

# Contents Page: Smale – Southern Inshore Fisheries Mgt Co Ltd

All written comments received on the MPI salmon relocation proposal, grouped according to surname/business/organisation/lwi name.

Written Comments Number	Last Name	First Name
526	Smale	Helen
82	Smith	Andrew
228	Smith	Annette
432	Smith	Gary and Kathryn
439	Smith	Craig
469	Smith	Paul
424	Soderberg	Carney
350	Southeastern Grocers	
473	Southern inshore Fisheries Mgt Co Ltd	

# Written Comments No: 0526

Subject	Salmon Farm Relocation
From	<u>Helen Smale</u>
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Sunday, 26 March 2017 8:07 p.m.

To: Ministry for Primary Industries  
The Salmon Relocation Advisory Panel

I have been fortunate to have a life-long connection to the Marlborough Sounds. My very first memory is as a very small child my Grandfather taking me fishing in the Sounds. I have spent many happy hours on holiday swimming, sailing/boating and generally having an idyllic childhood. In my working years, I spent 18 years working in water quality management for the shellfish industry. In that role I managed the Marlborough Shellfish Quality Programme, chaired and managed the Industry Water Quality Committee and Chaired for two years the International Conference of Molluscan Shellfish Safety. I am therefore familiar with water quality issues, especially as they apply to aquaculture production and quality compliance. I now work with my husband in our own business consultancy, as a consultant, trainer and executive coach.

I am writing in support of the MPI proposed salmon farm relocation for the following reasons:

1. The initial salmon farm sites were selected at the time using the best science available. It is not logical to ignore current science that proves low flow areas are not well suited to salmon farming. Not acting will ensure poor environmental and economic outcomes for the industry and the Region. This is not the legacy we should be leaving future generations.
2. We have a moral and social duty to provide a platform for salmon farming to occur in the most sustainable manner possible. Relocating is consistent with that principle.
3. Some see this as an opportunity to exclude salmon farms from the Marlborough Sounds on a permanent basis. This is a flawed perspective. Salmon farming is a legitimate business activity in New Zealand law. Stopping salmon farming, which is a very high value use of water space, does not make good sense for the local community from an employment or broader economic perspective. The industry is here to stay and not only produces a high-quality product but also does its very best to be a good corporate citizen.
4. The Marlborough Sounds is a treasure for us all to enjoy and make a living from. We are all incumbent to ensure future generations are able to do the same.

I am unable to present my views in person due to work commitments.

Yours faithfully  
Helen Smale

Helen Smale  
Consultant – Executive Coach  
Forté Management - Business Consulting, Training and Coaching  
Phone [REDACTED]  
Cell phone [REDACTED]  
Postal [REDACTED]  
Email [REDACTED]  
Skype [REDACTED]

# Written Comments No: 0526

Website [www.forte-management.co.nz](http://www.forte-management.co.nz)

Potential relocation of salmon farms in the Marlborough Sounds.

Andrew Smith



I work at NZKS and I found it really hard to get a job in Nelson so I would like to keep this one. I support the relocation of the 6 farms to higher water flow sites because it will mean we won't lose the farms. It will mean better quality and healthier salmon. We can grow more salmon and this will mean we will have more jobs. This move will be better for our environment and this will be good for tourism.

Andrew Smith.

DSH.

16/2/17.

## Written Comments No: 0228

Subject	Relocation
From	Annette Smith
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Thursday, 16 March 2017 8:48 a.m.

Yes I am in favour of relocation for the benefit of the environment.  
Annette Smith

## Written Comment No: 0432

Subject	salmon farm relocation
From	<a href="#">Gary Smith</a>
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Saturday, 25 March 2017 4:41 p.m.

### KING SALMON FARMS

As residence of Ruakaka Bay in the Queen Charlotte Sound, we wish to oppose all fish farming and relocation of farms in the Marlborough sounds.

Funny they want to relocate farms to high flow areas. MMM should of thought of that earlier, but as the saying goes GET YOUR FOOT IN THE DOOR FIRST, then address the rest later.

The New Zealand public are far from stupid.

Upon reading much on salmon farming, we feel the evidence is clear, noting the happenings in Tasmania, Chile, Norway Scotland, all have suffered hugely by intense farming.

We believe our pristine waterways need to be protected at all cost from King Salmon pollution.

The Queen Charlotte Sound needs to be protected , for future generations to enjoy in many years to come, not exploited by another overseas company who's main focus is Dollars.

Gary & Kathryn Smith

## Written Comment No: 0439

Subject	Salmon Farm Relocation
From	<a href="#">Craig Smith</a>
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Monday, 27 March 2017 10:23 a.m.
Attachments	<<SKMBT_C25317032709100.pdf>>

Hi

Please see my submission as attached.

Thanks

Craig

--

**Craig Smith, Service Delivery Manager**



W: [www.kingsalmon.co.nz](http://www.kingsalmon.co.nz) |

Tahunanui, 7011



Internet e-Mail Disclaimer: All information in this message and attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged. Only intended recipients are authorised to use it. Views and opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and do not necessarily reflect the views of the company. E-mail transmissions are not guaranteed to be secure or error free and The New Zealand King Salmon Co Ltd accepts no liability for such errors or omissions.

Join the campaign NOW!



**LOVENZSALMON**

[Visit our Facebook page](#)

Written Comment No: 0439

Don't just LIKE US ... LOVE US!!



# Written Comment No: 0439

Salmon Farm Relocation

Ministry for Primary Industries

Private Bag 14

Port Nelson

aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz

To: The Salmon Relocation Advisory Panel

**Craig Smith / NZ King Salmon/ Service Delivery Manager**

I support the potential salmon relocation process being proposed by MPI because I believe the salmon farm relocation will provide for better environmental, social and economic outcomes.

I understand that by relocating farms from lower water flow sites to higher water flows sites fish performance will improve and therefore the health of the salmon. It will also have a lower level of effect on the seabed which will have positive environmental benefits.

Environmentally adopting the Best Management Practice guidelines that were agreed by the Council and community is the future of aquaculture globally.

There will be more direct and indirect jobs created if this proposal goes ahead resulting in economic improvements for the communities in the top of the south.

Moving some farms away from baches to more remote locations will improve social amenities which is also a good thing.

This means allot to me and my family as I live and work in Nelson but my parents live in Moetapu Bay in the Marlboorough sounds. I also am an avid recreational fisherman, plus my young family also participate in allot of water sports like sailing, boating, and fishing in the Sounds and Nelson. There fore sustainable fisheries and water quality are of high importance to my family as well as my work.

Regards



Craig Smith

## Written Comment No: 0469

Subject	<b>Fwd:</b>
From	<a href="#">Charles Park</a>
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Monday, 27 March 2017 8:46 a.m.
Attachments	<<scan.pdf>>

Many thanks,  
Charlie.

Charlie Park, Tory Channel Regional Manager.



M: [REDACTED] | W: [www.kingsalmon.co.nz](http://www.kingsalmon.co.nz) | [REDACTED] Picton



ORAKING™

Internet e-Mail Disclaimer: All information in this message and attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged. Only intended recipients are authorised to use it. Views and opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and do not necessarily reflect the views of the company. E-mail transmissions are not guaranteed to be secure or error free and The New Zealand King Salmon Co Ltd accepts no liability for such errors or omissions.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Te Pangu Farm** [REDACTED]

Date: 27 March 2017 at 21:08

Subject:

To: Charles Park [REDACTED]

## Written Comment No: 0469

Salmon Farm Relocation

Ministry for Primary Industries

Private Bag 14

Port Nelson

aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz

To: The Salmon Relocation Advisory Panel

### Introduction – who you are / where you work / and your role

I support the potential salmon relocation process being proposed by MPI because I believe the salmon farm relocation will provide for better environmental, social and economic outcomes.

I understand that by relocating farms from lower water flow sites to higher water flows sites fish performance will improve and therefore the health of the salmon. It will also have a lower level of effect on the seabed which will have positive environmental benefits.

Environmentally, adopting the Best Management Practice guidelines that were agreed by the Council and community is the future for aquaculture globally.

There will be more direct and indirect jobs created if this proposal goes ahead resulting in economic improvements for the communities in the top of the south.

Moving some farms away from baches to more remote locations will improve social amenities which is also a good thing especially from a navigation viewpoint.

### What will this mean to you, and how will this affect your community or organisation?

THE RELOCATION OF THE SALMON FARMS WOULD MEAN MY JOB WOULD BE SECURE GIVING MYSELF, MY WIFE & OUR TWO KIDS FINANCIAL SECURITY FOR MANY YEARS. MANY JOBS WOULD BE CREATED IF THE RELOCATION IS SUCCESSFUL WHICH IS GOING TO BENEFIT THE COMMUNITY. I BELIEVE NZKS ARE A GREAT COMPANY TO WORK FOR & I LOOK FORWARD TO BEING PART OF THIS ORGANISATION FOR MANY YEARS TO COME.

I ~~would~~/would not like to be heard by the hearings panel (please cross out the option that does not apply to you).

All written comments must be received by MPI no later than 5pm on Monday 27th March

Name: PAUL SMITH  
Organisation/Company: NZKS  
Role: AQUACULTURE TECHNICIAN.

Email:

Phone:

Date: 27/03/17

## Written Comment No: 0424

Subject	<b>Submission for Relocation Assessment</b>
From	<u>Carney Soderberg</u>
To	aquaculture submissions
Cc	Robyn Vidak
Sent	Monday, 27 March 2017 11:13 a.m.
Attachments	<<Potential Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds CRS.docx>>

MPI

Please find attached my submission “ Potential Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds” as requested.

Regards

Carney R. Soderberg  
Sounds Resident



## Potential Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds COMMENTS FORM

NAME: Carney R Soderberg  
POSTAL ADDRESS: [REDACTED] Picton 7250, Marlborough  
EMAIL: [REDACTED]  
DAYTIME PHONE: [REDACTED]  
MOBILE: [REDACTED]

NO I do not want to speak to my comments at a public hearing  
To: [aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz)

I OPPOSE the relocation proposal for the following reasons:

### Issue

1. Process

### Comment

The use of Section 360A of the RMA gives the Minister of Aquaculture the power to over-ride the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan. It takes decision-making and resource management away from the Marlborough District Council and local community.

The subject matter covered, principle organisations involved, RMA issues affected, geographical proximities of subject land/water areas affected, experts used by the applicant, and methodologies of assessment employed to prepare the applicant's request and economic benefit statements, are identical to the those presented in the 2013 BOI and 2014 Supreme Court trials. This complete replication of the Econometric Analysis approach from the previous study, invalidates the report's claimed objective to provide an "independent economic impact assessment (EIA) " for subsequent decision making.

Simply "rebadging" the primary economic consultant performing the assessment

beneath the logo of a global consulting firm, fails to materially change the extent that the economic assessment approach used in the BOI trial was assessed as a major failure by the Board – forcing the Board to declare that while the assessment was unable to provide a quantum for the assessment, they adopted an understanding that the “must be material economic benefit to be generated from the previous application – and therefore, declared the assessment as providing the expected assurance.

Furthermore, it disregards the 2013 Board of Inquiry [BOI] and 2014 Supreme Court decisions about expansion of salmon farming into prohibited areas of the Marlborough Sounds.

The proposal provides the primary commercial benefit for one company, using public water space for free, above the interests of other users of the Marlborough Sounds; including residents, holiday makers, fishermen, naturists, tourism operators, boaters, etc.

It sets a precedent for the Minister to make similar unauthorised resource expropriations in New Zealand, usurping the rights and power of local authorities and the rights, prerogatives and wishes of local communities and stakeholders.

### 2. Precautionary approach

Policy 3 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement calls for a precautionary approach. This was reinforced by the BOI decision [par 179].

The three new high flow sites granted by the BOI are only just coming on stream. It would be precautionary to wait until monitoring shows the company can operate these sites, along

## Written Comment No: 0424

with their other high-flow sites, to comply with the Benthic Guidelines at maximum feed levels for at least three years before any more space is considered. [consistent with BOI Condition of Consent 44a]

This especially applies to Tio Point, which would be the fourth salmon farm created in close proximity to competitor farms in Tory Channel.

In the meantime, the applicant company should be forced to reduce the feed and stocking rates at the low flow sites to meet the Benthic Guidelines.

### 3. Nitrogen pollution

I dispute the accuracy of Minister's statement: "This proposal is about making better use of existing aquaculture space. There is no proposed increase in the total surface structure area used for salmon farming in the Marlborough Sounds," – Nathan Guy, Minister of Aquaculture.

The proposed relocation sites identified in this matter are not "existing aquaculture space". They are **prohibited** to aquaculture.

While farm surface area may remain about the same, there is a proposed five-fold increase in fish feed to 24,600T a year.

With more feed and more fish, the amount of nitrogen pollution discharged into the Sounds through salmon faeces would also increase. The high-flow farms would be discharging the equivalent of the nitrogen in sewage from a city the size of Christchurch, New Zealand, straight into the sea.<sup>1</sup>

## Written Comment No: 0424

Residents must meet strict obligations to keep waste out of the enclosed waters of the Sounds. Yet this proposal would allow the untreated discharge of polluting nutrients from six new salmon farms.

As a land-based comparison of low flow and high flow sites, it is not OK for a dairy farmer who has been pulled up for discharging effluent into a small stream to resolve the issue by increasing his herd and discharging to a faster river.

### 4. Offshore Alternatives

The NZKS Supreme Court decision ruled there was an obligation to consider alternatives under the NZ Coastal Policy Statement and Section 32 of the RMA. **"Particularly where the applicant for a plan change is seeking exclusive use of a public resource for private gain."** [SC 172-173]

Having salmon farms offshore (open ocean aquaculture) rather than in the confines of the Marlborough Sounds would dilute the pollution and remove the conflict with other users. This approach is being used in countries such as Norway.

Offshore alternatives are barely mentioned in this proposal. NZKS claims it would be achievable in 10 years but was too expensive and not yet proven.

There is no information about what is happening in other countries and no cost-benefit analysis about off-shore alternatives.

Rather than pushing this relocation proposal for areas prohibited to aquaculture, MPI and the industry

<sup>1</sup> BOI [par 379] Nitrogen equivalent calculations



## Written Comment No: 0424

should invest in research to expedite offshore farming as a future-proofed alternative.

### 5. King shag

Policy 11 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement calls for protection of indigenous species in the coastal environment.

The NZ King Shag is classified as nationally endangered and is found only in the Marlborough Sounds. It is a taonga for Ngati Kuia and Ngati Koata.

King Shag are sensitive to disturbance when breeding, roosting and feeding. Duffers Reef to the Waitata Reach, where five new farms are proposed, are key areas for these activities.

The threat to King Shag was a factor in the BOI restricting the number of new farms in the Waitata Reach to two in its 2013 decision [BOI 1252 ]. Yet this latest proposal is seeking another five farms in the King Shag foraging area.

### 6. Landscape and Cumulative effects

This proposal will degrade the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and High Natural Character values of the Waitata Reach. <sup>2</sup>

The Board of Inquiry decision identified the threshold number of salmon farms for Waitata Reach as TWO – Waitata and Richmond – and turned down three others because of the cumulative effects on Landscape, Natural Character, King shag feeding and Tangata Whenua . values. [BOI 1252]

NZKS and MPI have ignored this ruling, which was arrived at after a long and considered judicial process. Instead they have joined forces and put forward

## Written Comment No: 0424

this relocation proposal for FIVE more farms in the Waitata Reach. None of these farms can be justified.

2.Marlborough Landscape Study August 2015 by Boffa Miskell and Marlborough District Council, page 108;Natural Character of the Marlborough Coast, Defining and Mapping the Marlborough Coastal Environment, June 2014 by MDC, Boffa Miskell, DOC, Landcare Research and Lucas Associates, page 75

### **Comment:**

The Marlborough Sounds should not to be used by New Zealand King Salmon to expand their destructive and anti-economic practices. As stated, the sites that New Zealand wish to expand into are Prohibited to aquaculture. Any expansion of Salmon Farming should take place in an environment where permanent damage to the ecology of the Sounds is prevented.

Furthermore, the government should recognise that the projection of economic benefits assessed to be integral to this proposal are completely flawed, focus on misrepresentation of the behaviours required by the applicant to deliver the service, and consistently seek to mislead readers and decision makers as to whom and to what extent will benefit by moving forward with this expansion.

I strongly recommend that the government read the Peer Review Report accompanying the Impact Assessment, noting all the many weaknesses cited by EW from reviewing the report. These criticisms are major flaws directed to the Assessment and its authors and should not be ignored.

### **In conclusion:**

There should be no discussion of more salmon farms in the Marlborough Sounds until NZ King Salmon shows it can operate the ones it has within the agreed benthic guidelines. Furthermore, NZKS should be required to clean up it's current sites to pre-farm status before any additional space is considered. Otherwise, this expansion is no more than another progression in NZKS's March to permanently spoil/kill more areas in the Sounds.

Finally, government should come down hard on NZKS's repeated use of self-serving Economic projections that rely on company behaviours that escape simple commercial and economic realities.

## Written Comment No: 0424

**Desired outcome:** Option C: The Minister does not recommend the proposed regulations.

## Written Comments No: 0350

Subject	New Zealand King Salmon
From	<a href="#">Peter Redmond</a>
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Friday, 24 March 2017 5:42 a.m.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to you in regards to a submission made by the company New Zealand King Salmon (NzKs). We understand that NzKs have requested to relocate up to 6 of their sites to more ideal farming locations in the Marlborough Sounds. Having met with the company I understand that this will lead to a positive impact on the environment, community and ultimately employment opportunities.

My company is a retailer comprised of 750 stores in the southeast of the USA. We understand implicitly the need to balance the above three categories in all that we also do as a retailer. My experience with NzKs over the last three years is that they exercise extreme diligent and thought in to their decision making process. I also know the company to be very environmentally aware and considerate. I believe for NzKs to grow in the export arena this type of a move, as suggested, is key to mid and long term growth. As a retailer, price and item are extremely important...but consistency and continuity are critical. NzKs have done a great job here but I think this relocation may be pivotal to ensuring this in the future.

In short, on behalf of Southeastern Grocers, we would respectfully ask you to approve tis request.

Best Regards,

Peter Redmond

Peter Redmond  
Vice President - Deli / Bakery/ Prepared foods and Kitchen / Commerical Bread  
8928 Prominence Parkway Building 200  
Jacksonville, FL 32256



[www.segrocers.com](http://www.segrocers.com)




## Written Comments No: 0473

Subject	<b>Submission on King Salmon Relocation of Salmon Farms</b>
From	<u>Carol Scott</u>
To	aquaculture submissions
Sent	Sunday, 26 March 2017 1:05 p.m.
Attachments	<<Submission on the Potential Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds SIF.docx>>

Please find attached the submission on the Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds by King Salmon.

Can you please receipt delivery of this document by return email.

Kind Regards  
Carol

Carol Scott  
Southern Inshore Fisheries Mgt Co Ltd  
 Nelson



*Challenger Scallop  
Enhancement Co Ltd.*

27 March 2017

Salmon Farm Relocation  
Ministry for Primary Industries  
Private Bag 14, Port Nelson 7042  
Email: [aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz)

## **Submission on the Potential Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds**

**MPI Discussion Paper No: 2017/04**

### **SUMMARY**

The MPI discussion documents (1900 + pages) fails to adequately evaluate the overall risk to existing fisheries, both commercial and recreational. The long-term impacts should approval be given do not address the cumulative effects of salmon and mussel farming within the Sounds.

The document does not provide any assessment on over capacity (excess salmon stock) in the Marlborough Sounds that would affect water quality and the depletion of oxygen that is necessary to support other aquatic life, flora and fauna and shell fish species. These effects are currently being experienced in Port Macquarie, Tasmania, where an over capacity of salmon farms is depleting bottom habitats. King Salmon Limited have stated in several media releases that they will increase salmon numbers and increase harvest on a daily basis from 7,000 to 10,000 salmon per day.

By placing salmon farms into areas of higher water flow and the cumulative run-on effect of increased dispersal of faecal matter, denitrification and transfer of disease to the wider marine area which supports a diversity of finfish, shellfish and associated habitat, will have a detrimental effect. The proposed monitoring is after the fact and is not clear what remedial action on an adaptive framework would minimise the risk to the marine resources.

It is noted that there are new Benthic Guidelines proposed and the first monitoring results using this new monitoring process are not due until after the closure of this submission on the 27 March 2017.

The bottom line, inshore commercial fishers do not support the establishment of new farms and the relocations proposed within the Marlborough Sounds due to the risks to our wild fisheries.

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

This collective submission is made by Challenger Scallop Enhancement Company (Challenger) and Southern Inshore Fisheries Management Company on behalf of our shareholders, quota owners and affiliated fishers who participate in the scallop and finfish fisheries within the Marlborough Sounds and the wider fisheries management area 7 (FMA7).

# Written Comments No: 0473

We make this submission in respect of the proposed relocation of the King Salmon Limited (KSL) farms within the Pelorus and Queen Charlotte Sounds. Whilst we recognise the significance of the application with respect to achieving productivity and economic growth, from moving the salmon farms from low-flow to high-flow areas, we do however have concerns about some of the proposed locations and the ongoing long-term impacts of these farms.

This submission is also made with the support of Fisheries Inshore New Zealand (FINZ) as the national sector representative entity for inshore fisheries.

Whilst the MPI is tasked with preparing documentation for public consultation, it is disconcerting the level of resourcing applied to the aquaculture industry. The commercial wild fish sector struggle on an annual basis to have fish stocks quota levels reviewed when backed up by research or in a number of instances the level has not been adjusted since their introduction to the quota management system in 1986. We would welcome such enthusiasm by the Minister in respect of our sector to address our concerns and management requirements.

## 2. DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Of further concern is the current approach to override not only the previous decisions on the designated non-aquaculture areas by the Marlborough District Council (MDC) but also the decision-making process to evoke a change to the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan (MSRMP) by asking the Minister to consider recommending regulations under section 360A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

We have concerns with the interpretation of the powers of section 360A of the Resource Management Act 1991. The RMA defines the functions and powers of Ministers, see sections 24-27 for the Minister for the Environment, sections 28-28A for the Minister of Conservation and section 28B for the Minister of Aquaculture. The Minister of Aquaculture's powers in respect of making amendments are not unfettered.

Section 360A (2)(b) requires such amendments must not be inconsistent with, and are subject to, the other provisions of this Act (for example, subpart 1 of Part 7A). However, the Act does not specify which provisions have dominance over the section 28A power. In the absence of greater specificity, it cannot be presumed that the Minister has the powers he currently proposes to use to vary the regional plan to provide for the salmon farms or to what degree those powers are fettered by the provisions of the Resources Management Act.

We note the Minister for the Environment as the principal Minister for the Act does not have the power to direct changes in regional council plans. He may direct that councils prepare changes in respect of issues he might raise but he does not appear to have the power to impose changes to plans. Any direction for council to prepare a change passes the responsibility and accountability for the change, including the specifics of the change, to the council. The council must then follow the processes specified in the RMA to effect any change. Given the limitation on the powers of the principal Minister, it is not likely that the Minister for Aquaculture has the power to override the provisions of the RMA as promoted.

Whilst KSL are using the regulatory instruments available to them the practice of over-riding the decision-making process of a regional authority by an Order in Council is counter to the needs of local management and community interests and areas for marine environmental protection.

The MSRMP is a plan that has been consulted widely with stakeholders and the community and includes the sustainable utilisation of marine resources providing it incorporates:

## Written Comments No: 0473

- The aspirations of communities of interest;
- Realistic descriptions and acknowledgement of potential risks; and
- Recognition and accommodation for existing and future users of the environment

Challenger and Southern Inshore support the use of the MSRMP that incorporates the views of interested stakeholders and communities, analyses risk and provides guidelines for the sustainable use and utilisation of the Marlborough Sounds marine and wider terrestrial region.

### **3. SALMON FARM RELOCATION ISSUES**

The KSL proposal is to shift six currently consented salmon farms from low-flow water to high-flow water areas that are either open for marine farm consent applications or into areas that are designated as non-aquaculture areas by MDC. The latter classification concerns us the most since this designation was agreed upon to enhance and protect the marine environment in the Marlborough Sounds.

One of the major concerns from KSL to the existing salmon farm sites in the low-flow areas is the continued eutrophication through the build-up of faecal matter and denitrification and the inability for them to adhere to the current Benthic Guidelines. These guidelines were a culmination of knowledge from industry, scientists and the local community together with local and central government. If KSL were to follow these guidelines they suggest that the stocking level would have to be reduced and therefore an economic impact to the company.

We share KSL concerns on the environmental effects at their current low-flow sites, but we are not yet convinced that the risk to the environment and our fisheries is low enough at the proposed high-flow sites to allow for all the proposed salmon farms to be established at the same time. If anything, they should be adopted via an adaptive management plan that has clear monitoring guidelines and trigger points that would establish the most appropriate cumulative level of salmon farm occupation in each area. Only a presumption is made on whether the Benthic Guidelines can be met if all the salmon farms are relocated at one time and this concerns us.

Our main concerns are not only with the current salmon farm location issues but with the movement of these farms into areas of higher water flow and the cumulative run-on effect of increased dispersal of faecal matter, denitrification and transfer of disease to the wider marine area which supports a diversity of finfish, shellfish and associated habitats. The proposed monitoring is after the fact and is not clear what remedial action on an adaptive framework would minimise the risk to the marine resources.

We would request the need for trigger points as part of the consent conditions that saw the stocking levels of the salmon farms reduced immediately to a level that minimises that risk.

#### **3A. Pelorus Sound Relocation Sites**

Challenger and Southern Inshore are opposed to the relocation of three of KSL proposed salmon farms within Pelorus Sound. They are:

- a. Waitata Mid-Channel (Site 125)
- b. Horseshoe Bay (Site 124)
- c. Richmond Bay South (Site 106)

Whilst we observe from the biophysical model of the Marlborough Sounds that these areas are within the higher flow scale, they are however the most commercially viable scallop beds for utilisation within the southern scallop fishery in quota management area 7 (SCA7), with little and on



## Written Comments No: 0473

occasion nil harvested in both Golden and Tasman Bays due to environmental factors and land-based effects. The most significant factor being the overall siltation within these bays. In 2015 some 22 meatweight tonnes (22mwt=132t, this includes both the scallop meat and shell weight known as greenweight) harvested from both Pelorus and Queen Charlotte Sounds.

The most prolific scallop beds are found in the bays of Pelorus Sounds which are also important to a commercial finfish fishing with regulatory restrictions on certain fishing methods from 1 September to 31 March therefore reducing available seasonal fishing time.

Commercial and recreational scallop seasons differ from finfish and these commence on the 14 July and extend to the end of February the following year. Commercial scallop harvest and finfish trawling is prohibited within the inner Pelorus Sound. Any further spatial closures will impact on fishers ability to access the outer Pelorus Sound area.

Since 2015 there has been no commercial or recreational scallop harvesting in the Marlborough Sounds under a regulatory closure by MPI due to declining scallop biomass and sustainability concerns. A recent scallop survey of the Marlborough Sounds has been completed by NIWA and the biomass has increased by 20mwt<sup>1</sup>. The NIWA report concludes that biomass decline has abated and there is evidence of strong spring spat settlement and survival in the Marlborough Sounds.

Almost all of the Marlborough Sounds recruited biomass at relatively commercial densities (1 scallop per 25sqm) was observed in only five scallop beds mainly in the outer Marlborough Sounds.

Subsequent to the 2015 closure the MPI Shellfish Working Group advised the Minister for Primary Industries, Hon Nathan Guy, of the rebuild strategy for the 2016 to end of February 2017 fishing period, with a Gazette Notice advising the closure to the Marlborough Sounds SCA7 fishery for this period. Challenger also took the precautionary approach to minimise the impact on the Golden Bay and Tasman Bay scallop fisheries by closing them to commercial harvest of scallops. This sustainability measure not to close Tasman and Golden Bays was an oversight by MPI and should have been part of their responsible management of the fisheries.

### ***3A.1 Waitata Mid-Channel (Site 125)***

#### **Navigation and fishing operation**

Our first observation of this proposed site is the sheer fact that it is located mid-channel and therefore an obstruction to general vessel navigation but also in the operational path for trawling for finfish and scallop fishing. Trawling in such areas requires the vessel to maintain reasonable tow times and not be hindered by having to stop and start and therefore bringing gear in and out to avoid obstructions.

When considering the external dimensions of the proposed site plus the angular location of anchors, plus the need for a buffer zone around them to minimise the risk of hook-up, the spatial exclusion of this site is therefore far in excess of that proposed.

Whilst there was an extensive report on navigation appended to this application it failed to observe the navigational needs of vessels currently operating in the Pelorus Sound, and more importantly the need for commercial fishing vessels that have operated in the area for a number of years. The MPI discussion document and expert modelling on navigation only refers to surface use vessels and is severely flawed when it neglects to consider the other commercial users such as commercial trawling and scallop fishing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Survey of Scallops in SCA7, January 2017, ISSN 1179-5352 (on line).

## Written Comments No: 0473

The proposed relocation position for this farm is in deeper water (60m contour) with a tidal flow for dispersal of waste. The model does not include the effects of wind and turbulent water.

At the time of preparing the MPI report, the current flows are orientated in a NE/SW direction over a period of 36 days of monitoring. Increased faecal deposits are therefore entering the water column at the lower depths and settling within the Pelorus Sound area.

Adding to this, the NIWA biophysical model shows that a band of currents around 0.2-0.3m/s through the main channel of Pelorus Sound and into Kenepuru Sound is produced mainly by the tides with some contribution from estuarine flow of surface water. This information varies to the current rose information shown above. Whilst waste will be deposited further away from the salmon farm on the tides, it will however still remain on the seabed in the wider Pelorus Sound and accumulate over time.

The sheer size of this proposed salmon farm, which includes three circular plastic pens 71m in diameter with a circumference of 240m sat at a further 20m apart will prevent commercial fishing within the area. The proposed depth of the farm is 40m a mere 20m above the seafloor.

The dispersal areas, as referred to in the MPI advice to the Minister and the Working Group, is only a model based on expected solids dispersal (*Advice to the Minister of Aquaculture, 23 November 2016, page 54*). Faecal matter will settle as bottom waste within the environs of the farm, not just underneath as is the problem in the existing low flow farm areas. The majority of this waste in the modelling example is swept back into Pelorus Sound.

Nutrients discharges are of particular concern when fish are grown in open net pens because nutrient laden faeces, undigested feeds and other fish wastes flow freely into the surrounding environment. There are other wastes that must be considered from the forced feeding to accelerate growth.

It is the high likelihood of diseases being accelerated and dispersed over vast areas of the seabed that have effect on bottom benthos. For example, the spreading of disease to areas of significant value the Davidson Report (*Significant marine site survey and monitoring programme: Survey 2014 – 2015*) prepared for Marlborough District Council.

Other wastes from the marine farm such as ammonium will enter the water column for some distance due to dispersive mixing. Sneddon Tremblay (2011) from the Cawthron Institute states there will be biological effect from zinc produced by the farms that will need to be managed. The adverse effects when bioavailability of metals is relatively high because the guidelines are based on the concentrations of bioavailable, rather than the total metals.

Finally, the Waitata mid-channel proposed salmon farm is adjacent to Ketu Bay which is an important scallop fishery. Challenger is concerned with any waste deposits entering Ketu Bay from this farm. Monitoring any impact is paramount to ensure such an important scallop fishery resource to the commercial and recreational fishers is not affected.

### **3A.2 Horseshoe Bay and Richmond Bay**

Both these salmon farms are adjacent to each other in the inner Pelorus Sound and appear to block in the existing marine farms in both bays which do not have high current speed within them. Blocking the entrance to these bays would presumably impact the flow of nutrients to the existing

## Written Comments No: 0473

marine farms as well as be impacted from the deposition of faecal matter from the proposed salmon farms.

Richmond Bay provides habitat for scallop settlement and has supported a scallop fishery. Given the fishing footprint already established for this bay Challenger would like to ensure that this area remains available for the future.

The risk of waste settlement from the newly proposed salmon farm near The Reef and the other granted site at Kopaua, which sit on either side of the outer borders of Richmond Bay is cause for concern by Challenger. Adaptive management monitoring is paramount in Richmond Bay in order to closely monitor denitrification and other water quality issues that may arise.

The same modelling has been applied to these bays and the cumulative effects and waste dispersal concerns apply as noted for the Waitata mid-channel proposal.

From a finfish perspective, Southern Inshore are concerned about the continued placement of marine farms, whether shellfish or finfish, over habitat areas close to shore that support blue cod and other fishstocks that rely on these areas for food and shelter.

#### **4. Blow Hole Point - South**

KSL have lodged a resource consent application for a mussel farm at Blow Hole Point. We assume that the company is either trying to get in early to secure spatial allocation by applying for a mussel farm and then apply to change to finfish. Or, the company is unsure whether this area would support salmon farming and therefore wants to secure the area and sub-lease the mussel farm out as they have done at White Horse Rock.

#### **4. SEABED REDEMPTION OPTIONS**

Salmon farming is known to cause a localised impact within the footprint of the farm. Remediation of the natural processes can only occur if the farm stops producing waste matter falling to the seabed.

Risks to surrounding habitat on the seabed will only be minimised if some form of containment and or removal of waste is achieved. Should the farms be moved from low flow areas then the mess that has been created should be removed by KSL prior to any future relocation. A worthy instrument to assist with process and ensuring best practise would be an environmental performance bond. KSL is known to have a track record of non-compliance on environmental performance as there are numerous breaches on environmental guidelines mentioned in their own press releases.

Moving these salmon farms from the low flow to high flow areas will only exacerbate the area polluted by waste dispersal. This means that when the farms are moved to even higher flow, most likely Cook Strait, the Pelorus Sound will presumably be fallow for at least 5 years if not longer. The possibility of wild finfish and shellfish regenerating in this area is a complete unknown and not a position we want to see our environment experience.

#### **5. IMPACT ON COMMERCIAL FISHERIES**

The majority of the commercial fishing in the Marlborough Sounds is seasonal being based on regulatory controls or Challenger management rules. From a commercial scallop perspective, it is the cumulative impact and seabed degradation that these farms will have in our productive scallop beds as four out of the five most productive utilised bays are with Pelorus Sound.

## Written Comments No: 0473

We have discussed our concerns for the three main sites above but still remain concerned about the risk of caged finfish waste dispersal and potential disease transfer to the wild marine resources within all the proposed areas and more widely the impacts to the wider Marlborough Sounds.

No assessment has been provided for the cumulative impacts of all marine farming (shellfish or finfish) in the Marlborough Sounds to the wild marine resources and habitats. There must be a certain loading capacity of marine farms in the embayment's of the Marlborough Sounds whereby productivity becomes negatively impacted.

### **6. CONCLUSION**

Whilst we are not against marine farming in the Marlborough Sounds we do feel the need to express our concerns to the risk to our wild fisheries and the cumulative impacts from marine farm waste and the continued degradation of commercial fishing property rights by spatial exclusion within our productive fisheries areas.

Marine farming is just one spatial exclusion impact commercial fisheries have to contend with. There are a number of other areas being closed to commercial fishing for marine protected areas, oil and gas production, proposed sand mining, proposed recreational marine parks, and regulatory and voluntary closures for fisheries management. This is in addition to land-based activities that cause sedimentation which also impact on our available water space, water quality, and fishstock availability and abundance.

**Contact:** Carol Scott – Southern Inshore Fisheries Management Co Ltd  
John Reid/Doug Loder – Challenger Scallop Enhancement Co Ltd