



Summary Results 2004 and 2005 Joint Annual Report on Finfish Inspections

Information for Media Session with Honourable Pat Bell Minister of Agriculture and Lands

1:00 pm

August 3, 2006





Fish Health Audit and Surveillance Program - MAL

- The Fish Health Audit and Surveillance program is separate from the Compliance and Monitoring Program and operates as part of the Ministry's Animal Health Branch.
- This program has been in place since 2003. The Sea Lice Audit Program began in 2004.
- The Ministry is in the final stages of preparation of a comprehensive review of the results of the Fish Health and Sea Lice Audit Program that will be available by the end of September and will be provided in a separate public report.
- The report includes the diseases found on salmon farms as identified through the Ministry audit, an evaluation and comparison of the Ministry's findings to the information on disease reported publicly by the industry since 2003 and a review of the findings of the sea lice audit again compared to the industry information that has been posted monthly on the Ministry's website since 2003.





Finfish Site Visits

- On average, each finfish facility is visited 3 to 4 times per year by various provincial and federal government agencies, which may include:
 - Fish Health Technicians, MAL
 - MAL inspectors or biologist staff
 - Worker's Compensation Board
 - Department of Fisheries and Oceans
 - Ministry of Environment
- MAL Fisheries Inspectors conduct on site visits during:
 - annual inspections;
 - follow up visits as necessary;
 - during an investigation of an escape report or possible escape event;
 - and any other relevant issues relating to our compliance and monitoring program.





2004 & 2005 Inspection Cycle

- Second and third year of inspections under the joint agency Service Agreement between MAL and MOE
- Number of active salmon farms inspected for 2004 –
 77 and for 2005 75 farms
- Approximately 100 compliance points are assessed per inspection
- Company specific non-compliance results are made public and are included in the published report (at Appendix 8)
- Generally overall inspection results for 2004 and, in particular, 2005, indicate high levels of compliance







Comparison of Selected MAL Compliance Rates – Some examples, from 2002 through 2005

Area	2002	2003	2004	2005
Biomass	75%	86%	88%	96%
Tie off points	87%	92%	96%	97%
Boat docking signage	75%	81%	86%	99%

Comparison of Selected MOE Compliance Rates – Some examples, from 2003 through 2005

Area	2003	2004	2005
Overall domestic sewage requirements by site	70%	84%	91%
Water use licensing	67%	97%	94%
Proper storage of fuels	84%	91%	100%





Some Examples - Areas of 100% compliance for 2004 - MAL

- 77 of 77 sites had approved species on site
- 77 of 77 sites had stock inventory records kept for each finfish facility
- 77 of 77 sites had nets properly tagged
- 77 of 77 sites had a current licence

Some Examples - Areas of 100% compliance for 2005 - MAL

- 75 of 75 sites had approved species on site
- 75 of 75 sites had developed a Best Management Practices plan for their site
- 75 of 75 sites had written escape response plans on site
- 75 of 75 sites had designated areas to dock boats
- 75 of 75 sites had nets properly tagged
- 75 of 75 sites had a current licence
- 75 of 75 sites had stock inventory records kept for each finfish facility





Some Examples - Areas of 100% compliance for 2004 - MOE

- 77 of 77 sites properly disposed of bloodwater
- 77 of 77 sites had morts properly stored
- 77 of 77 sites had proper containment of waste generated from net cleaning

Some Examples - Areas of 100% compliance for 2005 - MOE

- 75 of 75 sites disposed of their blood water properly
- 75 of 75 sites had proper containment of waste generated from net cleaning activities
- 75 of 75 sites properly disposed of refuse
- 75 of 75 sites had sewage facilities on sites that met necessary requirements
- 75 of 75 sites properly stored fuels





Areas of lowest compliance for MAL related issues include:

- Management plan maximum throughput production or biomass requirements at 88% in 2004 and improving to 96% in 2005.
- Best management plan requirements, employee signing off the "understanding statement" at 84% in 2004 improving to 93% in 2005.
- The operator providing the licence number and or holders name in the therapeutics and record keeping requirements. At 80% in 2004 and improving to 97% in 2005.
- Anchor inspection requirements at 73% in 2004 and improving to 100% in 2005.
- The lowest compliance issues identified in 2005 for MAL requirements was meeting the record keeping requirements for out-of-water net servicing at 93% and the requirement for employees to sign the "understanding statement" for the BMP, again at 93%.

Areas of lowest compliance for MOE related issues include:

- Operators to keep proper sewage treatment records at 81% in 2004 and improving to 91% in 2005.
- Operators to keep a list of harmful materials at 84% in 2004 improving to 99% in 2005.
- The single lowest compliance issue identified in 2005 for MOE requirements was the requirement to maintain proper sewage maintenance records at 91%.





2004 and 2005 Investigations

- Enforcement Actions 2004, Marine Finfish Aquaculture
 - 16 site compliance reports left at farm sites where non-compliance issues were noted.
 - 11 referrals to MOE, 7 investigations initiated as a result of these referrals.
 - The Conservation Officer Service in the Ministry of Environment conducted 7 investigations as a result of these referrals. Five of the investigations resulted in charges being laid (4 for fish escapes and 1 for introduction of waste into the environment).
 - Two of the cases resulted in guilty pleas; the other 3 files are presently before the courts.
 The remaining 2 investigations related to the introduction of waste to the environment resulted in warnings.
- Enforcement Actions 2005, Marine Finfish Aquaculture
 - 19 site compliance reports left at farm sites where non-compliance issues were noted.
 - 7 referrals to partner agencies including DFO, ILMB and MOE, 2 of these to MOE.
 - The Conservation Officer Service in the Ministry of Environment had 2 incidents referred from MAL for investigation. One investigation involved the introduction of waste; the other related to unlicensed use of water.
 - There were 11 occurrences involving actual fish escapes, none of the reported escape incidents were considered significant enough to warrant formal referral to MOE.





Non-Compliance Enforcement Sanctions for 2004 and 2005

Licence Holder	Act or Regulation	Date	Action	Fine
Connors Bros. Ltd. (Heritage)	Environmental Management Act Section 6 – Introduction of Business Waste	2004-02-11	Violation Ticket	\$575
Stolt Sea Farm Inc.	Fisheries Act - Section 25 (2) – Failure to comply with a condition of licence	2004-08-19	Warning Ticket	
Target Marine Products Ltd.	Fisheries Aquaculture Regulation - Section 4 (1) (a) – Failure to report escape within 24 hours	2004-08-25	Violation Ticket	\$173
Pan Fish Canada Ltd.	Environmental Management Act - Section 6 – Introduction of Business Waste into Marine Environment	2005-02-16	Court	\$10,001
Stolt Sea Farms Inc.	Fisheries Aquaculture Regulation - Section 3 (2) – Failure to take reasonable precautions to prevent an escape	2005-02-23	Court	\$500





Fish Escapes, 2004

- 35 incidents of escapes or suspected escapes reported to the ministry. Inspectors determined that escapes occurred at 21 of the 35 reported incidents.
- The number of escapes reported by industry was 43,985 pieces. This includes 43,969 Atlantic Salmon, 5 Chinook and 11 Coho. Of the 43,985 pieces, four of these were deemed significant events.
- These four events were referred to COS for further investigation:
 - 500 smolts from a hatchery \$500.00 fine;
 - an escape of 2,587 still under investigation;
 - an escape of 33,245 still under investigation; and
 - an escape of 6,500 operator charged and results are pending.







Fish Escapes, 2005

- 35 incidents of escapes or suspected escapes reported to the ministry. Inspectors determined that escapes occurred at 11 of the 35 reported incidents.
- The total number of escapes reported by industry was 64 pieces. This includes 21 Atlantic Salmon, 2 Chinook and 41 Coho.
- No referrals on 2005 escapes were made to other agencies by MAL as investigations concluded referral to MOE was not required.







Finfish Aquaculture Waste Control Regulation

In September of 2002, the Finfish Aquaculture Waste Control Regulation (FAWCR), administered by MOE, came into effect, replacing the Aquaculture Waste Control Regulation.

The FAWCR requires:

- Operating farm sites to be registered with MOE prior to stocking a facility
- That farm operators are required to implement a Best Management Practices plan that:
 - requires the management of potentially harmful materials;
 - promotes the reduction of the discharge of wastes and pollutants;
 - prevents the attraction of wildlife to feed, foodstuffs and mortalities; and
 - requires the collection and disposal of mortalities in a manner to prevent spillage to the environment and minimize odours during storage and transportation.





Finfish Aquaculture Waste Control Regulation (continued)

The FAWCR also has provisions requiring environmental monitoring of sediments and reporting of monitoring results at farm sites:

- It establishes chemical and biological standards for sediments.
- It defines when farms can be restocked based on specific sediment conditions.
- Where chemical standards are exceeded, biological samples for marine benthic organisms are collected for compliance purposes.
- For the occasional exceedance the farm is required to be fallowed until recovery is demonstrated.

Inspection Results

- During 2004 and 2005, MOE conducted chemical and biological sampling of bottom sediments at selected farm sites as described in page 81 of the report.
- There is excellent compliance levels with the environmental standard closest to the farm pens as provided in the FAWCR of between 97 and 100%.





Enhancements to C&E Program 2004 and 2005

- Staff at MAL, MOE, DFO, CFIA continued to refine and enhance working relationships and communication efforts between agencies. A multi agency workshop was held to discuss common issues and concerns.
- Expanded regional contacts through enhanced cross compliance efforts with other agencies, most
 notably the Department of Fisheries and Oceans by conducting joint inspections, investigations and
 broadened communication efforts.
- All MAL Inspectors received enhanced on the job training that included GIS mapping and navigation.
- A comprehensive electronic database was created where inspectors now enter all inspection information and incident reports.
- A new all weather vessel was added to the fleet to improve year around access to marine sites.
- Development of policy material as highlighted in report.
- Ongoing cross briefings with MAL and MOE inspection officials.
- Branch staff at MAL are in the process of hiring an Administrative Compliance Clerk to assist Inspectors in their functions.





2006 Inspection Cycle



- Continued inspections of all active finfish sites for 2006 inspection cycle – underway
- MAL will continue to act as first responder to all incidents, such as escapes
- Ongoing discussions and enhancements with partner agencies such as MOE and DFO to continue to streamlining efforts, maximizing efficiencies and clarifying roles and action items
- Continued refinement of database systems
- Dive Audit Program renewed funding and a plan for 10 random audits at marine farm sites in 2006





Conclusion

- In summary overall inspection results for both 2004 and 2005 cycles indicate very high levels of compliance.
- Compliance and Enforcement staff at MAL and MOE continue to address noncompliance issues on an ongoing basis to ensure industry is meeting government requirements.
- Officials will continue to seek enhancements to the Compliance and Enforcement finfish aquaculture program.

