Non | Non | Non |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Medium | None required | Low to Medium | Low | Low | None necessary | Low | Low | Low |
| Confidence level 2012 | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium |
| Re-evaluated 2014 confidence level | High | No change | High | High | No change | No change | No change | High | High |

Jellyfish. Summary of impact assessment determinations: A verification assessment specifically related to jellyfish was not undertaken.

Reference table number refers to the individual impact table number found in the specialists section.

| Ref. Tbl No. | 1.4.1 | 1.4.2 | 1.4.3 | 1.4.4 |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Risk Area | Dredging: Jellyfish | | | |
| Nature of the impact | Blocking sea water intakes of vessel | H ₂ S mortalities to Jellyfish | Turbidity cause mortalities | Hard substrate exposed |
| Extent | Dredge event | Dredge event | Dredge event | Annual mining area |
| Duration | Extremely short term | Extremely short term | Extremely short term | Very short term |
| Intensity | No lasting effects | No lasting effects | Minor effects | Minor effects |
| Probability | Highly probable | Possible | Rare | Rare |
| Status (- ve of + ve) | Negative (to Jellyfish) | Negative (to Jellyfish) | Negative (to Jellyfish) | Positive (to jellyfish) |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Low | Low | Very low | Low |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Very low | Low | Very low | Very low |
| Confidence level 2012 | High | Low | Low | High |
| Re-rated 2014 confidence level | High | Low | Low | High |

B1.4 VERIFIED ASSESMENT OF IMPACTS: JELLYFISH

INTRODUCTION

The verification programme addresses the impacts associated with dredging within the target dredge area SP-1

The Jellyfish Specialist Study (Gibbons 2012) conducted within the framework of the EIA (Midgley 2012) identified impacts on the jellyfish communities that can be expected from the proposed Sandpiper Phosphate Project, and assessed their significance. A series of four impact tables which present the impacts as they were assigned in original jellyfish impact study in the 2012 EIA are presented below.

The proposed mining activities are not considered to have a significant and lasting impact on the abundance and distribution of jellyfish populations: the tailings plume is limited in spatial/temporal extent and jellyfish have no specialized respiratory surfaces that could get clogged; alterations to the benthos are unlikely to increase the habitat for polyp establishment if a layer of soft sediment is allowed to remain, and whilst hydrogen sulphide could kill individuals in the affected water column, this is likely to be on a very limited scale since dredging will take place seawards of the mud belt which is the main source of H₂S. More serious impacts are likely to be effected by jellyfish on mining operations, though not through clogging at the drag-head as jellyfish are uncommon at depth. However, at the surface, where water will be drawn into the vessel for cooling (etc.), they could cause a major problem for vessel activities.

A total of four negative impacts were identified in the original assessment study with one impact having low significance, three, very low significance.

Table 1.4: Jellyfish. Summary of impact assessment determinations

Note: A verification assessment specifically related to jellyfish was not undertaken.

Reference table number refers to the individual impact table number found in the specialists section.

| Ref. Tbl No. | 1.4.1 | 1.4.2 | 1.4.3 | 1.4.4 |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Risk Area | Dredging: Jellyfish | | | |
| Nature of the impact | Blocking sea water intakes of vessel | H ₂ S mortalities to Jellyfish | Turbidity cause mortalities | Hard substrate exposed |
| Extent | Dredge event | Dredge event | Dredge event | Annual mining area |
| Duration | Extremely short term | Extremely short term | Extremely short term | Very short term |
| Intensity | No lasting effects | No lasting effects | Minor effects | Minor effects |
| Probability | Highly probable | Possible | Rare | Rare |
| Status (- ve of + ve) | Negative (to Jellyfish) | Negative (to Jellyfish) | Negative (to Jellyfish) | Positive (to jellyfish) |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Low | Low | Very low | Low |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Very low | Low | Very low | Very low |
| Confidence level 2012 | High | Low | Low | High |
| Re-evaluated 2014 confidence level | No change | No change | No change | No change |

Table 1.4.1 Impact 1: Blocking of vessel seawater intake system by dense surface aggregations of jellyfish.

Note: A verification assessment specifically related to jellyfish was not undertaken.

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Nature of the impact | 1: Blocking of vessel seawater intake system by dense surface aggregations of jellyfish. Dense surface volumes of jellyfish have been known to block the seawater intakes. This incoming seawater is used to cool the vessel's engines and any blockage of the intake system could cause the engines to overheat and fail, if remedial action is not taken. | |
| Report | <i>Impacts assessed EIA (2012)</i> | <i>Impacts re-evaluated: Verification programme</i> |
| Extent | Dredge Event: The extent is limited to immediately adjacent to the vessel during all operations. No change of assessment | |
| Duration | Extremely short term: The duration is limited to the period of time when dense aggregations of jellyfish are around the vessel: probably no more than a few hours in duration. No change of assessment | |
| Intensity | No lasting effect: This impact would involve a relatively limited number of jellyfish and is more likely to have adverse impact to the vessel if not mitigated. No change of assessment | |
| Probability | Highly probable: Although it is not possible to predict exactly when dense jellyfish aggregations may appear around the vessel, they do tend to occur more commonly during late winter / early spring: it is inconceivable, given how many jellyfish there are off Namibia, that this threat will not arise. No change of assessment | |
| Status (+ of -) | Negative to individual jellyfish, possibly positive for fisheries. No change of assessment | |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Low: No change of assessment | |
| Mitigation | In the case of blockage, jellyfish will have to be physically removed or flushed from the system. Sailing the vessel to areas with less dense aggregations of jellyfish Forward looking sonar could be installed on the vessel to identify dense masses of sub-surface jellyfish during operations. A "jellyfish observer" on deck should be able to identify jellyfish aggregations at the surface. | |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Very Low: No change of assessment | |
| Confidence level | High: | |
| Confidence level Post Verification Assessment | | High No change of assessment |

Explanation: (Table 1.4.1: Impact 1)

Original EIA – Impact assessment

Although jellyfish can be found throughout the water column, more than 80% of biomass is found in the upper 50 m (Flynn *et al.*, in press). This means that jellyfish are unlikely to be entrained in large quantities in dredged sediments. However, it does mean that jellyfish could block seawater cooling intakes on the dredging vessel itself, which could pose a significant technical risk.

Post Verification Programme – Re-evaluated impact assessment

A re-evaluated assessment of this impact was not required in terms of the scope of the verification programme. The original assessment stands.

Table 1.4.2 Impact 2: Hydrogen sulphide released from dredge sediments causing mortalities to jellyfish.

Note: A verification assessment specifically related to jellyfish was not undertaken.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Nature of the impact | 2: Hydrogen sulphide released from dredge sediments causing mortalities to jellyfish. The mining operation is located seaward of the mud belt where high levels of hydrogen sulphide are known to be associated with soft sediments. Hydrogen sulphide releases from the sediments in the Mining Licence Area (which is adjacent to, but not in the mud belt) are thus envisaged to be significantly less frequent and intense. | |
| Report | <i>Impacts assessed EIA (2012)</i> | <i>Impacts re-evaluated: Verification programme</i> |
| Extent | Dredge Event: No change of assessment | |
| Duration | Extremely short term: The duration is short (hours), related to the pulsed release of hydrogen sulphide. No change of assessment | |
| Intensity | Minor effects: | No lasting effects: individuals may be affected, however, environmental functions and processes are not adversely affected. |
| Probability | Probable: In the event that the combination of adverse factors comes together at any one time, jellyfish mortalities will occur. No change of assessment | Possible: the possibility of H ₂ S poisoning of jellyfish cannot be eliminated entirely, the probability rating is adjusted, as a result of data collected from SP-1 confirming the limited presence of H ₂ S. |
| Status (+ of -) | Negative: to individual jellyfish, possibly positive for fisheries. No change of assessment | |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Low: No change of assessment | |
| Mitigation | No mitigation is presented | |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Low: No change of assessment | |
| Confidence level | High: Although there is no information on the tolerance of jellyfish to hydrogen sulphide, they are unlikely to have special adaptations to cope with it. More research on this is needed. | |
| Confidence level Post Verification Assessment | | High: data collected from across SP-1 confirms the limited presence of H ₂ S. (section C 2.1) |

Explanation: (Table 1.4.2: Impact 2)

Original EIA – Impact assessment

The liberation of large quantities of hydrogen sulphide by dredging activities has the potential to kill off any jellyfish present in the affected water column as these organisms possess no special tolerance to this metabolic toxin, although both medusa and polyps are remarkably tolerant of hypoxic water (Purcell *et al.*, 2001; Condon *et al.*, 2001).

Post Verification Programme – Re-evaluated impact assessment

A re-evaluated assessment of this impact was not required in terms of the scope of the verification programme. However, concentrations and thus possible fluxes of H₂S in sediment pore water are estimated to be low from measurements of proxy variables within the sediments in the target dredge area. Circumstantial evidence in support of this is the absence the large sulphate oxidising bacteria from the survey area during the period of the thiobacteria survey in July/August 2014. Further, evaluation of pyrite-S mobilisation from sediments indicate that this is low. Consequently H₂S fluxes to the lower water column are considered to be negligible and the absence of large sulphur oxidising bacteria, due to either natural causes or disruption from dredging, would have little effect on these.

Table 1.4.3 Impact 3: Lean water overflow sediments, if present in sufficient quantities, may cause mortalities to jellyfish.

Note: A verification assessment specifically related to jellyfish was not undertaken.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Nature of the impact | 3: Lean water overflow from the vessel generates a tailings plume of fine sediments which settle out through and are dispersed in the water column. These fine sediments if present in sufficient quantities may cause mortalities to jellyfish, though this is considered unlikely | |
| Report | Impacts assessed EIA (2012) | Impacts re-evaluated: Verification programme |
| Extent | Mine site: < 25 km. It is understood that whilst dredging a sediment plume of ~1500 m long and 800 m wide will be generated over the cut length of up to 22 km. This plume is determined to sink to the seabed over a distance of 500-1500 m from the point of discharge. The maximum concentrations of sediments in the sediment plume are envisaged to be <50 mg/l but most of the plume area will have total suspended sediment concentrations <10 mg/l above background (1-4 mg/l), these are regarded as low. | Dredge event: It is understood that whilst dredging a sediment plume of ~1500 m long and 800 m wide will be generated over the cut length of up to 4 km. This plume is determined to sink to the seabed over a distance of 500-1500 m from the point of discharge. The maximum concentrations of sediments in the sediment plume are envisaged to be <50 mg/l but most of the plume area will have total suspended sediment concentrations <10 mg/l above background (1-4 mg/l), these are regarded as low. (Revised: cut length is reported, not 22 km as originally listed (left column), but corrected to 4 km (this column). This correction, serves to reduced the spatial extent of the impact. |
| Duration | Extremely short term: No change of assessment | |
| Intensity | Minor effects: No change of assessment | |
| Probability | Rare: No change of assessment | |
| Status (+ of -) | Negative: to individual jellyfish, possibly positive for fisheries. No change of assessment | |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Very Low: No change of assessment | |
| Mitigation | No mitigation is presented | |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Very Low: No change of assessment | |
| Confidence level | Low: – research on this is needed | |
| Confidence level Post Verification Assessment | | Low: – research on this is needed. No change of assessment |

Explanation: (Table 1.4.3: Impact 3)

Original EIA – Impact assessment

The plume of fine sediment that will be generated in the water column during dredging operations has a limited potential to be deleterious to individual jellyfish, with population level impacts being dependent on the numbers of animals moving through the licence areas. That said, it must be stressed that no research has been conducted in this area. The “fines” could settle out on individual jellyfish, but as the organisms have no specialized respiratory surfaces that could be blocked, they should be able to continue swimming, and through swimming they should be able to rid themselves of settled particles. Whilst it could be argued that jellyfish might ingest particles in the tailing plume, this is considered unlikely.

Table 1.4.4 *Impact 4: Removal of seabed sediments will change the nature of the sediment surface. Jellyfish populations are known to increase in areas where there is an increase of hard substrate.*

Note: A verification assessment specifically related to jellyfish was not undertaken.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Nature of the impact | 4: Removal of seabed sediments will change the nature of the sediment surface. Jellyfish populations are known to increase in areas where there is an increase of hard substrate. Typically this occurs where rock, concrete or iron structures are erected. The removal of the upper relative soft layers of sediment, leaving a relative hard clay footwall surface may provide such a hard surface. | |
| Report | <i>Impacts assessed EIA (2012)</i> | <i>Impacts re-evaluated: Verification programme</i> |
| Extent | Annual Mining Area: No change of assessment | |
| Duration | Very Short term: No change of assessment | |
| Intensity | Minor effects: No change of assessment | |
| Probability | Rare: No change of assessment | |
| Status (+ of -) | Positive for jellyfish, negative for fisheries. No change of assessment | |
| Significance (no mitigation) | Low: No change of assessment | |
| Mitigation | None: If between 10 - 15 % of the original thickness of the sediment is not recovered, there will sufficient soft substrata to preclude polyp settlement. | |
| Significance (with mitigation) | Very Low: No change of assessment | |
| Confidence level | High: | |
| Confidence level Post Verification Assessment | | High: Slivers of undisturbed ground will be left in situ, as well as a covering of sediments over the harder (relatively) clay footwall. No change of assessment |

Explanation: (Table 1.4.4: Impact 4)

Original EIA – Impact assessment

The removal of surficial sediments from the benthic environment, as a result of dredging, will alter the nature of the seabed environment. Whilst this has no impact on jellyfish in the water column, it could increase the area suitable for polyp attachment should large areas of hard substrata be exposed. That said, polyps of other species seem to require a sediment-free surface for persistent establishment. This is unlikely to be realized given the immediate fallout from the tailings plume, and from the persistent sedimentation of photic zone production

Post Verification Programme – Re-evaluated impact assessment

A re-evaluated assessment of this impact was not required in terms of the scope of the verification programme. The original assessment stands.