From: Trish Baily
To: Tasmanian Salmon Study Secretariat
Subject: Submission from T Baily
Date: Wednesday, 1 July 2026 12:50:57 PM
Attachments: T Baily to Draft Salmon Plan.docx

Please find attached my submission to the Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry Draft Study Plan and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Submitted by: Trish Baily,

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

INDEPENDENT STUDY OF THE TASMANIAN SALMON INDUSTRY DRAFT STUDY PLAN AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

1 July 2026

Submission from Trish Baily, resident, Tasman Peninsula

I am a retiree and a passionate advocate for the environmental sustainability of Tasmania's unique island ecosystem. I have lived and worked in and on the ocean for most of my life and have a deep understanding of marine ecosystems. I have observed firsthand the destruction of wild fisheries resources by overfishing, both in Tasmania and in the Atlantic Ocean.

I fully support the submissions made by affiliate members of the Tasmanian Alliance for Marine Protection Inc (TAMP).

I find the draft Study Plan complex and covering an unusually broad range of topics. It is disturbing that the Study Plan, while labelled "independent," remains funded and controlled by government. It is hard to imagine how yet another government-funded review will achieve any positive outcome when the recommendations of prior reviews have not been implemented.

Perhaps the key action of this Study Plan should be to ensure that the recommendations and actions embedded in the Salmon Industry Plan (2023) and the Legislative Council Inquiry (2022) are actually implemented. That the EPA is made truly independent, and no longer tethered to ministerial direction.

With reference to the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP), I ask that the public be recognised as the major stakeholder in this process and given genuine, not token, representation. The salmon industry operates in public waters, and as such must recognise the public's right to clean water in order to maintain its social licence to operate.

A specific and positive action the Study should commit to is a robust, independent Ecosystem Services Analysis of the waters used by the salmon industry, built around a genuine cost-benefit analysis rather than a one-sided economic-impact statement. To date, public discussion of the industry's value has relied almost entirely on figures the industry itself supplies. A proper Ecosystems Services Analysis would place a comparable dollar value on what is lost.

At a minimum, the analysis should assess and, where possible, place a dollar value on:
- water quality and nutrient loading impacts on surrounding ecosystems;
- effects on native wild fish and shellfish stocks and broader ecosystem biodiversity
- the amenity, recreational, and tourism value of clean coastal waters

- the cultural and social value the community places on healthy waterways.
-local government and EPA remediation and monitoring costs, lost income to wild fisheries and tourism operators
- the mental health and wellbeing cost to residents living with visible waterway degradation, including stress and anxiety associated with loss of amenity, ongoing uncertainty over water quality, and the erosion of a way of life built around the coast

Each of these costs should then be set directly against the industry's claimed economic benefit, the subsidies, infrastructure, and regulatory support it currently receives, so that the analysis can present a genuine net-benefit figure to the Tasmanian public.
Without this kind of analysis, decisions about the industry's future will continue to be made on economic grounds alone, while the environmental and social costs are treated as unquantified and effectively invisible.

I remain deeply concerned at the acceleration in the deterioration of our waterways, to which the salmon industry has contributed. I trust that you will take my comments and concerns seriously, and that they will be reflected in the outcomes and decisions of this Study as it moves forward.

Trish Baily
[redacted]