


Fourth Minute of Marlborough Salmon Farm Relocation Advisory Panel

1. In the course of hearing those presenting orally in support of their comments, the Panel has received information on four particular issues where it has formed the view that opportunity must be provided to the proponent of the proposal to provide a response.
2. The reason for that is that as a matter of natural justice and fairness it is necessary for that opportunity to be provided to respond to assertions made in the course of the hearings which may potentially have significance in the decision-making process.
3. The issues involved are:
 - (i) Criticisms have been levelled in two respects at the accuracy or reliability of the feed input tonnage figures provided for the baseline scenario modelling in the Report entitled *NIWA – Modelled water column effects on potential salmon farm relocation sites in Pelorus Sound – HAM Report 12 (18 October 2016 Broekhuizen & Hadfield)*:
 - (a) The inclusion in Table 1-1 of the report for scenario 1 of 822.8 tonnes of input feed for each of Crail Bay Farm 1 and Crail Bay Farm 2 when those farms are no longer in operation – it being asserted the result is a reduction in differences modelled in each of the other scenarios against the baseline scenario, thus affecting the reliability of the modelled conclusions;
 - (b) The variance in a range of the other tonnage input figures for many (but not all) of the farms in Table 1-1, which are also asserted to undermine the reliability of the modelled results.
 - (ii) Assertions have been made that there have been major continued mortalities at both the Waihinau and Ruakaka farms, in particular over the years since 2014. It has been asserted that either such continued high mortality rates may not have been reported to the authorities or advised to Dr Diggles when he was preparing his report entitled *Updated disease risk assessment report – relocation of salmon farms in Marlborough Sounds (7 September, 2016, Diggles)*. Alternatively, it has been asserted that that report did not properly record and identify the actual causes of continued high rates of mortalities, or address their significance in terms of sustainability of salmon farming in Pelorus Sound, or in terms of risk to other fauna.
 - (iii) An issue has been raised in the powerpoint presented by Mr Schuckard in relation to a significant adverse effect on light attenuation which he asserts arises from an increased level of chlorophyll *a* in the water column caused by the discharges from the proposed new sites in Waitata Reach, (including those adjacent to Blowhole Point in that description). He asserted that a consequence would be a significant adverse effect on the light levels available for foraging King Shags on the seabed, to such an extent as to effectively deny to them in practical terms use of extensive areas of their foraging grounds in and adjacent to the Reach.

- (iv) A number of varying figures have been challenged before the Panel in respect of the exchange proposed by way of replacement farm areas. In particular, MPI's depiction of the exchange being an effective 'swop' of like for like of surface areas occupied, is challenged on the basis that while surface structure area may be similar or less for the exchange sites proposed, the total 'consented' areas to be actually occupied appear to be significantly larger.
4. As is obvious from the issues raised, the party with the most readily available information to provide an informed response may be New Zealand King Salmon Limited rather than, or in addition to, MPI as the proponent. Our Terms of Reference enable the Panel to hear from 'other experts, including those engaged by the Crown'. The important thing is for the Panel to be properly informed of any relevant facts relating to the issues raised.
5. The Panel intends to provide opportunity for such closely focussed responses to be provided as part of the reply by the proponent, and/or through New Zealand King Salmon Limited, as is most appropriate, depending on which entity holds the relevant information to enable an informed response.
6. The opportunity to provide those responses is made available on Monday, 22 May 2017 at 10.30 a.m., (though we note that issue 3(iii) may possibly be able to be addressed during the experts' meeting on King Shags to be held on 15 May.)

Dated 12 May, 2017



P R Skelton

Peter Skelton
Hearing Panel Chair