ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT
VOLUME 4 –A14.1 MARINE ENVIRONMENT- DETAILED ASSESSMENT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

A14.1 MARINE ENVIRONMENT – DETAILED ASSESSMENT

14.1 INTRODUCTION

This Appendix provides the assessment of the physical and ecological effects of the proposed marine facilities in Rupert's Bay. The proposed works at Rupert's Bay include both the provision of a temporary unloading facility and construction of the permanent wharf and its associated dredging (see Figures 2.1 and 2.14, Volume 3 of the ES). The potential impacts on the physical environment and ecology are considered.

The in-shore sea rescue facility to be based in James Bay (described in Section 2.3.10 of Chapter 2, Volume 2) does not involve any physical development and will not have any significant effects on the marine environment. Therefore, it has been excluded from the assessment.

Initially both Rupert's Bay and Prosperous Bay were under consideration as possible sites for the Contractors wharf. Appendix 14.2 provides a summary of the comparative assessment of the ecological constraints associated with both these bays which was used to inform the selection of the most suitable site, Rupert's Bay.

The potential effects on the seascape and visual amenity of the Rupert's Bay is considered in Appendix 10, Volume 4 and Chapter 10, Volume 2. Effects on the recreational uses of the area are assessed in Chapter 5 Land Use.

14.2 METHODS

14.2.1 General Approach to the Assessment

Figure 2.1 and 2.14 show the location of the three elements of the marine facilities which could have a physical impact on Rupert's Bay, both in the construction and the operational phases of the works, i.e.:

- **A permanent wharf,** some 300m long, consisting of a 120m long causeway out to the 180m long head of the jetty. Running along the eastern side of the head of the wharf will be a 40m long lighter berth (at the inshore end of the wharf) and, further from the shore, a 120m long main cargo quay. Between these two berths there will be a 15m wide fixed RO-RO ramp,
- **The temporary unloading facility.** There are two potential locations for this: either the permanent wharf in its partially completed form, or a separate facility at the western side of the bay.
- **Dredging** for the cargo quay to give water depths of at least seven metres at all states of the tide.

The assessment of the impacts on Rupert's Bay was carried out in four stages as follows:

1) The definition of the physical characteristics (waves, currents and sediments) of the Bay. The existing conditions for the physical marine environment have been based on both surveys and desk study. Surveys carried out including bathymetry and wave and current data collection. Where these characteristics may be affected, the nature of those impacts are discussed in terms of their importance and significance. The marine ecology, recreation, amenity and commercial interests of the Bay have

also been taken into consideration. This has been determined by both desk study and surveys which are described below.

2) Assessment of the potential effects which could occur temporarily during construction and permanently during operation.
3) Identification of the mitigation measures which will and have been incorporated into the scheme to reduce any negative impacts.
4) Description of the residual effects, i.e. prediction of the effects which are likely to occur assuming the mitigation measures are implemented.

The importance of the existing marine environment and the magnitude of possible impacts and significance of the potential residual effects has been established using a similar approach to that described in Section 15.2 of the detailed assessment for the Surface Water Environment, Appendix 15.1. The importance of the marine environment has been determined according to the attributes relevant to the coastal environment including biodiversity, aesthetics, recreation and other uses such as commercial and navigation (Department of Transport, 2003).

Potential impacts that may result from the construction and operation of the scheme have been assessed for significance following a methodology based broadly on Department for Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) /Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) methodology. This methodology was originally produced for the assessment of the impact of highway development on the water environment, but lends itself to this assessment of effects on the marine/coastal environment as it enables systematic ranking of the features and impacts.

Potential impacts have been classed as adverse/beneficial, direct/indirect, permanent/temporary, and short/long term. The magnitude of a potential impact is independent of the importance of the feature and is initially estimated on the basis of no mitigation measures being included. The significance of a specific potential impact is derived from both the importance of the feature and the magnitude of the impact taking into account proposed mitigation. The result of this assessment is presented as “residual impacts”. The assessment is largely based on a qualitative approach which has involved an element of professional judgement in determining likely effects.

The assessment process described above has three stages:

1) Rupert’s Bay has been assessed for **importance** using the criteria presented in **Table 14.1**;
2) The **magnitude** of potential impacts is then determined using the criteria in **Table 14.2**; and
3) Finally, the importance of the Bay is compared against the magnitude of potential impacts in the assessment of **significance matrix** presented in **Table 14.3.**

Table 14.1 Criteria to determine the importance of features

Importance of feature/attribute	Criteria
Very High	Attribute has a high quality and high rarity on the regional or national scale
High	Attribute has a high quality and high rarity on the local scale
Medium	Attribute has medium quality and medium rarity on the local scale
Low	Attribute has low quality and low rarity on the local scale

Note: quality includes factors such as biodiversity, aesthetics and recreation

Table 14.2 Criteria to determine the Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Criteria
Major adverse	Results in loss of attribute and/or quality and integrity of the attribute
Moderate adverse	Results in effect on integrity of attribute, or loss of part of attribute
Minor adverse	Results in some measurable change in attributes quality or vulnerability
Negligible	Results in effect on attribute, but of insufficient magnitude to effect the use or integrity

Note: It is assumed that beneficial impacts better than minor are unlikely to occur as a result of the scheme and are therefore not presented.

Table 14.3 Assessment of Significance Matrix

Importance of Attribute	Magnitude of Impact				
		Major	**Moderate**	**Minor**	**Negligible**
	Very High	Very large	Large/very large	Moderate/large	Neutral
	High	Large/very large	Moderate/large	Slight/moderate	Neutral
	Medium	Large	Moderate	Slight	Neutral
	Low	Slight/moderate	Slight	Neutral	Neutral

14.2.2 Sources of Potential Effects

The three elements of the works identified above could potentially cause impacts to the physical environment in the following ways.

- **Damage to the seabed directly** due to construction activity (e.g. excavation, spillage of construction materials).
- **Damage to the seabed due to coverage** (e.g. the permanent works in the wharf) or removal (in the dredged area).
- **Increase in turbidity resulting from release of fines** (e.g., disturbance of the seabed, spillage, washing out of fines from unprotected fill material).
- **Redistribution of sediments** (erosion and/or deposition) within the bay as a result of the impact of the temporary or permanent works on the wave climate by, e.g., reflections from the new structures, protection of parts of the bay that are currently exposed to wave action.

14.2.3 Marine Ecology Survey Methods

Following the identification of Rupert's Bay as the preferred option for the wharf, a more detailed assessment was undertaken of the conditions at Rupert's Bay by means of a bathymetric survey. An ecology study formed part of this assessment and comprised a fish survey, a survey of the benthic (sea-bed) communities and a turtle survey, undertaken in November and December 2006 by staff of the Fisheries Directorate of the SHG's Agriculture and Natural Resources Department.

Selected transects were determined so that a representative sample of the area was covered in the survey. Transects were determined by using the maps produced by the bathymetric scans. At each transect, the GPS location was recorded, along with depth and environmental parameters including sea temperature, time, sea state, swell height, cloud cover and visibility.

Two divers using Self-Contained Underwater Breathing Apparatus (SCUBA) laid a 50m weighted transect line on the seabed. Using underwater boards and prepared recording

sheets, divers recorded target species encountered 2m either side of the transect line and common and endemic species. For target species, estimated length of each fish encountered was recorded. For common and endemic species, abundance figures were used to determine the estimated number along each transect line.

For the benthic survey a weighted quadrat was placed at 10m intervals along each transect line. An underwater video camera was then used to video each quadrat and the images subsequently analysed on computer. At each point of the quadrat (which was split up into 10cm intervals), the benthos was recorded i.e. feather star, turf algae, etc. and percentage cover was established. In addition, random sampling of invertebrates and other marine animals actually under boulders, etc. was carried out along the transect line.

Turtle sightings (and any other significant marine species sightings) were made by surface scans of the area by an observer situated from 1pm to 4pm at Rupert's Shears. Using binoculars, the observer scanned the area and recorded time, species (if known) and number of turtles seen. Environmental parameters were recorded every fifteen minutes including sea state, swell height, cloud cover and visibility.

14.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

14.3.1. Sources of Information and Consultees

A baseline sufficiently detailed for the assessment of potential impacts was determined following a campaign of fieldwork and a desk study of existing reports. The sources of information included the following:

a) Extracts from "Admiralty Sailing Directions Africa Pilot", Volume 2, published by the UK Hydrographic Office, 2004, provided by Atkins
b) Data on wind speed and direction from Bottom Woods for the years 1985 to 2004, provided by Atkins.
c) The "Geophysical Survey and Data Quality Report of the Rupert's Bay Bathymetric, Side Scan Sonar and 'Pinger' Seismic Survey, St Helena", dated August 2006, Report number 2006 – Project Number FR-2007-5633, prepared by Tritan Survey cc, provided by Atkins.
d) The "Final Report on Marine Ecology Survey at Rupert's Bay, St Helena in conjunction with the Air Access Project", dated January 2007, prepared by the Marine Scientific Officer, Fisheries Section, of the Agriculture and Natural Resources Department of SHG.
e) Data from measurements of waves within Rupert's Bay for the period March to September 2007, provided by Atkins.
f) The report "St Helena Access – DBO Reference Designs, Wave Conditions Survey" dated May 2007, prepared by Atkins on behalf of the SHG and DFID.
g) Atkins drawings and technical specifications relating to Marine Facilities for the proposed St Helena Access including the ITT for the DBO contract: DFID and SHG, May 2007.
h) Land Development Control Plan, 2007
i) Marine Scientific Officer, ANRD
j) Dive Club representative
k) Fisherman's Association
l) Harbour Master and Port Health Control

m) St Helena Nature Conservation Group
n) Director of Tourism
o) Arts and Crafts Association

14.3.2 Physical Marine Environment of Rupert's Bay

14.3.2.1 Nature of the Seabed and Coast

Figure 14.1, extracted from the Tritan Report shows the seabed depths and sediments in the bay. The majority of the seabed (shaded olive-green on the figure) in the nearshore and offshore areas is shown as sands. Within some 200 to 300 metres of the shore, the bed is predominantly rocky, with the exception that at the southern corner of the bay it remains sandy to the inshore limit of the survey. This sand foreshore fronts the existing small pocket beach to the south west of the root of the proposed wharf. Figure 14.2 - Photographs 14.1 and 14.2 in Volume 3 show the existing Bay.

Where the seabed is sandy within the bay, it slopes gently in a North West direction away from the shore, with the slope flattening from around 1 in 25 off the pocket beach to in the region of 1 in 30 to 1 in 40 further offshore.

The majority of the coast is rocky, except in the southern corner where it is sandy, at the pocket beach, and for around 100m to the north of the beach where the shore is protected by a rubble slope. It is expected that prior to being protected this length of coast may also have been sandy.

14.3.2.2 Tides

Characteristic tidal levels for the area, provided by Atkins, are indicated in Table 14.4

Table 14.4 Tides

Tidal Level	Elevation (m)
Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT)	1.30
Mean High Water Springs (MHWS)	0.90
Mean Sea Level (MSL)	0.50
Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS)	0.10
Lowest Astronomical Tide (LAT)	-0.2

The Admiralty Pilot states that (off St Helena) The South Sub Tropical Current sets West throughout the year at an average rate of 1/2 knot'. Currents in the area are therefore weak.

14.3.2.3 Waves

The wave climate of St Helena is strongly influenced by the southeast trade winds. Rupert's Bay is thus on the lee shore. The following key points have been deduced from Atkins report on wave climate (item f above) and the recorded data (item e above)

- The report states that '**the north western shore receives almost only swell waves**'.
- The offshore wave data confirms clearly that, offshore of St Helena, **waves from the north western sector are significantly lower than from other directions**. As a result, the significant wave height likely to be exceeded once in 100 years is estimated as 2.61m from the sector 240° to 030°, as opposed to 4.49m for all directions.
- **Waves within Rupert's Bay are on average less than 0.35m significant height** (based on long term offshore wave statistics). The recorded data (item e above) suggests the mean wave height in the bay 0.77m, the apparent discrepancy being explained in item f, by the fact that the recorded data was taken during winter.
- **Waves within the bay are predominantly from the north rather than the west** (based on directional figures from item e). This is consistent with the prevailing south easterly swell reaching the bay by diffracting around the north of the island.

14.3.3 Marine Ecology

St Helena's coastline presents a predominance of sheer rocky, sea cliffs, wave-cut rock reefs and shelves with occasional offshore stacks inhabited by nesting seabirds. There are very few beaches and these are largely formed from cobble deposits. The island, particularly on the south and eastern shores is subject to a heavy sea swell from the prevailing winds though there are records of occasional high wave action from the north, considered to result from intense storms in the north Atlantic (Ashmole & Ashmole 2000). The tidal range is a little over one metre between mean water levels for high and low spring tides.

The waters of the neritic zone (i.e. over the relatively narrow inshore shelf around St Helena) are less than 300 metres deep but beyond this the seabed descends sharply to depths well in excess of 4000 metres. The coastal waters of St Helena therefore present an isolated marine habitat similar to the terrestrial habitats and a number of marine animals and plants are similarly found nowhere else or are limited to St Helena and Ascension Islands. Of the 10 species of endemic fish, four are typical of shallow inshore waters and are considered common around the coastal rock and boulder shore habitats of St Helena. These species are the St Helena Gregory, the St Helena damselfish, the St Helena wrasse, or greenfish, all found from the shores to a depth of 35 metres, and Springer's blenny often found in rock pools. The remaining endemic species are found in deeper waters of the neritic, below 35 metres and some may now be rare, known from recent historical observations or single specimens.

The seabed of the inshore neritic zone have been surveyed by the Directorate of Fisheries by remote sensing to determine the nature of the habitats present. Habitats range from solid bedrock, to boulder deposits, to sandy substrates with intergrades between and mosaics formed from these substrates. In contrast, there is little survey information on the inshore fish species around the coastal waters of St Helena though a species list of such fish has been compiled for the waters around James and Rupert's Bay. Commercial fisheries records give an indication of the pelagic species in the open waters. This group will not come under any direct influence from the airport development and are not considered further in this section.

Rupert's Bay in the north of the island provides a sheltered anchorage to the east of James Bay. It has developed as the island's industrial area with a jetty serving a fish factory and a seawall and boom associated with the fuel storage facility for the island.

The shore is reinforced by rock-fill breakwaters though a small cobble and pebble beach remains with a very small area of exposed sand which provides one of the few safe locations for swimming in the sea on the island. There has been a rapid colonisation of the shoreline by periwinkles, limpets, crabs, and leafy green algae on the rock-fill breakwater which was completed in June 2004.

Sea-bed habitats below mean low water to around 5 metres depth are composed mainly of boulders in a sandy matrix. In shallower water under the influence of wave action closer to the shore, sands and silts are mobilised into the water column. Beyond, in slightly deeper water are areas of rippled sandy shoals. Rock ledges are locally present by the shore. The permanently submerged rocks and boulders are covered with a turf of fine brown algae, with patches of red coralline algae. A species of leafy green alga occupies the zone around mean water and is exposed at lower tide levels. On the rocks in deeper water, beyond the zone where wave action readily suspends sand particles, are small colonies of an encrusting colonial coral *Favia fragrum*.

During the preliminary surveys of Rupert's Bays, the fish species listed in Table 14.5 were noted.

Table 14.5 Fish Species Noted during Preliminary Surveys at Prosperous and Rupert's Bay

Species	**English name**	**Rupert's Bay**
Acanthurus bahanianus	Ocean surgeon	Numerous over rocks/boulders
Chaetodon sanctaehelenae	St. Helena butterfly fish	Numerous shoals over rocks/boulders. Endemic to St Helena & Ascension
Thalassoma sanctaehelenae	St Helena wrasse	Frequent over rocks. Endemic to St. Helena
Sparisoma strigatum	Strigate parrotfish	Occasional over rocks
Canthigaster sanctaehelenae	St Helena pufferfish	One or two fish seen over rocks
Aulostomus strigosus	Trumpet fish	One or two fish seen over rocks
Diplodus sargus	Seabream	Small numbers over rocks
Stegastes sanctaehelenae	St Helena Gregory	
Trachenotus ovatus	Silverfish	
Epinephelus adcencionis	Rock Hind	
Holocentrus adcensionis	Squirrelfish	
Abudefduf saxatilis	Sergeant major	
Acanthostracion notaca	Cowfish	
Scorpaena plumieri	Gurnard	
Bothus sp.	Flounder	One fish noted partially hidden in sandy shoals
Mulloidychthys martinicus	Yellow goatfish	A few fish over the sandy shoals
Total Species Noted		**9**

The Directorate of Fisheries holds records for the fish species seen in the shallow waters of James Bay and Rupert's Bay. Around 25 species are commonly recorded from these areas.

Following the results of the initial habitat appraisal at Rupert's Bay, a further survey was undertaken. The SCUBA habitat survey of transects across the bay has shown the dominant habitat type to be sand sediments with the second most abundant substrate type being bare rock often with a fine coating of sand. These habitats showed a very low diversity of marine life. Together these substrates accounted for between 80-90% of the habitat types present along most transects with very few areas of scattered reef with some slight increase in the diversity of benthic organisms.

During one afternoon of the two dedicated to the turtle survey, hawksbill turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata)* were encountered periodically. Occurrence of hawksbill turtles in Rupert's Bay could be related to offloading of fishing boats, as this is when the turtles are seen most frequently. From this limited sampling period and the results of two years of data from a marine sightings scheme, there appear to be frequent turtle sightings in the Rupert's Bay area.

Full details of the survey results are given the report enclosed in Appendix 14.3 in Volume 4 of the ES: Final Report on Marine Ecology Survey at Rupert's Bay (Bennett, ANRD, 2007).

14.3.4 Commercial, Navigation and Recreation Uses of Rupert's Bay

Rupert's Bay is extensively used by recreational users including swimmers and for water sports. The Rupert's Bay beach is also a very popular picnic area.. It is one of the two coastal areas with access to sea by road which is also safe for swimming. The only other area is Jamestown Wharf which is inaccessible when the RMS St Helena is in the harbour. Rupert's Bay is therefore of high national importance for the island. Although the LDCP considers that its attraction is downgraded because of the bulk fuel farm and commercial development close by. At present there is no information relating to the usage of the Bay either in terms of number of users or in terms of frequency including weekend use, holidays, weekdays and seasonal variation. Sailing, wind surfing and sea kayaking take place around the shores of St Helena, but are mainly concentrated in James Bay.

The coastal waters of St Helena are used for leisure diving. There are a number of wrecks and natural marine features such as caves which interest divers although none of the dive sites specifically lie within Rupert's Bay itself. The dive sites include the following:

- **Buttermilk Point** to the north of Rupert's Bay and Banks Valley Bay;
- The **White Lion and Dark Dale** wrecks which are within **James Bay**; and
- The natural features of **Cavalho Point and Dock yard** which are located in **Flagstaff Bay**.

Rupert's Bay is very important for commercial fishing. The Shears landing platform is the point at which all catches are off-loaded for processing at businesses located in the valley. Commercial fishing is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5. The Bay is also the point at which fuel is delivered by tanker to the existing bulk fuel stores in the valley. For these reasons the Bay is considered to be of high importance. Rupert's Bay and the coastline nearby are also used for recreational fishing – see Figure 14.2, Photograph 14.3 in Volume 3. The footpaths in and around the Bay are discussed in more detail in Chapter 12 and Appendix 12.1.

The coastline and inland waters of St Helena are also important for the tourism industry. Trips to observe the coastline, sea birds and marine life including dolphins, depart from James Bay frequently.

14.3.5 Summary of Existing Conditions

Rupert's Bay is relatively sheltered. The wave climate is mild and, within the bay, waves approach the shore predominantly (but not exclusively) from a northerly direction. Currents are weak. Movement of sediments is likely therefore to be predominantly wave driven and will be strongest in shallow water where the sea bed is sandy. Wave induced longshore currents are likely to be weak. They would be expected to predominantly southwards on the eastern shore and conversely, eastwards on the southern shore of the bay. It is for this reason that the small beach sits at the southern corner of the bay, facing the incoming waves. Rupert's Bay is considered to be of very high importance to St Helena for a number of reasons including commercial uses for landing fish and receiving fuel deliveries and the beach is an important resource for recreation.

With respect to ecology, the Bay is considered to be of low diversity with a predominance of species-poor sandy substrates.

14.4 CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS - TEMPORARY

14.4.1 Potential Effects

The nature of these effects are summarised in Table 14.6 below, based on consideration of the works in the context of the existing physical environment, ecology and use of the bay discussed above in Section 14.3.

Table 14.6 Summary of Potential Adverse Effects on the Physical Marine Environment during Construction

Potential Impacts during Construction
Coverage of the sea bed, temporarily, during the period for which the temporary unloading facility at the western side of the bay is being constructed, in place and being removed.
Damage to the seabed as a result of plant constructing the temporary unloading berth and the permanent wharf with loss of benthic flora and fauna.
Deterioration in water quality in the bay resulting from release of fines due to, e.g., disturbance of the seabed, spillage, dredging and washing out of fines from unprotected fill material. This may adversely affect benthic flora and fauna in areas of re-deposition.
Changes in wave climate and thus sediment transport in the bay as a result of the existence of the temporary unloading berth at the western side of the bay. This is considered unlikely to be significant due to the position of the berth (on a rocky coast) and its alignment (the berth is aligned into the prevailing seas and is unlikely to cause major reflections or interruptions to longshore currents).
Changes in wave climate and thus sediment transport in the bay as a result of the existence of the partially constructed jetty (used as a temporary unloading berth). The likely impact of the jetty along this line is considered below in the section discussing the permanent works.
Possible disruption to people using the Bay for commercial fishing, fuel deliveries and recreation.
Possible spillages of oils and other materials from vessels. This may adversely affect benthic flora and fauna in and around Rupert's Bay
Possible temporary closures of Rupert's Beach for safety reasons.

14.4.2 Mitigation

Mitigation has been developed through the design and incorporated into the technical specification which the Contractor must follow. Mitigation measures have also been developed for the construction and operation of the proposed scheme and these are set out in the EMP. In general these require that working practices and techniques will be

such that the risks of pollution from the release of fines or other construction materials will be minimised. Examples of such measures are provided below:

- The Contractor shall prepare **procedures for protection of the marine environment** including prevention of contamination from suspended solids and any discharge of fuels, mineral oils and chemicals associated with malpractice or accident.
- Surface or groundwater from excavations or other parts of the working area shall not be pumped or allowed to run directly into a watercourse, the sea or drain. Such water shall be passed through suitably sized settlement lagoons to remove silt solids before discharge to a watercourse.
- The Contractor shall undertake **daily inspections of the working area both along the shore and in the marine zone**. The Contractor shall carry out routine **monitoring** of the water quality during relevant construction activities.
- Marine mitigation shall include the following:
  - Subject to the source and nature of material, **quarried rock shall be washed** prior to transport if necessary.
  - **Sediment traps and/or silt curtains** shall be incorporated into the construction process of the jetty to prevent silt escaping from the working area.
- The Contractor shall **minimise the footprint** of his working area within the coastal zone.
- The wharf shall be designed so as to **avoid any land take and adverse impacts on Rupert's beach and amenity area as far as possible**.
- Measures to **minimise the disturbance to businesses and users of the amenity area and beach** at Rupert's Bay.
- **Temporary closures of Rupert's Beach shall be kept to an absolute minimum**. The community shall be informed at least two weeks in advance of any temporary closure period. The duration and purpose of any closure will be communicated through the radio and newspapers.
- The Contractor is required to confirm that his **plant and equipment has been cleaned prior to shipping**. Plant and equipment must have been cleaned and where necessary disinfected prior to shipping to prevent introduction of non-native species, including eggs, seeds and other pathogens etc. Inbound deliveries will be screened on arrival
- **International Maritime Organisation (IMO) – Conventions and guidelines** relating to reception of wastes from ships, disposal of materials at sea, safety of navigation, security and the handling of hazardous cargoes.

14.4.3 Residual Impacts

Residual impacts with respect to the temporary effects of sediment disturbance and the release of fines is likely to occur to some extent. Given the low importance attached to the receptors of such disturbance, in particular the low-diversity marine flora and fauna, such impacts are not considered significant.

The construction of the landing facilities for construction materials at Rupert's Bay will result in some habitat loss to marine benthic communities and could give rise to the potential for pollution during construction and from shipping traffic at the wharf. However, marine communities at Rupert's Bay are considered to be of low diversity and the replacement substrate provided by the proposed temporary wharf (at either location) that will be available for colonisation by marine communities will render any loss of benthic habitat of **negligible** significance. The residual effects are summarised in Table 14.7.

Table 14.7 Summary of Residual Construction Effects

Description of Potential Impact	Classification of Potential Impact	Assessment of Significance Without Mitigation	Proposed and Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
The mobilisation of sediment laden runoff which could enter local watercourses, drains and the marine environment. Sediment could also be disturbed or enter the marine environment during dredging and wharf construction.	Direct Temporary Short term	Moderate to major adverse	Measures to prevent sediment laden runoff being discharged to local watercourses untreated will be put in place. Measures to reduce the effects of disturbance of fine material during dredging and to control the ingress of fine material during construction of the wharf will be in place as described in the EMP in Volume 5 of the ES.	**Minor adverse**
The potential risk of chemical and fuel (oil) spillages entering local watercourses and the marine environment	Direct Temporary Short term	Moderate to major adverse	Measures to protect local watercourses and the marine environment from the potential risk of chemical/fuel spillages will be put in place, these shall include an emergency procedure to be followed in the event of a spillage or other pollution incident.	**Neutral**

Description of Potential Impact	Classification of Potential Impact	Assessment of Significance Without Mitigation	Proposed and Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Disruption to navigation, commercial use, tourism and recreation	Temporary Short term	Major adverse	Avoid land take and adverse impacts on Rupert's beach and amenity area as far as possible. Implement measures to minimise the disturbance to businesses and users of the amenity area and beach at Rupert's Bay. Temporary closures of the beach shall be kept to an absolute minimum.	**Minor adverse**
Marine and shore habitats at Rupert's Bay are considered to be of low value on an island-wide basis. Possibility for additional loss of benthic habitat at temporary wharf location	Temporary Short term	Minor adverse to neutral	Wharf structures likely to provide new substrates for use by epiphytic plants and animals.	**Neutral**

14.5 PERMANENT AND OPERATIONAL EFFECTS

14.5.1 Potential Effects

These effects, in certain circumstances, could well be more significant, particularly in terms of the impact on sediment transport, by virtue of the fact that it is permanent. As an example, if a temporary structure has an impact on sediment transport, once the structure is removed, the system may well recover rapidly and completely. However, in the case of permanent works, the structure remains and the impact may become progressively more significant with time. The nature of the likely effects of the operational phase is discussed in Table 14.8.

Table 14.8 Potential Adverse Effects on the Physical Environment during Operation

Potential Operation/Permanent Impacts
Permanent removal of the seabed as a result of the berth dredging
Permanent coverage of the seabed beneath the new wharf (quay, causeway and breakwater)
Redistribution of sediments resulting from changes in wave climate and thus sediment transport in the bay as a result of the existence of the new wharf. The likely impact of the wharf along this line is considered below in the section discussing the permanent works.

As discussed in Section 14.3.4 above, the location of the small beach at the southern corner of the bay is a function of the local wave climate. The construction of the new wharf will mean that the wave climate at the beach will be changed as, in future, only waves from the North West will reach the beach, rather than the predominantly northern waves to which it is currently exposed. As result the beach will tend to realign to face the new dominant wave direction, which would suggest that the beach would tend to migrate towards the new wharf. In addition, the presence of the wharf, including the causeway out to the berth, will prevent the generation of the (weak) longshore currents in that part of the bay. This, together with the more sheltered wave climate, suggests that the beach could be more susceptible to the accumulation of fines and flotsam. The beach is very important to the island as a recreational beach and these adverse impacts are likely to be significant.

14.5.2 Mitigation

In order to reduce the impact on the beach, the DBO Contractor will be required to "incorporate culverts (into the causeway) to maintain the existing water circulation and sediment flow within the bay". Further, the contractor will be required to use sand arising from the berth dredging to nourish the beach, and thus increase its ability to adjust to the new wave conditions. The design of the wharf shall aim to avoid impeding the natural flow of water and sediment around the bay.

Mitigation shall be provided for the loss of littoral and benthic habitats, particularly rocky substrates that support epiphytic plants and animals (i.e. those attached to the surface) or which provide voids and crevices as refuges for fish and invertebrates. This shall to some extent be achieved through the detailed design and method of construction of the wharf which could provide attachment substrates and cavities for marine wildlife.

The wharf includes oil interceptors in the drainage design. As with construction International Maritime Organisation (IMO) conventions and guidelines relating to protection of the marine environment will also apply during operation.

14.5.3 Residual Effects

As noted above with respect to construction impacts, permanent impacts upon the marine flora and fauna are not considered significant in view of the limited biodiversity of the Bay. The new substrates provided by the underwater structures of the permanent wharf will provide new habitats for colonisation by benthic and sessile marine plants and animals. Fish species will also be attracted by the shelter provided by the new structures and the new feeding areas that will arise following colonisation. Overall, the ecological effects at Rupert's Bay are expected to be **negligible**.

Table 14.9 provides a summary of the permanent residual effects during operation.

Table 14.9 Summary of the Permanent Residual Effects During Operation

Description of Potential Impact	Classification of Potential Impact	Assessment of Significance Without Mitigation	Proposed and Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Movement of the small recreational beach along the shore of the bay	Permanent Long term	Moderate adverse	Nourishment of the beach with sand arising from the dredging	**Minor adverse**

Description of Potential Impact	Classification of Potential Impact	Assessment of Significance Without Mitigation	Proposed and Recommended Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Accumulation of fines and flotsam on the recreational beach	Permanent Long term	Moderate adverse	Incorporation of culverts into the causeway to allow easy passage of currents through it	**Minor adverse**
Recreation – potential impact on the beach and Bay	Permanent Long term	Major adverse	Although the physical impact on the beach will be mitigated as described above. The placement of the wharf close to the beach will reduce its amenity value of the beach and Bay.	**Moderate adverse**
Navigation and commercial use	Permanent Long term	Major beneficial	The wharf will provide much improved facilities for landing cargo for St Helena.	**Major beneficial**
Marine and shore habitats at Rupert's Bay which are considered to be low value and are island-wide basis.	Possibility for additional loss of benthic habitat to wharf extensions	Impacts may be minor adverse to neutral	Wharf structures likely to provide new substrates for use by epiphytic plants and animals. Measures to prevent pollution of the marine environment will be in place including those described in the EMP in Volume 5 of this ES. Surface drainage from the wharf will pass through oil interceptors.	**Neutral**