From:	Paula Sheppy
To:	Tasmanian Salmon Study Secretariat
Subject:	Salmon Industry Study Submission
Date:	Wednesday, 24 June 2026 1:18:45 PM
Attachments:	Salmon Industry Study - Submission - Paula Sheppy.pdf

---

Dear Dr Craik & Dr Reichelt

Please find attached my submission in response to the draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Study Plan for the Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry.

I am a long-term resident of Surveyors Bay, in the Huon Valley, and wanted to ensure that the lived experience of residents living alongside salmon farming operations is reflected in the study's scope before the consultation period closes.

I am happy to be contacted if further detail or clarification would be useful as the study progresses.

Kind regards

Paula Sheppy
Dover, Tasmania

Submission to the Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry

Draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Draft Study Plan

To the Joint Study Leads: Dr Wendy Craik AM and Dr Russell Reichelt AO

From: Paula Sheppy, resident, Big Roaring Beach, Surveyors, Huon Valley, Tasmania

I am writing as a private resident to provide feedback on the draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan and Study Plan, in advance of the 5 July 2026 closing date. I have lived on a rural property at Big Roaring Beach near Dover for 20 years, within sight and sound of salmon farming operations, and I want to ensure that the lived experience of residents in directly affected communities is explicitly captured within the study's scope, not just gathered as anecdote.

I want to be clear that I am not opposed to the salmon industry. It has a legitimate place in Tasmania and good reasons to exist. My concern is that its scale, regulation and oversight have not kept pace with its growth, and that the study should treat this as a question of sustainability and accountability rather than simply industry benefit versus community cost.

Light pollution from cleaning vessels

The main source of night-time light pollution affecting my property is the cleaning ships that service the pens. These vessels berth at nearby pens overnight, and their lighting is bright enough to illuminate bedrooms within homes overlooking the water, disrupting sleep and altering what was previously a dark, quiet waterway at night. This is a direct amenity and wellbeing impact that I would like to see considered under Topic #6 (social and cultural benefits and costs to the Tasmanian community, including effect on infrastructure and amenity).

Visual dominance of salmon pens on the horizon

The scale of the industry has changed markedly in the past approximately 15 years. Prior to that, operations were smaller and more boutique in character, and I had no objection to the industry or the pens themselves. The increase in the number of vessels and pens since then has changed the character of this landscape substantially. What was once an open water view is now, in many directions, a working industrial seascape, and the industry's footprint now feels out of proportion to its surroundings. This is a legitimate amenity and

sense of place impact, and I would ask that the study's assessment of social and cultural costs under Topic #6 explicitly include visual and landscape impact on residents, not only economic and employment benefits.

Decline in marine wildlife and changed relationship with local waters

Over the same 10 to 15 year period, I have observed a marked decline in the marine wildlife I would once routinely see in local waters. Alongside this, shark sightings in the area have become more frequent, to the point that I and others I know now feel real anxiety about swimming in waters we previously used without concern. I do not have the scientific standing to assert a causal link between these observations and salmon farming operations, but I believe the pattern itself, declining wildlife sightings alongside changed shark activity, is exactly the kind of community-observed evidence the study should be testing against the scientific record. I would ask that this be considered under Topic #2 (environmental values, impacts and benefits) and Topic #3 (ecosystem health and wildlife impacts), and that residents with long-term, place-based observation of these waters be recognised as a source of evidence under the "regional and coastal communities" stakeholder group, alongside recreational fishers and other marine users already identified in the Stakeholder Register.

Regulation, oversight and financial contribution

I understand the industry is currently substantially self-regulating. Given the scale it has reached and the impacts described above, I believe this is no longer adequate. I would ask the study, under Topic #4 (examination of Tasmanian salmon industry regulation, compared internationally) and Topic #9 (benchmarking against global best practice), to specifically assess whether independent, third-party oversight, rather than industry self-monitoring, is needed for environmental and amenity compliance. I would also ask the study to consider whether the industry's financial contribution to the state is proportionate to its impact, and whether a model closer to that applied to the mining industry, with a higher level of taxation or royalty directed toward environmental remediation and community impact, would be appropriate here.

Request

I would welcome the opportunity to contribute further observations, including approximate dates, locations and patterns of change, as the study progresses, and I support the inclusion of a community submission process or local meeting in the Huon and Channel region as part of Phase 1 engagement.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft plans.

Paula Sheppy
Dover, Tasmania