From:	Ruth Howard
To:	Tasmanian Salmon Study Secretariat
Subject:	Public Feedback on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan for the Salmon Industry
Date:	Thursday, 2 July 2026 8:16:07 AM
Attachments:	Public submission feedback on Salmon Aquaculture industry scope of Tasmania.docx

Hello, please accept my public submission concerning Topics #1, #3 and #5, concerning the scope of the investigation into the sustainability of the salmon aquaculture industry. Given more time, I'd give more feedback on the public health concerns. I will do that in the next public submission stage, thank you. Warm regards, Ruth Howard

Public Feedback on Stakeholder Engagement Plan Independent Study of the Tasmanian Salmon Industry

Public submission feedback on the scope of Tasmania's regulatory framework on the salmon aquaculture industry in determining the effectiveness of its sustainability, including protection of Tasmania's and Antarctic wildlife biodiversity and marine and freshwater ecosystems, including examining monitoring, compliance, penalties, biosecurity, animal welfare and environmental performance standards.

I am a concerned citizen and mother, a former chef, hospitality and tourism entrepreneur and currently a food technology educator, concerned for consumer public health protections in the food and tourism industries, including the preservation of protected plant and animal species in Tasmania and the Antarctic.

I wish to address the compromisingly narrow scope of Topic #1: Overview of the global salmon industry – the big picture for Australia, Norway, Chile, Scotland, Canada, New Zealand. Contributions to global and local demand for protein. Role in food security.

Firstly, in order to justify public expenditure on this study and satisfy the Government's own sustainability criteria, Topic #1 must also address the salmon aquaculture industry's role in accelerating food insecurity. Topic #1 currently has a blatant built-in bias toward the salmon aquaculture industry that greenwashes by using the marketing term "food security", obfuscating the industry's lack of sustainability in our food chain, which exposes the public to food insecurity as a direct result of salmon farming practices. Would anyone think this marketing speech was deliberately placed knowingly to counter all perceptions otherwise? For example, farmed salmon is depriving approx. 4 million people in North West Africa, Gambia, Senegal, and Mauritania who are struggling to meet their nutritional needs. This is a dire food insecurity as a direct result of salmon aquaculture! https://foodservicefootprint.com/farmed-salmon-driving-food-insecurity/

"Highlighting the hypocrisy of global aquaculture corporations, who claim to be helping feed a growing world population while taking precious resources from the Global South for export to high-income markets.

To be sustainable and promote food security, the salmon aquaculture farming industry must end the use of whole caught wild fish in feed. Yet here we are planning to feed this farmed salmon upon our wild sardine schools. This is an unsustainable plan by the Tasmanian Government and fin fish aquaculture farmers, which can lead to overfishing of our precious forage fish. Sardines are considered a lynchpin in the marine food chain. Tasmanian recreational anglers worry that depleting sardine numbers will negatively impact dependent seabirds, whales, dolphins, and seals, leading to ecosystem collapse. In addition, anglers are wary that intensive commercial extraction, even if deemed sustainable at an aggregate level, will rapidly strip out baitfish from specific, heavily fished local reef areas where recreational

anglers operate. Industrial netting operations inherently risk high bycatch of non-target, threatened, or protected marine species. All ecosystem collapses endanger human food security as accelerated biodiversity loss leaves less food to be caught or foraged from our waterways.

- Topic #1 must include the scope how do Tasmanians ensure global salmon fin fish aquaculture corporations do not overfish yet again in our waters?
- Topic #1 must include the scope to address the unsustainable local and global impacts of these global fin fish aquaculture corporations upon food insecurity.

Topic #3 Health impacts of salmon farming, including: public health, ecosystem health, wildlife impacts and salmon health.

Topic #3 requires a full investigation into how there are fin fish aquaculture hatcheries stationed in a cluster in New Norfolk at the mouth of Hobart and other residents' drinking water catchment areas? (Specifically Huon Aquaculture's Meadowbank facility on the Derwent River). Why was there no public consultation beforehand? Why is our EPA not protecting the public? What investigation into the public health risks of the inoculations of the hatcheries?

- Topic #3 must include the scope of how the public drinking water catchment is at risk from salmon hatcheries. There is no real-time notification framework**:** A parliamentary and public investigation revealed that Huon Aquaculture used the antibiotic *oxytetracycline* for 20 days during a disease outbreak, without legally needing to notify the public. The lack of a real-time disclosure framework for freshwater hatcheries drew heavy criticism from parliamentarians and downstream communities.

Topic #5 The direct and indirect contribution of the salmon industry to the Tasmanian economy, including regional economies, employment opportunities and career pathways, and the industry’s role in developing skills and knowledge.

- Topic #5 scope is also biased and does not include a true account of the intrusions of this industry on Tasmania’s actually sustainable food sources and produce and our wildlife tourism and recreational fishing. Where are the studies, please to divine how these industries are impacted by the violent, unsustainable malpractices in salmon fin fish aquaculture that encroach upon our protected species (Antarctic krill, native seals, red hand fish, maugean skate and other angler marine fish and shellfish species) and marine ecosystems. Why are these industries unprotected and at risk?
- In addition, Topic #5 scope should investigate the current self-regulation of this industry that makes a mockery of consumer seafood certification. The Aquaculture Stewardship Certification does not declare the true lack of sustainability that farmed salmon exposes the public to. It is a confusing consumer label. I suggest revoking this greenwashing seafood sustainability label now.

Ruth Howard New Town Hobart TAS

[redacted]

[redacted]