From: Kathy O"Hara
To: Tasmanian Salmon Study Secretariat
Subject: Draft engagement plan.
Date: Friday, 5 June 2026 11:41:44 AM

Dear Salmonstudy team,

Congratulations on the publication of a comprensively thought out draft study engagement plan.

On the face of it, it appears to emphase transparency and to give equal weight to both sides of argument - let's face it - there are definitely "sides".

However, repeating readings have raised the following concerns:-

What is rationale for withholding public feedback on the draft study plan, as mentioned on page 9, Section 5?

If your claims of transparency are to be supported, withholding initial public imput undermines the veracity of this claim

It is also concerning to see the subtle positive spin on commercial salmon activities embedded in this document.
Words like "benefit" applied to commercial salmon activities, but no mention of "benefit" from withdrawal of/reduction of water-based finfish farming.

The document implies that the actual salmon industry contributes scientific research benefits to the environment- page 8, topic 8)

There's no mention that there'll be research into the well-documented impacts of industrial noise on coastal communities in this document.

Repeated readings of this 15 page document document does not mention the word "noise".

Not once.

To ensure confidence in the truly independent nature of this study (we have been hoodwinked by so-called "independant" reports weighted toward the needs of JBS, Cooke and Petuna, in the past) you will need to reconsider some of your wording.

Also, for the everyday respondent, please SIMPLIFY your vernacular!
The lists and charts are good:- nice and concise, but the preamble has too many

clumsy paragraphs on confidentiality etc.
One or two clear sentences will convey all that's needed, and allow respondents to focus on the "meat and potatoes" of the subject matter.

Kind regards

Kathy O'Hara

Sent from Outlook for Android