Deliberations of the Scientific Advisory Group (SAG)

Doug Bright, Ph.D., Professor-Applied Research, RRU

Asit Mazumder, Ph.D., Professor, and NSERC Senior Research Chair in Environmental Management of Drinking Water, Ecosystems, and Watersheds, UVic

Scott McKinley, Ph.D., Professor, NSERC Research Chair (Biotelemetry) and Canada Research Chair (Aquaculture and the Environment), UBC

Tom Pedersen, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences, and Associate Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies, UBC

Critically Important Issues Not Addressed Under the Draft Regulation

- CUMULATIVE EFFECTS NOT ADDRESSED Within Framework: Waste Management Act as Enabling Legislation is Best Suited to Managing Individual Operations
- MAXIMUM LOADING Based on Assimilative Capacity (Need to manage in consideration of all coastal inputs, not just aquaculture)
- Need Formal, Effective Mechanism to Fix Several Important KNOWLEDGE GAPS



Norwegian situation

New fish farms:

model predicts degree of exploitation versus impact.

Operational farms: monitoring performed

Apply Env. Quality Stds. which discriminate levels of impact

Monitoring Level of Effort commensurate with degree of expoitation and expected impact.

Focus is on biological monitoring, not chemical surrogates

So what about sulphides ??

- Measuring sulfide in top 2 cm of sediment tells us nothing about what is happening in ecologically important surface sediment depths
- Steep concentration gradients in sulphides near surface lead to high variability in measured concentrations

- Link between sulphide and ecological impairment is tenuous – there is definitely a relationship but it is highly variable across sites
- Finding consensus on generic sulphide threshold for protection will not be possible

Relationship between benthic community impairment and sediment sulfide levels (adapted from Brooks, 2001).

Open symbols are data for reference sites (≥ 300 m)



Sulphide level associated with a 50% species reduction – 30 m from net pen

_	Low	Medium	High
	Salinity	Salinity	Salinity
Fine Grained	65 uM	190 uM	350 uM
Medium Grained	260 uM	720 uM	1300 uM
Coarse	730 uM	2100	3900
Grained		uM	uM

• Mean sulfide concentrations shall be significantly $\leq 6000 \ \mu M$ at 30 metres outside of the Direct Impact Zone (statistical test: one-sided *t-test*, $\alpha = 0.05$).

Supporting Comments

Sulfide levels below this level generally support a <u>high level</u> of <u>biodiversity</u> & sediment impacts that may occur remediate very quickly. A sulfide level of 6,000 μ M is considered the transition to an anaerobic environmental condition (Wildish, 2001).

BCSFA, Oct. 2001

What Wildish et al. (2001) actually said:

"In the present study we identified organic enrichment impacts of the order of tens of meters. This is consistent with a severe effect near the centre of the steel cage array, which persisted with negative redox and sulfide > 6000 uM, for \sim 12 mo after cessation of salmon feeding."

Other things we've heard during deliberations

- Siting will be most important aspect that limits environmental effects
- ...but there aren't enough higher current sites, so there is a real possibility of expanding in finegrained, more sheltered areas
- Net-pen productivity levels have not been managed in the past in consideration of the capacity of the receiving environment

Other things we've heard during deliberations

 Sediments under or adjacent to all net pens will exceed 6,000, and even 10,000 uM sulfide at peak production

Lack of info. has resulted in technical debate about this claim

What matters more is that sediments recover rapidly

the available scientific information does not support claims

Critical Issues

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS NOT ADDRESSED

 MAXIMUM LOADING APPROACH NEEDED, considering all coastal activities

KNOWLEDGE GAPS

