

The Potential Relocation of Salmon Farms in the Marlborough Sounds: Feedback form

Written comments must be lodged by 5pm on Monday, 27 March 2017.

Comments can be:

- emailed to aquaculture.submissions@mpi.govt.nz
- posted to

**Salmon Farm Relocation
Ministry for Primary Industries
Private Bag 14
Port Nelson 7042**

Consultation questions

These questions are designed to stimulate your thinking and help us report back clearly on people's written comments. There are also spaces after each question on the feedback form for additional comments. These questions are the same as those in the consultation document.

Please make sure it is clear which aspect of the proposal (including question number if appropriate) you are commenting on.

MPI will consider all relevant material made in your written comments, so you are welcome to provide information supporting your feedback. Please make sure you include the following information in your written comments:

- the title of the consultation document
- your name and title
- your organisation's name (if you are submitting on behalf of an organisation), and whether your written comments represents the whole organisation or a section of it
- your contact details (such as, phone number, address, and email).

Written comments are official information

Please note that your written comments are official information. Written comments may be subject of requests for information under the Official Information Act 1982. The Official Information Act specifies that information is to be made available to requestors unless there are sufficient grounds for withholding it, as set out in the Official Information Act.

Persons who make written comments may wish to indicate grounds for withholding specific information contained within their feedback, such as if the information is commercially sensitive or if they wish, personal information to be withheld. The Ministry for Primary Industries will take such indications into account when determining whether or not to release the information.

Public hearings

A Marlborough Salmon Farm Relocation Advisory Panel will hold hearings in April. These hearings will allow people to speak to their written comments.

If you would like to attend a hearing and meet with the panel, please let us know as part of your written comments, including which location you would prefer.

Once we receive your written comments and your request to meet with the panel, we will notify you of the date, time and location.

<input type="checkbox"/>	I would like to speak to my written comments at a public hearing
<input type="checkbox"/>	I do not want to speak to my written comments at a public hearing

Questions

Question 1:

Do you think that up to six salmon farms within Marlborough Sounds should be allowed to relocate to higher-flow sites?

Question 2:

Which of the potential relocation sites do you think are suitable for salmon farming?

Question 3:

Which of the existing lower-flow sites should be relocated?

Question 4:

If you have concerns about particular sites, what are they and what could be done to address these concerns?

Question 5:

Do you feel that there are potential benefits or costs of relocating farms that have not been identified?

Question 6:

Are there rules, policies or conditions that you believe should be added? Please provide information to support any proposed new provisions?

Question 7:

Provided that detailed standards and requirements are met, do you agree that salmon farming on the potential relocation sites should be a restricted discretionary activity?

Question 8:

Do you agree that the overall surface structure area of salmon farms should not be increased?

Question 9:

If the sites at the existing lower-flow farms (other than Crail Bay MFL032) are vacated, do you believe that marine farming should be prohibited in these sites or do you think that these sites should remain open to other types of aquaculture for aquaculture settlement purposes?

Question 10:

Given the multiple ownership at Crail Bay MFL32, if this site is relocated, should aquaculture be fully prohibited or should shellfish farming be allowed to continue?

Question 11:

Do you agree with a staged adaptive management approach if salmon farming at the potential relocation sites proceeds?

Question 12:

Is there any wording you agree or do not agree with in the proposed regulations?

Question 13:

Are there any particular issues at the existing lower-flow sites that you would like to comment on?

Question 14:

Which of the existing lower-flow salmon farms in the Marlborough Sounds do you think are a higher priority to relocate and why?

Question 15:

Is there anything specific that you would like the Minister for Primary Industries to be aware of for any of these sites when thinking about the potential relocation proposal?

Question 16:

Are there particular landscape or natural character values that you want to identify to the Minister for Primary Industries for any of the potential relocation sites?

Question 17:

Are there other effects on landscape and natural character not outlined in the Hudson Associates or Drakeford Williams reports that you would like the Minister for Primary Industries to be aware of?

Question 18:

Are there any further measures that you believe could be taken to reduce effects at on landscape and natural character at the potential relocation sites?

Question 19:

What are your thoughts on the potential water quality effects at the potential relocation sites?

Question 20:

Are there ways in which the potential relocation sites should be developed to help avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on water quality?

Question 21:

Are there other effects on water quality that you would like us to be aware of?

Question 22:

What further information would you suggest the Minister for Primary Industries collects on water quality effects in relation to the Tio Point site?

Question 23:

What are your thoughts on the seabed effects at the potential sites?

Question 24:

Are there ways to develop the potential sites to help avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the seabed at each site?

Question 25:

Are there other seabed values or effects that you would like the Minister for Primary Industries to be aware of?

Question 26:

Are there effects on pelagic fish that you would like the Minister for Primary Industries to aware of?

Question 27:

Are there effects on seabirds that you would like the Minister for Primary Industries to be aware of?

Question 28:

Do any of the sites pose a greater risk to seabirds than other sites?

Question 29:

Are there marine mammals in the Marlborough Sounds that you think may be particularly impacted by this proposal?

Question 30:

Do any of the potential sites pose a greater risk to marine mammals than other sites?

Question 31:

Do you agree that there should be an independently audited Biosecurity Management Plan for salmon farming?

Question 32:

What are your thoughts on the potential improvement in salmon health from the proposal? What about salmon welfare and husbandry?

Question 33:

Are there particular navigational effects at any of the potential relocation sites that the Minister for Primary Industries should be aware of?

Question 34:

What is your view on the Waitata Mid-Channel site from a navigational perspective, and the possibility of cruise ships or large superyachts using the area?

Question 35:

Are there particular tourism and recreation values that you would like the Minister for Primary Industries to be aware of at any of the potential sites?

Question 36:

What measures could be taken to remedy or mitigate effects on tourism and recreation values if salmon farms were relocated to these sites?

Question 37:

Are there other heritage values that the Minister for Primary Industries should be aware of?

Question 38:

Are there any other measures that should be taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate noise effects at any of the potential sites?

Question 39:

Are there any other matters in relation to underwater lighting that you think the Minister for Primary Industries should be aware of?

Question 40:

Social and community effects of the potential relocation proposal are wider than just residential amenity. What effects do you think there will be as a result of the potential relocation proposal?

