

DRAFT

Environmental Impact Statement

**Proposed Barramundi Fish Farm at Snake Bay  
Melville Island, Northern Territory**



Prepared by  
Enesar Consulting Pty Ltd

for  
MARINE HARVEST

May 2006  
(Report No. HO02072/02-Snake Bay EIS-version 1)

DRAFT

Environmental Impact Statement

**Proposed Barramundi Fish Farm at Snake Bay  
Melville Island, Northern Territory**



Prepared by  
Enesar Consulting Pty Ltd

for  
MARINE HARVEST

May 2006

(Report No. HO02072/02-Snake Bay EIS-version 1)

---

**Contents**

Contents	i
Foreword	1
1 Executive Summary	2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Objectives of the EIS	2
1.3 Description of Proposal	2
1.4 Objectives of the Proposal	3
1.5 Location	3
1.6 Schedule	3
1.7 Layout and Infrastructure	4
1.8 Preferred Design Criteria for the Facility	4
1.9 Services and Support	6
1.9.1 Transport	6
1.9.2 Staffing	6
1.9.3 Power, Potable Water and Storage	6
1.10 Farm Operation	6
1.10.1 Emissions from the Operation	7
1.10.2 Chemicals	8
1.10.3 Ongoing Management, Maintenance and Administrative Requirements	8
1.11 Decommissioning and Rehabilitation	8
1.12 Legislative Requirements	8
1.13 Alternatives	9
1.14 Existing Environment	10
1.15 Physical and Biological Environment	11

i

1.16	Snake Bay Baseline Investigation	12
1.17	Port Hurd Pilot Farm Environmental Monitoring Results	13
1.18	Paspaley Pearls Oyster Studies	13
1.19	Risk Assessments	14
1.20	Environmental Management	19
1.21	Public Involvement and Consultation	23
2	Introduction	25
2.1	Background	25
2.2	Objectives and Scope of this Report	25
3	Description of the Proposal	26
3.1	Overview	26
3.2	Objectives, Benefits and Justification for the Project	26
	3.2.1 Background	26
	3.2.2 Objectives	28
	3.2.3 Benefits and Justification	28
3.3	Location of the Project	29
3.4	Project Schedule	31
3.5	Layout and Infrastructure	31
	3.5.1 Infrastructure	31
	3.5.1.1 Temporary Shore-Based Facility	31
	3.5.1.2 Long Term Barge-Based Facility	32
3.6	Preferred Design Criteria for the Facility	34
	3.6.1 Aims of the Design	34
	3.6.2 Site Limiting Factors	34
	3.6.3 Fish Net Design Criteria	35
	3.6.4 Barge Design Criteria	35
	3.6.5 Mooring Design Criteria	36
3.7	Services and Support	37
	3.7.1 Transport and Boat Movements	37
	3.7.2 Staffing and Servicing Requirements	38
	3.7.3 Barge Facilities	39
	3.7.4 Power, Potable Water Supply and Storage	39
3.8	Farm Operation	40
	3.8.1 Fish Cultivation	40
	3.8.2 Feeding	41
	3.8.3 Pens Inspections and Cleaning	42
	3.8.4 Grading and Counting	42
	3.8.5 Growth and Harvesting	43
	3.8.6 Steel Nets Construction	43
	3.8.7 Ensiler and Domestic Waste Disposal	43
	3.8.8 Emissions	44
	3.8.9 Chemicals	46
	3.8.9.1 Diesel and Fuels	46
	3.8.9.2 Solvents and Cleaners	46

	3.8.9.3	Chemicals, Fuels and Hazardous Materials Register	46
	3.8.10	Ongoing Management, Maintenance and Administrative Requirements	49
3.9		Decommissioning and Rehabilitation	49
3.10		Legislative Requirements	50
	3.10.1	Lease Requirements	50
	3.10.2	Native Title	50
	3.10.3	Compliance with Applicable Standards	51
4		Alternatives	52
	4.1	Not Proceeding with the Proposal	52
	4.2	Alternative Locations or Layout for the Whole Proposal	52
	4.3	Alternatives for Components of the Proposal	53
	4.3.1	Steel Nets	53
	4.3.2	Mooring Devices	53
	4.3.3	Operational Facilities	53
	4.4	Alternative Environmental Management Techniques	54
5		Existing Environment	55
	5.1	Regional Setting	55
	5.1.1	Climatic Zones	55
	5.1.2	Catchment Terrain Type	55
	5.1.3	Marine and Coastal Form and Habitat Structure	55
	5.1.4	Regional Population Centres	56
	5.1.5	Land and Water Use	56
	5.1.6	Land and Water Sensitivities	57
	5.1.7	Aboriginal Relationships to the Land and Cultural Values	58
	5.1.8	Feedback from Consultation with Local Tiwi People	59
	5.2	Physical and Biological Environment	59
	5.2.1	Existing Environment	59
	5.2.1.1	Climatic Factors	60
	5.2.1.2	Hydrology and Water Quality	61
	5.2.1.3	Bathymetry	61
	5.2.1.4	Existing Coastal and Marine Flora Species	61
	5.2.1.5	Existing Coastal and Marine Fauna Species	63
	5.2.2	Turtles and Dugongs	65
	5.2.3	Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity	66
	5.3	Snake Bay Baseline Investigation	66
	5.3.1	Investigation	66
	5.3.2	Findings	67
	5.3.3	Conclusions	69
6		Potential Impacts from Fin-fish Aquaculture	70

6.1	Potential Impacts from Construction of the Farm	70
6.2	Potential Impacts of Escaped Fish	70
6.3	Potential Impacts from Fish Faeces and Nutrient Loads	70
6.4	Potential Impacts from Excess Feed and Feed Quality	71
6.5	Potential Impacts from Fish Feeding on Naturally-Occurring Food – Removal of Food from the Food Chain	71
6.6	Potential Impacts from Fish Aggregation	71
6.7	Potential Impacts from the Introduction of Diseases and Parasites and the Treatment of Fish using Introduced Chemicals	71
6.8	Potential Impacts from Waste Generation and Hazardous Materials	72
6.9	Potential Impacts from the Loss of Nets	73
6.10	Potential Impacts to Hydrodynamics	73
6.11	Potential Impacts on and from Predators	73
6.12	Potential Impacts on Flora	74
6.13	Potential Impacts on Bird, Reptile, Fish and Mammal Habitats	74
6.14	Potential Impacts on EPBC Act-listed Threatened and Migratory Species	74
6.15	Potential Impacts from Disturbance to Land Surface	75
6.16	Potential Impacts to Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity	75
6.17	Potential Impacts on Social and Recreational Values	76
6.18	Potential Impacts on Local Infrastructure	77
6.19	Potential Impacts on Archaeological, Historical, Cultural and Aboriginal Sites	77
6.20	Potential Impacts on Marine Traffic	77
6.21	Potential Impacts on Staff of Pest Insects	77
6.22	Potential Impacts from the Farm on Personnel Emergencies	78
6.23	Potential Impacts on the Barramundi Market	78
6.24	Unknown, Unpredictable or Irreversible Impacts	78
7	Assessment of Impacts from the Port Hurd Pilot Farm	79
7.1	Port Hurd Environmental Monitoring Results	79
7.1.1	Port Hurd Investigations	79
7.1.2	Findings	80
7.1.2.1	Gullala Inlet Control Site	80
7.1.3	Implications and Recommendations	82
7.2	Comparison of Snake Bay versus Port Hurd Operations	82
7.3	Paspaley Pearls Oyster Studies	84
8	Discussion of Potential Impacts and Risk Assessment	85
8.1	Construction	87
8.1.1	Risk Assessment	87
8.2	Escaped Fish	87
8.2.1	Interbreeding	87
8.2.2	Disease and Parasite Transfer	88

8.2.3	Competition with Wild Populations and Increased Predation	88
8.2.4	Risk Assessment	88
8.3	Fish Faeces and Nutrient Loads	88
8.3.1	Risk Assessment	90
8.4	Excess Feed and Feed Quality	90
8.4.1	Risk Assessment	90
8.5	Removal of Fish from the Food Chain	91
8.6	Fish Aggregation	92
8.6.1	Risk Assessment	92
8.7	Introduction of Diseases and Parasites	92
8.7.1	Risk Assessment	93
8.8	Introduction of Chemicals from Treatment of Fish Parasites or Diseases	94
8.8.1	Risk Assessment	94
8.9	Waste Generation and Hazardous Materials	95
8.9.1	Risk Assessment	95
8.10	Loss of Nets	95
8.10.1	Risk Assessment	96
8.11	Hydrodynamics	96
8.11.1	Risk Assessment	96
8.12	Predators	97
8.12.1	Risk Assessment	97
8.13	Flora	97
8.13.1	Risk Assessment	97
8.14	Bird, Reptile, Fish and Mammal Habitats	98
8.14.1	Risk Assessment	99
8.15	EPBC Act-listed Threatened and Migratory Species	99
8.15.1	Risk Assessment	99
8.16	Land Surface	101
8.16.1	Risk Assessment	101
8.17	Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity	101
8.17.1	Greenhouse Gases	101
8.17.2	Risk Assessment	102
8.18	Social and Recreational	102
8.18.1	Risk Assessment	103
8.19	Local Infrastructure	103
8.19.1	Risk Assessment	103
8.20	Archaeological, Historical, Cultural and Aboriginal Sites	104
8.20.1	Risk Assessment	104
8.21	Marine Traffic	104
8.21.1	Risk Assessment	105
8.22	Insects Pests	105
8.22.1	Risk Assessment	105

8.23	Personnel Emergencies	106
8.23.1	Risk Assessment	106
8.24	Summary of Risk Assessments	106
9	Proposed Mitigation, Management and Monitoring	111
9.1	Maintenance and Monitoring Manual	111
9.2	Construction	111
9.3	Fish Escape	112
9.4	Disease and Parasite Transfer	112
9.5	Fish Faeces and Nutrient Loads	115
9.6	Excess Fish Feed and Feed Quality	115
9.7	Waste	117
9.7.1	General Mitigation Measures for Waste	117
9.7.2	Solid Putrescible Waste	118
9.7.3	Sewage and Grey Water	118
9.7.4	Solid Inert Waste	119
9.7.5	Prescribed Waste	120
9.7.6	Dead Farm Fish	120
9.8	Storage, Handling and Containment of Chemical and Hazardous Substances	121
9.9	Nets and Moorings	123
9.10	Hydrodynamics	124
9.11	Water and Sediment Quality	124
9.12	Management of Predators	126
9.13	Bird, Reptile, Fish and Mammal Habitats	127
9.14	Flora	128
9.15	EPBC Act-listed Threatened and Migratory Species	129
9.16	Land Surface	130
9.17	Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity	131
9.18	Social and Recreational	132
9.19	Archaeological, Historical, Cultural and Aboriginal Sites	133
9.20	Marine Traffic	133
9.21	Mitigation of Nuisance and Health Risks from Pest Insects	134
9.22	Personnel Emergencies	134
9.23	Management and Monitoring of Quality of Farmed Barramundi	135
10	Environmental Management	136
10.1	Company Health Safety Environment and Quality Policy	136
10.1.1	Objectives	137
10.2	Operational Standards	137
10.3	Standard Operational Procedures	138
10.4	Monitoring and Reporting Strategies	138
11	Public Involvement and Consultation	143
11.1	August to September 2005	143
11.2	November 2005	144

11.3	Future Consultation	144
12	Conclusions	145
13	References	147
	Limitations	148
	Figures	
	Appendices	

### Tables

Table 3.1:	Coordinates of Lease Area	30
Table 3.2:	Comparison Summary of the Mooring and Net Design Arrangements	37
Table 3.3:	Typical Composition of Fish Feed	41
Table 3.4:	Estimate of Quantities of Liquid and Solid Wastes	45
Table 3.5:	List of Chemicals Stored on Site, based on the Port Hurd Pilot Program Chemical Register	47
Table 3.6:	Applicable Environmental and Health Legislation	51
Table 3.7:	List of Threatened and Migratory Species from EPBC Web Site for the Proposed Development Site	63
Table 7.1:	Comparisons of Snake Bay versus Port Hurd Operations	83
Table 8.1:	Marine Harvest Risk Ranking System	86
Table 8.2:	Maximum Amount of Discharge (kg) per 1000 kg of Fish Produced	89
Table 8.3:	Summary of Potential Greenhouse Gases Emissions from the Proposed Snake Bay Barramundi Farm	102
Table 8.4:	Risk Assessments Summary	107
Table 10.1:	Summary of Proposed Monitoring Requirements	139

### Plates

Plate 1:	Illustration of the type of 1 <sup>st</sup> generation fish-pen infrastructure proposed for the site
Plate 2:	Diver Carrying Out Repairs on Port Hurd Farm Nets

### Figures

Figure 1:	Location Map
Figure 2:	Land Capability – Aquaculture
Figure 3:	Proposed Lease Area
Figure 4:	Proposed Barge Design
Figure 5:	Mooring Arrays with Central Feeding Barge
Figure 6:	Mooring Design Details
Figure 7:	Areas of Traditional Tribal Ownership on Tiwi Islands
Figure 8:	Sampling Investigation Locations for Snake Bay Baseline Study
Figure 9:	Sampling Investigation Locations for Port Hurd Biennial Monitoring
Figure 10:	Sampling Investigation Locations for Gullala Inlet Control Sites

## **Appendices**

- A Environmental Impact Statement Requirement Letter from Northern Territory Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage
  - B Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines for Snake Bay Proposed Aquaculture Farm
  - C Tiwi Islands Regional Natural Resource Management Strategy Selected Maps
  - D Snake Bay Bathymetry
  - E Snake Bay Baseline Report by Aquenal Pty Ltd
  - F Port Hurd Biennial Report by Aquenal Pty Ltd
  - G Paspaley Pearls Oyster Trials at Port Hurd
  - H Greenhouse Gases Calculations
  - I Tiwi Land Council Letter
  - J Fish Feed Residue Monitoring
  - K Marine Harvest Port Hurd Standard Operating Procedures
  - L Community Consultation Records
-

## **Foreword**

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Snake Bay in the Northern Territory is one of three EIS documents for new barramundi fish farms which have been proposed by Marine Harvest. Marine Harvest's business strategy requires that three sites be operational in order for the barramundi fish-farming venture to be viable. The other two sites proposed for barramundi farms are Port Patterson and Channel Island. Marine Harvest has prioritised the sites on the basis of the distance and associated transport logistics from Darwin. It considers that the Channel Island site is the first priority, with Port Patterson being the second and Snake Bay being the third.

On 7 March 2006, Marine Harvest was bought out by Pan Fish, a Norwegian aquaculture company, producing, world-wide, around one third of the quantity of fish produced by Marine Harvest. It is likely, given the size and history of Marine Harvest, that many of its procedures and policies will be adopted by Pan Fish. Hence Marine Harvest's commitment to sustainable aquaculture is expected to be maintained.

As this EIS has been commissioned by Marine Harvest for the purpose of satisfying the EIS requirements for approval of a controlled action under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act), the report will continue to refer to Marine Harvest, rather than Pan Fish, as the proponent.

## **1 Executive Summary**

### **1.1 Introduction**

Marine Harvest is planning to develop and operate a barramundi sea-cage fish farm within a proposed marine farming lease located at Snake Bay, Melville Island, in the Northern Territory. The Snake Bay farm is proposed to be the third of three barramundi farms, the other two sites being Port Patterson and Channel Island. Marine Harvest's business strategy requires that three sites be operational in order for the barramundi fish-farming venture to be viable. Marine Harvest has prioritised the sites on the basis of the distance and associated transport logistics from Darwin. It considers that the Channel Island site is the first priority, with Port Patterson being the second and Snake Bay being the third.

The Northern Territory Minister for Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage, Ms Marion Scrymgour, confirmed on 13 September 2005 that the proposal would require assessment under the *Environmental Assessment Act 1994* at the level of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Minister provided Marine Harvest with guidelines for the EIS which were drawn up in accordance with Schedule 1 of the *Bilateral Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the Northern Territory* under Section 45 of the EPBC Act relating to EIS.

### **1.2 Objectives of the EIS**

The objectives of this EIS report are to provide sufficiently detailed information on the proposal and on the environment to permit informed public comment and regulatory decision to be made on the proposal, and to permit environmental management measures to be drawn up.

### **1.3 Description of Proposal**

The proposed Snake Bay farm will be based on the pilot barramundi sea-cage fish farm which has been operated by Marine Harvest at Port Hurd, on Bathurst Island in the Northern Territory, since 2000. The proposed farm will have the capacity, after a lead up period of two years, to produce 1500 tonnes of fish per year.

The long term aim is to grow the site to the stage where it will be able to produce up to 5000 tonnes of fish per year. The site will initially be stocked with juvenile barramundi supplied from a hatchery using local NT broodstock. The juvenile barramundi will be transferred to the sea pens for on-growing, and will then take 18 months to reach their harvest size of approximately 3 kg.

All stock, from juvenile-size upwards, will be housed in steel mesh pens and fed pelletised food from automatic feeding stations.

During the initial set up of the farm, and until an operations barge has been constructed and installed on site, a shore-based facility will be leased from the existing fishing tour operator based at Snake Bay.

Harvested fish will be transported to Darwin live, by well boat, or killed and chilled on the barge prior to transportation.

#### **1.4 Objectives of the Proposal**

The main objectives of the project are to develop a sustainable farmed barramundi fish industry and market, while preventing or minimising impacts to the surrounding environment.

It is expected the project will have benefits in the form of direct employment of staff and contractors, some of which are likely to be sourced locally. It will also answer the need for economic development in the Tiwi Islands, which Tiwi leaders have identified as an urgent requirement for the Islands. The Snake Bay operation should help prevent additional pressure on wild barramundi stocks while providing a product which is in great demand in Australian and in overseas markets. As the operation will be sourcing its juvenile stock from the Darwin Aquaculture Centre, which breeds barramundi under controlled conditions, it will not be depleting wild barramundi stocks.

To justify its investment in improved infrastructure Marine Harvest needs to improve current economies of scale and to harvest more than 1000 tonnes per annum from each proposed farm. Marine Harvest is also considering building its own well boat for delivery of fish from the farm and it is intending to have barges built for on-site operations at Snake Bay and Port Patterson. According to its research, Marine Harvest could sell up to 5000 tonnes of farmed barramundi in Australia before it would have a need to export.

#### **1.5 Location**

Snake Bay is a tidal estuary on the north coast of Melville Island, it extends inland into the waters of Curtis Haven which is fed by the Tjipripu River. The proposed project area will be located within the marine waters of the bay 3.5 kilometres to the south-east of the community of Milikapiti.

#### **1.6 Schedule**

Construction of the project will commence once approval has been granted by all relevant authorities. It is expected this may be around August 2006. It is anticipated that construction of the operation will be a staged process.

Stage 1 will take place over approximately 12 months and will involve the construction of sea pens able to farm up to 3500 tonnes of fish per year. During the initial period, the site will be operating out of an existing shore-based facility. It is expected that basic

infrastructure to begin fish farming could be in place within the first 7 months, and the farm would be serviced from the shore-based facility until the barge is operational.

Stage 2 will occur over a further 12-month period and will involve the construction of additional pens to allow production to increase to 5,000 tonnes per year. The farm is expected to operate indefinitely.

### **1.7 Layout and Infrastructure**

The temporary shore-based facility will be sited within pre-existing infrastructure at Milikapiti. Facilities are likely to be leased from the local fishing tour operator.

The proposed long term facility will be entirely contained on water and will not comprise any on-shore facilities. The proposed farm will include the following infrastructure:

- A central automatic barge – which will include; live-aboard facilities, fresh water storage, a workshop, feed silos, feed distribution equipment, a dead-fish ensiler and chemical and fuel storage facilities;
- Steel mesh nets (pens);
- A mooring system consisting of cyclone-proof anchors; and
- Outboard motor boats for movement of personnel, day-to-day goods and waste disposal.

The pens will be plastic circles of approximately 48 metres circumference. The pens will be made with steel-net mesh which, at the pilot Port Hurd operation, has been proven to exclude crocodiles and sharks and to not entrap predators. The holding nets will have 8-metre deep side walls with a maximum net depth of 8.5 metres. Each pen will have a minimum seabed clearance of around 2 metres as they will be placed over channel areas that are at least 10 metres deep. The pens will be positioned in 2 lines of 2 x 6 pens each. The pens will be constructed on the beach on a disturbed area near the existing boat ramp and will then be towed into position.

The site will be clearly visible during the day. At night the barge will be lit up with corner lights and a flood light shining directly on the outer deck. The outer limit of the sea pens and the lease will be marked with flashing lights to be visible for navigational safety.

### **1.8 Preferred Design Criteria for the Facility**

The design of the farm is partly dictated by the unique characteristics of the estuarine environment in Snake Bay and partly by Marine Harvest's experience at its pilot project at Port Hurd, on the west coast of Bathurst Island.

The main aims of the design include minimising impacts on the physical and biological environment, minimising stress on farmed fish, maximising control on feeding,

maximising water circulation and oxygen input, minimising risks of infrastructure and farm fish losses and complying with applicable legislation and standards.

There are a number of site characteristics at Snake Bay which impose some limitations to the design of the operation, these include a narrow deep channel, large tides and exposure to mild cyclonic influences and the presence of two imunga (hunting or fishing) sites, one on each side of the proposed lease.

The following design criteria have been chosen for the fish nets:

- Use of galvanised steel nets, for grow-out and nursery pens, with 35-mm bar mesh. These have been successful at Port Hurd in excluding predators, in preventing predators from being entrapped in the mesh, in minimising stock losses, fouling, net changing and repair, in maintaining good water through-flow, and in minimising the incidence of gill fluke and parasites on the fish.
- Use of polyethylene fibre net placed on the inside of the steel nets for nursery purposes.
- Placement of nursery pens in different current corridors to that of the grow-out pens.
- Use of sacrificial aluminium anodes suspended 4 metres below the water surface to protect the nets from corrosion below the water line.
- Placement of the nets over, at least, a 10-metre-deep channel, so that all nets have at least 2 metres clearance from the seafloor; and
- Periodic replacement of approximately 1 metre of mesh around the collar of the cages to eliminate corrosion.

The barge will be sited in the centre of the array of nets and will be manned 24 hours a day. Concrete slabs will be used as the pontoon base for the construction of the barge, and Styrofoam will be used to pad the sides of the concrete slabs. Donga-style demountable buildings will be bolted onto the concrete slabs. The barge will be automated, it will have underwater cameras to monitor feeding. All fish feed will be stored in silos, the feed will be transferred with a blower system to the nets. The barge will have an ensiler which is designed to digest dead fish; the digested product will be transported to Darwin for use in fertilisers. Sewage from the barge will be treated with the 'Humphrey' system.

Mooring of the nets and the barge will be with the use of steel anchors, installed by cyclone mooring specialists, to moor the facilities and prevent them from being washed away or turned over in rough weather; however, they will be able to move with wave motion and water currents. The mooring array proposed for Snake Bay will have six nets hooked up to each system.

## **1.9 Services and Support**

### **1.9.1 Transport**

Staff and construction contractors will reach the facility via fly-in, fly-out from Darwin to the existing airstrip at Milikapiti. They would then travel by car from the airport to the community of Milikapiti and the nominated shore-based site. Access to the farm site would be by outboard motor boat from Milikapiti.

Goods and equipment will be carried to and from site via the Tiwi Barge Company, which will service the operation on a weekly basis during construction and harvesting, and on a fortnightly basis at other times. Much of the waste disposal will take place via the Tiwi Barge which will transport the waste for Waste Master, a licensed waste-disposal company using Darwin facilities.

### **1.9.2 Staffing**

During construction of the site, there will be a need for between 10 and 15 people on the operational side, a barge with 4 divers and 4 other support contractors.

Staffing of the temporary shore-based facility, once the site has begun farming fish, will require around 8 staff per weekly roster, i.e. a total of 16 people on staff. In addition, contractors will be required periodically for particular tasks.

Once the barge has been set up and the automated feed system is up and running, it is anticipated that between 2 and 6 people will be required on the barge, with two staff being on the barge at anytime. Day-to-day operations will be carried out during normal daylight working hours, except in some circumstances where tidal schedules may dictate that work be done to coincide with a neap tide.

Employees will be sourced locally whenever possible. A skeleton of staff will be housed on the barge when it is commissioned.

### **1.9.3 Power, Potable Water and Storage**

Power to the site and to the barge will be supplied via a diesel generator which will operate 24 hours a day.

Potable water will be provided to the barge via a service ship from Darwin and will be replenished weekly or fortnightly.

Storage of fuels and chemicals at the temporary land-based facility will be in above-ground storage tanks in manufacturers containers and in bunded areas. Feed and all farm equipment will also be stored at the temporary facility.

Storage of all fuels, chemicals, feed and farm equipment will be accommodated on the barge when it is commissioned.

## **1.10 Farm Operation**

The proposed Snake Bay farm will operate much in the same way as the Port Hurd operation.

The stocking density of the nets with the juvenile fish will begin at around 4 kg per cubic metre, based on 80,000 to 120,000 juvenile fish per pen, and is likely to have an upper limit of 35 to 45 kilograms of fish per cubic metre based on a fully stocked cage of 3-kilogram fish.

The fish will be fed on Nova ME pellets developed by Skretting. This is a high-performance sinking feed, which is mammalian-product free. No hormones are used in the feed. The pellets are specifically designed for marine fish and their composition and ingredients are of high quality.

Pens will be inspected daily from the surface, and any damage to the pens will be repaired immediately where possible. Pens inspections by divers would typically be carried out fortnightly.

The fish will be graded and counted at set times. These events will be kept to a minimum in order to minimise the chances of damaging their skin and therefore increasing their chances of exposure to disease.

Fish will be separated or removed from pens with the help of Seine nets. The Seine nets will be used to crowd the fish into one side of the pen and a fish pump will then be used to bring the fish up onto the barge for grading, counting and/or harvesting.

Based on the Port Hurd experience, the steel mesh nets will last around 2 years. If 24 nets are present, this will require that around one net is built and replaced every month. Constructing the nets will only require manual handling and no machining will be necessary. The constructed nets will be floated to the farm mooring area with the help of a high tide.

An ensiler will be kept at the temporary land-base and on the permanent barge, when commissioned. The ensiler will be used for the disposal of dead fish (morts). All solid wastes generated at the temporary land base will be disposed to skip bins and recycled via the landfill recycling system. It is likely that putrescible waste generated on the barge could be disposed into the ensiler.

#### **1.10.1 Emissions from the Operation**

Emissions from the proposed operation are expected to include:

- wastes to water from excess feed not consumed by farm fish, fish faeces, dead fish (morts), parasite control treatment, and grey water from the barge;
- solid wastes from feed bags, dead fish (morts), and waste from the occupation of the barge by staff;
- noise from outboard motors, feeding equipment, occupation of the barge, harvesting operations, site maintenance, net and pen construction;
- light from the habitation of the site during night hours and illumination of farm outline for vessel safety; and

- emissions to air may include noxious smells from dead fish stock, and noxious smells and fumes from the presence of chemicals and fuels and from running outboard motors, the generator, and feeding equipment and emissions of greenhouse gases from the consumption and presence of fuels.

### **1.10.2 Chemicals**

The operation will store a number of chemicals and hazardous materials which will be managed in accordance with Dangerous Goods Regulations.

Small quantities of cleaners and detergents will be stored for use. Some laboratory and workshop chemicals will be stored and used. Minor quantities of greases and solvents for maintenance purposes will be stored in the workshop. The most significant hazardous materials stored on site are diesel and unleaded petrol. These will be used to power engines on the motor boats and on the farm's pumps and generators.

### **1.10.3 Ongoing Management, Maintenance and Administrative Requirements**

An engineer will be present on site whose responsibility will be to carry out maintenance on machinery and the barge. General maintenance schedules will be documented in the site procedures and will follow a 'per hours of operation' scheme. It is anticipated that administrative work conducted on the farm will be minimal. Most administrative duties would be conducted from the Darwin office.

## **1.11 Decommissioning and Rehabilitation**

The temporary land-based facility will be established in pre-existing premises at Milikapiti. It is expected that this facility will be used for around 12 months. The land-based facilities will be vacated upon commissioning and establishment of the barge facility. The aim will be to reinstate the land to its previous condition and to leave the facility in a stable and clean state, free from wastes, and free of potential mosquito breeding sites.

The long-term barge facility will be established approximately 12 months after the land-based facility. Its life expectancy is indefinite at this stage. Decommissioning and rehabilitation of the barge facility will require removal of the barge, the nets and the plastic circles, removal of all anchor ropes and of any steel anchors.

Where possible, some of the materials will be reused and recycled; any materials which cannot will need to be disposed to appropriate waste-disposal facilities in Darwin and will be transported via the Tiwi Barge Company.

## **1.12 Legislative Requirements**

A licence is required for the development under Northern Territory Fisheries legislation. Part of the requirements for such a licence is that the proponent must first obtain a permit and a lease. A lease is granted by the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment and the Minister decides the length of the lease.

Marine Harvest is in the process of applying to the Northern Territory Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Environment for a Crown lease over the proposed area of 100 hectares. A Crown Lease Term is a development lease containing conditions and covenants requiring development to be undertaken in accordance with the agreed development plan. A granted lease is valid for 10 years.

Native title does not currently impact on marine areas but it is considered possible that this situation may change in relation to bay areas. Marine Harvest has been in contact with the Tiwi Land Council over many years as a result of the Port Hurd operation and as part of the development consent process.

Marine Harvest will comply with relevant requirements of the *Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act* (1989) and the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act* 1976.

The temporary shore-based facilities which will need to be established, and the barge-based facilities which will be constructed, will comply with all relevant Environmental Health Standards for Public Health, Food and Radiation Protection including, but not limited to all relevant Northern Territory legislation. The facilities will be inspected regularly by a Food Health inspector.

### **1.13 Alternatives**

The Marine Harvest-proposed Snake Bay Barramundi Fish Farm is a component of a three-farm business plan to establish a sustainable farmed-barramundi industry. Should the proposal for Snake Bay not proceed, Marine Harvest would still aim to pursue the establishment of the other proposed sites. However the business plan would not allow for the purchase of a well boat until a longer period of time had passed.

Marine Harvest has investigated much of the Northern Territory coastline for suitable sites for its proposed barramundi marine farming operations. Its selection criteria included proximity and accessibility to Darwin, shelter from cyclones and marine influences, suitable current speeds, adequate water depth and sea-bed clearance, and distance from Milikapiti. The sites Marine Harvest has selected, including the Snake Bay site, are the most suitable and potentially available, for its aquaculture purposes.

Alternatives for components of the proposal have been trialled at the Port Hurd pilot farm. Marine Harvest is using this experience to select the best components for its proposed farm infrastructure. These include:

- 48-metre circumference pens,
- Cyclone mooring of nets in 4 linear sets of 6 nets,
- Temporary land base at existing facilities,
- Long term barge base, moored centrally between the sets of nets, and
- Tried and tested barge design.

Marine Harvest is committed to choosing the most effective environmental management techniques which will achieve the goals of preventing and minimising impacts to the environment from the operation. Alternative management options will be discussed in the Environmental Management Plan which will be drawn up separately for the site.

#### 1.14 Existing Environment

Regionally, the Tiwi Islands are within an area of high rainfall, with rainfall in the project area estimated at between 1800 and 2000 millimetres of rain per annum. The region is characterised by one dry and one wet season, with the latter extending from November to May. The ambient maximum daily temperature would normally remain above 30°C for most of the year. The topography of Melville Island is dominated by low altitude dissected sandstone (Van Diemen Sandstone) hills which peak at 136.5 metres above mean sea level. Most of the areas fringing the coast and drainage lines consist of tidal flats. Snake Bay is located in the extension of the Tjipripu River estuary. The river and other tributaries to the estuary are partly fed by springs issuing from the sandstone hills.

There has been an unbroken history of Tiwi occupation of the land on the islands and the islands are 90 percent Tiwi populated. The population of the Tiwi Islands consists of around 2,350 people, spread over four main communities and several outstations. Milikapiti is the population centre closest to Snake Bay and has a population of around 400. It is located on the western shore of the bay; it has a jetty suitable for barges, and has a licensed airstrip which services flights to and from Pirlangimpi, and twice a day to and from Darwin (25 minutes).

The people of the Tiwi Islands reside predominantly in the main population centres and communities; sealed and unsealed roads link most of these. Much of the island is still pristine and unaffected by human presence.

Economic uses include use of plants and animals as a food source. In the mid 1990s, Milikapiti was successfully exporting sweet potato for sale on the mainland. Plantation forestry and harvest of native timber is one of the major contributors to the region's economy. Sea-cage aquaculture, based on the Port Hurd experience, is now considered a viable economic venture. There is no established industry on Snake Bay itself, the waterway is used for tourism and recreational fishing.

Some areas of land and specified sites have high spiritual value determined through Tiwi history. However, all Tiwi land is valued as part of the overall amenity and as a source of plants and animals that are valuable for ceremonial purposes and for traditional food.

Melville and Bathurst Islands are divided into eight areas of traditional tribal ownership, as shown in Figure 7. Snake Bay is bounded on the western side by land owned by the Wulirankuwu tribe and on the eastern side by land owned by the Yimpinari tribe. Two imunga (hunting/fishing sacred sites) areas are located to the east of Point Strath and may partly overlap the proposed project area. The Tiwi Land Council has issued a statement saying that the *'members of YIMPINARI and the members of WULIRANGKUWU [...] have met and discussed this matter at Meetings from December*

2005 to April 2006 and that they agree that there are no sites of significance or sacred sites recorded or known to be affected by this application by Marine Harvest'.

### 1.15 Physical and Biological Environment

'The proposed farm location is inside the sheltered section of Snake Bay formed by the narrows between Johnson Point (locally known as Picnic Point) and Point Strath [...]. The water passing through this channel flows at speeds exceeding 3 knots during spring tides. The proposed farm location is in a small area of deep water [generally 10 or more metres] in the wider waters inside the narrows and therefore subject to lower current velocities. There is no influence from ocean swells inside the narrows but during the late dry season the waters have properties approaching those of marine waters. During the wet season there is a large inflow of fresh water from the Tjipripu River and the surrounding catchment but this decreases to negligible during the dry season.' (Aqenal, January 2006).

Snake Bay extends inland into Curtis Haven which is reported to be a near-pristine estuary, classified in geomorphic terms as a tide-dominated estuary, with mean wave height of 0.55 metre, maximum wave height of 2.5 metres, tidal range of 2.5 metres, and diurnal tides.

The main hydrological influences on this water body are the 6 metre tidal range (3 to 7 metre tides) at the mouth of the estuary, which diminish to around 2.5 metres in the upper estuary. These diurnal tides result in large daily flushing of the mangroves with seawater. During the wet there is strong flushing with fresh water. The water is very warm, with salinity approaching that of seawater and minimal fresh water input at the end of the dry season.

The Snake Bay estuary is generally considered to be a near-pristine environment with only localised anthropogenic impacts.

Existing issues within the environment of Snake Bay and Milikapiti include high sediment loads in run off, weed infestations, and need for education of local population about coastal issues. Other issues identified for the larger part of the Tiwi Islands include the lack of quarantine procedures, illegal fishing, arrival of cane toads in Darwin.

The south of the Snake Bay coastal area is dominated by a broad fringe of mangroves. The north of the Bay's coastal area comprises areas of eucalyptus forest and woodland, clusters of mangroves, small strips of dry rainforest and stands of melaleuca open forests and woodlands. Forestry plantations have been established to the west and north of the township of Milikapiti. Narrow riparian and wetland zones and dry rainforest strips have been earmarked as areas of high conservation value in the Tiwi Islands RNRMS.

It is understood that seagrass meadows exist within the Snake Bay / Curtis Haven estuary, though their extents and locations are not well documented.

The NRETA (2006(b)) notes that in the Tiwi-Cobourg Bioregion, 'a range of threatening factors has begun to undermine this [pristine] condition. Notably, these include feral animals (cats, pigs, water buffalo, cattle, banteng, and horses), weeds and changed fire

regimes.' Broad-scale vegetation clearing on Melville Island for plantations of exotic timber exacerbates the risks to local species. Eleven (11) Threatened Species and nineteen (19) Migratory Species are listed for the area covered by the proposal (EPBC Web Site).

Two marine turtle breeding sites have been documented within the northern reaches of Snake Bay, one on the coast near Don Point to the north of the locality of Milikapiti and the other on the opposite shore of Snake Bay immediately east of Milikapiti. They are both several kilometres to the north of the proposed project area.

The Tiwi Islands RNRMS documented that Tiwi knowledge consider that only two estuarine bays on the north-eastern tip of Melville Island are considered to have significant dugong populations, these do not include Snake Bay.

In addition, there is a traditional indigenous practice of harvesting turtle eggs, and hunting turtles and dugongs. This practice is actively followed by the Milikapiti community, which reports regular taking of turtles and hunting of dugong when they are seen. This is understood to have traditionally been done in a sustainable fashion, though the combination of these traditional activities with other pressures such as injuries from boat strikes or net entanglement, destruction of hatcheries or habitats by natural or man-induced causes, may be contributing to the pressure on these species.

Existing air quality at Milikapiti is considered to be 'clean' as there is no major industry in the area. Disturbance to the existing amenity occurs via smoke emissions from camp fires and barbeques, minimal nuisance noise from cars and other road vehicles, sporadic airstrip usage, occasional motor boats, and nominal lighting presence associated with night domestic uses and street lighting.

### **1.16 Snake Bay Baseline Investigation**

A baseline investigation has been carried out at Snake Bay to provide pre-operational data against which subsequent monitoring may be compared to assess potential impacts from nutrients released by the proposed aquaculture operation at Snake Bay. The investigations were carried out by Aquenal Pty Ltd.

Water quality, nutrients levels, chlorophyll  $\alpha$ , epiphytic algae, mangrove stand and composition and benthic infauna parameters were sampled and measured in Snake Bay within proposed farm locations, within potential receptor sites and within control sites in a neighbouring estuary. These results were compared by Aquenal to those obtained for the Port Hurd pilot farm and its control estuary at Gullula Inlet on neighbouring Bathurst Island. The results showed that the values at Snake Bay are within the range of those recorded at Port Hurd and could therefore be considered typical of this type of mangrove estuary.

### **1.17 Port Hurd Pilot Farm Environmental Monitoring Results**

Marine Harvest's first barramundi fish farm was established at Port Hurd in 2000 and was considered the pilot project for barramundi farming in the Northern Territory.

This farm and its surrounding environment has been the subject of environmental investigations aimed at assessing the potential long and short term biological impacts from the fish farming operation on its environment.

The monitoring results over two years showed that most water quality parameters were closely related to rainfall, i.e. were seasonally influenced. Nutrient levels were not uniformly seasonal in their variation and exceeded the ANZECC trigger levels on a number of sampling occasions at the Port Hurd, farm and nearby control sites at Maand Creek. A general increase in chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels was observed.

Gullala Creek and Inlet, located 13 kilometres north of Port Hurd, was also chosen by Aquenal Pty Ltd as a more remote and second control site. The samples at Gullala Creek were analysed for the same parameters as those for the Port Hurd samples. All parameters, except chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels, showed similar trends at Port Hurd and at Gullala Creek. Although there appeared to be a general rise in chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels at the Gullala Inlet sampling sites, this was to a lesser degree than at Port Hurd. Aquenal reported that this could not be correlated to other parameters included in the study, and the Port Hurd increase could not be directly attributed to the farm operations

The Port Hurd and Gullala Inlet monitoring results therefore suggest that the pilot farm at Port Hurd has not been causing any notable changes to water or sediment quality, or to nutrient-influenced parameters.

The applicability of the Port Hurd results to the proposed Snake Bay farm operation is dependent on the similarities and differences between the operations. The main differences of note include:

- Faster tidal currents and larger tidal fluctuations at Port Hurd than at Snake Bay;
- Presence of a barge at Snake Bay;
- Smaller nets (i.e. less fish per net) at Snake Bay; and
- Larger fish tonnages at Snake Bay.

Although the overall input of nutrients will be larger at Snake Bay than at Port Hurd, due to the proposed larger farm output, it is expected that the management measures applied to the farm, and based on the Port Hurd operation, will help to achieve the same lack of impact on the overall nutrient levels in the bay as those reported by the monitoring at Port Hurd.

### **1.18 Paspaley Pearls Oyster Studies**

Paspaley Pearls have a pearl oyster farm operation located in Bynoe Harbour, adjacent to Port Patterson, where Marine Harvest is proposing to establish one of its barramundi

farming operations. A trial was carried out by Paspaley Pearls by placing oyster cages adjacent to the established barramundi farm at Port Hurd and then checking the health of the oysters after a nominated timeframe.

The trial showed that the oysters did not appear to suffer any adverse effects from the presence of the fish farm. A single unhealthy oyster was interpreted to be an isolated case, unrelated to the presence of the fish farm. The trial therefore provided reassurance to the pearl farmers that the proposed barramundi fish farm at Port Patterson was not likely to cause any impacts to its operation in Bynoe Harbour.

Importantly, the results can be extrapolated to native soft bodied shellfish located in similar water currents near the fish farm which would therefore be unlikely to be affected by any of the fish farming operations.

### **1.19 Risk Assessments**

Qualitative risk assessments have been carried out for all identified aspects and impacts of the proposed barramundi farm. A summary of this is provided in the table below. The table shows that only four aspects have been assessed as having a risk ranking of 2 or 1, i.e. having serious or high risk. These are:

- fish faeces and nutrient loads,
- wastes and hazardous materials,
- predators, and
- personnel emergencies.

### Risk Assessments Summary

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Construction	Possible	Minor/ moderate	3 = medium	Noise and traffic impacts will be temporary and managed via the EMP.
Fish Escape	Possible	Moderate	3 = medium	Some temporary adverse effects including predation on endemic smaller fish and removal of feed from the environment could occur.
Fish faeces and nutrient loads	Certain	Minor / moderate	2 to 1 = serious to high	Faeces will enter the water column, but monitoring at Port Hurd suggests little impact from added nutrient load.
Excess feed and quality	Possible / unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 – 3 = low to medium	Loss of feed will be strictly minimized by management methods and feed quality is high, hence impact on fauna, flora and overall environment will be low.
Fish aggregation	Likely	Minor	3 = medium	No effect on fishing reported from Port Hurd pilot farm.
Introduction of diseases	Unlikely	Moderate	4 = low	Very low incidences at Port Hurd pilot farm.

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Introduction of parasites	Rare	Minor	4 = low	Very low incidences at Port Hurd pilot farm.
Introduction of chemicals	Rare / unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 = low	Port Hurd pilot farm experience has shown that there has been very little need for chemical usage due to low incidence of disease outbreaks.
Waste and hazardous materials	Unlikely / possible	Moderate / major	4 – 2 = low to serious	Stringent management methods will be implemented via the EMP to minimize the likelihood and mitigate the consequences of any potential spillages.
Loss of nets	Unlikely	Moderate / major	4 – 3 = low to medium	The new infrastructure proposed and the more moderate water currents at Snake Bay mean that risks are diminished.
Hydrodynamics	Likely	Minor	3 = medium	The only notable impact is likely to be redistribution of sediments around the mooring anchors.
Predators	Possible	Catastrophic	2 – 1 = serious to high	Increased exposure of humans to crocodiles and therefore increased likelihood of attacks.
Flora	Rare / unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 = low	Impacts are expected to be minor of moderate due to the location of the farm and the proposed management methods.

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Bird, reptile, fish and mammal habitats	Unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 = low	Baseline and Port Hurd information and monitoring suggests there is a low risk of impact on fauna habitats.
EPBC Act listed threatened and migratory species	Unlikely / rare	Moderate	4 = low	Baseline and Port Hurd information and monitoring suggests there is a low risk of impact on EPBC listed, threatened or migratory species or their habitats.
Land surface	Possible	Minor	4 = low	Use of unsealed areas will be minimized.
Air quality, noise, lighting and visual amenity	Likely	Minor	4 = low	Only low level intermittent nuisance is likely.
Social / recreational	Possible	Minor	4 = low	Strong links have already been established between Marine Harvest and the local population.

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Local infrastructure	Unlikely	Minor	4 = low	Most demand on the local infrastructure is expected to occur during construction. This demand will drop significantly during operation of the farm.
Archaeological / historical, cultural and aboriginal sites	Rare	Minor	4 = low	The Tiwi Land Council is aware of the proposed farm proximity to the 'imunga' sites and has not raised any objections to the farm going ahead.
Marine traffic	Unlikely	Minor	4 = low	The farm may up to double boat trips on the bay, but traffic will still remain very low.
Insect pests	Unlikely	Moderate	4 = low	Managed by operational procedures.
Personnel emergencies	Possible	Minor to catastrophic	4 to 2 = low to serious	Personnel emergencies can occur in any workplace; dangers will be managed via standard operating procedures and the site EMP.

## **1.20 Environmental Management**

Nutreco's company Health Safety Environment and Quality (HSEQ) Policy applies to all its business units, of which Marine Harvest is a part.

Underpinning the HSEQ Policy, the objectives of Marine Harvest are:

- To minimise the impact of its operations on the surrounding environment;
- To ensure that conservation of the biodiversity is not impacted by Marine Harvest operations;
- To ensure that environment program are developed and implemented in consultation with the Tiwi Land Council;
- To minimise the footprint of the development; and
- To maintain a low impact facility.

Marine Harvest will operate its Snake Bay facility in line with these objectives.

Based on its experience at its Port Hurd pilot barramundi fish farm on Bathurst Island, Marine Harvest is familiar with what is required to resource and implement an appropriate environmental management system tailored to the requirements of the tropical environment on the Tiwi Islands.

Marine Harvest has developed a number of operating procedures for all aspects of its Port Hurd farm. These standard operating procedures (SOPs) will be reviewed and modified for the Snake Bay site operation prior to commissioning. The SOPs will be incorporated into the Maintenance and Monitoring Manual to be developed for the operation. In addition, site specific procedures will be developed for Snake Bay as they relate to the operation of the barge facility.

A regular monitoring program will be carried out at the proposed Snake Bay farm, which will follow up on the baseline work carried out by Aquenal Pty Ltd. This program should pick up early any potential changes in water and sediment quality brought about by the proposed farm.

A detailed monitoring and reporting plan will be drawn up as part of the EMP for the site.

A summary of the monitoring requirements for the site is provided in the following table. This will be used as the basis for the monitoring requirements to be included in the Environmental Management Plan for the farm.

### Summary of Proposed Monitoring Requirements

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
Construction	9.2	Meetings to be held with staff, contractors and farm management or construction manager. Meetings should cover procedures, incidents and corrective actions.	Weekly
Fish Escape	9.3	Inspection of nets and moorings	As noted
		Tide prediction software to be investigated	Daily or as needed
Disease and Parasite Transfer	9.4	Visual inspection of fish health	Daily
		Recording of mortality rate	Daily
		Analysis by Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory	As needed
		Visit by Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory	Annually
Faeces and Nutrients	9.5	Water sampling	Weekly
		Water, sediment, mangroves	Annually or biennially
Excess Feed and Feed Quality	9.6	Feed tested at the source by Skretting	As needed
		Underwater camera	During feeding
Wastes	9.7	Check all wastes are placed in dedicated containers, etc.	Ongoing/daily
		Records to be kept of all volumes and destinations of solid waste and prescribed waste disposed from the farm	Ongoing

<b>Aspect</b>	<b>Reference Section No.</b>	<b>Monitoring Activity</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Treated Sewage effluent	9.7.3	Water samples of effluent analysed for target parameters	Initially weekly then six monthly
Farm Fish Deaths	9.7.6	Check level on ensiler	Monthly and as needed
Chemical and Hazardous substances	9.8	Storage areas to be checked for leakages and storage integrity and compliance	Weekly
		Hazardous substances audit	Annually
Nets and Moorings	9.9	Mooring components checked by divers	Six monthly or as needed
		Nets monitored from surface	Daily
		Nets inspected by divers (from inside nets)	Fortnightly
		Diving inspection of nets and moorings (outside of nets)	Six monthly
		Nets and moorings replacement	Minimum every two years
Hydrodynamics	9.10	Seafloor inspections by divers for scouring around mooring anchors (same time as mooring inspections)	Six monthly
Water and sediments	9.11	Water temperature and oxygen levels	Daily
		Water sampling and mangrove roots	Fortnightly during the dry, two-monthly during the wet
		Water, sediment sampling and mangrove stands and roots	Annually or biennially

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
Bird, reptile and fish habitats	9.13	Record and review record of impacts and complaints	Ongoing
		Record all animal deaths in and around the lease	Ongoing
		Monitor water sediments and flora as noted	As noted
Flora	9.14	Seagrasses – best method still to be determined	To be determined
		Mangrove stands and roots	Fortnightly, two-monthly, annually or biennially
EPBC-Act listed Threatened and Migratory Species	9.15	Monitoring of water, sediment and flora as noted	As noted
		Recording and assessing any complaints, reports or sightings of dugongs and turtles and any other wildlife presence or death	Ongoing
Land surface	9.16	Inspections of unsealed surfaces during occupation of temporary land base	Weekly
		Inspections of unsealed surfaces upon vacating temporary land base	On vacating premises
		Recording and assessing complaints	Ongoing
Noise, lighting, air quality and amenity	9.17	Log book of operating hours of all noisy equipment	Ongoing
		Maintenance schedule to be followed for all motorized equipment	According to equipment maintenance schedule

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
		Recording and assessing any complaints	Ongoing
Social and recreational	9.18	Review and assess complaints or incidents reported	Ongoing
Archaeological, historical, cultural and Aboriginal sites	9.19	Record and review any complaints	Ongoing
Marine traffic	9.20	Record any incidents or complaints and assess	Ongoing
Pest insects	9.21	Incident reports to be review and assessed	Ongoing
Personnel emergencies	9.22	Incident, accident and emergency reports to be kept and assessed	Ongoing
Quality of farmed barramundi	9.23	Monitoring of health	Daily
		Testing of dead fish	As needed
		Regular checks by Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory	Annually

### 1.21 Public Involvement and Consultation

The proposed operation at Snake Bay has been in the public domain for a number of years now. Information regarding the proposal and the pilot project at Port Hurd has been disseminated through the newspapers.

Formal and informal consultation has been ongoing with the local Tiwi people since prior to the establishment of the pilot project at Port Hurd. Expectations from local Tiwi people are that some may have employment opportunities and training; that they may obtain royalties based on a percent of the farm's production; and that they may provide goods and services to the operation when these are available at a market competitive rate.

In August 2005, the draft guidelines for this EIS were put up for public comment by the Minister for Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage of the Northern Territory, and feedback from this has been incorporated into the final guidelines for the EIS.

In August to September 2005 and November 2005, formal public consultation and meetings were held with a number of government, non-government organisations and private stakeholders.

Feedback from the August to September 2005 meetings mostly centred on the need to answer all concerns raised regarding preservation of habitat and minimisation of risks to species of concern, namely turtles and dugongs. Concerns were also raised about the proposed farm's potential impacts on aesthetics and on game fishing; of particular concern was the possibility of wild fish aggregating under the farm's sea cages and therefore not being accessible to amateur fishermen. Restrictions to access to the bays and changes to water current flows due to the presence of the fish farm were also noted as issues of concern.

An open day was held at Port Hurd on 22 November 2005. Around 70 people attended, of which around 30 were local Tiwi people. A large number of the attendees were members of the Tiwi community on Melville and Bathurst Islands. The Tiwi Land Council has been very supportive of the project. Members of the Northern Land Council were also present at the open day. They have indicated preliminary support for the other fish farming operations planned by Marine Harvest, but want to have a detailed consultation once the EIS has been through the process. Issues raised during the open day on 22 November 2005 included:

- maintaining the aesthetics of the surrounding environment,
- issue of wastes from the fish farm, and
- aggregation of wild fish beneath the sea cages.

These aspects have been addressed within this EIS report.

Marine Harvest has maintained active consultation with the Tiwi Land Council throughout all of the Port Hurd pilot operation; it is committed to continue formal and informal liaison with the Tiwi people during the operation of the Snake Bay site.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Background

Marine Harvest is planning to develop and operate a barramundi fish farm within a proposed marine farming lease located at Snake Bay, Melville Island, in the Northern Territory.

Referral for the project was lodged on 27 May 2005 with the Australian Department of Environment and Heritage under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The proposal was declared a controlled action under the EPBC Act, the controlling provisions being:

- Sections 18 and 18A (Listed threatened species and communities) and
- Sections 20 and 20A (Listed migratory species).

The Northern Territory Minister for Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage, Ms Marion Scrymgour, confirmed on 13 September 2005 that the proposal would require assessment under the *Environmental Assessment Act 1994* at the level of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). A copy of this correspondence is provided in Appendix A.

Following a public comment period, the Minister provided Marine Harvest with guidelines for the EIS which were drawn up in accordance with Schedule 1 of the *Bilateral Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the Northern Territory* under Section 45 of the EPBC Act relating to EIS. The guidelines included provisions aimed at addressing issues which were raised during the public review process of the draft guidelines. A copy of the guidelines is provided in Appendix B.

### 2.2 Objectives and Scope of this Report

The objectives of this EIS report are to provide sufficiently detailed information on the proposal and on the environment to permit informed public comment and regulatory decision to be made on the proposal, and to permit environmental management measures to be drawn up.

The scope of the report includes:

- a description of the proposal and an outline of the benefits from the proposal,
- a discussion of the alternatives,
- a description of the environment in which it will operate, and an outline of the potential impacts,
- a description of the management measures proposed to minimise any adverse impacts, and
- the provision for public involvement and consultation.

### **3 Description of the Proposal**

#### **3.1 Overview**

Marine Harvest proposes to develop and operate a barramundi farm located within a marine farming lease site located at Snake Bay, Melville Island, in the Northern Territory (NT). The farm will be based on the pilot barramundi fish farm which has been operated by Marine Harvest at Port Hurd, on Bathurst Island, since 2000.

The proposed farm will have the capacity, after a lead up period of two years, to produce 1500 tonnes of fish per year. The long term aim is to grow the site to the stage where it will be able to produce up to 5000 tonnes of fish per year. The site will initially be stocked with juvenile barramundi supplied from a hatchery using local NT broodstock. The juvenile barramundi will be transferred to the sea pens for on-growing, and will then take 18 months to reach their harvest size of approximately 3 kilograms. In the longer term, it is planned that the juvenile barramundi will be supplied by a Marine Harvest-run nursery, which it is planning to set up near Channel Island, in Darwin Harbour. It is envisaged that the Snake Bay site may also have a nursery facility.

All stock, from juvenile-size upwards, will be housed in steel mesh pens and fed pelletised food from automatic feeding stations. Feeding will be monitored to ensure as little wastage as possible in the form of uneaten pellets. The proposed farm will be based on plastic circles of 48 metres circumference.

During the initial set up of the farm, and until an operations barge has been constructed and installed on site, it is likely that an existing shore-based facility will be leased from the existing fishing tour operator based at Snake Bay. Staff will access the site by plane from Darwin to Milikapiti, then by car and by boat to the farm pens.

The final design of the site incorporates an autonomous floating barge which will contain all operational equipment for the farm and workers. The barge will include live-aboard facilities, a workshop and an ensiler for dead fish. The barge will also store up to 250 tonnes of feed which will be distributed to the fish via a blower system. The silos will supply feed to a blower system that will distribute the feed via a 75mm polyethylene (PE) pipe. This method can move feed up to 800m from the source. Feed used will be extruded dry feed which is specifically formulated for tropical fish and in which up to half of the protein used is non-fish.

Harvested fish will be transported to Darwin live, by well boat, or killed and chilled on the barge prior to transportation.

#### **3.2 Objectives, Benefits and Justification for the Project**

##### **3.2.1 Background**

The Marine Harvest Company of today was created in April 2005 by the merger of Marine Harvest and Stolt Sea Farm, the fish farming, processing, sales and marketing

businesses of Nutreco Holding N.V. and Stolt-Nielsen S.A. respectively. Marine Harvest has been subsequently bought out by Pan Fish. Marine Harvest is the world's leading fish farming company, and the leading producer and supplier of farmed salmon in the world. Marine Harvest is also an important supplier of sea trout, and is pioneering the farming of species new to aquaculture such as cod, halibut, yellowtail, sturgeon, tilapia and barramundi.

Marine Harvest's Mission Statement is:

*'Marine Harvest is a leading provider of excellent quality fish products that satisfy consumers' current and emerging needs through sustainable production, reliable supply, innovation and competitive value, at all times holding the concerns of society and fair opportunities for our employees as top priorities.'*

Responsibility is a key value held by Marine Harvest and it notes that:

*'as a leading and responsible company, Marine Harvest sets and meets the highest standards of production, especially in food safety and sustainability. We take account of the concerns of the communities where we work and of wider society and will only work with those organisations whose commitment matches our own.'*

The inception of barramundi fish farming at Port Hurd began from a vision of the then Pivot company to diversify Marine Harvest's customer base. The vision included establishing a tropical cage-based industry founded on the temperate fish-farming learning. Marine Harvest regards tropical aquaculture as a necessary part of its business.

The fish farming operation at Port Hurd (Barra Base) has been used by Marine Harvest as a feasibility and experimental trial for tropical fish marine farming. The operation has been underway since 2000 and, in keeping with its experimental nature, it has undergone several changes, dictated by adaptation to the environment and development of experience in the process. Changes have included, for instance, replacing steel cages and plastic nets with plastic polar circles and steel nets. The Port Hurd operation has allowed Marine Harvest to gain valuable experience and to make informed decisions and choices when planning the expansion to its tropical marine farming operations.

Marine Harvest is aiming to set up three more barramundi sea cage farms or nurseries in the Northern Territory; one at Snake Bay, on the north coast of Melville Island; one at Port Patterson, to the west of Darwin Harbour; and a nursery and grow out facility in Darwin Harbour to the northeast of Channel Island. Marine Harvest has budgeted around \$15 million to get all three sites started up.

To justify its investment in improved infrastructure Marine Harvest needs to improve current economies of scale and to harvest more than 1000 tonnes per annum from each proposed farm. Marine Harvest is also considering building its own well boat for delivery of fish from the farm and it is intending to have barges built for on-site operations at Snake Bay and Port Patterson. According to its research, Marine Harvest could sell up to 5000 tonnes of farmed barramundi in Australia before it would have a need to export. The purchase of a well boat would rely on an increase in farm throughput for justification.

Currently around 80 to 90 percent of Marine Harvest's farmed barramundi is being sold within Australia, the remainder is exported to the United States.

### **3.2.2 Objectives**

The objectives of the project are:

- to develop a sustainable farmed barramundi fish industry and market,
- to operate a barramundi sea farm industry which will successfully and sustainably grow juvenile fish from the Darwin Aquaculture Centre to marketable sizes,
- to be an economically viable operation, providing reasonable returns to shareholders,
- to prevent or minimise impacts to the surrounding environment,
- to maintain good relationships with the local residents, providing both economic and job opportunities, and
- to provide a platform for the development of other tropical culture species.

### **3.2.3 Benefits and Justification**

#### **Marine Harvest Contributions**

Marine Harvest has recognised the economic and environmental benefits of fish farming.

Aquaculture farms, just like the proposed Snake Bay farm, are typically located in remote coastal areas. The majority of the employees for Marine Harvest farms usually live in these areas, which are often noted for their limited employment opportunities. Marine Harvest is therefore aware of the significant economic and social role it has to play in these communities. Initiatives and continuing efforts are made to develop positive relationships in the communities, these include nature conservation programmes, environmental initiatives, sponsorship of local sports and cultural events.

#### **Direct Employment**

Around 8 to 16 staff will be required to operate the Snake Bay farm. In addition, contractors will be needed periodically:

- 4 to 6 people for net construction,
- 4 people for diving and inspection, and
- 4 to 6 people for harvesting.

Employees will be sourced locally whenever possible.

#### **Establishment of a Sizable Local Business**

In 1996, Tiwi leaders identified the urgency of developing an independent economy for the islanders which would help to improve social outcomes and eliminate the influence of

welfare dependence. It was noted that the greatest assets of the Tiwi Islands are their natural resources and people. Natural resources utilisation was identified as a key area for economic development and also an area with high potential for providing long-term employment and training opportunities for Tiwi residents.

The Tiwi population at Snake Bay and on the islands is very supportive of the fish farming operation. The arrangement at Snake Bay is likely to be similar to that for Port Hurd, whereby the Tiwi population will earn royalties from the farms' revenue. The Tiwi also derive great pride in their association with the business and the presence of such a high profile venture being set up in their waters. Tourism operators visiting Port Hurd also use the fish farm as an attraction which appears to generate a great deal of interest. It is likely that this will also be the case at Snake Bay.

### **Relieve Pressure on Wild Barramundi Stocks**

The Snake Bay operation should help prevent additional pressure on wild barramundi stocks while providing a product which is in great demand in Australian and overseas markets. As the operation will be sourcing its juvenile stock from the Darwin Aquaculture Centre, which breeds barramundi under controlled conditions, it will not be depleting wild barramundi stocks.

### **Flow-on Benefits**

Flow-on benefits from the operation to the local community will include:

- Potential for employment of suitably qualified or trained local residents,
- Sourcing of sundry everyday goods from local shops,
- Regular use of airstrip facility,
- Use of local transport, construction contractors, Council machinery,
- Use of local accommodation by contractors or visitors not accommodated by the operation, and
- Active support for cultural, environmental and sporting activities.

## **3.3 Location of the Project**

The proposed location for the barramundi farm site is within Snake Bay, Melville Island, Tiwi Islands, Northern Territory. The Tiwi Islands comprise Melville Island (the second largest island off the Australian mainland at 5788km<sup>2</sup>) and Bathurst Island (1693km<sup>2</sup>) and a few scattered smaller islands off the coast. The Tiwi Islands lie some 60 km north of Darwin and are separated from mainland Australia by the Clarence Strait. The Tiwi Islands were separated from mainland Australia between 8,000 and 12,000 years ago. Figure 1 illustrates the location of the Tiwi Islands and more specifically Snake Bay.

Snake Bay is a tidal estuary on the north coast of Melville Island; it extends inland into the waters of Curtis Haven which is fed by the Tjipripu River. The proposed project area will be located within the marine waters of the bay around half a kilometre to the north-

east of Point Strath, which is situated around 3.5 kilometres to the south-east of the community of Milikapiti.

A site suitability assessment for marine aquaculture was carried out and documented in the *Tiwi Islands Regional Nature Resource Management Strategy* (Tiwi RNRMS, 2004), issued by the Tiwi Land Council in 2004. This assessment showed that there were three locations around Bathurst and Melville Islands which were suitable for marine aquaculture. One was at Port Hurd, where the Marine Harvest pilot fish farming operation is currently operating, another was a large portion of Apsley Strait, the channel between Bathurst and Melville Islands, and the third was within Snake Bay, where this operation is proposed to be located. The sites were selected on the basis of natural sheltering from cyclones and suitable depth and ocean currents. The assessment noted however that a buffer of 3 kilometres should be kept around Milikapiti community in order to protect it from potential pollution (refer to Figure 2).

Marine Harvest also used its experience at Port Hurd to help it identify optimal tropical marine fish farming characteristics. The proposed farm location was chosen based on selection criteria such as sea-bed clearance, tidal currents, sheltering from strong marine influences, distance from the community of Milikapiti and accessibility to Darwin.

Coordinates for the four corner points of the proposed lease area are provided in Table 3.1, below. Refer to Figure 3 showing the location of the proposed lease area.

**Table 3.1: Coordinates of Lease Area**

Point	Coordinate	Degrees	Minutes
A	Latitude	11	26
	Longitude	130	42.1
B	Latitude	11	26.18
	Longitude	130	41.98
C	Latitude	11	26.79
	Longitude	130	42.82
D	Latitude	11	26.51
	Longitude	130	43.15

### **3.4 Project Schedule**

Construction of the project will commence once approval has been granted by all relevant authorities. It is expected this may be around August 2006 based on the following time line:

1. submission of EIS in May 2006;
2. 28 days for public comment upon submission of EIS;
3. presentation to the NT Government of the outcomes of the EIS and verbal presentation of the information to the Snake Bay community;
4. submission of addendum to answer public comments;
5. consideration by the NT Minister; and
6. submission to the Federal Minister.

Once approval is given, it is anticipated that construction of the operation will be a staged process.

Stage 1 will take place over approximately 12 months and will involve the construction of sea pens able to farm up to 1500 tonnes of fish per year. During the initial period, the site will be operating out of a temporary land base which will be established in an existing shore-based facility. It is expected that basic infrastructure to begin fish farming could be in place within the first 7 months, and the farm would be serviced from the temporary shore-based facility until the barge is operational.

Stage 2 will be over a longer period, and will involve the construction of additional pens to allow production to increase to 5,000 tonnes per year. The farm is expected to operate indefinitely.

When the early stages of the fish farming facilities have been constructed and have been put in place, the go-ahead will be given to the Darwin Aquaculture Centre to initiate spawning of barramundi brood stock. It is expected this would take around 1 month and would be followed by around 3 months grow-out of hatchlings to juvenile stage (100-200mm). The 3 months grow-out could be carried out in a specifically-designed nursery area at the farm.

### **3.5 Layout and Infrastructure**

#### **3.5.1 Infrastructure**

Both the temporary shore-based facilities and the barge-based facilities are described below.

##### **3.5.1.1 Temporary Shore-Based Facility**

The shore-based facility will be sited within pre-existing infrastructure at Milikapiti. Investigations and negotiations are currently being carried out at Milikapiti to locate and

secure appropriate premises for the purpose of acting as a management and operational base for the construction and early operational stages of the fish farm.

Facilities are likely to be leased from the existing fishing tour operator. At a minimum, Marine Harvest will need to have the following facilities available for the construction and operation of the early stages of the fish farm:

- undercover feed storage area, around 5 x 5 metres initially during start up but up to 10 x 10 metres when the farm is producing 1500 t/p.a.,
- bunded area(s) for fuel and chemical storage,
- lockable storage for any hazardous substances,
- ensiler storage,
- equipment storage, eg fork lift and/or loader for moving feed pallets, fish grader, fish pump, fish counter machines,
- net-construction facility,
- workshop, office, and
- accommodation for 2 to 6 people.

The pens will be constructed on the beach on a disturbed area near the existing boat ramp and will then be towed into position.

#### *3.5.1.2 Long Term Barge-Based Facility*

The proposed long term facility will be entirely contained on water and will not comprise any on-shore facilities. The proposed farm will include the following infrastructure:

- A central automatic barge – which will include; live-aboard facilities, fresh water storage, a workshop, feed silos, feed distribution equipment, a dead-fish ensiler and chemical and fuel storage facilities;
- Steel mesh nets (pens);
- A mooring system consisting of cyclone-proof anchors; and
- Outboard motor boats for movement of personnel, day-to-day goods and waste disposal.

Initially, net building is likely to be carried out locally, however as production increases, it may be viable to build nets in Darwin and transport them to site. The pens will be attached to the sea floor using steel anchors installed by cyclone-mooring specialists.

A copy of the general plan arrangement of the typical central-feeding barge, which Marine Harvest is proposing to use for the operation, is provided in Figure 4. The barge will be situated in the centre of the mooring array and will be flanked by the pens. The barge will be constructed under contract in Darwin and will be sailed to the site and moored to the sea floor using steel anchors installed by cyclone mooring specialists.

The pens will be plastic circles of approximately 48 metres circumference. The pens will be made with steel-net mesh which, at the pilot Port Hurd operation, has been proven to exclude crocodiles and sharks and to not entrap predators. The holding nets will have 8-metre deep side walls, and funnel-shaped net base, making the nets a maximum of 8.5 metres deep. The total volume of the nets will be around 1800 cubic metres. Each pen will have a minimum seabed clearance of around 2 metres as they will be placed over channel areas that are at least 10 metres deep. The pens will be positioned in two lines of two by six pens each. The pens will be grouped in straight arrays of six pens and the long axis of the arrays will be placed parallel to the channel's direction.

Plate 1, below, illustrates a first generation 86-metre plastic pens in grid mooring array, which is similar to the arrangement proposed for the Snake Bay site, except that the Snake Bay site will include a centrally moored barge and the nets will be smaller.

The site will be clearly visible during the day. At night the barge will be lit up with corner lights and a flood light shining directly on the outer deck. The outer limit of the sea pens and the lease will be marked with flashing lights to be visible for navigational safety.



**Plate 1: Illustration of the type of 1<sup>st</sup> generation fish-pen infrastructure proposed for the site**

### **3.6 Preferred Design Criteria for the Facility**

The design of the farm is partly dictated by the unique characteristics of the estuarine environment in Snake Bay and partly by Marine Harvest's experience at its pilot project at Port Hurd, on the west coast of Bathurst Island.

#### **3.6.1 Aims of the Design**

The aims of the design include:

- minimising impact to the seafloor and the estuarine environment;
- minimising impact of the presence of the fish on other faunal species in the estuary;
- minimising stress to the farmed fish to optimise good growth conditions and minimise disease exposure;
- maximising the control over the feeding in order to maximise feed economy by minimising feed wastage and loss to the environment;
- maximising water circulation and oxygen input;
- minimising maintenance work in order to avoid excessive disturbance to the fish and the environment;
- minimising risk of mooring breakage and fish escape due to high waves and extremely high tides (king tides);
- minimising risk of fish escapes during extremely low tides; and
- complying with applicable legislation and standards.

#### **3.6.2 Site Limiting Factors**

There are a number of site characteristics at Snake Bay which impose some limitations to the design of the operation, these include:

- A narrow deep channel which means that the nets can only be set out along a narrow corridor;
- Large tides and exposure to mild cyclonic influences, which means that anchoring needs to be able to withstand these stresses on the infrastructure;
- The presence of two imunga (hunting or fishing) sites, one on each side of the proposed lease, which means that consideration will need to be kept for these small Aboriginal sacred sites; and
- The presence of the pens in the middle of the bay means that in conditions of poor visibility, or at night, flashing lights will need to be present at the corners of the lease to signal their presence.

### **3.6.3 Fish Net Design Criteria**

In order to achieve the aims listed in Section 3.6.1, the following design criteria have been chosen for the fish nets:

- Use of galvanised steel nets, for grow-out and nursery pens, with 35-mm bar mesh. These have been successful at Port Hurd in excluding predators, such as turtles, sharks and crocodiles, from feeding on the farmed fish, and in preventing predators from being entrapped in the mesh. The nets have also been found to minimise stock losses, fouling, net changing and repair. They have a life expectancy of eighteen to twenty-four months, though this may be longer at Snake Bay where the water currents are lower than at Port Hurd (3.5 versus 4.2 knots). This type of marine mesh assists in the maintenance of good water flow through the pens, therefore ensuring adequate oxygen supply to the fish and reduction in stress. Steel nets have also been found to be effective in minimising the incidence of gill fluke and parasites on the fish.
- Use of polyethylene fibre net placed on the inside of the steel nets for nursery purposes and until the fingerlings reach around 200g.
- Possible placement of nursery pens in different current corridors to that of the grow-out pens in order to maximise oxygen input, and minimise any potential bacterial load and therefore potential disease or pest transfer. This also facilitates the monitoring and feeding work by a nursery-dedicated staff member.
- Use of sacrificial aluminium anodes suspended 4 metres below the water surface to protect the nets from corrosion below the water line. The aluminium anodes are 1 metre long and they attract the corrosive ions that would otherwise cause the galvanising on the steel nets to disappear and cause them to corrode within only a few months. Sixteen anodes are placed on each net and these last for 2 years, i.e. essentially the life of the net.
- Placement of the nets over, at least, a 10-metre-deep channel, so that all nets have at least 2 metres clearance from the seafloor; and
- Periodic replacement of approximately 1 metre of mesh around the collar of the cages to eliminate corrosion.

### **3.6.4 Barge Design Criteria**

The following design criteria have been nominated for the barge:

- The barge will be sited in the centre of the array of nets to permit farm staff to oversee all pens effectively;
- The barge will be manned 24 hours a day so that any problems can be attended to immediately;
- Sewage from the barge will be treated with the 'Humphrey' system which meets US Coastguard standards approval;

- Concrete slabs will be used as the pontoon base for the construction of the barge, and Styrofoam will be used to pad the sides of the concrete slabs;
- Donga-style demountable buildings will be bolted onto the concrete slabs;
- The barge will be automated and will provide staff with feeding figures. Underwater cameras will be used to monitor feeding and to prevent feed wastage;
- The barge will store all fish feed in silos which will supply a blower system to transfer feed into 75 millimetre polyethylene pipes, carrying feed up to 800 metres from the barge;
- The barge will have an ensiler which is designed to digest dead fish, thereby preventing them from fouling the estuary. The digested product will be transported to Darwin for use in fertilisers;
- Chemicals stored on board will be within a bunded facility and will be held in the smallest containers practicable to minimise the chance of large spills;
- During day-to-day operations, there will be no need for on-shore facilities as all equipment and consumables will be stored on the barge and supplies will be delivered by boat; and
- Contractors will be used for all construction including net replacement, diving, mooring work and harvesting.

### **3.6.5 Mooring Design Criteria**

Mooring of the nets and the barge will be with the use of steel anchors, installed by cyclone mooring specialists, to moor the facilities and prevent them from being washed away or turned over in rough weather; however, they will be able to move with wave motion and water currents. The anchors are designed to bury themselves more deeply in the seafloor substrate when pulled upon and can burrow down to 4 metres below the seafloor.

The latest mooring arrays used at Port Hurd were successful in withstanding cyclonic and king tide conditions, though they failed in the highest king tide which coincided with high waves (2-3 metres). This failure was caused by the larger size of the nets (86 and 100 metres circumference) and the large number of nets (12) per mooring array. The mooring array proposed for Snake Bay will have six, instead of twelve nets, hooked up to each system, and will have smaller nets of 48 metre circumference and less total volume, thereby decreasing the drag by the currents and resultant stress on the moorings.

The mooring system for the barge will consist of four anchors and four mooring lines, hooked up to each of the corners of the barge.

Figure 5 shows the design for three six-pen mooring arrays with a central feeding barge. The proposed design for Snake Bay is for four six-pen mooring arrays with a central feeding barge, and the alignment of the pens will be in two single lines, as shown in

Figure 5. Figure 6 shows the details of the mooring equipment and connections which are likely to be used at Snake Bay, though the layout of the pens reflects the now-abandoned cluster arrangement which was used at Port Hurd.

Table 3.2 below provides a summary comparison of the mooring and net design arrangements proposed for Snake Bay as opposed to those used at Port Hurd. The comparison illustrates clearly that the proposed new design for Snake Bay nets and moorings will offer less drag in the water and will be secured more effectively with a larger number of mooring lines, than the old design used at the Port Hurd pilot farm.

**Table 3.2: Comparison Summary of the Mooring and Net Design Arrangements**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Snake Bay Proposed Design for Grow-out Nets</b>	<b>Port Hurd Old Design for Grow-out Nets</b>	<b>Port Hurd Old Design for Nursery Nets</b>
Net circumference	48 metres	86 or 100 metres	48 metres
Net depth	8.5 metres	9.5 metres	5.5 metres
Net volume	1800 cubic metres	3200 cubic metres	1200 cubic metres
Mesh sizes	35 millimetres	32 millimetres	20 millimetres
Mooring lines	18 lines per 6 nets in a line	20 lines per 12 clustered nets	Dependent on number of nets per array
Width of nets facing oncoming currents	15 metres	27 -30 metres	15 metres

### **3.7 Services and Support**

#### **3.7.1 Transport and Boat Movements**

Staff and construction contractors will reach the facility via fly-in, fly-out from Darwin to the existing airstrip at Milikapiti. They would then travel by car from the airport to the community of Milikapiti and the nominated shore-based site. Access to the farm site would be by outboard motor boat from Milikapiti. The operation will have at least one motor boat moored to the barge and this will be available at all times to permit rapid staff movement in the event of an emergency.

At this stage it is not anticipated that any upgrades to the airstrip or the local roads will be required for the operation to go ahead. Boat launching facilities will need to be shared

with the local users. Should conflict arise, it may be necessary for Marine Harvest to consider upgrading those facilities.

Goods and equipment will be carried to and from site via the Tiwi Barge Company, which will service the operation on a weekly basis during construction and harvesting, and on a fortnightly basis at other times. Much of the waste disposal will take place via the Tiwi Barge which will transport the waste for Waste Master, a licensed waste-disposal company using Darwin facilities.

Boat movements to and from the site during construction of mooring arrays will be via outboard motor boat. It is anticipated that morning and afternoon trips will be taken to the lease site and that the mooring contractors will take several weeks to complete the mooring system.

Boat movements to and from the site during day-to-day operations, and prior to the establishment of the on-site barge, will be via outboard motor boats and will be initially twice daily, increasing to three times daily as the fish grow and require more feed.

Boat movements to and from site during day-to-day operations, after the establishment of the on-site barge, will be via outboard motor boat and may average once a day.

It is considered that the current infrastructure is sufficient to cater for the additional traffic generated by the operation. There is no jetty on site and all operations will either be from a beach or from the barge.

### **3.7.2 Staffing and Servicing Requirements**

During construction of the site, there will be a need for between 10 and 15 people on the operational side, a barge with 4 divers and 4 other support contractors. The numbers will fluctuate according to the tides, with no construction taking place during spring tides and most work taking place during neap tides. To coincide with the neap tides, it may occasionally be necessary to work evenings, nights or early mornings, otherwise most work will be carried out during normal daytime hours.

Staffing of the temporary shore-based facility, once the site has begun farming fish, will require around 8 staff per weekly roster, i.e. a total of 16 people on staff. In addition, contractors will be required periodically for particular tasks:

- 4 to 6 contractors will be needed monthly for net construction;
- contract divers will be needed fortnightly to inspect and mend the nets; and
- 4 to 6 contractors will be needed monthly to help with the harvesting operations.

Once the barge has been set up and the automated feed system is up and running, it is anticipated that between 2 and 6 people will be required on the barge, with two staff being on the barge at anytime. Day-to-day operations will be carried out during normal daylight working hours, except in some circumstances where tidal schedules may dictate that work be done to coincide with a neap tide.

Employees will be sourced locally whenever possible. A skeleton of staff will be housed on the barge when it is commissioned.

### **3.7.3 Barge Facilities**

The barramundi farm is to be predominantly marine-based with only limited activities occurring on land during the construction phase of the facility.

The barge will include live-aboard facilities consisting of kitchen, living room, two bedrooms, a laundry, a bathroom with toilet, sink and shower, a computer/office area, a workshop and an ensiler for dead fish. A large portion of the barge will consist of silos which will hold the fish feed. The barge will be equipped with satellite communications. A copy of a typical plan for the proposed barge is provided in Figure 4.

Basic requirements of the day-to-day live-aboard activities will include:

- cooking, storing food and disposing of food and packaging wastes and grey water;
- personnel washing and disposal of sewage wastes;
- clothes washing and disposal of grey water;
- power supply to the barge generator; and
- storage, supply and disposal of sundry consumables for personal, kitchen, laundry and office purposes.

### **3.7.4 Power, Potable Water Supply and Storage**

#### **Power**

Power to the site and to the barge will be supplied via a diesel generator which will operate 24 hours a day. A small backup generator will be available in case of breakdown of the primary genset.

#### **Potable Water**

Potable water will be provided to the barge via a service ship from Darwin and will be replenished weekly or fortnightly. It is estimated that around 5000L of water would be required per week for a barge housing up to 4 staff.

#### **Storage at Temporary Land Base**

Storage of diesel at the temporary land-based facility will be in an above-ground storage tank (around 10,000 litres) which will be in an impermeable bunded area. This tank will supply fuel to small intermediate bulk containers (IBCs) which will be used to refuel transport boats. Unleaded fuel will be stored in smaller fuel containers and will also be kept in a bunded area. Unleaded fuel is used by the feed-pumps and outboard motors.

Storage of chemicals will be in the manufacturers' containers, in a bunded area, and in accordance with the requirements set out in the relevant Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS). All chemicals and fuels will be stored under cover to shelter them from sun and rain. Feed and all other equipment will also require undercover storage.

### **Storage on Barge**

Chemicals which will be stored on board the barge will include products such as diesel, petrol, cleaning fluids (eg. calcium hypochlorite or Phoraid for disinfection of barges, boats and footwear), and chemicals required for digestion in the ensiler. They will be stored in a bunded area and under similar storage requirements as noted above. However, given the finite area available, storage may need to be in smaller quantities, using smaller units. It is currently envisaged that all storage requirements will be accommodated on the barge itself and that no shore-based storage will be required.

## **3.8 Farm Operation**

Marine Harvest proposes to operate the Snake Bay farm in a similar manner to the way the pilot Port Hurd barramundi farm has been managed.

### **3.8.1 Fish Cultivation**

Marine Harvest intends to farm barramundi (*Lates calcarifer*) at their lease in Snake Bay. Juvenile fish will be bred at the Darwin Aquaculture Centre (DAC) which is a facility owned by the Northern Territory Government. In the natural environment, barramundi spawn on full and new moons over the summer months. Hatcheries such as the DAC, are able to control spawning all year round using artificial light and temperature regulation. The availability of stock from the DAC, which uses local NT broodstock, has ensured that no potential exotic fish diseases are transferred from interstate-sourced fish. The hatchlings are vaccinated at the DAC for bloat (enteritis) and for streptococcus.

The proposed farm will have the capacity to produce 3500 – 5000 tonnes of fish per year, though this represents a long term target and it is expected that it would take a few years to reach that level of production.

The site will initially be stocked with juvenile barramundi sourced from the DAC. The fingerlings (10 – 20 grams) will be grown in specific nursery pens. The juvenile barramundi will be transferred to the grow-out pens for on-growing when they are approximately 200 millimetres long, i.e. after around 3 months. They will take around 18 months to reach harvest size of approximately 3 kilograms.

The stocking density of the nets with the juvenile fish will begin at around 4 kg per cubic metre, based on 80,000 to 120,000 juvenile fish per pen, and is likely to have an upper limit of 35 to 45 kilograms of fish per cubic metre based on a fully stocked cage of 3-kilogram fish. However, the fixed-net dimensions, harvesting programs, fish wellbeing, and slower current conditions at Snake Bay compared to Port Hurd mean that stocking densities are likely to be below 45 kilograms per cubic metre.

Intakes of juvenile fish are likely to be similar to those at Port Hurd, whereby two groups of fish will be taken in every two months, at one-week intervals, with around 80,000 to 120,000 fish taken in during the first intake week and another 80,000 to 120,000 fish taken in during the second intake week. The intake number will be governed by survival rate and market demand.

It is planned that ultimately the juvenile barramundi will be grown from hatchling to juvenile size within a nursery-type set up which is proposed to be located near Channel Island in Darwin Harbour. The hatchlings would still be sourced from the DAC.

### 3.8.2 Feeding

The fish will be fed on pellets from the automatic feed blower located on the barge. A blower system will transfer the feed from the barge to the pens via 75 millimetres diameter polyethylene (PE) pipe. The feed is mobilised by water and jetted into the pens.

The pellets vary in size from 4 to 15 millimetres, according to varying age classes of fish. Pellets will be shipped to the barge in 25 or 500 kilogram bags, protected by heat shrink-wrapping in one-tonne lots. Feed used is extruded dry feed which is specifically formulated for tropical fish where up to half of the protein used is non-fish.

The feed used will be Nova ME developed by Skretting. This is a high-performance sinking feed, which is mammalian-product free. No hormones are used in the feed.

The pellets are specifically designed for marine fish and their composition and ingredients are detailed in the tables below. Table 3.3 provides the typical composition of the fish feed. The typical ingredients included in the fish feed include: fish meal, plant protein meal, poultry protein meal, wheat, fish oil, poultry oil, vitamins and minerals. The percentage of these ingredients may vary according to the quality of the raw material used.

**Table 3.3: Typical Composition of Fish Feed**

Component	Percentage	
	3 or 4 mm pellets	6, 9 and 11 mm pellets
Crude protein	50	45
Crude lipid	17	20
Carbohydrates	15	18
Moisture	8	8
Ash	10	9
Total phosphorus	1.4	1.4
Available phosphorus	0.9	0.9

It is anticipated that the same feed mix combination will be used at Snake Bay as that currently used at the Port Hurd pilot farm, i.e. around 7/8 will be feed from Tasmania supplied by Skretting, and 1/8 will be feed from Queensland, supplied by Ridley's Aquafeed. This feed mix combination uses an increased amount of high quality feed from

Skretting and is believed to have contributed to the good health in the fish at the Port Hurd pilot farm.

### **3.8.3 Pens Inspections and Cleaning**

Pens will be inspected daily from the surface, and any damage to the pens will be repaired immediately where possible. In the case of major damage requiring divers' intervention, this will be synchronised with periods of slower currents and good visibility. Pens inspections by divers would typically be carried out fortnightly on neap tides, when water flows are less and visibility is good. Divers will inspect the pens for integrity and will carry with them pliers and steel spirals to carry out any necessary repairs on the spot (refer to Plate 2).



**Plate 2: Diver Carrying Out Repairs on Port Hurd Farm Nets**

The steel nets do not require any cleaning. Fibre nets will be cleaned fortnightly on the neap tides. Divers will enter the nets and will use a rotating disk with high water pressure.

### **3.8.4 Grading and Counting**

The fish will be graded and counted at set times. These events will be kept to a minimum in order to minimise the chances of damaging their skin and therefore increasing their chances of exposure to disease. They are generally graded and/or counted four times during their life: at the hatchery, prior to receipt by Marine Harvest, when they are transferred to the grower pens, and finally at harvest time.

Each group of fish is given a label, eg. 03/05A would represent the group taken in March 2005 at the first intake, and 03/05B would represent the group taken in March 2005 at the second intake. If the groups become combined they would be labelled with an AB

suffix. Each time they are handled for grading or any other reason, the label is tagged with an additional digit, eg. 031/05B has been handled once, 032/05B has been handled twice, and so on. All specifics relating to the handling exercise, and other details about the fish groups are collated digitally on the on-site computers. This system of labelling assists with quality control.

Fish will be separated or removed from pens with the help of Seine nets, which are not gill nets. The Seine nets will be used to crowd the fish into one side of the pen and a fish pump is then used to bring the fish up onto the barge for grading, counting and/or harvesting.

### **3.8.5 Growth and Harvesting**

Predicted growth rates are based on those from the Port Hurd site where growth rates have been excellent. The fish will take approximately 18 months to reach a marketable size of approximately 3 kilograms.

A harvesting vessel will be deployed from Darwin. This will consist either of a well boat for live transport or a boat containing a large amount of ice stored in wells. The fish to be harvested will be crowded into a small area in the corner of the pen. The fish will then be sucked into a hopper and discharged to the boat well. If the fish are to be iced they will be discharged via a chute into an ice slurry on the harvesting vessel. The sudden reduction in water temperature from 30°C to 0°C kills the fish. The operation is carried out as quickly as possible to reduce the stress on the fish from overcrowding in the harvesting pen, and to ensure the temperature of the fish drops as quickly as possible. The fish are then packed into containers filled with ice to ensure the temperature of the fish remains at around 2° for the duration of the 12-hour trip to Darwin.

It is anticipated that in the long term the fish will be harvested live into well boats. This method has the advantage of providing a longer 'shelf' life to the fish.

### **3.8.6 Steel Nets Construction**

Based on the Port Hurd experience, the nets last around 2 years. If 24 nets are present, this requires that around one net is built and replaced every month.

Nets will be constructed from rolls of mesh which will initially be handled by a loader. Lengths of mesh will then be joined with steel wire spirals to achieve the required pen size. The work will only require manual handling and no machining will be necessary. The constructed nets will be floated to the farm mooring area with the help of a high tide.

### **3.8.7 Ensiler and Domestic Waste Disposal**

An ensiler will be kept both at the temporary land-base and on the permanent barge, when commissioned. The ensiler will be used for the disposal of dead fish (morts). All solid wastes generated at the temporary land base will be disposed to skip bins and recycled via the landfill recycling system. On the barge it is likely that putrescible waste could be disposed into the ensiler. The resultant product would have different ratios of nitrogen, phosphate and potassium than the product issuing from fish only and this would need to be taken into account when supplying the product to the fertiliser company MOECO, so that it may adjust its admixtures when manufacturing its fertilisers.

### 3.8.8 Emissions

Emissions from the proposed operation include:

- wastes to water from:
  - excess feed not consumed by farm fish,
  - fish faeces,
  - dead fish (morts),
  - parasite control treatment, and
  - grey water from the barge;
- solid wastes from:
  - feed bags,
  - dead fish (morts), and
  - waste from the occupation of the barge by staff;
- noise, light and air:
  - noise from outboard motors, feeding equipment, occupation of the barge, harvesting operations, site maintenance, net and pen construction;
  - light from the habitation of the site during night hours and illumination of farm outline for vessel safety; and
  - emissions to air may include noxious smells from dead fish stock, and noxious smells and fumes from the presence of chemicals and fuels and from running outboard motors, the generator, and feeding equipment and emissions of greenhouse gases from the consumption and presence of fuels.

Table 3.4 provides an indication of the quantities of each waste type.

**Table 3.4: Estimate of Quantities of Liquid and Solid Wastes**

Waste receptor	Type	Quantity (estimate)	Comment
Water body	Excess feed	Minimal	Feeding is strictly monitored via feed tables so surplus feed is minimal. Any minimal stray amounts would be taken up by local wild fish.
	Fish faeces	16 - 20 kg per 1000 kg of fish produced	Would be expected to be mostly flushed by tides.
	Morts	Nil to minimal	Solid and liquid wastes from morts will be minimal given that they are removed daily from the nets and decay would be non-existent to minimal.
	Parasite control treatment	Nil to minimal	Fish at Port Hurd were found to not require any parasite treatment from the time steel mesh nets were used.
	Waste water from barge	5000 litres/week	Grey water consisting of treated sewage waste, and use of barge by personnel.
Recycler	Morts and putrescibles from ensiler	2% of fish produced	Would be sent to fertiliser company for recycling.
Landfill - recycling	Recyclables (eg. cans, paper, plastics, etc.)	2 kg / week / per person, plus a small amount of other containers required for the operation.	Recycled at the Darwin landfill.
Landfill	Non-recyclable packaging and other non-recyclable wastes (eg. feed bags)	5 kg of feed bags / 1000 kg of fish, plus a small amount of other wastes from the operation.	Disposed to the Darwin landfill.

### **3.8.9 Chemicals**

The operation will store a number of chemicals and hazardous materials which will be managed in accordance with Dangerous Goods Regulations.

Small quantities of cleaners and detergents will be stored for use. Some laboratory and workshop chemicals will be stored and used. Minor quantities of greases and solvents for maintenance purposes will be stored in the workshop. The most significant hazardous materials stored on site are: diesel and unleaded petrol. These will be used to power engines on the supply vessels and on the farm.

#### *3.8.9.1 Diesel and Fuels*

The main fuels required by the operation will be diesel and unleaded. Between 190 and 250 litres of diesel per day will be required by the generator for the temporary land-based operation of the farm. It is anticipated that around 1000 litres of diesel will be required by the barge each month. It is estimated that around 1000 litres of unleaded fuel will be used monthly in the outboard motor boats and the Honda feeding pump. Car trips would be expected to be minimal and to entail around 3 to 4 trips per week over only 2 to 3 kilometres.

The maximum amount of fuel to be stored at the temporary land-base is likely to be around 5,000 to 10,000 litres of diesel and between 1,000 and 1,500 litres of unleaded fuel. Storage quantities on the barge at any one time will probably be of the order of 2,500 to 5,000 litres of diesel and 1,000 litres of unleaded fuel. All diesel and fuel will be stored in a purpose-built, bunded area.

#### *3.8.9.2 Solvents and Cleaners*

The workshop on board the barge will contain solvents, cleaners and degreasers.

#### *3.8.9.3 Chemicals, Fuels and Hazardous Materials Register*

A list of chemicals which are expected to be required on site is provided in Table 3.5; these are grouped into laboratory chemicals, workshop chemicals and fuels. A distinction is also made in the last two columns regarding which chemicals will be required on the barge and which will be required on the land-based temporary facility.

The chemicals held in the farm's laboratory are used for fish health reasons, such as disease identification, etc. These would be kept at the temporary land-based facility and on the barge. In contrast, paint-store chemicals would be used for infrastructure maintenance on the temporary land-based fish farm, but many of these will not be required for the barge.

**Table 3.5: List of Chemicals Stored on Site, based on the Port Hurd Pilot Program Chemical Register**

Chemical Name	Areas Stored	Typical Amount Held	Land Base	Barge
Clean Hands Hands Cleaner	CLEANERS BUND	20 L	Yes	Yes
Country Wide Pine Disinfectant	CLEANERS BUND	20 L	Yes	Yes
Raw Linseed Oil	CLEANERS BUND	20 L	Yes	No
Sapur Carpet Cleaner	CLEANERS BUND	5 L	Yes	No
Watty! Ck Citronella	CLEANERS BUND	60 L	Yes	No
Citric Acid	LAB	20 L	Yes	No
Ethanol 100%	LAB	5 L	Yes	Yes
Formalin 10% neutral buffered	LAB	10 L	Yes	Yes
Lugol's Iodine	LAB	1 L	Yes	Yes
Methanol (AR)	LAB	1 L	Yes	Yes
Methylated spirits	LAB	10 L	Yes	Yes
Chlorine Bleach of Phoraid	LAB	5 L	Yes	Yes
Hydrochloric Acid	LAB	5 L	Yes	Yes
Giemsa stain	LAB	3 L	Yes	Yes
Gram stain kit	LAB		Yes	Yes
Oxytetracyline (antibiotic)	LOCKED CONTAINER	200 kg	Yes	Yes
Acetone	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	Yes
Cabots Deck Oil	PAINT STORE	10 L	Yes	No
International Interbond 201	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
International Interbond DeckCoat	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
International Intrerbond Intertuf 203	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
Jotun AntiFoul	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
Jotun PenGuard HB	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Biosafe Gripcoat A	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Biosafe Gripcoat B	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Biosafe topcoat	PAINT STORE	20 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Bosafe Build Coat	PAINT STORE	10 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Killrust Superior Protection Epoxy	PAINT STORE	2 L	Yes	No
WATTYL POLY U 400	PAINT STORE	2 L	Yes	No
WATTYL SeaPro Antifouling	PAINT STORE	10 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Sigma EP Tie Coat A	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Sigma EP Tie Coat B	PAINT STORE	5 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Sigma Plane Ecol HA120 antifoul	PAINT STORE	10 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Sigma Thinner 91-79	PAINT STORE	20 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Thinner 91-92	PAINT STORE	20 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Thinner L707	PAINT STORE	2 L	Yes	No
WATTYL Thinner T10 901/19310	PAINT STORE	2 L	Yes	No
Rustroy	WORK SHOP		Yes	Yes

Chemical Name	Areas Stored	Typical Amount Held	Land Base	Barge
Aquadhere	WORKSHOP	500 ml	Yes	Yes
Araldite	WORKSHOP	200 ml	Yes	Yes
Bostic PVC glue	WORKSHOP	250 ml	Yes	Yes
Bostic PVC primer	WORKSHOP	250 ml	Yes	Yes
Braizing flux powder	WORKSHOP	1 L	Yes	Yes
CRC aerostart	WORKSHOP	1 spray can	Yes	Yes
CRC bulk	WORKSHOP	20 L	Yes	Yes
CRC lube	WORKSHOP	4 spray can	Yes	Yes
Diesel injector cleaner	WORKSHOP	500 ml	Yes	Yes
Duralac anticorrosion joining compound	WORKSHOP	3 tubes	Yes	Yes
Exhaust manifold cement	WORKSHOP	100 ml	Yes	Yes
Food Lube	WORKSHOP	1 cylinder	Yes	Yes
Geminex yellow label paint	WORKSHOP	1 L	Yes	No
HIAB Skewing grease	WORKSHOP	100 ml	Yes	Yes
Lanotec bulk	WORKSHOP	20 L	Yes	Yes
Leak sealer spray	WORKSHOP	1 spray can	Yes	No
Loctite 243	WORKSHOP	100 ml	Yes	Yes
Loctite 401 adhesive	WORKSHOP	25 ml	Yes	Yes
Loctite 567	WORKSHOP	250 ml	Yes	Yes
Loctite bluemax silicone	WORKSHOP	100 ml	Yes	Yes
Loctite gasket seal	WORKSHOP	500 ml	Yes	Yes
PBR rubber grease	WORKSHOP	100 ml	Yes	Yes
Pot Belly heat resistant paint	WORKSHOP	2 spray can	Yes	Yes
PVC glue	WORKSHOP	500 ml	Yes	Yes
PVC primer	WORKSHOP	500 ml	Yes	Yes
RTD metal cut compound	WORKSHOP	1 L	Yes	Yes
Silver braizing flux paste	WORKSHOP	100 ml	Yes	Yes
Space Invader foam	WORKSHOP	1 spray can	Yes	No
Tectyl spray	WORKSHOP	1 spray can	Yes	Yes
Trefolex cutting compound	WORKSHOP	1 L	Yes	Yes
Zinc It	WORKSHOP	6 spray can	Yes	Yes
Rust Guard Paint	WORKSHOP	1 spray can	Yes	Yes
Diesel Fuel	BUNDED AREA	5,000 – 10,000 L	Yes	Yes
Unleaded Petroleum Fuel	BUNDED AREA	1,000 – 1,500 L	Yes	Yes
Lubricating oil	BUNDED AREA	WORKSHOP	Yes	Yes
Air	BOTTLE CRATE	450 kg	Yes	Yes
Oxygen	BOTTLE CRATE	45 kg	Yes	Yes
Acetylene	BOTTLE CRATE	45 kg	Yes	Yes
Potassium Hydroxide (for ensiler)	BUNDED AREA	1000 kg	Yes	Yes

### **3.8.10 Ongoing Management, Maintenance and Administrative Requirements**

An engineer will be present on site whose responsibility will be to carry out maintenance on machinery and the barge. General maintenance schedules will be documented in the site procedures and will follow a 'per hours of operation' scheme, whereby the generator is serviced every 250 hours of operation, the barge is serviced every 200 hours of operation, and so on.

It is anticipated that administrative work conducted on the farm will be minimal. The 'office' will be equipped with a computer, a telephone and a facsimile machine. The farm would be required to send stock information to Darwin, to confirm travel arrangements, and to pass on ordering requirements, etc. All other administrative duties would be conducted from the Darwin office.

## **3.9 Decommissioning and Rehabilitation**

The temporary land-based facility will be established in pre-existing premises at Milikapiti. It is expected that this facility will be used for around 12 months. The land-based facilities will be vacated and rehabilitated upon commissioning and establishment of the barge facility on the farm site. Rehabilitation works of the land-based facility will encompass:

- removal of any temporary structures,
- removal of any equipment and fuel storage containers,
- recycling and reuse of any equipment and materials which can be recycled or reused,
- removal of any waste materials, and disposal to appropriate waste disposal facilities,
- leaving all ground surfaces in a stable and clean condition, not prone to erosion, and
- ensuring that no potential mosquito breeding sites are left on the premises.

The works will be carried out within four months of the facility being vacated, provided this is carried out prior to the wet season. The aim, where possible, will be to reinstate the land to its previous condition and to leave the facility in a stable and clean state, free from wastes, and free of potential mosquito breeding sites. If required revegetation of the area will occur using seed mixes collected from the local plants.

The area will be carefully monitored over at least two years to ensure no weed infestation occurs. If weed infestation is prevalent a weed eradication program will be implemented over the same period.

The long-term barge facility will be established approximately 12 months after the land-based facility. Its life expectancy is indefinite at this stage. If operation of the site ceases in the future, Marine Harvest will discuss potential sale of the operation with the

Government and with the Tiwi people who may take over ownership for some other purpose.

Decommissioning and rehabilitation of the barge facility will require:

- removal of barge,
- removal of nets and plastic circles,
- removal of all anchor ropes, and
- removal of any steel anchors which have not dug down too deep for removal.

It is possible that some of the materials could be reused and recycled:

- The barge or its components should be able to be recycled;
- The plastic circles have a very long life, around 10 years, which means that the material could be recycled;
- The anchor ropes can be reused for landscaping or other similar usage;
- The anchors are made of heavy steel and can be reused; and
- Any equipment or machinery can be sold for reuse.

Any materials which cannot be reused or recycled, will need to be disposed to appropriate waste-disposal facilities in Darwin and will be transported via the Tiwi Barge Company.

### **3.10 Legislative Requirements**

#### **3.10.1 Lease Requirements**

A licence is required for the development under Northern Territory Fisheries legislation. Part of the requirements for such a licence is that the proponent must first obtain a permit and a lease. A lease is granted by the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment and the Minister decides the length of the lease. If the lease period is greater than 12 years then the proponent must also apply to the Development Consent Authority for approval of the lease before the title can be registered.

Marine Harvest is in the process of applying to the Northern Territory Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Environment for a Crown lease over the proposed area of 100 hectares. A Crown Lease Term is a development lease containing conditions and covenants requiring development to be undertaken in accordance with the agreed development plan. A granted lease is valid for 10 years.

#### **3.10.2 Native Title**

Native title does not currently impact on marine areas but it is considered possible that this situation may change in relation to bay areas. Under the Northern Territory legislation, development applicants must have contact with traditional landowners in the

area as part of the development consent process. Marine Harvest has been in contact with the Tiwi Land Council over many years as a result of the Port Hurd operation. Several meetings about the Snake Bay proposal have been held with the local community who have also attended an Open Day at Port Hurd. The local community are very supportive of this proposal.

Marine Harvest will comply with relevant requirements of the *Northern Territory Aboriginal Sacred Sites Act* (1989) and the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act* 1976.

### 3.10.3 Compliance with Applicable Standards

The temporary shore-based facilities which will need to be established, and the barge-based facilities which will be constructed, will comply with all relevant Environmental Health Standards for Public Health, Food and Radiation Protection including, but not limited to, the Northern Territory legislation, summarised in Table 3.6 below. The facilities will be inspected regularly by a Food Health inspector.

**Table 3.6: Applicable Environmental and Health Legislation**

<b>Applicable Legislation</b>	<b>Enforcement Agency</b>
Public Health (General Sanitation, Mosquito Prevention, Rat Exclusion & Prevention) Regulations	Territory Health Services
Water Act	Department Lands, Planning & Environment
Water Supply and Sewerage Services Act	Power and Water Authority
Public Health (Nightsoil, Garbage, Cesspits, Wells & Water) Regulations	Territory Health Services
Waste Management and Pollution Control Act, 1998	Department of Lands, Planning and Environment

## 4 Alternatives

### 4.1 Not Proceeding with the Proposal

The Marine Harvest-proposed Snake Bay Barramundi Fish Farm is a component of a business plan which includes the proposed Port Patterson barramundi fish farm, and the proposed Channel Island nursery site. The aim of the business plan is for Marine Harvest to develop a sustainable farmed-barramundi industry.

The plan requires that three grow-out sites be operational and 5000 tonnes of fish be harvested annually from all farms combined for the operation to be able to support a dedicated well boat. Without the economy of scale and its own well boat, production costs (and on-selling costs) would be much higher, since a well boat would need to be contracted and scheduling of harvests would be more difficult.

The Snake Bay proposal is ranked third, by Marine Harvest, in the priority list of the three proposed sites, with Channel Island being the first priority, and Port Patterson the second. Should the proposal for Snake Bay not proceed, Marine Harvest would still aim to pursue the establishment of the other proposed sites. However the business plan would not allow for the purchase of a well boat until a longer period of time had passed. Consequently, production costs would be much higher and it is likely to be more of a challenge to establish the farmed barramundi market.

### 4.2 Alternative Locations or Layout for the Whole Proposal

Marine Harvest has investigated much of the Northern Territory coastline for suitable sites for its proposed barramundi marine farming operations. Its selection criteria included:

- proximity/accessibility to Darwin,
- shelter from cyclones,
- suitable current speeds, and
- adequate water depth.

Marine Harvest found that many of the optimal sites were already taken by existing pearl-oyster farming operators, whose selection criteria are similar to those for marine fish farming. The sites Marine Harvest has selected, including the Snake Bay site, are the most suitable and potentially available, for its aquaculture purposes.

The Port Hurd farm operation has allowed Marine Harvest to trial its operational requirements and it is from these trials that optimal requirements from Snake Bay have been identified.

## **4.3 Alternatives for Components of the Proposal**

### **4.3.1 Steel Nets**

Based on the Port Hurd experience, it was found that the steel-cage cluster arrangement was not suitable for withstanding cyclonic conditions. The plastic circles with steel nets arrangement, which Marine Harvest propose to use at Snake Bay, were found to successfully withstand a Category 3 cyclone (March 2005) and a King tide (September 2005). The latter arrangement is therefore considered to be the best option and will be adopted for the proposed Snake Bay barramundi farm.

Marine Harvest has trialled both large and small net sizes at Port Hurd. The size of the pens is likely to be 48-metre circumference pens, as opposed to the larger pen sizes used at Port Hurd (86-metre or 100-metre circumference pens). Based on the Port Hurd experience, these smaller pens are considered optimal, as they are less visually obtrusive than the larger pens and they will help contain potential disease outbreaks to small groups of farmed fish. The smaller size means they will be lighter, and will therefore be exposed to less water drag and consequently put less strain on the mooring lines than the larger nets. The main disadvantages of the smaller nets are related to the extra amount of labour involved in constructing, mooring, maintaining the nets and the extra labour involved in feeding and monitoring more nets.

### **4.3.2 Mooring Devices**

The nets will be anchored to the seafloor via cyclone-proof mooring devices installed by cyclone-mooring specialists. This system has proven at Port Hurd to be generally successful in withstanding cyclonic conditions and king tides. Marine Harvest has opted to use smaller mooring arrays, where less nets will be attached to each mooring line.

### **4.3.3 Operational Facilities**

The farm will initially be operated from temporary land-based facilities until a barge is constructed for the site. The temporary facilities will be set up in pre-existing premises at Milikapiti.

The long term aim is to have all operations centred at sea at the farm itself, as this process is more practical and efficient. It avoids excessive motor boat movements, permits staff to optimise working hours, and allows staff to be present at all times to monitor the farm and respond rapidly to any emergency.

Unlike Port Hurd, there are no suitable pre-existing land-based facilities which could be readily converted for the long-term use of the proposed fish farm. If Marine Harvest did not choose the barge-based option, permanent new land-based facilities would need to be constructed at Milikapiti. Construction and use of a land-based facility would be more environmentally invasive and would also result in land-based impacts which would require rehabilitation.

When the barge is constructed, the intention is to place the barge in the middle of the farm area with the pens in two rows on either side of the barge. This layout optimises the visibility and accessibility of the pens by staff for inspection, feeding, harvesting, security, etc.

The barge design will be based on existing, tried and tested barges used in Canada, which have a concrete base with Styrofoam casing, and has a number of specifically designed dongas bolted onto it. The barge is expected to be around 40 metres long. The barge will be anchored to the seafloor via cyclone-proof mooring devices installed by cyclone-mooring specialists.

#### **4.4 Alternative Environmental Management Techniques**

A summary of the proposed environmental management techniques is discussed in Sections 9 and 10. These will be further detailed in the Environmental Management Plan which will be drawn up separately for the site. Alternative management options will be discussed in the Environmental Management Plan.

Marine Harvest is committed to choosing the most effective environmental management techniques which will achieve the goals of preventing and minimising impacts to the environment from the operation.

## 5 Existing Environment

### 5.1 Regional Setting

Details on the physical location of Snake Bay and the proposed project area are provided in Section 3.3. Location maps are provided at Figures 1 and 3.

#### 5.1.1 Climatic Zones

The Tiwi Islands have climatic characteristics which differ from the rest of the Northern Territory. The proposed project area is located within the northern-most rainfall zone over the Tiwi Islands which receives between 1800 and 2000 millimetres of rain per annum (Tiwi Islands Regional Natural Resource Management Strategy – Atlas, Tiwi Land Council, 2004 published in the Tiwi Islands RNRMS). Around 90 percent of the rain falls during the wet season which extends from November to May. The ambient maximum daily temperature would normally remain above 30°C for most of the year.

#### 5.1.2 Catchment Terrain Type

The topography of Melville Island is dominated by low altitude dissected sandstone (Van Diemen Sandstone) hills which peak at 136.5 metres above mean sea level. The sandstone hills slope down towards the coast and inland drainage courses. Most of the areas fringing the coast and drainage lines consist of tidal flats.

Snake Bay is located in the extension of the Tjipripu River estuary. The Tjipripu River catchment is one of nine catchments on Melville Island. The river and other tributaries to the estuary are partly fed by springs issuing from the sandstone hills.

#### 5.1.3 Marine and Coastal Form and Habitat Structure

Most of the river mouths on Melville Island consist of drowned river valleys which have become long and wide estuaries subjected to macro tidal influences. Snake Bay extends inland into Curtis Haven which is reported to be a near-pristine estuary, classified in geomorphic terms as a tide-dominated estuary, with mean wave height of 0.55 metre, maximum wave height of 2.5 metres, tidal range of 2.5 metres, and diurnal tides (ozestuaries.com).

The south of the Snake Bay coastal area is dominated by a broad fringe of mangroves. The north of the bay's coastal area comprises areas of eucalyptus forest and woodland, clusters of mangroves, small strips of dry rainforest and stands of melaleuca open forests and woodlands. Forestry plantations have been established to the west and north of the township of Milikapiti.

Narrow riparian and wetland zones and dry rainforest strips have been earmarked as areas of high conservation value in the Tiwi Islands RNRMS.

#### **5.1.4 Regional Population Centres**

The population of the Tiwi Islands consists of around 2,350 people, spread over four main communities and several outstations. Milikapiti is the population centre closest to Snake Bay and has a population of around 400. It is located on the western shore of the bay; it has a jetty suitable for barges, and has a licensed airstrip which services flights to and from Pirlangimpi, and twice a day to and from Darwin (25 minutes). Pirlangimpi is the largest population centre of the Tiwi Islands, located on the west coast of Melville Island. Main roads and community roads link Milikapiti to the other population centres on Melville Island and, via a bridge between the localities of Paru and Nguuu, the roads also link to communities and population centres on Bathurst Island. Refer to Figures 1 and 3.

The day to day management of the Milikapiti community is the responsibility of the Milikapiti Community Services Officer under the direction of the Milikapiti Community Management Board. The Works and Infrastructure Division of the Tiwi Islands Local Government is located in Milikapiti.

Services and facilities available at Milikapiti include a store, post office and banking facilities, recreation and sports facilities, a library and Centerlink agency, a health centre, a club and public garage.

#### **5.1.5 Land and Water Use**

Land uses on Melville Island include traditional uses and economic uses. Traditional uses are detailed in the following section. The population is predominantly grouped in the main population centres and communities, and sealed and unsealed roads link most of these. Much of the island is still pristine and unaffected by human presence.

Traditional land uses include harvesting plants and animals as a food source. In the mid 1990s, Milikapiti was successfully exporting sweet potato for sale on the mainland. Plantation forestry and harvest of native timber is one of the major contributors to the region's economy. Based on the Port Hurd experience, sea-cage aquaculture is now considered a viable economic venture. Other opportunities identified for land and water uses include:

- cropping and grazing activities,
- use of suitable sand, gravel and topsoil for construction and mineral extraction,
- plantation of native fruit and controlled harvest of wildlife, eg. Kakadu Plum and crocodile eggs,
- essential oil production from native vegetation,
- native vegetation for timber and soil and clay for art and craft production,
- surface and groundwater supply for irrigation and tourism,
- stocking a marine fishery for commercial and tourism activities, and
- use of undisturbed areas for nature-based tourism enterprises.

There is no established industry on Snake Bay itself, the waterway is used for tourism and recreational fishing.

Groundwater on Melville Island occurs either in a shallow unconfined aquifer or in a confined sandstone-hosted aquifer. The shallow aquifer occurs within the Van Diemen Sandstone and in the overlying laterite and alluvium; it covers most of the island and is the most readily used for water supplies. Water quality is generally good with pH between 4 and 6, low salinity and hardness (Haig et al, 2003 in Tiwi RNRMS). Groundwater usage around the Snake Bay area is generally limited to the shallow aquifer, which is currently being pumped via water bores in the locality of Milikapiti and to the north of the township. However, much of the shallow groundwater in the vicinity of the bay is either poor or brackish due to marine influences. Bores completed in Milikapiti in the confined aquifer (Moonkinu Member) have intersected water at around 100 metres below ground level. The Van Diemen Sandstone unit has high water storage capacity and high quality water. Springs occur across a large area of Melville Island and are associated with the sandstone hills.

The surface water catchment area of the Tjipripu River is around 726 square kilometres. During the dry season the dominant flow component is sourced from springs or drainage of the shallow aquifer (Van Diemen Sandstone) along the course of the waterway (i.e. base flow). During the wet season, rainfall runoff becomes the main flow component. The Tjipripu River flows through most of the year as the Van Diemen Sandstone thickness in the catchment area provides sustained base flows and springs. The surface water quality of the creeks on Melville Island has been assessed as being similar to that of the groundwater from the shallow aquifer, i.e. good with pH between 4 and 6, low salinity and hardness (Haig et al, 2003 in Tiwi RNRMS). Increases in surface water turbidity have been reported locally and have been attributed to feral buffalo activity as well as contributions from road works and clearing operations.

#### **5.1.6 Land and Water Sensitivities**

The Tiwi people consider that *'the ownership, allocation and expression of land and natural resources provide the definition of who a person is and where they fit within society'* (Tiwi RNRMS). Some areas of land and specified sites have high spiritual value determined through Tiwi history. However, all Tiwi land is valued as part of the overall amenity and as a source of plants and animals that are valuable for ceremonial purposes and for traditional food.

The marine environment is recognised as being particularly valuable for food, as relatively little effort is required to harvest a good quantity. This includes shellfish, mussels, oysters, periwinkles, mangrove worms and mud crabs which occur in mangrove communities. Fish, dugong and turtle are regularly harvested from the sea, and certain beaches are good sources of turtle and bird eggs (Tiwi RNRMS). Snake Bay is included, as is the whole north coast of Melville and Bathurst Islands, in an area noted to be a 'significant area for seagrass and dugong' (Tiwi RNRMS Atlas Map 14). Two small 'imunga' sites are also noted to be present within Snake Bay in the vicinity of and overlapping the proposed marine lease (Tiwi RNRMS Atlas Map 15). Correspondence from the Northern Territory Government notes that these sites are 'sacred sites' according to the Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority. The Tiwi Land Council has issued

a certificate regarding the Marine Harvest proposed lease area (refer to Section 8.20). It is anticipated that the operation will have no direct impact on those areas.

The Tiwi Islands RNRMS (Map 16) notes two areas to be suitable for seacage aquaculture, one in the channel between Melville and Bathurst Islands (Apsley Strait) and one within Snake Bay. These areas are noted to be at least 10 metres deep during the lowest tide and have reportedly less than 3.5-metre high waves. Map 16 also notes that buffers of 3 kilometres from the main population centres such as Milikapiti, need to be kept for pollution prevention reasons. The proposed project area is situated within the nominated suitable area within Snake Bay and it begins outside the extents of the 3-kilometre buffer around Milikapiti.

Copies of these maps are provided in Appendix C.

### **5.1.7 Aboriginal Relationships to the Land and Cultural Values**

There has been an unbroken history of Tiwi occupation of the land on the islands and the islands are 90 percent Tiwi populated. The natural resources of the region were used for food, shelter, medicine, weapons, tools and spiritual purposes. The region still provides rich food sources from the marine and coastal environment both from local plant and animal stock.

Melville and Bathurst Islands are divided into eight areas of traditional tribal ownership, as shown in Figure 7. Snake Bay is bounded on the western side by land owned by the Wulirankuwu tribe and on the eastern side by land owned by the Yimpinari tribe.

The majority of the Tiwi sites of significance are located on or near the coast of both Melville and Bathurst Island and consist of a variety of sites such as hunting campsites, grave sites, residential sites, ceremonial sites and imunga areas.

Hunting campsites are located at Point Strath, immediately to the south of the proposed project area, north of Don Point, to the north of Milikapiti, and two sites at Brown Point and at Dermott Creek. A grave site is located at the northernmost point on the east coast of Snake Bay and two imunga (hunting/fishing sacred sites) areas are located to the east of Point Strath and may partly overlap the proposed project area. Two other imunga areas are located further up the estuary one in each arm.

Although the links to the land are strong, the economic pressures on the population are such that the Tiwi elders are seeking other ways to gain economic independence via the creation of sustainable industry. To date, the main industries earmarked as sustainable and viable in the islands are plantation forestry and sea-cage aquaculture. However, the Tiwi Islands RNRMS clearly identifies the long term need to preserve cultural values and natural resources.

Although it is understood that the Tiwi people of Melville and Bathurst Islands have been under the influence of the Catholic Church since the arrival of missionaries in 1911, they have kept many aspects of their traditional culture, especially their art and craft and clan dances. Many Catholic ceremonies are marked by adaptations of traditional dances, body painting and decorations. The Tiwi language is spoken by all the population and is unique in that it has no or only tenuous links with other mainland languages.

### **5.1.8 Feedback from Consultation with Local Tiwi People**

Formal and informal consultation has been ongoing with the local Tiwi people since prior to the establishment of the pilot project at Port Hurd. This issue is further discussed in Section 11. The Tiwi people have been supportive of the investment, the operation and the opportunities which tropical fish farming can bring.

At least one staff member of Marine Harvest has been attending the regular meetings (3 to 4 per year) held by the local Community and the Union (local government, businesses) covering social issues. Marine Harvest also sits on the Tiwi Islands Coastal Committee Group.

Expectations from local Tiwi people are that some may have employment opportunities and training; that they may obtain royalties based on a percent of the farm's production; and that they may provide goods and services to the operation when these are available at a market competitive rate.

Discussions with community members at Milikapiti took place in September 2005 to identify any issues which the community wanted to be addressed in the EIS. Employment opportunities were the main issues raised by the community.

A group of approximately 30 Tiwi people attended an Open Day at Barra Base, Port Hurd, in November 2005. They were able to see the existing barramundi farm in operation and heard an update on the EIS process and the findings of the baseline studies to that time.

It is expected that the Tiwi involvement at the Snake Bay operation will be similar to that at Port Hurd, namely use of the Tiwi barge company, use of Tiwi building companies, engagement of workers from the Tiwi population. At Port Hurd, 4 out of around 13 employees (7 permanent and 6 casual), were found to have Tiwi-connections, i.e. around 30%. This is believed to be within the average ratio for most industries employing indigenous workers.

Other involvements of Marine Harvest have included:

- Provision of \$50,000 seed capital for the publication of 'Tiwi meet the Future, Tiwi and the Dutch – Celebrating 300 Years Together' published by the Tiwi Land Council in 2005;
- Arranged for 1000 barramundi burgers to be served on Commemoration Day (300 years of Tiwi-Dutch interaction); and
- Provided products to be sold at the local school fair (Garden Point).

## **5.2 Physical and Biological Environment**

### **5.2.1 Existing Environment**

'The proposed farm location is inside the sheltered section of Snake Bay formed by the narrows between Johnson Point (locally known as Picnic Point) and Point Strath on the

lower estuary of the Tjipripu River. Snake Bay to seaward of the narrows is an area of shoal water and sandbars with a narrow channel scoured by tidal flows which follows the southern shore.' (Aquenal, January 2006).

The existing physical environment at Snake Bay has not been documented in a comprehensive manner. Discrete studies have been undertaken in several areas and general information is available from public sources. The following section is a summary of this information and aims to provide an objective view of the present status of the physical environment at Snake Bay.

A number of issues have been identified previously within the environment of Snake Bay and Milikapiti, some of which have been addressed and remediated:

- High sediment load in run off from Milikapiti into Snake Bay due to erosion and inadequate drainage system (Milikapiti Community Government Council program titled '*Clean Seas - Addressing High Sediment Load Stormwater Discharge into Snake Bay – Milikapiti*' under the Northern Territory Coasts and Clean Seas Projects 1999-2000);
- Weed infestation in the foreshore and behind the coastal strip of Milikapiti (Milikapiti Community Government Council project '*Weed Control and Native Revegetation – Milikapiti Foreshore and Surrounds*' under the Northern Territory 2001-2002 Coastcare Projects); and
- Need for educating the local population about coastal issues such as coastal threats, biodiversity, coastal processes and environmental management (Tiwi Land Council project '*Tiwi Coastal Education*' under the Northern Territory 2001-2002 Coastcare Projects).

The Tiwi Land Council, as part of its development of the Regional Natural Resource Management Strategy for the Tiwi Islands has identified the main threats to natural resource values to be:

- lack of quarantine procedures,
- weed infestations,
- illegal fishing, and
- arrival of cane toads in Darwin.

The Snake Bay estuary is generally considered to be a near-pristine environment with only localised anthropogenic impacts.

#### 5.2.1.1 Climatic Factors

The climate of the Tiwi Islands is tropical monsoonal, characterised by a hot and humid 'summer' or wet season, and a hot and dry 'winter' or dry season. Snake Bay is located within a region which generally receives between 1800 and 2000 millimetres (1.8 to 2 metres) of rain annually. Average annual minimum temperatures range from 18°C in July to 24°C in November and December, and average annual maximum temperatures range

from 31°C in July to 33.8°C in November. Relative humidity ranges from monthly means of 71 to 88% at 9am and from 46 to 77% at 3pm. According to the Bureau of Meteorology web site and the Tiwi RNRMS, tropical cyclone events over the Tiwi Islands are regular events and would typically occur more readily during El Niña events. Cyclone events would typically be Category 3 or 4, though Category 5 cyclones have been recorded. Sea level rises in the region can be extreme and experience at Port Hurd has shown that sea level rises of 2 to 3 metres can occur.

#### *5.2.1.2 Hydrology and Water Quality*

The following summary is extracted from Aquenal's Baseline Environmental Survey - Snake Bay (January 2006). The proposed site is located in an area of deep water just inside the narrows on the centre line of the estuary. The water passing through this channel flows at speeds exceeding 3 knots during spring tides. The proposed farm location is in a small area of deep water at the inner end of the channel in the wider waters inside the narrows and is therefore subject to lower current velocities. There is no influence from ocean swells inside the narrows, but during the late dry season, the waters have properties approaching those of marine waters. During the wet season, there is a large inflow of fresh water from the Tjipripu River and the surrounding catchment, but this decreases to negligible during the dry season.

The main hydrological influences on this water body are the 6 metre tidal range (3 to 7 metre tides) at the mouth of the estuary, which diminish to around 2.5 metres in the upper estuary. These diurnal tides result in large daily flushing of the mangroves with seawater, and run-off from heavy rains during the wet season. Towards the end of the dry season, when terrestrial run-off has ceased and hot temperatures prevail, negligible net flushing occurs through the estuary.

Water temperature, dissolved oxygen and salinity readings obtained during Aquenal's baseline survey (August 2005 report) show that water quality in Snake Bay is within the range of the quality of water in Port Hurd, and is therefore considered typical for this type of mangrove estuary. Water is very warm, with salinity approaching that of seawater and minimal fresh water input at the end of the dry season. More detailed water quality information is provided in Section 5.3 which summarises the baseline study carried out by Aquenal.

#### *5.2.1.3 Bathymetry*

The proposed site will be located over a narrow portion of the estuary where water currents have scoured a channel which is deeper than in the remainder of the estuary. The south-western boundary of the proposed lease is located around the 4 metre depth contour, but the channel quickly deepens to 12 and 13 metres along a line parallel to the south-western boundary. The centre-line of the proposed lease has channel depths ranging from 8 metres in the south to 27 metres in the north. The north-eastern boundary overlaps depths that range mostly within 10 to 13 metres. (Refer to Appendix D).

#### *5.2.1.4 Existing Coastal and Marine Flora Species*

Three main vegetation classes occur along the coastal reaches of Snake Bay and Curtis Haven (the name used for the upper reaches of the estuary). The upper reaches of the estuary, and therefore Curtis Haven, are dominated by mangal forests (mangroves). The

lower reaches of the estuary, and encompassing the northern extents of Curtis Haven and most of Snake Bay are dominated by moderately open eucalypt forest. Small patches of dry rainforest are scattered throughout both of these main vegetation classes.

### **Mangal Forests (mangroves)**

The mangal forests fringing Curtis Haven consist mostly of low open woodlands in tidally inundated coastal areas, with the dominant species consisting of *Sonneratia alba*, *Rhizophora stylosa*, *Bruguiera parviflora*, *Xylocarpus mekongensis* and *Ceriops tagal*. Mangrove formations typically have relatively low plant species diversity (NRETA, 2006(a)).

*Sonneratia alba* is a tall white mangrove plant typically found on the seaward side, and *Ceriops tagal*, which is smaller and typically found on the landward side. *Rhizophora stylosa* forms a maze of arching stilt roots from the trunk and slender aerial roots from branches.

### **Eucalypt Forest (moderately open)**

This class is described as a tall forest dominated by *Eucalyptus miniata*, *E. tetradonta* and / or *E. nesophila*, typically with grassy understorey.

### **Dry Rainforest**

Consists of coastal thickets and dry slopes of broken plateau edge. These are very limited in extent and are shown to occur in two localised coastal areas in the vicinity of the proposed farm site (Tiwi RNRMS – Tiwi-Cobourge Bioregion Conservation Values and Environmental Resources).

NRETA (2006(b)) notes that rainforest patches in the Tiwi-Cobourge Bioregion, suffer impact from feral animals, fire and weeds and, though not yet formally designated, meet the criteria for vulnerable.

### **Marine Flora**

It is understood that seagrass meadows exist within the Snake Bay / Curtis Haven estuary, though their extents and locations are not well documented. However, their presence would generally imply that turtles and dugongs may range the area as seagrasses play an important part in their diets.

DIPE (2003) notes that dugong will preferentially feed on seagrass species which are lowest in fibre and highest in available nitrogen and presumed digestibility. The favoured genera of seagrass species are *Halophila* and *Halodule*. When feeding on seagrasses, dugongs dig up the whole plant including the nutrient-rich rhizomes and can consume between 21 and 36 kilograms of seagrass each day.

Damages to seagrasses (DIPE, 2003) occur through natural events such as cyclones and floods, which cause severe wave action, shifting sand, adverse salinity changes and light reduction. Anthropogenic impacts on seagrasses can be caused by 'mining, trawling, dredging, inland and coastal clearing and land reclamation. These activities

either directly remove seagrass or result in community degradation through increased sedimentation and turbidity.’

#### 5.2.1.5 Existing Coastal and Marine Fauna Species

##### **Tiwi – Cobourg Bioregion**

The NRETA (2006(b)) notes that the Tiwi-Cobourg Bioregion, which includes the area of the site, contains extensive superficially intact environments, in remote areas with little human impact, ‘some of the most ‘pristine’ environments in the nation, providing refuge for many species which have declined or disappeared from much of the rest of their range beyond this bioregion.’ It notes that ‘a range of threatening factors has begun to undermine this condition. Notably, these include feral animals (cats, pigs, water buffalo, cattle, banteng, and horses), weeds and changed fire regimes.’ Broad-scale vegetation clearing on Melville Island for plantations of exotic timber exacerbates the risks to local species.

##### **EPBC-Listed Species**

Eleven (11) Threatened Species and nineteen (19) Migratory Species are listed for the area covered by the proposal (EPBC Web Site). These are provided in Table 3.7 below.

**Table 3.7: List of Threatened and Migratory Species from EPBC Web Site for the Proposed Development Site**

Threatened Species	Status	Type of Presence
<b>Birds</b>		
<i>Erythrotriorchis radiatus</i> Red Goshawk	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat likely to occur within area
<i>Tyto novaehollandiae melvillensis</i> Masked Owl (Tiwi Islands)	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat likely to occur within area
<b>Mammals</b>		
<i>Sminthopsis butleri</i> Butler's Dunnart	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Xeromys myoides</i> Water Mouse, False Water Rat	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<b>Reptiles</b>		
<i>Caretta caretta</i> Loggerhead Turtle	Endangered	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Chelonia mydas</i> Green Turtle	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Dermodochelys coriacea</i> Leathery Turtle, Leatherback Turtle, Luth	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Eretmodochelys imbricata</i> Hawksbill Turtle	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> Pacific Ridley, Olive Ridley	Endangered	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Natator depressus</i> Flatback Turtle	Vulnerable	Breeding likely to occur within area

<b>Sharks</b>		
<i>Rhincodon typus</i> Whale Shark	Vulnerable	Species or species habitat may occur within area
Migratory Species	Status	Type of Presence
<b>Migratory Terrestrial Species</b>		
<b>Birds</b>		
<i>Coracina tenuirostris melvillensis</i> Melville Cicadabird	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Haliaeetus leucogaster</i> White-bellied Sea-Eagle	Migratory	Species or species habitat likely to occur within area
<i>Hirundo rustica</i> Barn Swallow	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Rhipidura rufifrons</i> Rufous Fantail	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<b>Migratory Wetland Species</b>		
<b>Birds</b>		
<i>Charadrius veredus</i> Oriental Plover, Oriental Dotterel	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Glareola maldivarum</i> Oriental Pratincole	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Numenius minutus</i> Little Curlew, Little Whimbrel	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<b>Migratory Marine Species</b>		
<b>Mammals</b>		
<i>Balaenoptera edeni</i> Bryde's Whale	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Dugong dugong</i> Dugong	Migratory	Species or species habitat likely to occur within area
<i>Orcinus orca</i> Killer Whale, Orca	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Tursiops aduncus</i> (Arafura/Timor Sea populations) Spotted Bottlenose Dolphin (Arafura/Timor Sea populations)	Migratory	Species or species habitat likely to occur within area
<b>Reptiles</b>		
<i>Caretta caretta</i> Loggerhead Turtle	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Chelonia mydas</i> Green Turtle	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Crocodylus porosus</i> Estuarine Crocodile, Salt-water Crocodile	Migratory	Species or species habitat likely to occur within area
<i>Dermodochelys coriacea</i> Leathery Turtle, Leatherback Turtle, Luth	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> Hawksbill Turtle	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area
<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> Pacific Ridley, Olive Ridley	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area

<i>Natator depressus</i> Flatback Turtle	Migratory	Breeding likely to occur within area
<b>Sharks</b>		
<i>Rhincodon typus</i> Whale Shark	Migratory	Species or species habitat may occur within area

## 5.2.2 Turtles and Dugongs

### Marine Turtles Occurrences

Marine turtle locations and breeding sites are documented along much of the north, north-west and east coasts of Melville Island and to a lesser extent along some of the south coast of the island. They are mostly restricted to the outer coast and are not situated deep within protected embayments such as estuaries. The situation is similar for Bathurst Island where the breeding sites are concentrated along the north and west coast and to a lesser degree along the south coast of the island. No sites have been documented within Apsley Strait the channel between the two islands. Two marine turtle breeding sites have been documented within the northern reaches of Snake Bay, one on the coast near Don Point to the north of the locality of Milikapiti and the other on the opposite shore of Snake Bay immediately east of Milikapiti. These are both to the north, or ocean side, of the proposed project area and are located several kilometres away (refer to a copy of Map 13 from Tiwi RNRMS provided in Appendix C).

### Dugong Occurrences

The Northern Territory Parks and Wildlife Service, as documented in the Tiwi Islands RNRMS, report that the whole of the north coast and most of the northern estuaries of both Melville and Bathurst Islands are significant seagrass and potential dugong sites. The Tiwi Islands RNRMS documented that Tiwi knowledge consider that only two estuarine bays on the north-eastern tip of Melville Island are considered to have significant dugong populations, these do not include Snake Bay. (Refer to a copy of Map 14 from Tiwi RNRMS provided in Appendix C).

### Existing Pressures on Dugongs and Turtles

There are a number of existing pressures on dugongs and turtles and their habitats, in the Tiwi Islands and beyond (NAILSMA, 2004 and DIPE, 2003). These include:

- boat strikes,
- injuries from entanglement in fishing and ghost nets,
- marine debris,
- destruction of turtle nesting sites by feral animals such as pigs,
- natural and man-induced damage to and pollution of catchments affecting the quality and quantity of seagrass eaten by dugongs and turtles, and
- possibly, disease, stress and harassment.

In addition, there is an indigenous traditional practice of harvesting turtle eggs, and hunting turtles and dugongs. This practice is actively followed by the Milikapiti community, which reports regular taking of turtles and hunting of dugong when they are seen. This is understood to have traditionally been done in a sustainable fashion, though the combination of these traditional activities with other elements, listed above, may be contributing to the pressure on these species.

DIPE (2003) notes that the aggregation of dugongs on the seaward (north) side of the Tiwi Islands is the largest population in the Northern Territory. DIPE's report (2003) does not record any dugongs being present within the reaches of Snake Bay / Curtis Haven estuary.

### **5.2.3 Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity**

The existing environment in the community of Milikapiti is considered to have clean air quality, as there is no major industry in the area. The community of around 400 people does generate some disturbance to the existing environment via contributions such as smoke emissions from camp fires and barbecues, minimal nuisance noise from cars and other road vehicles, and occasional motor boats, and nominal lighting presence associated with night domestic uses and street lighting. There is also an air strip which carries several daily flights to and from Darwin and to and from Pirlangimpi. A guided fishing camp operates at Snake Bay. All these contribute to ambient noise, odour and light emissions, though their effects are temporary and short-lived.

## **5.3 Snake Bay Baseline Investigation**

A baseline investigation has been carried out at Snake Bay to provide pre-operational data against which subsequent monitoring may be compared to assess potential impacts of the proposed aquaculture operation at Snake Bay. The investigations were carried out by Aquenal Pty Ltd in August and October 2005 and reported in November 2005. A copy of the full report is provided in Appendix E.

Aquenal Pty Ltd were previously contracted by Marine Harvest to carry out the baseline survey for the existing barramundi farm at Port Hurd in 2002. During the investigations for the proposed sites, a follow up survey of Port Hurd was carried out.

### **5.3.1 Investigation**

The drogue survey was carried out in August 2005 to identify water movements which, in turn, supported the identification of the proposed sampling sites for baseline studies. Six baseline sampling locations (labelled F1 to F6) were selected within the Snake Bay estuary as well as separate control sites (labelled C1 to C6) within the Mirikauyunga Creek estuary, situated 3 kilometres to the west of Snake Bay. Figure 8 provides the location plan of the sampling sites for the investigation. The investigation carried out by Aquenal Pty Ltd in 2005 was aimed at assessing 'the baseline conditions of several parameters expected to be sensitive to impact from elevated nutrient levels which may result from the proposed aquaculture operations.' In each estuary, three sites were in shallow water and three sites were in deep water. The shallow water sites needed to be accessible an hour after half tide on an outgoing spring tide to enable sampling. Aquenal

Pty Ltd noted that its drogoue survey indicated that waters passing through the proposed farm site on an incoming tide would be carried to all parts of the lower estuary within 8 kilometres on a single tide cycle. All sites were selected also for their high susceptibility to nutrient accumulation.

Aquenal Pty Ltd notes that sampling at the end of the dry season is considered optimal as worst-case conditions would exist as a result of little or no terrestrial run-off, high temperatures and likely nutrients accumulation on intertidal flats and in deeper channels. Sampling for this baseline survey was carried out during the first week of October 2005.

Samples and observations were collected for the following criteria which would provide an indication of potential future impacts from the proposed farm:

- sediment description,
- redox,
- particle size,
- photography of mangrove root assemblages,
- mangrove stand structure and condition,
- benthic infauna,
- water borne nutrients,
- chlorophyll, and
- water quality parameters (temperature, salinity, pH and dissolved oxygen).

### **5.3.2 Findings**

Aquenal Pty Ltd emphasises that the data collected is intended primarily as a snapshot of the situation at time of sampling. Its main purpose is to provide a pre-operation baseline against which subsequent investigations may be compared for the purpose of assessing any impacts from nutrients released by the proposed fish farming operation at Snake Bay. Comparisons have been drawn against the data collected at Marine Harvest's Port Hurd operation (discussed in Section 7.1) which has now been in operation for several years.

#### **Observations**

Observations at each of the sampling sites confirmed that they were all subject to depositional conditions. The presence of numerous burrows and observations of benthic cores indicated prolific animal life within the substrate at each location. The natural organic loading in all but one location (C5) is moderate rather than high and reduction of organic matter is proceeding apace with its deposition. The sediment composition at each site varied from mangrove mud to sandier more mobile sediments, with locations within the control area at Mirikauyunga Creek estuary generally being finer grained due to the more sheltered waters, compared with those of Snake Bay.

### **Water Quality**

Water temperature ranged between 26.4 to 27.8°C, pH ranged from 7.3 to 7.8, dissolved oxygen levels were between 58.4% and 80.6% and salinity readings were generally slightly higher within Snake Bay than within Mirikauyunga Creek, with Snake Bay salinities ranging between 31.8 and 33 ppt and Mirikauyunga Creek ranging from 31.5 to 32.3 ppt. These were consistent with end of dry season conditions and comparable with data from Port Hurd and therefore may be considered typical of these mangrove-dominated estuarine environments.

### **Nutrients**

Ammonia levels ranged from 0.02 to 0.04 mg/L at all sites except C6 where it was 0.06 and 0.07 mg/L. Nitrite levels were below detection threshold values for all farm sites and at the threshold level of 0.005 mg/L at control sites other than C5-2 and C6 where they were 0.010 mg/L. Nitrate levels were 0.01 mg/L at farm sites and 0.02 to 0.03 mg/L at control sites. Aquenal Pty Ltd compared these values to those at Port Hurd and noted that they were generally on the high side of the Port Hurd nutrients range.

### **Chlorophyll $\alpha$**

Chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels at farm sites were generally 3 mg/L or 4 mg/L, with the exception of F1-1 which recorded 2 mg/L. Control sites recorded slightly lower chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels of 2 mg/L or 3 mg/L only. Levels of chlorophyll  $\alpha$  at deep water sites were not different from those at shallow water sites. The values are within the range of those recorded over a 2-year monitoring program at Port Hurd and may be considered typical of this type of mangrove estuary.

### **Macroscopic Epiphytic Algae**

Macroscopic epiphytic algal growth was not detected on intertidal mangrove root and rhizome assemblages, which appeared in excellent health.

### **Mangrove Stand Structure and Composition**

Mangrove stand structure and composition was dominated by *Rhizophora* sp. at the Snake Bay sites reflecting the more gently sloping land surrounding that bay, while the more varied stand composition at the control sites on the Mirikauyunga Creek estuary reflected the steeper banks found there. Communities at both sites were typical for similar estuaries.

### **Benthic Infauna**

Benthic infaunal analysis found no obvious signs of existing impacts on macrobenthic communities in Snake Bay and the adjacent Mirikauyunga Creek estuary. Analysis of faunal similarities amongst samples from these two estuaries detected habitat-related variation, with intertidal and shallow subtidal communities distinct from deeper subtidal communities.

### **5.3.3 Conclusions**

Aquenal Pty Ltd noted that if the proposed aquaculture facility becomes operational at Snake Bay, then follow-up monitoring will be required, at control sites and at sites most likely to show impact, in order to gain an understanding of natural variation and assess potential impact from nutrient input from the operation. The proposed monitoring program is discussed in Sections 9.11, 9.14 and 10.4.

## **6 Potential Impacts from Fin-fish Aquaculture**

This section outlines a summary of the potential impacts which could occur as a result of the establishment of a fin-fish aquaculture facility.

### **6.1 Potential Impacts from Construction of the Farm**

- noise from hand tools at the beach,
- noise from motor boats,
- additional disturbance to beach and sandy foreshore,
- increase in boat and road traffic,
- localised seabed disturbance during placement of anchors, and
- increase in people at Milikapiti.

### **6.2 Potential Impacts of Escaped Fish**

A number of parties, including the Australian Marine Conservation Society (2005), have suggested that the accidental release of farmed fish could lead to;

- The alteration of the genetic profile of the resident wild population;
- Disease and parasite transfer to wild population;
- Competition with wild populations for habitat and food; and
- Predation on local populations of wild species.

### **6.3 Potential Impacts from Fish Faeces and Nutrient Loads**

Addition of localised input of fish faeces and nutrients could have the following potential impacts:

- accumulation of fish faeces on seafloor,
- effects on water quality and benthos,
- eutrophication of water column,
- growth of algae,
- effects on fauna habitats, and
- hydrogen sulphide production from sediment.

#### **6.4 Potential Impacts from Excess Feed and Feed Quality**

The potential impacts from excess feed are similar to those from fish faeces and nutrients inputs. These potential impacts and those related to feed quality are listed below.

- accumulation of fish feed pellets on seafloor,
- effects on water quality and benthos,
- eutrophication of water column,
- growth of algae,
- effects on fauna habitats, and
- effects on fish from ingestion of feed pellets.

#### **6.5 Potential Impacts from Fish Feeding on Naturally-Occurring Food – Removal of Food from the Food Chain**

The farmed barramundi may feed on naturally occurring food in the water, namely small fish which may swim through the farm cages. This may remove some small fish from the food chain, which may in turn affect the larger fish in that chain.

#### **6.6 Potential Impacts from Fish Aggregation**

Fish aggregation beneath farm cages is expected to occur and the potential impacts from this could include:

- relocation of fish from other areas of the bay to beneath the cages,
- effects on the distribution of fish populations across the bay,
- changes in nutrient dynamics beneath the cages, and
- effects on the recreational fishery.

#### **6.7 Potential Impacts from the Introduction of Diseases and Parasites and the Treatment of Fish using Introduced Chemicals**

Potential impacts from the potential introduction of diseases and parasites include:

- transfer of diseases and parasites to wild fish, and
- effects from the introduction of chemicals to the water column from the treatment of farmed fish.

## 6.8 Potential Impacts from Waste Generation and Hazardous Materials

The most severe potential impacts from wastes and hazardous materials on the farm operation could include:

- disturbance to the amenity of the area;
- harm or disturbance to marine habitat and marine wildlife;
- poor water quality; and
- harm to human health.

Disturbance to the amenity could potentially be caused by:

- visual impacts of rubbish, and
- fuel spills on water.

Harm or disturbance to marine habitat and marine wildlife could potentially be caused by:

- chemical spills resulting in death of fish and mammals,
- excessive emission of nutrients to the seawater and changes to the water quality,
- possible accumulation of excessive or accidental wastes into the intertidal sediments and coastal vegetation, and
- entanglement with or ingestion of rubbish or solid wastes accidentally lost from the farm.

Water quality could potentially be affected by:

- excessive unconsumed feed, localised undispersed fish faeces, and waste water from the barge entering the seawater, and causing eutrophication of the water column and nutrient inputs,
- exceptionally large disease outbreak in the farmed fish, resulting in mass deaths,
- accidental spillage of fuels or chemicals, and
- accidental spillage of untreated sewage from the barge.

Harm to human health could potentially be caused by:

- accidental untreated barge sewage entering the seawater,
- inability to optimally treat sewage generated on the barge,
- accidental spillage or mishandling of fuels and chemicals on and from the barge,
- inability to optimally treat or remove fish and putrescible wastes from the barge,

- lack of safety night lighting around boundary of farm, and
- accidental fire or explosion due to the presence of chemicals and fuels.

## 6.9 Potential Impacts from the Loss of Nets

Potential environmental issues from the loss of nets include:

- hazards to vessels and sea creatures from impact or entanglement with the nets or moorings;
- damage to coastal flora from impact or entanglement with the nets or moorings;
- damage to the seafloor from dragging of the moorings;
- littering of broken materials into the marine and coastal environment; and
- loss of farm stock to the environment.

## 6.10 Potential Impacts to Hydrodynamics

It is possible that there could be some minor changes to hydrodynamics from:

- the presence of mooring anchors in the seafloor, and
- the presence of mooring lines, nets and a barge in the water.

The main potential impacts would include:

- localized erosion of seafloor,
- local changes in water currents,
- local disturbance to marine flora,
- local disturbance to marine fauna.

## 6.11 Potential Impacts on and from Predators

Potential impacts on predators would include:

- encounters and potential injuries from steel nets,
- redistribution of predators around the bay, and
- increase in total predator numbers within the bay.

Potential impacts from predators would include:

- increased predation on aggregated fish, and

- increase presence of predators within a localized area which may increase the risk of attacks or injuries from predators on staff or locals.

## 6.12 Potential Impacts on Flora

There is little potential for terrestrial or coastal vegetation to be disturbed by the presence of the farm as any on-land activities will take place within pre-existing premises at Milikapiti or on the open beach areas.

Marine flora could potentially be disturbed by:

- the presence of mooring anchors in the seabed,
- the potential friction from the base of nets reaching the seafloor during extremely low tides,
- the potential accumulation of faeces or uneaten feed on the seabed,
- the potential changes in hydrodynamics and water quality, and
- the potential accumulation of excess nutrients in the water column and the associated potential increases in epiphytic algae.

## 6.13 Potential Impacts on Bird, Reptile, Fish and Mammal Habitats

Estuarine waters around the farm and the seabed beneath the farm could be impacted as detailed below. The possible effects on habitats could include:

- physical presence of the farm and moorings in and on the water,
- presence of nets providing suitable structures for wild fish aggregation,
- changes to the water quality,
- changes to marine flora,
- input of uneaten fish feed,
- changes to the abundance of small wild fish from farm fish feeding,
- changes to water hydrodynamics, and
- inputs of additional activities in and on the water.

## 6.14 Potential Impacts on EPBC Act-listed Threatened and Migratory Species

Potential effects from the farm operations on EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species may include the following:

- displacement of the EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species from the water column, and interruption to routes used to access feeding or breeding and calving sites;
- increased presence of predators which may in turn hunt EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species;
- potential injuries to EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species resulting from boat strikes or net entanglement;
- alterations to seagrass beds, or other marine flora used as feed, through nutrient inputs, which may cause microalgae (epiphytic) growth on the fronds resulting in a reduction in light intake, nutrients uptake and growth;
- impacts from night lighting which may distract turtle hatchlings; and
- impacts from noise or increased boat traffic on breeding species.

### **6.15 Potential Impacts from Disturbance to Land Surface**

Disturbance to the land by farm operations is only likely to be minimal as land uses will predominantly be restricted to pre-existing premises at Milikapiti. Potential areas of land surface disturbance may include:

- the use of unsealed areas, such as the beach during nets construction, and
- the use of unsealed roads by vehicles.

Disturbance to the land surface could cause impacts on shallow rooted plants, compaction of surface soils and mobilisation of soil particles, which could in turn generate airborne dust or sediment in water ways and in the Bay.

### **6.16 Potential Impacts to Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity**

As motor boat traffic on the Bay is currently very limited, it is anticipated that the operation could probably double that traffic.

In addition, potential air, noise and lighting impacts from the operation could be brought about by:

#### ***odours and greenhouse gases***

- emissions from the use of diesel generators and petrol engines,
- potential odours from dead fish,
- odours from used steel nets prior to disposal,

**noise**

- noise from the use of the feeding pump (small Honda fire-fighter pump), which is reportedly very quiet and is used daily for around 6 hours a day,
- noise from the use of the fish pump (4 cylinder diesel Perkins motor), used on average around 2 days per week,
- noise from the use of outboard motor boats,
- noise during the operation of hand tools during construction of farm and during construction of the nets on the beach,

**lighting**

- presence of flashing lights at corners of lease,
- presence of a flood light on the barge deck,
- presence of internal lights at night, and

**aesthetic**

- potential loss of remoteness, naturalness, and aesthetic and tourism values.

**6.17 Potential Impacts on Social and Recreational Values**

Potential impacts to social and recreational values and framework could include:

- small and temporary increase of non-islanders with local inhabitants,
- participation in and instigation of social and recreational events at Milikapiti by farm employees and contractors, and
- increase in intercultural awareness between Tiwis and local residents and mainlanders.

Most of these impacts are considered to be essentially positive and to not have any negative repercussions.

Potential negative impacts could occur:

- from lack of respect for indigenous culture and values,
- from perceived imbalances in income or other benefits between employed and unemployed Tiwis or farm employees, or
- from inappropriate, offensive or violent social behaviour.

### **6.18 Potential Impacts on Local Infrastructure**

Impacts on local infrastructure are anticipated to be very limited as farm employees and contractors will essentially be using existing facilities and no additional infrastructure will need to be constructed to meet the needs of the farm personnel. Most goods and equipment will be sourced from Darwin and will be delivered to the farm via the Tiwi Barge Company.

It is expected that Milikapiti will experience:

- a small increase in vehicular traffic to and from the airstrip to meet flights to and from Darwin, on local roads into town, and on local roads to the boat launching facility; and
- a small increase in the uses of the local shops and other amenities at Milikapiti.

### **6.19 Potential Impacts on Archaeological, Historical, Cultural and Aboriginal Sites**

Potential impacts on archaeological, historical, cultural and Aboriginal sites could include the disturbance of artefacts, ruins and remains, or the disturbance of cultural and Aboriginal traditional values and beliefs associated with particular sites.

### **6.20 Potential Impacts on Marine Traffic**

Potential impacts on marine traffic may include:

- increases in motor boat traffic on Snake Bay,
- increases in barge visits and traffic on the Darwin to Snake Bay route,
- increased demand on the jetty facilities, and
- increased movements of large objects in the bay when floating nets across from the beach to the farm.

### **6.21 Potential Impacts on Staff of Pest Insects**

Potential impacts on staff of pest insects may include:

- itchiness,
- minor pain,
- nuisance, and
- illness.

## 6.22 Potential Impacts from the Farm on Personnel Emergencies

The type of personnel emergencies which could potentially occur at the farm include:

- body injury from working with farm equipment or from occupation of the barge;
- outboard motor boat or road vehicle accident;
- exposure to toxic fumes or fluids from fuels or chemicals used at the farm;
- heat stress or dehydration;
- other personal health issues, e.g. heart attack, or illness, which may require urgent medical attention;
- crocodile attack or exposure to other potentially lethal species eg. box jellyfish, stone fish, sea snake, etc.; and
- cyclonic events potentially rendering the barge unsafe for inhabitation.

These will be managed via measures outlined in the forthcoming Environmental Management Plan for the site and summarised in Section 9.22.

## 6.23 Potential Impacts on the Barramundi Market

In order for Marine Harvest to sell the amount of fish it is aiming to produce from all three of its proposed barramundi farms in the future, it will need to establish new markets for the farmed barramundi, in retail areas not previously carrying barramundi. This means that it is not expected that the wild-caught barramundi market should be excessively affected by the presence of farmed barramundi.

## 6.24 Unknown, Unpredictable or Irreversible Impacts

During its five years' experience at the Port Hurd pilot farm, Marine Harvest has already encountered many of the potential problems that could face such marine farms in the Northern Territory. An Environmental Management Plan and monitoring programs were implemented during this period. As this experience has been drawn upon to design the Snake Bay proposed aquaculture development and compile this EIS report, it is considered that most potential problems have already been identified and addressed in earlier sections of this report.

## **7 Assessment of Impacts from the Port Hurd Pilot Farm**

### **7.1 Port Hurd Environmental Monitoring Results**

Marine Harvest's first barramundi fish farm was established at Port Hurd in 2000 and was considered the pilot project for barramundi farming in the Northern Territory.

The farm was first stocked in March 2001, and the first harvest occurred in May 2002. During 2002, approximately 210 tonnes of barramundi were harvested followed by approximately 700 tonnes in 2003. In 2004, the harvest rate was 20 to 25 tonnes per week. The fish farm and associated on-shore facilities at Barra Base are the only man-made developments on Port Hurd or its tributaries which have significant nutrient output.

This farm and its surrounding environment has been the subject of environmental investigations aimed at assessing the potential long and short term biological impacts from the fish farming operation on its environment.

Information regarding the potential impacts on the estuarine environment from the Port Hurd site is considered to be important in understanding potential impacts which may also occur from the proposed Snake Bay barramundi fish farm. Consequently, it is considered important to discuss these here. This section provides a synopsis of the work carried out by Aquenal Pty Ltd. A copy of the full report is provided in Appendix F.

#### **7.1.1 Port Hurd Investigations**

In 2003, Aquenal Pty Ltd carried out an initial site specific investigation in the vicinity of Marine Harvest's aquaculture operations at Port Hurd. This investigation was carried out in October 2003 and it was designed to monitor nutrients and algal proliferation. Periodical monitoring by Marine Harvest was also carried out between October 2003 and October 2005, covering easily measured parameters. A follow-up investigation was carried out in October 2005 by Aquenal Pty Ltd (reported in November 2005), with the aim of assessing both short and long term changes to the environment. Control sites had been established in Maand Creek, which is the south-west arm of Port Hurd, and in Gullala Creek, which is the neighbouring inlet north of Port Hurd. Due to the remoteness and distance, the Gullala Creek sites were only monitored during the October 2003 and October 2005 sampling events. Figure 9 provides the sampling locations.

A number of environmental parameters were chosen as indicators of long term biological impacts, these were:

- benthic infauna community structure,
- mangrove stand structure and condition,
- planktonic algal concentrations in the water column,
- proliferation of epiphytic algae on mangrove roots, and
- sediment redox levels.

Other more easily measurable parameters were also chosen to help quantify any changes and to permit correlation with observational parameters; these included parameters such as rainfall, salinity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, nitrate, nitrite, ammonia nitrogen, and chlorophyll.

Two complete sampling rounds and assessments covering all the parameters listed above were carried out and reported in the 2003, and 2005 reports. Periodical monitoring during the intervening period between October 2003 and October 2005 only included measurement or sampling for parameters such as rainfall, salinity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, nitrate, nitrite, oxides of nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, dissolved inorganic nitrogen and chlorophyll. These are reported separately in October 2005.

The October 2005 nutrient report pulled together all the nutrient information gathered during the preceding two years and provided an interpretation of the findings, these are summarised below.

### **7.1.2 Findings**

Rainfall averages in 2005 are down on the previous two years. At September 2005, the cumulative total for 2005 was around 500 millimetres less than for 2004 and 2003. Both salinity and temperature had strong correlations with rainfall and were therefore seasonally influenced. Dissolved oxygen concentrations were closely correlated to seasonal fluctuations. NO<sub>x</sub> (nitrate plus nitrite), ammonia and dissolved inorganic nitrogen concentrations were all above the ANZECC Interim Trigger Levels for estuaries at all sites at some stage throughout the monitoring period and these were not readily correlated to seasonal influences. Chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels increased in 2004 and 2005 at both farm and control sites and were generally above the ANZECC Trigger Levels. Assessment of mangrove root and rhizome assemblages showed these to be in excellent health with regard to epiphytic algal growth. Both farm and control sites showed similar good state of health with no sign of algal growth, therefore indicating that levels of waterborne nutrients are too low for the establishment of epiphytic algae. It should be noted that the ANZECC Trigger Levels are a "one size fits all" set of trigger levels, applying to all Australian and New Zealand estuaries. It is arguable that mangrove estuaries with little or no freshwater inflow for 6 months of the year and wide intertidal mud flats should have a separate set of trigger levels.

In summary, the October 2005 report found that most water quality parameters were closely related to rainfall, i.e. were seasonally influenced. Nutrient levels were not uniformly seasonal in their variation and exceeded the ANZECC trigger levels on a number of sampling occasions at both Port Hurd control sites (Maand Creek) and at the farm monitoring sites. A general increase in chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels was observed.

The significance, or not, of these results could not be assessed without the assessment of the results from the Gullala Inlet control site, which are discussed below.

#### **7.1.2.1 Gullala Inlet Control Site**

Gullala Creek and Inlet, located 13 kilometres north of Port Hurd, was chosen by Aquenal Pty Ltd as a control site. It was considered suitable as a control site for Port Hurd, due to:

- its proximity to Port Hurd,
- the relative sizes of both estuaries,
- the protection of the entrances by extensive offshore sandbars, and
- the same hydrological regimes and influences on both estuaries.

The initial survey at Gullala Inlet was carried out in October 2003, at the same time as the Port Hurd sampling, and the biennial sampling was also carried out at the same time in October 2005.

Six sampling sites were selected in Gullala Creek as control sites. These were selected to correspond as closely as possible to the monitoring sites in Port Hurd and were labelled C1 to C6. Sampling locations are shown in Figure 10. A copy of Aquenal Pty Ltd's biennial report is provided in Appendix F. The following is a summary of the findings and implication from the results obtained from Gullala Creek.

#### Visual Assessment

Cores of sediments were taken and observed for length, colour, plant and animal life, gas vesicles and smell. Aquenal's interpretation noted that at all farm and control sites brown-grey mud was present in most cores and represented the material which is currently being deposited in both Port Hurd and Gullala estuaries; the sedimentation characteristics at both sites were similar; the natural organic loading was moderate and similar in all cores; and animal life and burrows were prolific and abundant at both sites in both years. Aquenal noted that organic matter was being reduced at the same pace as the deposition rate in most cores, with the exception of sites F3 (Port Hurd) and C3 (Gullala) where sedimentation was more rapid than organic matter reduction, causing sediments to become anoxic at those sites. As this was noted at both farm and control sites, it could not be attributed to nutrient outputs from the farm.

#### Redox Potential

Results reported by Aquenal from the baseline and monitoring surveys show that sediments at the study sites are poorly to moderately oxygenated indicating that reduction of organic matter is proceeding at a slightly higher rate than penetration of oxygen through the sediments. Redox values found in these surveys are similar to those expected in a healthy, undisturbed environment. Aquenal noted that given the influence of animal burrows and minor surface disturbance on the redox results, no conclusions could be drawn from them.

#### Chlorophyll $\alpha$

Aquenal noted that there appeared to be a general rise in chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels at Port Hurd in 2004 and 2005 (from a mean of 2.8 to a mean of 3.3  $\mu\text{g/L}$  = 17.8% increase). This general rise was also observed at the Gullala Inlet sampling sites, though to a lesser degree (from a mean of 2.33 to 2.41  $\mu\text{g/L}$  = 3.47% increase). This could not be correlated to other parameters included in the study, and the Port Hurd increase could not be directly attributed to the farm operations. However, Aquenal noted that this could

be of concern and it recommended that levels should continue to be monitored regularly around the farm site to assess any further increase over time. Aquenal also recommended that if chlorophyll  $\alpha$  levels were seen to continue to rise at Port Hurd, then a set of samples should be taken from Gullala Inlet to assess whether this was an ongoing generalised regional phenomenon.

#### Mangrove Stand and Composition

Aquenal noted that there were a number of dead and damaged trees within the survey sites, and these were probably caused by a cyclone which passed over the sites in 2004. The main changes in dominance at the two Gullala Inlet control sites were due to natural evolution of the maturing stand composition. Aquenal concluded that there were no changes attributable to marine farming.

#### Epiphytic Algal Growth

The three intertidal control sites at Gullala Inlet, C1, C2 and C3 were surveyed in 2003 and 2005 and Aquenal found that they showed a similar state of health in both years, with no sign of algal growth. Farm survey sites also showed an excellent state of health both in 2003 and in 2005; this indicated that levels of waterborne nutrients were too low for the establishment of epiphytic algae in the intertidal zone.

#### Benthic Infauna

Similar trends of decline in faunal dominance and increase in species richness and diversity were noted at the Gullala Inlet control sites and at Port Hurd survey sites. Aquenal concluded therefore that farming at Port Hurd had had no detectable impact on benthic infauna species richness or abundance.

#### **7.1.3 Implications and Recommendations**

Aquenal recommended that ongoing regular monitoring of water quality and nutrient parameters be maintained in order to help distinguish between natural variation and biological impact.

## **7.2 Comparison of Snake Bay versus Port Hurd Operations**

There are a number of differences between the Snake Bay and Port Hurd operations. Some are related to contrasts in environmental conditions, some related to differences in infrastructure and others to the scale of the operations. Table 7.1 below summarises the notable differences which may influence the applicability of the Port Hurd and Gullala Inlet monitoring results, to the proposed Snake Bay operation.

**Table 7.1: Comparisons of Snake Bay versus Port Hurd Operations**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Port Hurd</b>	<b>Snake Bay</b>
Current speeds	Up to 4.2 knots	Up to 3.5 knots
Tidal fluctuations	7 metre tidal range	Typically 6 metre tides but can range from 3 to 7 metres
Farm operations	Operated from a land base	Operated from a barge
Nets	Large nets (86 or 100 metre circumference); clustered in two close-spaced parallel lines with 6 nets in each line, i.e. 12 nets per group.	Small nets (48 metre circumference); set out in a single line of 6 nets per group.
Fish Tonnage	1000 tonnes	1500 tonnes to 5000 tonnes

The stronger tidal currents and higher tidal fluctuations at Port Hurd compared to Snake Bay mean that flushing of the Port Hurd estuary may be stronger than at Snake Bay and therefore any potential nutrients added to the water column may be removed more efficiently from Port Hurd than from Snake Bay.

The smaller nets and net clusters at Snake Bay mean that nutrient inputs potentially contributed by the fish and the feed are likely to be more spread out and to be more easily dissipated and diluted by the water currents, even though the currents are less in magnitude than those at Port Hurd.

The presence of a habitable barge at Snake Bay means that there is potential for other sources of nutrients to enter the water body. The risk of significant nutrients inputs is assessed to be low and stringent management measures will be applied to the barge to ensure that any water effluent from the barge is appropriately treated.

The Port Hurd and Gullala Inlet monitoring results suggest that the pilot farm at Port Hurd has not been causing any notable changes to water or sediment quality, or to nutrient-influenced parameters. A small increase in chlorophyll  $\alpha$  has been noted but cannot be directly attributed to the farm. Similar management measures will be applied to the proposed Snake Bay operation as have been implemented at the Port Hurd pilot farm.

A regular monitoring program will be carried out at the proposed Snake Bay farm, which will follow up on the baseline work carried out by Aquenal Pty Ltd and summarised in Section 5.3. This program should pick up early any potential changes in water and sediment quality brought about by the proposed farm.

### **7.3 Paspaley Pearls Oyster Studies**

Paspaley Pearls have a pearl oyster farm operation located in Bynoe Harbour, adjacent to Port Patterson, where Marine Harvest is proposing to establish one of its barramundi farming operations. Paspaley Pearls expressed concerns over the potential impacts of the proposed barramundi farm on its oyster farming operations. An agreement was reached between Paspaley Pearls and Marine Harvest to carry out a trial by placing oyster cages adjacent to the established barramundi farm at Port Hurd and then checking the health of the oysters after a nominated timeframe.

Two traps containing approximately 12 oysters each were hung on the fish farming cages at Port Hurd on 20 December 2004. Two lots of oysters were sent for pathology, one on 19 January 2005 and the second on 23 February 2005. The samples were analysed by the veterinary pathologist at the Berrimah Veterinary Laboratory in Berrimah, Northern Territory. All samples (except for one) were found to have no histopathological changes, no evidence of inflammatory, degenerative or proliferative lesions. There was no evidence of microbial (viral, bacterial, or fungal) organisms and no evidence of parasitic infections. One unhealthy oyster was found in the first batch of samples. This oyster was found to have marked atrophy or degeneration of glandular tissue in the digestive gland. Its heart was found to have a mild diffuse haemocytic infiltration with low-grade focal aggregates of haemocytes apparent. The veterinary pathologist interpretation noted that the changes to the digestive gland were severe and irreversible and were likely to be long-standing (over 2 to 3 weeks old). He also noted that there was no direct evidence of primary microbial (virus, fungal, bacterial or parasitic) cause, though an earlier bacterial septicaemia (unrelated to the Port Hurd operation) could not be excluded. A copy of the information is provided in Appendix G.

The trial showed that the oysters did not appear to suffer any adverse effects from the presence of the fish farm. The single unhealthy oyster was interpreted to be an isolated case, unrelated to the presence of the fish farm. The trial therefore provided reassurance to the pearl farmers that the proposed barramundi fish farm at Port Patterson was not likely to cause any impacts to its operation in Bynoe Harbour.

Importantly, the results can be extrapolated to suggest that other native soft bodied shellfish located in similar water currents near the fish farm would be unlikely to be affected by any of the fish farming operations.

## **8 Discussion of Potential Impacts and Risk Assessment**

A summary of potential environmental impacts from a fin-fish aquaculture facility has been provided in Section 6.

This section discusses the potential environmental impacts in the context of the location of the proposed farm at Snake Bay and also provides a risk assessment for the salient potential impacts.

The risks have been evaluated using the Marine Harvest Risk Ranking System shown in Table 8.1.

Table A shows the classification levels for consequences, i.e. realistically the worst outcome that could occur; and Table B shows the classification levels for the likelihood, i.e. the likelihood that an incident will occur. These classifications are then combined using the risk table and a ranking is then attributed to the impact

Risk rankings range from 1 to 4, as follows:

- 1 = high risk
- 2 = serious risk
- 3 = medium risk
- 4 = low risk

**Table 8.1: Marine Harvest Risk Ranking System**

Table A		
Consequence	Injury/Illness Classification	Environmental Impact
Minor	Localised First Aid Treatment	Event with no adverse effects
Moderate	Medical treatment required	Event with some (temporary) adverse effects; Exceedence of permitted levels.
Major	Extensive injuries, permanent part disability.	Event with long-term effects; Provokes actions from authorities, complaints from community, environmental action groups, limited media attention.
Catastrophic	Fatality(s) or permanent serious disability(s)	Event with major impact on environment

Step 1 – Using Table A  
Realistically determine the worst outcome that could occur.

Consider the following:

- Extent of injuries
- Process loss
- Property damage
- Harm to the environment

Table B	
Likelihood	Description
Almost certain	Common repeating occurrence
Likely	Known to occur or, 'it has happened before'
Possible	Could occur or, 'I've heard of it happening'
Unlikely	Not likely to occur
Rare	Practically impossible

Step 2 – Using Table

Determine the likelihood that an incident will occur/recur. Consider the following when making this decision:

- The number of times tasks are undertaken which could result in this, or a similar, incident;
- The number of people performing these tasks or exposed to the hazard at the time; and
- The probability of an incident occurring/recurring while the task is being performed.

Risk Table				
Likelihood	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Almost certain	2 Serious Risk	1 High Risk	1 High Risk	1 High Risk
Likely	3 Medium Risk	2 Serious Risk	1 High Risk	1 High Risk
Possibly	4 Medium Risk	3 Medium Risk	2 Serious Risk	1 High Risk
Unlikely	4 Low Risk	4 Low Risk	3 Medium Risk	2 Serious Risk
Rare	4 Low Risk	4 Low Risk	4 Low Risk	4 Low Risk

Step 3 – Using the Risk Table

Join the consequence and likelihood classifications together on the Risk Table to identify the risk rank. For example, a 'Moderate' consequence together with a 'Likely' likelihood gives a risk rank of 2 which is serious (S).

## 8.1 Construction

Potential impacts during the construction of the farm are expected to be very limited and minimal as:

- Construction of the barge will be carried out in Darwin;
- No major construction will be required at the temporary land base;
- Construction of moorings and nets will occur at the beach on the sandy foreshore; and
- Installation of mooring anchors will be carried out by divers and with the assistance of boats.

### 8.1.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

The likelihood of construction works impacting on the environment is considered **possible**, particularly with regards to noise and increases in traffic and people.

#### Consequence

The consequence of construction impacts on the environment are expected to be either **minor** or **moderate**, as the people of Milikapiti are supportive of the farm venture and will be aware of the construction being carried out.

<b>Risk 3 = medium risk</b>
-----------------------------

## 8.2 Escaped Fish

The Port Hurd farm has lost fish from its cages in the past. Originally nets were being damaged by crocodiles, however no crocodile damage has been recorded since the nets have been constructed using 3.2-mm-diameter steel mesh. Fish were lost during a cyclone when older-style cages collapsed, this style of net is no longer used. On another occasion fish were missing from a cage possibly due to theft while the farm was unattended during a cyclone. More recently (January 2006), the Port Hurd farm lost a large number of fish due to nets being washed away during strong water currents combined with a wave surge, all of which were brought about by low pressure conditions, direct westerly winds and a particularly high spring tide.

### 8.2.1 Interbreeding

While it is probable that escaped fish would breed with the local population, interbreeding is likely to have negligible impact on the genetic makeup of local barramundi stocks as the farm barramundi will be sourced from local Northern Territory broodstock. This is supported by the following papers.

A 2005 PhD thesis (Marshall, 2005) notes that the genetic structures found during the study indicated that there is a genetic division among river drainages, however it

hypothesizes that due to the genetic diversity found in the Ord River, this river may have been the source site of most of the barramundi found in the north of Australia.

The Western Australian Department of Fisheries (1999) discussion paper 'The Translocation of Barramundi' notes that 'other scientifically recognised authorities believe there is no direct evidence that mixing gene pools will have deleterious effects [on local endemic barramundi populations] and have argued that, among barramundi stocks, genetic differences have been demonstrated only for populations, not for individual fish, and that it is the proportion of the genes present that differs between different river systems, not the actual genes.'

### **8.2.2 Disease and Parasite Transfer**

The quality of the broodstock, the handling procedures, the use of quality feed and steel-mesh nets has led recently to a relatively disease-free and parasite-free farm fish population at the Port Hurd pilot farm. The same methods and procedures will be used for the Snake Bay operation. Any diseases or parasites carried by the farm barramundi (eg. enteritis caused by *Vibrio carcheri* and *Photobacterium damsela*) are likely to be endemic in Northern Territory waters and the wild fish population will already have been exposed to them. Farm staff at Port Hurd have observed that wild barramundi populations carry a significantly larger number of parasites than the farm barramundi.

### **8.2.3 Competition with Wild Populations and Increased Predation**

The balance of species may be offset during a brief period after a possible escape of farm fish, however the impact would be short lived and would not be expected to have any long term consequences.

### **8.2.4 Risk Assessment**

#### **Likelihood**

The likelihood of fish escaping is considered **possible**, as it has happened at Port Hurd during extremely adverse tidal and climatic conditions. However, design changes have been proposed for the Snake Bay farm which should significantly diminish the likelihood of fish escapes. These design changes include reduction in net sizes, reduction in the number of nets per mooring array and an increase in mooring lines per mooring array.

#### **Consequence**

The consequence of fish potentially escaping the proposed farm is classified as **moderate**, as the event could have some temporary adverse effects. The possible adverse effects include predation on endemic smaller fish and removal of naturally occurring feed from the environment.

<b>Risk 3 = medium risk</b>
-----------------------------

## **8.3 Fish Faeces and Nutrient Loads**

Fish faeces will fall through the water column and may reach the sediment on the sea floor. The nutrients from the faeces generated by a dense population of farmed fish have

the potential to impact on the water column and on the benthos, causing eutrophication in the water column and benthos potentially resulting in increased aquatic plant growth and deficiencies in dissolved oxygen levels. In severe cases, hydrogen sulphide can be generated from the sediment. Eutrophication will be exacerbated by high water temperatures (as are found in Snake Bay), excess fish feed passing through the water column and by lack of water movement.

The degree of impact is dependent on the number of fish, the amount of faeces generated and the strength of the water currents passing through and beneath the fish nets. Water currents in Snake Bay can reach up to 3.5 knots during spring tides. The amount of waste generated is expected to be in the order of around 79 to 107 kg per 1200 to 1500kg of feed eaten by the fish. However, much of this waste (63 to 88 kg) is dissolved waste, i.e. it is immediately assimilated into the water passing the nets, and the remainder (16 to 20 kg) is excreted as faeces. According to personal communications with Mr David Whyte of Skretting (8 March 2006), it is estimated that around 95 percent of the nitrogen waste is excreted via the gills, the remainder 5 percent of nitrogen and the bulk of the phosphorus is excreted as faeces. These data were obtained from Skretting and represent the 'environmental impact' calculations from their Nova ME feed which Marine Harvest are proposing to use for the farmed barramundi at Snake Bay. Skretting's 'environmental impacts' table for this feed is reproduced in Table 8.2, below.

**Table 8.2: Maximum Amount of Discharge (kg) per 1000 kg of Fish Produced**

Component	Waste Type	FCR = 1.2	FCR = 1.5	Waste Route*
Nitrogen	Dissolved Waste	56.4	78.0	95% of nitrogen waste is as ammonia via the fish gills and the remainder 5% as faeces
	Solid Waste	9.6	12.0	
	Total Nitrogen Waste	66	90	
Phosphorus	Dissolved Waste	6.7	9.4	Almost 100% of phosphorus is excreted as faeces
	Solid Waste	6.0	7.5	
	Total Phosphorus Waste	12.7	16.9	

**Notes:** FCR = feed conversion ratio, eg. with FCR = 1.2 every 1000kg of fish produced requires 1200kg of feed.

\*personal communication from Mr David Whyte of Skretting (8 March 2006).

**Source:** Skretting Nova ME Environmental Impact table.

The Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS) conducted some preliminary investigations of the nutrients inputs from the Port Hurd barramundi farm. Their data suggest that at the time of the survey, there was minimal difference in nutrient concentrations between water entering and exiting the cages. A rudimentary nutrient budget indicated that nitrogen inputs from the farm would contribute less than 10% of the

nitrogen required for algal productivity in the estuary (pers. comm. Dr David McKinnon, AIMS, January 2006).

### 8.3.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

The likelihood of fish faeces and nutrients entering the water column is **certain**. However the actual amount of nutrients is more difficult to quantify as it is dependent on the number and size of the fish present at the farm; these parameters will vary regularly.

#### Consequence

On the basis of the monitoring results at Port Hurd (discussed in Sections 7.1 and 7.2) it is considered that the input of nutrients from the proposed farm are likely to have only **minor**, and at worst, only **moderate** consequences on the environment.

<b>Risk 2 = serious or at worst 1 = high risk</b>
---

## 8.4 Excess Feed and Feed Quality

The eutrophication issues associated with fish faeces equally apply to excess feed passing through the cage. Due to cost implications, farmers take a great deal of care to prevent feed passing through the cages uneaten. However, any uneaten feed, which could be swept away by the currents, could have the potential to cause eutrophication at some distance from the cages. Careful monitoring of food usage and conversion rates is important in avoiding loss of feed and is a critical issue for the economics of the operation. However, since the fish also feed on naturally-occurring food sources such as small fish, calculation of conversion rates must be treated with some caution.

Uneaten feed could also be eaten by wild fish swimming around the cages. This could potentially cause changes in the wild fish feeding patterns, and the feed quality could potentially affect the fish.

### 8.4.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

The potential for loss of feed and accumulation of feed on the seafloor or in the water column is minimal due to:

- Stringent farm controls on feed input to minimise waste; this is done via strict feeding tables based on fish size/weight, number of fish, water temperature, etc.
- Uptake of the very small amounts of uneaten feed by wild fish swimming around and beneath the cages.
- The feed containing plant protein meal, which increases the pellets' water absorptivity thereby speeding up the breakdown of the pellets and the ability of the water currents to carry away and dilute the fragments.

- The presence of strong water currents at the farm site given its location in a relatively narrow and deep water channel formed by water channelled through a narrow passage of the estuary.

The likelihood ranking is therefore considered to be somewhere between **possible** to **unlikely**.

### Consequences

The potential impacts on wild fish from eating farm feed are likely to be minimal, as the loss of feed will be very small and the quality of the feed will be very high (refer to Section 3.8.2).

Hence the risk of uneaten feed accumulating on the seafloor or in the water column is extremely low, therefore the risk of eutrophication and nutrient accumulation is considered negligible.

The consequences ranking is therefore considered to be generally **minor**, though at worst it could be **moderate**.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk, at worst 3 = medium risk</b>
--

## 8.5 Removal of Fish from the Food Chain

The waters of Snake Bay are likely to be home to small species of fish, which provide a natural food source for the barramundi. While the farmed fish are fed on the pelleted diet, fish are voracious eaters. Depletion of this food source by the farmed fish could impact on small endemic fish and ultimately on the rest of the populations in that food chain.

### Likelihood

It is considered **likely** that a minimal amount of small endemic fish will be eaten by the farmed barramundi.

### Consequences

The amount of fish eaten is likely to be small as the farmed barramundi will be fed to satiation with feed pellets and will not require much if any supplementation of their diet. Furthermore, the farmed fish are captive and cannot hunt and catch fish as they would in the open marine environment, hence they are not likely to have access to many small fish. It is also understood that farm cages may act as a habitat and therefore increase the carrying capacity of the estuary and, in turn, support a larger population of small food fish.

It is therefore considered that the consequences would be **minor**.

<b>Risk 3 = medium risk</b>
-----------------------------

## 8.6 Fish Aggregation

Concerns have been raised by guided fishing tour operators relating to the impact of the fish farms on recreational fishing. It has been suggested that the farm acts as a fish aggregation device (FAD) and attracts fish from the flats to the farm where they are not available for recreational fishing. It is thought they are attracted to a floating device in a pelagic environment and to the provision of uneaten food (Dempster et al, 2002; Boyra et al, 2004).

While it is well established that floating cages will act as aggregation sites, it is unclear what overall effect they have on fish populations within particular areas. In Dempster *et al*, it was reported that a change in nutrient dynamics might be expected beneath the sea cages as a result of the local fish aggregation beneath them. The local fish are likely to consume any food falling through the cages and the resulting faeces would be expected to be dispersed more readily than uneaten pellets of food.

Anecdotal reports from recreational fishing charter boat operators around the Port Hurd pilot fish farm suggest that they have not noticed any reduction in fish catches on the flats, in fact fishing may have improved since the start up of the farm, and the size of the thread-fin salmon being caught was the same. The fact that the charter boat operators keep coming to Port Hurd suggests that fishing must not have been adversely impacted.

### 8.6.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

As discussed above, it is **likely** that wild fish will aggregate beneath the barramundi farm cages.

#### Consequences

It is considered that wild fish swimming beneath and around the farm cages will eat any of the uneaten pellets falling through the cages. The resultant faeces are likely to be more easily dispersed in the water column than the pellet materials would have been. Hence their presence would be considered beneficial to the environmental output of the farm.

Experience at the Port Hurd pilot farm has shown that although wild fish do aggregate beneath the farm cages, fishing in the surrounding waters at Port Hurd has not been affected and has reportedly even improved. The consequence would therefore be ranked as **minor**.

<b>Risk 3 = medium risk</b>
-----------------------------

## 8.7 Introduction of Diseases and Parasites

Like all other cultured animals, barramundi are subject to a range of bacterial, fungal, viral and parasitic diseases. Disease outbreaks are usually associated with some form of stress, such as, extremes of temperature, low dissolved oxygen or poor nutrition and handling of the fish.

Bacterial infection is the most common cause of disease in barramundi aquaculture. Columnaris disease is particularly common in small fingerlings held in water below about 25°C. Other bacterial infections are seen throughout the year but generally become more prevalent in mid winter and mid summer. Another factor associated with bacterial infection is frequent grading of the fish. Once fingerlings are moved into grow-out cages and grading frequency declines, disease incidence also declines. Bacteria have numerous points of infection, however damaged skin seems to be a common focus.

Initial disease issues noted at the pilot project at Port Hurd were enteritis caused by *Vibrio carcheri* and *Photobacterium damsela*; both bacteria are endemic in Northern Territory waters. The fish are sourced from local broodstock and are grown in waters with similar conditions to their native context hence any diseases or pests are likely to be endemic to Northern Territory waters and other fish will already have been exposed to them.

Fungal infections are less common in warmer waters and are unlikely to cause a problem in Snake Bay.

Two viral infections have been reported in barramundi farm populations, however they do not seem to cause a problem in fish-farming operations if appropriate hygiene measures are employed.

Epidemiological studies show that disease transfer requires a vector and water may be an adequate vector for some fish diseases. Direct contact between local fish populations and the farm fish is rare but may occur when either wild fish leap into the pens or when farmed fish escape. Due to the relative crowding within the cages, it is more likely that, should any disease appear within the farmed population, it will initially spread throughout the farm. The likelihood of disease is also increased in nursery fish if they are kept in the vicinity of older fish. This is why Marine Harvest is aiming to have a separate nursery site at Channel Island.

Should contact occur between diseased or parasite-affected farmed fish and wild fish, impacts on local wild fish are likely to be minimal given that most of the diseases and parasites, are already endemic in the wild fish population.

### **8.7.1 Risk Assessment**

#### **Likelihood**

Based on the Port Hurd experience, the farmed fish have very few parasites and it is therefore **rare** that parasites would transfer from the farmed fish to the wild fish population.

The management methods used and any diseases encountered at the Port Hurd pilot farm are expected to be similar to those used and encountered at Snake Bay. Although it is possible, that diseases from the farmed fish would be introduced to the wild fish population, experience at Port Hurd has shown that it is **unlikely** that this should happen.

## Consequences

The presence of low numbers of parasites on the farmed fish at Snake Bay is expected to have nil or at worst **minor** consequence on the environment, as the wild fish population has been reported to have more parasites than the farmed fish.

The potential transfer of diseases from the farmed fish to the wild fish population is expected to have only **minor** to **moderate** consequences, as the diseases encountered are the same in both populations.

**Parasite transfer risk 4 = low risk**

**Disease transfer risk 4 = low risk**

## 8.8 Introduction of Chemicals from Treatment of Fish Parasites or Diseases

There are some concerns that treatment of fish diseases using chemicals can affect water quality and other native fish. Barramundi at the Marine Harvest Site at Port Hurd at Bathurst Island are noted to be relatively disease-free. Diseases previously found in these fish included a parasitic disease associated with gill flukes and two bacterial diseases.

Since using steel nets, it has been found that the parasitic diseases have all but been eliminated. The steel net surfaces appear to be unfavourable for the colonisation by parasites. Studies by Marine Harvest have shown that farmed fish have less parasites than wild fish and have not demonstrated any discomfort from the presence of low numbers of the parasites. As steel nets will be used at Snake Bay, it is anticipated that the farmed fish will not require any treatment for parasites.

The two bacterial diseases were previously being treated using antibiotics. Both diseases have had local autogenous vaccines developed and all hatchlings will be vaccinated for these diseases prior to being delivered to Marine Harvest. Hence the need to use antibiotics is likely to be extremely rare. All diseased fish will be sent to the government veterinary laboratories for diagnosis; feedback will determine whether antibiotic treatment is necessary, which antibiotic should be used and what dosage should be applied. No antibiotics have been used on vaccinated fish at the Port Hurd pilot farm.

Use of antibiotics at Snake Bay is likely to follow a similar trend to that at Port Hurd. It is therefore considered that the use of antibiotics will be rare and short-term and will therefore not have any notable impacts on the environment, biota or sediments.

### 8.8.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

The most recent infrastructure and fish management methods at the Port Hurd pilot farm resulted in the fish not needing any parasite treatment or use of antibiotics. Although the

likelihood for the need of chemicals usage cannot be completely ruled out, the need for their use is likely to be either **rare** or **unlikely**.

### Consequences

In the event of the need to treat the farmed fish with introduced chemicals, the amounts of unused chemicals reaching the surrounding waters are likely to be nominal; hence the potential consequences to the environment would be either **minor** or at worst, **moderate**.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

## 8.9 Waste Generation and Hazardous Materials

Wastes will be generated by the operation and hazardous material will be stored, used and handled for the purposes of the operation.

### 8.9.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

Wastes will be generated by the operation and hazardous material will be stored, used and handled for the purposes of the operation. Although there are inherent spillage and contamination risks, particularly with liquid wastes and liquid hazardous materials, it is expected that stringent management methods, similar to those used successfully at the pilot Port Hurd farm, will be applied to the proposed Snake Bay farm. These methods are discussed in Section 9.7. The likelihood for wastes and hazardous materials to impact on the environment is therefore assessed to be typically **unlikely** and at worst, **possible**.

### Consequences

Despite thorough and stringent management methods, and although any potential spills of waste or hazardous materials are likely to be small, it cannot be ruled out that an accidental large spill could occur. The consequences of such a spill (eg. spillage of fuel or oil) would be ranked as either **moderate** ('event with some temporary adverse effects') or **major** ('event with long-term effects') (refer to Section 6.8 for a list of potential impacts).

<b>Risk 4 to 2 = low to serious risk</b>
--

## 8.10 Loss of Nets

If moorings are inadequate to secure the cages, the nets may become detached and could drift, and the moorings and anchors could also be dragged across the seabed. This could cause environmental damage and have severe economic impact on the business.

### 8.10.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

Although nets have been lost from the Port Hurd pilot farm, the design criteria proposed for the Snake Bay nets and mooring system (refer to Sections 3.6.3 and 3.6.5) are expected to minimise the likelihood of net losses occurring at the proposed Snake Bay farm. Furthermore, tidal currents, maximum wave heights, and cyclonic effects are all of a lesser magnitude at Snake Bay than at Port Hurd. The likelihood ranking for the loss of nets is therefore assessed to be **unlikely**.

#### Consequences

The potential impacts from the loss of nets have been listed in Section 6.9. The consequences are considered to range from **moderate** in terms of physical impact, as the effects would be temporary to **major** for impacts on species, such as dugong, turtles or other threatened species, through entanglement and for navigation hazard.

<b>Risk 4 to 3 = low to medium risk</b>
---

### 8.11 Hydrodynamics

Minor localised changes to hydrodynamics will occur from the presence of the mooring anchors and lines, the nets, and the proposed barge.

#### 8.11.1 Risk Assessment

##### Likelihood

It is **likely** that impacts from the minor changes to hydrodynamics from the farm's infrastructure will be registered by modifications to local water currents, by some seafloor scouring around the mooring anchors and associated effects on local marine flora, and by local fauna.

##### Consequences

The impacts from the localised changes to hydrodynamics would be expected to be minimal around the mooring lines and nets, and may be more marked around the barge and the mooring anchors. The impacts in the water column would be localised and would not impact on an area much larger than the lease itself. The impacts from hydrodynamic changes to water flows around the anchors could potentially cause minor scouring of the seabed surface around the anchors and potential redistribution of a small amount of sediments. Marine flora could be locally affected by the removal of sediment. Marine fauna would not be expected to be negatively affected by the small changes in hydrodynamics. The overall consequences from localised changes to hydrodynamics would be assessed to be **minor**.

<b>Risk 3 = medium</b>
------------------------

## 8.12 Predators

The main predators would be fish larger than those present within the nets, as well as seabirds, turtles, sharks and crocodiles. Feed provided to the farmed fish is strictly controlled so that there is as little wastage as possible. This will limit the amount of wild fish circling the nets for an opportunistic feed. Seabirds have not been a problem at Port Hurd and are not expected to be a problem at Snake Bay either. Sharks and crocodiles will be avoided by staff and will not be fed or encouraged to visit the site. It is expected that potential predators will quickly learn that they cannot penetrate the steel nets and hence will not incur any injuries from encounters with the nets. There have been very few incidents of this type at Port Hurd, and then only in the early days of the operation.

It is possible that due to fish aggregation beneath the nets, larger predators may attempt to feed there, however this is not expected to be any different from them feeding on a school of fish elsewhere. The aggregation phenomenon is not expected to attract more predators than already live in the estuary, as total wild fish numbers in the estuary are not expected to be increased significantly as a result of the farm activities.

Increased activity by humans on the water for the purpose of operating the farm could increase the exposure of staff to large predators such as crocodiles.

### 8.12.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

The main impact from large predators is assessed to be related to the increased exposure of humans to crocodiles, for example, due to the increased amount of time spent by staff and contractors travelling and working for the proposed farm in crocodile-inhabited waters. Although the likelihood of an incident occurring with a large predator is considered **unlikely**, it is assessed to be **possible**.

#### Consequences

The very worst, possible consequence could be **catastrophic**, i.e. it could potentially involve a fatality or permanent serious disability.

<b>Risk 2 to 1 = serious to high risk</b>
---

## 8.13 Flora

As noted in Section 6.12 the farm operations are not expected to have any effects on terrestrial flora. However, it is possible that some impacts could be incurred by marine flora species. The risk of this occurring is discussed below.

### 8.13.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

The likelihood of marine flora being locally affected by the proposed farm is considered to be possible, given that mooring anchors will be placed in the seabed and there may be localised changes to the hydrodynamics around the anchoring points. It is considered

unlikely, though possible that the base of the nets could reach the seafloor during extremely low tides.

It is however considered unlikely that any faeces or uneaten food would accumulate on the seabed as the nets will be placed in a channel flushed by strong tidal currents; furthermore, the feed is rapidly broken down, due to its vegetable meal component.

Marine flora in these areas is likely to be only sparsely developed as the strong tidal currents are likely to preclude extensive marine vegetation growth. Seagrasses would typically develop in areas of relatively weak water currents. The presence of strong currents will also encourage rapid dispersion of nutrient sources such as faeces and uneaten food pellets.

Monitoring at the Port Hurd pilot farm has also suggested that this type of barramundi farm does not appear to be causing any adverse impacts on mangrove stands in areas where nutrients could potentially accumulate.

Based on the above, it is considered that potentially adverse impacts on marine and coastal flora from the proposed farm, would be only a **rare to unlikely** occurrence.

### Consequences

Potential impacts to any existing and likely sparse marine flora beneath the proposed farm, or to any flora occurring within Snake Bay, are assessed to be either **minor** (i.e. no adverse effects) to **moderate** (i.e. event with some temporary adverse effects).

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

### 8.14 Bird, Reptile, Fish and Mammal Habitats

Potential direct impacts to bird, reptile, fish and mammal habitats have been listed in Section 6.13. Indirect effects could potentially affect a wider area than the farm via changes to the water quality, which could in turn potentially affect the marine and coastal plant growth (e.g. seagrasses and mangrove species) and hence the habitats for fauna species directly and indirectly dependent on these.

Sensitive habitat areas, such as breeding sites, which may be potentially affected by the operations of the fish farm are several kilometres (> 3 kilometres) from the proposed operation and are at least 1 kilometre from any marine routes to and from the farm.

### **8.14.1 Risk Assessment**

#### **Likelihood**

Direct physical impacts on sensitive habitats are not likely based on the baseline information and the physical location of the development in relation to physical habitat such as breeding sites. The likelihood of the local fauna habitats being affected in terms of their physico-chemical parameters is considered to be **unlikely**, based on the baseline information collected for the area, experience at the Port Hurd pilot farm, and the environmental monitoring results obtained at that operation (refer to Section 7.1).

#### **Consequences**

Potential consequences from any direct impacts on the local fauna habitats are unlikely (refer above and to Section 6.13). Indirect effects, as documented in Section 7.1, are likely to be non-existent or insignificant in their consequences. In summary, consequences from potential effects from the farm on bird, reptile, fish and mammal habitats are assessed to be **minor**, or a very worst, **moderate**.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

### **8.15 EPBC Act-listed Threatened and Migratory Species**

There is potential for the proposed farm to cause disturbance to EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species (refer to Table 3.7, Section 5.2.1.5) and their habitats. The risk of these disturbances actually occurring is assessed below. The risks will be managed according to management methods which are listed in Sections 9.15 and 10.4, and which will be further refined in the Environmental Management Plan to be drawn up for the proposed operation.

It should be noted that based on the Port Hurd experience, effects from the farm on all bird species are expected to be insignificant. Focus in this section is therefore given to reptiles (essentially turtles) and mammals (predominantly dugong) which are included in the EPBC Act listing of Table 3.7, Section 5.2.1.5.

#### **8.15.1 Risk Assessment**

##### **Likelihood**

##### *Displacement*

The presence of the proposed nets and barge are not expected to cause any significant displacement of EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species from their customary feeding or breeding routes. Occurrences of dugong within Snake Bay are reportedly very rare, and these incursions are short-lived, possibly due to limited seagrass beds and due to indigenous hunting practices. There have not been any reports of dugongs calving in the bay. Turtles may range the bay, but their breeding sites are several kilometres from the proposed farm site and on the seaward side, and they would more commonly feed in areas less exposed to strong tidal currents, that is, in calmer embayments away from the proposed farm site.

The proposed farm is therefore not expected to disturb either the dugong or the turtle breeding or feeding sites. The likelihood of displacement is therefore assessed to be **unlikely**.

#### *Predators*

There is unlikely to be any significant increase in wild fish numbers in the estuary as a result of the presence of the proposed farm. As a consequence, it is unlikely that predator numbers would increase beyond the present as the quantity of their food source is not expected to increase. It follows, therefore, that it is **unlikely** that there would be any increase in predator attacks on threatened species such as turtles.

#### *Potential Injuries*

The larger number of outboard motorboat trips carried out on the estuary as a result of the farm operations, could potentially increase the likelihood of boat strikes on turtles and dugongs. However, dugong presence in Snake Bay is **rare**, based on Tiwi RNRMS and local reports. Furthermore, boat speeds will be controlled and propeller guards will be fitted.

The risk of dugong and turtles getting entangled in the farm nets is considered non-existent given that the nets are made of solid steel mesh and that the fibre nets used for nursery purposes are kept on the inside of the steel nets. The Port Hurd experience has shown that the farm operations do not contribute to turtle or dugong injuries.

#### *Alterations to Seagrass Beds*

Based on the monitoring results from the Port Hurd pilot farm (Section 7.1) it is **unlikely** that there will be any noticeable alterations to seagrass beds in Snake Bay. This important food source is not expected to be affected by the proposed farm operations.

#### *Night Lighting*

It is considered '**rare**' (i.e. practically impossible) that the proposed Snake Bay operation night lighting could impact on the turtle hatchlings light-sensitive direction instincts. The operation is located several kilometres from the nearest reported turtle nesting site and a headland is located between the two. It is therefore likely that moonlight or even lights at Milikapiti would have a stronger influence on the turtles at that site than the minimal night lights used at the lease and on the proposed barge.

#### *Noise and Boat Traffic*

Daytime noise from the farm operations will include motor boat traffic, pump operations and generator operation. Night-time noise will generally be restricted to the barge's generator operation, except on rare occasions when night harvesting will be required to coordinate with tidal and well boat timings. Marine Harvest will endeavour to purchase and use the quietest models for all 'noisy' equipment, it will service all its equipment to ensure optimal working order and will investigate and use sound proofing whenever possible. This will be addressed in the EMP for the site.

Boat traffic will be essentially restricted to day time hours and will be in a straight route between Milikapiti and the farm. This route, at closest, is over 2 kilometres away from the nearest turtle breeding site. Boat traffic from the farm is not expected to affect breeding turtles.

### Consequences

The worst possible consequence rating attributable to the potential impacts listed in Section 6.14 is '**moderate**', i.e. an event with some (temporary) adverse effects, such as dugongs or turtles experiencing some minor and temporary bruising or stress from a potential and rare encounter with a propeller-guarded craft. Management methods proposed are outlined in Section 9.15 and 10.4.

**Risk 4 = low risk**

## 8.16 Land Surface

Disturbance to land surface will be limited and short lived as the farm will operated only temporarily from pre-existing shore-based facilities. Potential impacts from disturbance to the land surface are listed in Section 6.15.

### 8.16.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

It is **possible** that minor impacts could be registered on the beach areas where the nets would be constructed, and on unsealed tracks due to vehicular movements.

#### Consequences

The consequences from work being carried out on the sand beaches are considered to be **minor** as no vegetation will be disturbed and only small amounts of surface material will be moved around which would then be reworked by the tides. Vehicular movements will be minimal and disturbance effects would also be **minor**.

**Risk 4 = low risk**

## 8.17 Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity

The proposed farm operation is likely to have some limited impacts on aspects of air quality, predominantly due to combustion engines odours and greenhouse gas emissions; noise generation from the operation of motor boats, pumps and generators; lighting from the farms corner markers and the barge night lighting; and the general changes to the visual amenity of the Bay.

### 8.17.1 Greenhouse Gases

The main sources of greenhouse gases would be the generator used to produce power for the operation, the outboard motor boats and the feed and harvesting pump. It is

considered that contributions from minimal car trips from Milikapiti to the air strip would be nominal and not significant enough to warrant including in the calculations. Calculations of potential greenhouse gases emitted by the main sources of the operation have been carried out and are provided in Appendix H. Table 8.3 provides a summary of the potential emissions from the operation. The total annual greenhouse gas emissions from the operation is estimated at 1,331 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> (equivalent). Estimated Australian annual greenhouse gas emissions are around 550 million tonnes; it could therefore be said that the operation would contribute around 2.42 x 10<sup>-4</sup> percent to the total Australian emissions.

**Table 8.3: Summary of Potential Greenhouse Gases Emissions from the Proposed Snake Bay Barramundi Farm**

Source	Estimated Fuel Consumption	Total CO <sub>2</sub> -Equivalent Emissions (tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> / year)
Land-base generator	190 to 250 litres of diesel/day	1,122.7
Barge-base generator	1000 litres of diesel/month	172.9
Outboard motors and pump engines	1000 litres of unleaded/month	35.41
<b>Total Annual Estimated</b>		<b>1,331.01</b>

### 8.17.2 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

It is considered **likely** that the impacts listed in Section 6.16 will cause some low level and intermittent environmental nuisance.

#### Consequences

Based on the operation of the Port Hurd farm, the consequences from the potential impacts listed in Section 6.16 are considered to be **minor** and more often unnoticeable.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

### 8.18 Social and Recreational

Most of the social and recreational impacts listed in Section 6.17 are considered to be positive, although there is potential for some negative social impacts to occur as a result of inappropriate behaviour or cultural differences.

### 8.18.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

Given that the farm workers will be working long days, it is not expected that there will be much opportunity for social mixing between farm staff and local residents. The likelihood for these negative impacts to occur is also considered to be unlikely, as Marine Harvest has experience in working in the locality and with the local people. Tiwi people are generally welcoming of the project and will benefit from its profits. Many employees will also be Tiwi people, who will be familiar with local social structure and behaviour. However, it cannot be ruled out that some friction may occur, and the likelihood of these negative impacts should therefore be considered **possible**.

#### Consequences

Due to the high cultural awareness which Marine Harvest fosters in its employees, it is considered that any potential friction would be insignificant. **Minor** consequences could occur when a local person felt disadvantaged and could be impacted financially or personally.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

### 8.19 Local Infrastructure

The local infrastructure, such as the airstrip, local roads, jetty, shops and town facilities, will have an increase in use during the construction of the proposed farm and during the occupation of the temporary shore-based facility. Nevertheless, Marine Harvest does not expect that any upgrades to the local infrastructure will be necessary to cope with the additional traffic brought on during the construction of its proposed farm.

This increase in use of the local infrastructure facilities will diminish considerably once the farm operations are run entirely from the barge.

### 8.19.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

It is considered **unlikely** that the small increases in aircraft passengers and vehicular traffic on the local roads, the increases in boat traffic at the jetty, or the increased use of local businesses as a result of the start up of the proposed farm, would cause any negative impacts on the local infrastructure.

#### Consequences

Most of the impacts listed in Section 6.18 with regards to the effects on local infrastructure from the farm operation are considered to be very **minor** and are unlikely to bring about any adverse impacts on the local infrastructure.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

## 8.20 Archaeological, Historical, Cultural and Aboriginal Sites

No archaeological and historical sites are noted in the vicinity of the farm site. Two imunga sites (traditional Aboriginal sites) are noted on either side of the proposed farm lease boundaries. These are understood to be traditional hunting sites.

Discussions and communications have been carried out with the Northern Territory Government and with the Tiwi Land Council. The Tiwi Land Council has issued a statement saying that the *'members of YIMPINARI and the members of WULIRANGKUWU [...] have met and discussed this matter at Meetings from December 2005 to April 2006 and that they agree that there are no sites of significance or sacred sites recorded or known to be affected by this application by Marine Harvest'*. A copy of the correspondence is provided in Appendix I.

### 8.20.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

It is considered **'rare'** i.e. practically impossible, that there would be any impacts to archaeological, historical, cultural or aboriginal sites as there are only two 'imunga' sites in the vicinity of the proposed farm lease boundaries which are clearly identified to Marine Harvest. These sites will be shown to and respected by all staff. The Tiwi Land Council is aware of the proposed farm's proximity to the 'imunga' sites and has not raised any objections to the farm going ahead in the area.

#### Consequences

The consequences of the presence of the proposed farm in close proximity to the 'imunga' sites are considered to be **minor**, i.e. 'an event with no adverse effects' on the 'imunga' sites.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

## 8.21 Marine Traffic

The Tiwi Barge Company barge will service the operation weekly during construction and harvesting, and fortnightly at other times. It is expected that the requirements of the operation will not increase the movements of the barge beyond its current schedule.

It is anticipated that sailing of the live-on farm barge from Darwin to the north coast of Melville Island will not require any dedicated access corridors.

No dedicated water access corridors will be required for the movement of nets during installation, given that Snake Bay is a wide enough waterway so that movements of large equipment like the nets will not cause any inconvenience to other users. Movements of nets will be carried out during calm seas, at high tide and in good visibility conditions.

Existing traffic on the waterway is currently very limited given the small population base. It is anticipated that motorboat traffic from the farm will contribute up to around half of the boat traffic on the waterway.

#### **8.21.1 Risk Assessment**

##### **Likelihood**

It is considered **unlikely** that the increase in motor boat traffic on Snake Bay as a result of the proposed farm operations should cause any environmental impacts. Although it is estimated that the farm boat trips may up to double the current boat traffic on the bay, the total number of boat trips by the farm would still very low, estimated to be around a maximum of three return trips per day.

##### **Consequences**

No adverse effects are predicted from this increase in marine boat traffic, hence it is estimated that this would represent only a '**minor**' consequence.

<b>Risk 4 = low risk</b>
--------------------------

#### **8.22 Insects Pests**

No increase in pest insects such as mosquitoes is likely to occur due to the hygiene and management of the operation which will limit opportunities for insects to breed.

It is anticipated that most staff members will be sourced either from the Tiwi Islands or the Darwin area and will already be familiar with the ambient conditions of coastal Northern Territory, i.e. heat, humidity and associated pest insects. There is a small possibility that staff could contract some insect-borne disease such as malaria or Ross-river virus.

It is expected that the presence of biting and pest insects will not cause any significant difficulties in the day-to-day running of the farm operations and appropriate mitigation measures will be put in place to manage any potential nuisance or medical impacts on staff (Sections 9.21 and 9.22).

#### **8.22.1 Risk Assessment**

##### **Likelihood**

It is considered **unlikely** that the operation of the farm will encourage the breeding of any disease-carrying insects due to the high standard of hygiene implemented by Marine Harvest. Operational procedures will ensure that staff take precautions to prevent being bitten by disease-carrying insects.

## Consequences

Potential consequences from a staff member contracting an insect-borne disease could be **moderate**, i.e. they could require medical treatment and a period of prolonged rest or convalescence.

**Risk 4 = low risk**

## 8.23 Personnel Emergencies

Personnel emergencies may occur in any workplace and there is potential for personnel emergencies to occur at the proposed barramundi farm at Snake Bay. Potential emergencies have been summarised in Section 6.22.

### 8.23.1 Risk Assessment

#### Likelihood

All of the potential impacts outlined as possible outcomes from personnel emergencies at the proposed farm and listed in Section 6.22 are classified as being **possible**.

#### Consequences

The worst possible outcome from any one of these potential impacts could be a fatality, i.e. the consequences would be classified as **catastrophic**. This catastrophic outcome is very **unlikely**, given the experience at the Port Hurd pilot farm, where most incidents would be classified in the **minor** or **moderate** categories.

**Risk 4 to 2 = low to serious risk**

## 8.24 Summary of Risk Assessments

Qualitative risk assessments have been carried out for all identified aspects and impacts of the proposed barramundi farm. A summary of these is provided in Table 8.4 below. The table shows that only four aspects have been assessed as having a risk ranking of 2 or 1, i.e. having serious or high risks. These are:

- fish faeces and nutrient loads,
- wastes and hazardous materials,
- predators, and
- personnel emergencies.

**Table 8.4: Risk Assessments Summary**

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Construction	Possible	Minor/ moderate	3 = medium	Noise and traffic impacts will be temporary and managed via the EMP.
Fish Escape	Possible	Moderate	3 = medium	Some temporary adverse effects including predation on endemic smaller fish and removal of feed from the environment could occur.
Fish faeces and nutrient loads	Certain	Minor / moderate	2 to 1 = serious to high	Faeces will enter the water column, but monitoring at Port Hurd suggests little impact from added nutrient load.
Excess feed and quality	Possible / unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 to 3 = low to medium	Loss of feed will be strictly minimized by management methods and feed quality is high, hence impact on fauna, flora and overall environment will be low.
Fish aggregation	Likely	Minor	3 = medium	No effect on fishing reported from Port Hurd pilot farm.
Introduction of diseases	Unlikely	Moderate	4 = low	Very low incidences at Port Hurd pilot farm.

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Introduction of parasites	Rare	Minor	4 = low	Very low incidences at Port Hurd pilot farm.
Introduction of chemicals	Rare / unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 = low	Port Hurd pilot farm experience has shown that there has been very little need for chemical usage due to low incidence of disease outbreaks.
Waste and hazardous materials	Unlikely / possible	Moderate / major	4 to 2 = low to serious	Stringent management methods will be implemented via the EMP to minimize the likelihood and mitigate the consequences of any potential spillages.
Loss of nets	Unlikely	Moderate / major	4 to 3 = low to medium	The new infrastructure proposed and the more moderate water currents at Snake Bay mean that risks are diminished.
Hydrodynamics	Likely	Minor	3 = medium	The only notable impact is likely to be redistribution of sediments around the mooring anchors.
Predators	Possible	Catastrophic	2 to 1 = serious to high	Increased exposure of humans to crocodiles and therefore increased likelihood of attacks.
Flora	Rare / unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 = low	Impacts are expected to be minor of moderate due to the location of the farm and the proposed management methods.

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Bird, reptile, fish and mammal habitats	Unlikely	Minor / moderate	4 = low	Baseline and Port Hurd information and monitoring suggests there is a low risk of impact on fauna habitats.
EPBC Act listed threatened and migratory species	Unlikely / rare	Moderate	4 = low	Baseline and Port Hurd information and monitoring suggests there is a low risk of impact on EPBC listed, threatened or migratory species or their habitats.
Land surface	Possible	Minor	4 = low	Use of unsealed areas will be minimized.
Air quality, noise, lighting and visual amenity	Likely	Minor	4 = low	Only low level intermittent nuisance is likely.
Social / recreational	Possible	Minor	4 = low	Strong links have already been established between Marine Harvest and the local population.
Local infrastructure	Unlikely	Minor	4 = low	Most demand on the local infrastructure is expected to occur during construction. This demand will drop significantly during operation of the farm.

Aspect	Likelihood of Impacts	Consequence of Impacts	Risk Ranking of Impacts	Comments
Archaeological / historical, cultural and aboriginal sites	Rare	Minor	4 = low	The Tiwi Land Council is aware of the proposed farm proximity to the 'imunga' sites and has not raised any objections to the farm going ahead.
Marine traffic	Unlikely	Minor	4 = low	The farm may up to double boat trips on the bay, but traffic will still remain very low.
Insect pests	Unlikely	Moderate	4 = low	Managed by operational procedures.
Personnel emergencies	Possible	Minor to catastrophic	4 to 2 = low to serious	Personnel emergencies can occur in any workplace; dangers will be managed via standard operating procedures and the site EMP.

## 9 Proposed Mitigation, Management and Monitoring

The mitigation, management and monitoring measures for each risk are proposed as preliminary measures only and these will need to be refined in the Environmental Management Plan which will be drawn up for the operation following approval. Risk control measures generally conform to the hierarchy of:

- elimination,
- substitution,
- engineering controls,
- procedural controls, and
- personal protective equipment.

Detailed management and monitoring requirements will be set out in the Environmental Management Plan to be designed for the site. The following are intended as general guidelines and indications of the proposed management and monitoring measures to be put in place to address potential impacts from the aspects listed in Section 6. These take into consideration the associated risk rankings discussed in Section 8 of this report.

### 9.1 Maintenance and Monitoring Manual

In concurrence with the construction of the proposed development, Marine Harvest will develop a Maintenance and Monitoring Manual for the operation of the site. The Manual will be based on lessons learned from the Port Hurd pilot operation and will include details of the maintenance schedule for equipment and structures and will also include the schedule for the environmental monitoring program. The Manual will form the basis of the site induction program and training program for all staff.

### 9.2 Construction

#### ***Risk Ranking 3 – Medium Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

A construction management plan will be drawn up to ensure that potential environmental impacts from the construction of the farm are minimised and effectively managed.

The plan will include:

- Induction of staff and contractors into all aspects of the plan;
- Hours of operation;
- Marine traffic speed limits and codes;
- Procedures for minimising environmental impacts from construction;

- Noise management;
- Use of equipment with low noise rating;
- Maintenance of equipment for optimal operation; and
- Social awareness training for all staff and contractors.

### **Monitoring**

Weekly meetings will be held with all staff, contractors and farm management or construction manager. The meetings will be held to ensure that all procedures are being adhered to and that any incidents are recorded and corrective action taken where necessary.

## **9.3 Fish Escape**

### **Risk Ranking 3 – Medium Risk**

The risk of fish escape has been discussed in Section 8.2.

### **Mitigation and Management**

The steel mesh nets which have been trialled most recently at the Port Hurd operation have been found to be the most appropriate and robust for the environmental conditions and these nets will be used at Snake Bay. A maintenance schedule will be developed to include a routine inspection program for the nets and moorings (refer to Section 9.9).

### **Monitoring**

Visual inspection will occur daily on the exposed net areas and a fortnightly inspection using divers will examine the net area below the water surface. An engineering inspection of the moorings will take place every six months to ensure any wear or sub-optimal mooring features can be identified and remedied prior to failure.

Marine Harvest will investigate the usefulness of using a tide predicting software package developed by the Australian Institute of Marine Science (AIMS) at its proposed farm.

## **9.4 Disease and Parasite Transfer**

### **Risk Ranking 4 - Low Risk**

Based on the Port Hurd experience, barramundi at the farm are likely to remain relatively parasite-free with gill fluke and copepod being the only minor problems with the fish. Management methods proposed at the Snake Bay farm are detailed below.

## **Mitigation and Management**

The fish will be carefully screened within the hatchery for known disease of importance prior to despatch, reducing the likelihood that disease will be transferred to the farm and its environment from the hatchery.

### *Screening Juveniles*

Through disease screening and treatment of juvenile fish from the hatchery, the likelihood of disease being introduced into the farm can be greatly reduced. The Darwin Aquaculture Centre carefully monitors fish stocks for disease to prevent the transfer into farmed or wild stocks.

### *Stress Reduction*

Marine Harvest will reduce the stress on the fish which could lead to disease, by ensuring water quality remains near optimal level, reducing stocking densities (to a sustainable yet economic level), and by feeding high quality diets, and minimising fish handling.

### *Fish Treatment*

Fish will be vaccinated at the hatchery against *Vibrio carcheri*, *Photobacterium damsela*, and *streptococcus iniae* and will be handled as little as possible to avoid scale/skin damage and increased exposure to disease.

Based on the Port Hurd experience, it is expected that the use of steel nets will negate the need for treatment for gill fluke and copepod infestation on the farmed fish.

Treatment for gill fluke and copepod infestation is unlikely to be carried out. When the use of steel nets was implemented throughout the Port Hurd pilot farm, these parasites were reduced to very low numbers in the farmed fish, and they did not require any treatment.

### *Disease Management*

Sick, diseased and dead fish will be immediately removed from the pens and placed in the ensiler. The dedicated onsite scientist will monitor the incidence of deaths and will carry out tests on the fish if any upward trend is noted.

In the case of a suspected disease outbreak, fish would be sent to a veterinary laboratory for diagnosis. Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory which will confirm the diagnosis and recommend what, if any, treatment is necessary. The veterinary report would confirm whether the problem was treatable by antibiotic or not and would confirm the dose required if antibiotic could be used. The powdered antibiotic would be mixed with vegetable oil in a machine similar to a cement mixer and the resultant sludge would then be mixed with the feed. The feed would be dispensed to the fish via air cannons.

Initial disease issues were enteritis caused by *Vibrio harveyi* and *Photobacterium damsela*; both bacteria are endemic in Northern Territory waters. Experience at Port Hurd has shown that good hatchery practice and vaccination of the fish at the DAC has

reduced the problem. Use of antibiotics has not been necessary in any of the vaccinated fish.

#### *Hygiene & Quarantine Procedures*

A number of hygiene procedures will be used for the purpose of disease transfer prevention; these will include the following measures.

- Footbaths for all staff coming onto and leaving the farm.
- Morts will be collected first, then disposed to the ensiler. After disposal of morts the barge will be disinfected prior to being used for feeding.
- The fish tanker will be disinfected after delivery of juvenile fish to the farm and prior to going back to the DAC.
- The Berrimah Veterinary Laboratories will take samples and test the juvenile fish for the range of likely diseases prior to the fish leaving for the Marine Harvest farm.
- The disinfectant used will either be calcium hypochlorite (i.e. chlorine) or the same product used by the DAC, which is Phoraid. Phoraid is said to be non-toxic and biodegradable and does not break down as rapidly as chlorine when exposed to the sun.

#### **Monitoring**

Staff at Marine Harvest will monitor fish health looking for obvious disease signals such as appetite depression, irregular swimming patterns, increased frequency of gill movement, and any other general irregularities. Fish that are obviously unwell will be removed and either treated or destroyed.

The farm will have one staff member who is a laboratory scientific officer who will be dedicated to monitoring for disease in the fish. This person will record and monitor the daily mortality rate in each pen and will note whether there are any increases worthy of investigation. The scientific officer will be a trained bacteriologist who will carry out tests on fish in order to identify what might be a problem in the fish. The government veterinary laboratory at Berrimah will be used to confirm any diagnosis.

Marine Harvest has an excellent relationship with the Government Veterinary Service and should any problems occur within the farm, a government vet will be asked to inspect the site. The Service will make at least one annual routine visit to the lease.

## **9.5 Fish Faeces and Nutrient Loads**

### ***Risk Ranking – Serious or High***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

Through careful management of fish feeding the potential impacts from excess nutrients entering the environment can be minimised. The siting of the cages in a high-current channel will help the rapid flushing of faeces and minor amounts of uneaten feed from underneath the cages. Moving the cages around the lease site according to a documented schedule, to allow following of the sediments below the cages, will allow any deposited nutrients to be broken down and any build up in the sediment reduced. Water flow beneath the cages will carry most faeces and nutrients away from the farm. Strong current are expected to break up any solid particles and to rapidly dilute any deposits. Scouring of the sediment surface will also occur during tidal flows and during rainfall events when copious quantities of water enter the catchment. The scouring of sediment surfaces will assist in reducing the build up of faeces or nutrients below the cages.

#### ***Monitoring***

Monitoring of the water column at the farm site on a weekly basis as noted in Sections 9.11 and 10.4 will provide an early indication of potential nutrient issues in the water column. The biennial ambient monitoring program will be carried out to ensure that any potential impacts attributable to the farm are identified and addressed early.

## **9.6 Excess Fish Feed and Feed Quality**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low to Medium***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

A number of measures will be put in place to ensure that the feed is sourced from sustainable resources, that its quality satisfies relevant guideline levels, and that minimal feed is lost to the surrounding water.

#### ***Fish Feed Sources***

The typical ratio of fish production to feed used is between 1:1.1 and 1:1.4, i.e. for 500 tonne production, between 550 and 700 tonnes of feed will be used. Marine Harvest has been working at developing feed which uses vegetable raw materials in addition to fish meal and fish oil in the fish feed. The aim is to achieve as low as practicable wild fish to barramundi conversion ratio, to reduce dependence on the wild catch, and to provide consumers with healthy fish products from sustainable fish farming. Marine Harvest applies a purchasing policy that requires fishmeal and fish oil to be sourced only from managed and sustainable fisheries. Fish oil is now used as part of the fish feed, when originally, fish oil was considered a by-product of fish meal production. It is understood that aquaculture marine fish production requires between 2.5 to 3.2 pelagic (other fish) equivalent inputs (wet weight basis) per unit of farmed fish output.

The wild fish component of the feed is provided by the Peruvian and Chilean anchovy, jack mackerel and sardine fisheries which are under direct government control. These governments play an active role in scientific monitoring of the fisheries, in ensuring that these are fished in a completely sustainable manner, and in setting quotas and bans. Mr David Whyte of Skretting (pers. comm. 9 February 2006) considers that the Peruvian and Chilean fisheries, from which Skretting source the wild fish component of their feed, are some of the most sustainable and well managed fisheries in the world.

### *Feed Quality*

Details on the barramundi feed composition and ingredients are provided in Section 3.8.2. The barramundi feed is mammal-protein free, free of genetically modified organisms' DNA, no hormones or growth promoters are used in the fish feed, and all raw materials are sourced from areas of the world that are known to be very low in industrial pollution from heavy metals, dioxins and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

### *Feed Loss*

Feeding will be managed by the use of feed tables. Feed tables are designed by a fish-feeding specialist who calculates the appropriate amount of feed required per pen according to the number and size of the fish in each pen and the water temperature. This method of feeding is based on optimising fish appetite and growth and minimising feed wastage; it diminishes overfeeding of fish, and has proven to be very successful in preventing feed wastage by encouraging fish to eat with full appetite when the feed is provided to them. Since its implementation at the pilot farm at Port Hurd, this feed program has reduced feed consumption by 60 percent and has only resulted in a minor reduction in growth rate. The farm has a vested interest in managing feed loss as feed costs are one of the biggest overhead costs.

## **Monitoring**

### *Fish Feed Quality*

Skretting carries out annual residue monitoring at the Cambridge feed mill in Tasmania, in conjunction with residue monitoring in the other 15 feed mills located worldwide. Residue monitoring analyses are carried out on the fish feed finished product and on source products such as poultry meal, feather meal, fish meal, fish oil, tuna meal and poultry oil. The samples are analysed for heavy metals, antioxidants, dioxins, polychlorinated biphenyls, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, flame retardants, nitrosamines and pesticides. The residue-monitoring analytical results are assessed against the most stringent European Union limits. Skretting factories have implemented a Risk Management System to ensure that quick action can be taken in the event of high residue levels being detected.

Results from Skretting's residue monitoring for 2003, 2004 and 2005 at the Cambridge Mill in Tasmania are provided in Appendix J. These show that residues for all the compounds analysed are well within the recommended limits set by the European Union.

### *Feed Loss*

Any uneaten feed will be monitored by camera to ensure that as little wastage as possible occurs in the form of uneaten pellets. Any potential excess nutrients impacts will be monitored as described in Section 9.11.

## **9.7 Waste**

Waste management in the Northern Territory is governed by the *Waste Management and Pollution Control Act 2003*. Waste includes any matter, whether solid, gaseous or radioactive, which is discharged, emitted or deposited in the environment in such volume, consistency or manner as to cause an alteration to the environment<sup>1</sup>.

There are a number of operations at the Snake Bay marine farm that will generate waste on a day to day basis as discussed in Section 8.9. Provisions for the reduction, re-use, recycling and, appropriate disposal of this waste will be outlined in detail in the Environmental Management Plan for the Snake Bay facility.

The amount of waste likely to be generated from the operations at Snake Bay are minimal, and provided waste disposal procedures are adhered to the risk of any on site impact from waste will be low.

### ***Risk Ranking – Low to Serious (for major spillage)***

The paragraphs below outline the proposed waste management measures to be employed at the Snake Bay farm.

#### **9.7.1 General Mitigation Measures for Waste**

Marine Harvest intends to implement actions which will be identified in the EMP for Snake Bay. The EMP will provide details on the following:

- Farm staff training regarding waste minimisation and waste management procedures;
- Monitoring and reporting of volumes, types and destinations of waste materials; volumes of all materials brought onto the farm should also be tallied for comparison purposes;
- Appropriate storage, transport and disposal of all materials and wastes generated;
- Regular reassessment of waste minimisation options to ensure that the operation remains current and proactive in limiting its waste generation; and
- Clearly documented procedures regarding waste management.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pacific ETRS. May 2003. Environmental Systems Lead Auditor Training Manual.

### **9.7.2 Solid Putrescible Waste**

Putrescible waste is waste that can be decomposed by bacterial action<sup>2</sup>. The barramundi farm at Snake Bay is likely to generate putrescible waste from sources such as kitchen scraps (from meats and vegetable matter), office and kitchen paper and cardboard packaging, as well as the dead fish carcasses (morts).

#### **Mitigation and Management**

Kitchen food scraps will be stored on the barge in a standard, sealed rubbish container, in a store room to prevent attracting birds and crocodiles to the site. Kitchen scraps will either be removed from the barge regularly and transported by boat to a local landfill site or composting facility, or, it is more likely that all suitable materials will be disposed directly into the ensiler, the contents of which will be used for composting following shipment to Darwin. Morts will also be digested in an ensiler located on board the barge.

Office paper and all cardboard will be re-used where possible, or bundled and stored appropriately for recycling. Paper and cardboard will be collected at the same time as the other non-putrescible rubbish and will be transported by boat to a recycling centre.

#### **Monitoring**

Monitoring measures will include:

- checking the level on the ensiler monthly to ensure it operates optimally and is emptied when required, and
- checking that any putrescible waste not placed in the ensiler is stored in securely sealed containers in a dedicated storage area, and does not attract and scavenging birds or other animals.

### **9.7.3 Sewage and Grey Water**

Liquid wastes are generated by sewage and sullage water. The numbers of personnel at the barge at any time are small and washing consists of personal hygiene, cleaning of the facility, washing of dishes and minimal clothes washing. Sewage and sullage will be treated with the best available on-board facilities to ensure processed water meets the most stringent guidelines prior to being discharged to the bay.

#### **Management and Mitigation**

All sewage generated on board the barge facility will be treated by the Humphrey system. The Humphrey system complies with US coast guard requirements.

In the Humphrey system, the sewage from the toilet(s) flows directly into the digester unit(s), where it makes its way through a series of baffles. It is broken down and dissolved by natural bacterial action during this stage. The resulting effluent is pumped

---

<sup>2</sup> EPA. May 2004. Classification of wastes. Publication 448.1. Victorian EPA. [WWW.epa.vic.gov.au](http://WWW.epa.vic.gov.au).

through the activated carbon filter and passes through the disinfecting system, where the final stage of purification and deodorising takes place prior to discharge to the water body. Maintenance of the system is simple and would be included in a regular program, which would entail:

- periodical addition of Humphrey Activator to keep bacterial action operating optimally,
- regular checking and replacement of the activated carbon filter, and
- regular checking and top up of disinfectant.

### **Monitoring**

Quality of the effluent is expected to meet effluent standards set in the ANZECC 2000 *Water Quality Guideline for Fresh and Marine Waters*. These guidelines are recognised nationally and widely adopted by most relevant authorities. Samples of the effluent will be taken weekly during initial commissioning of the equipment on the barge and once a steady state has been achieved the effluent will be sampled monthly. Analysis of the effluent will be by a NATA accredited laboratory. Results of the analysis will be submitted in the annual report to the Environment Protection Authority. Analyses will include a broad range of target compounds during the first rounds of screening, eg: faecal coliforms, ammonia, visual appearance and colour, odour, pH, temperature, oil and grease, heavy metals, pesticides, detergent compounds. The suite of analytes will then be refined over time.

#### **9.7.4 Solid Inert Waste**

Solid inert waste is hard waste and dry vegetative material, which have negligible chemical impact on the environment. Solid inert waste from the Snake Bay Fish Farm will include feed bags, plastics (kitchen and workshop), glass (kitchen and workshop), polystyrene (from damaged pens and from the barge), steel (from damaged or old pen mesh), and clean waste generated from the workshop.

### **Mitigation and Management**

This waste will be stored in dedicated storage containers and areas; all recyclable waste will be separated into different containers. Solid wastes will be removed by boat regularly and will be disposed to an appropriate waste disposal facility in Darwin for recycling or landfill. Where possible all recyclable wastes such as plastic will be sent to a recycler in Darwin.

There is no ability to recycle the bag waste, which is by far, the greatest volume of solid waste generated.

### **Monitoring**

The farm will keep records of the volumes of solid waste it generates and will regularly reassess new reduction, reuse or recycling options for its waste.

### **9.7.5 Prescribed Waste**

Prescribed waste can have hazardous properties. If not managed properly these wastes may pose a threat to life or health of living organisms due to their toxic properties. Other wastes in this category may pose a threat to safety of humans or equipment due to explosive, reactive or corrosive properties. The proposed barramundi farm at Snake Bay will only generate small quantities of prescribed waste, these will include small amounts of chemicals, laboratory materials for fish monitoring, spent batteries and waste oils.

#### **Mitigation and Management**

All prescribed wastes such as chemicals, laboratory materials for fish monitoring, spent batteries and waste oils will be stored in their original containers with lids on or in dedicated and sealable storage containers. All containers will be clearly labelled with appropriate warnings and will be kept in impervious storage areas. Waste containers of incompatible substances will be stored separately from each other. These wastes will be picked up by the transport barge and will be disposed appropriately by Waste Master, which is a licensed waste disposal company in the Northern Territory.

#### **Monitoring**

The farm will keep records of the quantities of prescribed waste which it disposes of, and the destination of its disposal.

### **9.7.6 Dead Farm Fish**

From experience at Port Hurd, around 2 percent of the farm population will die through natural causes. The management of this fish waste is described below.

#### **Mitigation and Management**

The pens will be inspected daily to ensure the fish remain healthy and any fish which appear sick are removed and disposed of to the ensiler. The ensiler is an 11,000-litre tank with two access holes at the top. A chopper pump is built in to the ensiler to cut up fish into smaller pieces for faster decay and mechanical stirrers will keep the mixture moving to also help speed up decay. The tank will be made from tank-grade polyethylene and will contain potassium hydroxide diluted to between 1 and 10% by weight in water. Typically, potassium hydroxide in the ensiler will be used at a rate of about 10% potassium hydroxide per mort volume, i.e. 100 kilograms of potassium hydroxide would be required to ensile 1 tonne of dead fish. It is expected that at least 1 tonne of potassium hydroxide would be held on site at any time. In the case of a disease outbreak, storage of up to 2 tonnes of potassium hydroxide may be necessary. However, holding requirements may be reduced depending on the frequency of the supply barge visits.

The mort ensiler is developed to treat fish morts and offal. The wastes are thoroughly mixed with acids and form a stable, odourless end product. The end product can in some cases be used as a fertiliser or basic product for further processing. The end product has a commercial value in that it is rich in fish oils and proteins.

The ensiler will be emptied periodically. The process involves turning off the pump and stirrers so the contents settles. The supernatant liquid is then let out of an outlet at the side of the container and transferred to an iso-bin. The excess sludge left at the bottom of the ensiler does not build up rapidly as it keeps breaking down. When build up is excessive, the sludge is removed with a sludge pump inserted at the top of the ensiler and transferred to an iso-bin.

The material from the ensiler will be shipped to a proprietary composting operation in Darwin (MOECO) for mixing with their usual composting products. It is understood that all the fertilisers which are produced will be bought by the Tiwi Islands Sylvatech (forestry company) from Marine Harvest, who will therefore recover some or all of its ensilage costs.

### **Monitoring**

The contents of the ensiler will be checked regularly (monthly and as needed) to ensure that the process is operating properly within the tank and that the level does not build up beyond its capacity.

The farm will keep records of the volumes of waste removed from the ensiler and recycled via the composting stream.

## **9.8 Storage, Handling and Containment of Chemical and Hazardous Substances**

The barge facility will store a number of hazardous chemicals which must be managed according to Dangerous Goods Regulations.

### **Risk Ranking – Serious Risk**

#### **Mitigation and Management**

Storage, handling and containment procedures for chemicals and hazardous substances will be drawn up as part of the site's Environmental Management Plan.

Some of the main procedures will include:

- Storing all substances in their original manufacturers' containers, with labels clearly visible and legible;
- Storing all substances in accordance with manufacturer's instructions or following instructions on pertaining material safety data sheets (MSDSs);
- Storing incompatible substances away from each other and in separate and dedicated storage areas;
- Storage of hazardous chemicals in excess of 200 litres will require a bunded area; the area will be bunded to contain at least 110% of the volume of the largest vessel it contains, or 25% of the total volume of fuel stored within the bund;

- The bunded area will have a roof for protection from the sun and from rain. This will help prevent overflow in the event of a spill in the bund;
- The bunded area will also include a sump for drainage of the spilled contents to a holding tank;
- All outlet points on all fuel storage containers will be fitted with safety / emergency valves to for use in the case of a catastrophic event; and
- Training of all staff and contractors in the appropriate handling and storage of all substances to prevent injury to themselves and others, and to prevent impacts on the surrounding environment. If new products are to be brought onto the farm, a briefing needs to be held regarding any particular storage or handling requirements for that product.

### **Emergency Management of Chemicals and Hazardous Substances**

Emergency and contingency plans for the management of chemical and hazardous substances spillages will be drawn up as part of the site's Environmental Management Plan.

Some of the main aspects of the plan will include:

- Procedures to address the immediate response to any chemical and fuel spillage to ensure clean up is carried out expediently and further spillage is averted;
- Procedures to notify all relevant company, local and government parties as soon as possible;
- Ensuring that appropriate clean up materials are available where needed and in appropriate quantities;
- Ensuring that all clean-up waste is stored in appropriate containers;
- Ensuring that clean-up waste is disposed to an appropriately licensed waste disposal facility;
- Ensuring that all staff are trained in the clean up procedures for all chemicals and hazardous substances;
- Ensuring that an appropriate response plan is in place to handle all eventualities that may arise from any chemical or hazardous substances spill;
- Ensuring that post-incident debrief is carried out so that any lessons to be learned from the incidents are implemented; and
- Ensuring that regular refresher training is carried out to familiarize staff with such eventualities.

## **Monitoring**

All storage areas will be checked weekly for evidence of leakages, and all containers will be visually inspected for integrity.

Annual auditing of all substances stored will need to be carried out to ensure that they are stored appropriately, that MSDS sheets are available, and that all staff are trained in the handling of all products used by the farm operations.

## **9.9 Nets and Moorings**

### **Risk Ranking – Low to Medium Risk**

#### **Mitigation and Management**

##### **Nets**

A number of measures will be put in place at Snake Bay to minimise the potential for the loss of nets and moorings. These will include engineering and procedural measures.

The steel nets proposed by Marine Harvest will greatly minimise the risk of escapes. These cages have proven to be very durable in adverse weather conditions throughout the world and at the Port Hurd pilot farm, and can handle waves greater than 2.5 metres.

The size of nets proposed to be used at Snake Bay will be smaller than those used most recently at Port Hurd; there will also be less nets attached to each mooring array than at Port Hurd. This will diminish the drag from water currents and the resultant stress on the mooring system. Moorings will be installed by cyclone mooring specialists.

##### **Moorings**

Moorings will be designed specifically for the size and type of nets used, and to the most stringent standards to withstand the maximum water currents and wave heights likely at Snake Bay and within the location chosen for the nets.

#### **Monitoring**

The site manager will be responsible for ensuring that the monitoring schedule and regular maintenance are carried out as specified in the forthcoming Environmental Management Plan.

Regular moorings inspections will be carried out during conditions suitable for diving, and a program of maintenance and replacement of mooring equipment will be put in place to ensure the moorings are in the best possible condition to withstand potentially harsh conditions.

- All mooring components will be checked by divers six monthly;
- Mooring components will be replaced regularly under a strategic maintenance program and at a minimum will be fully replaced each 2 years;

- Nets will be monitored daily from the water surface and fortnightly below the water line by divers;
- Components of nets will be replaced as needed and under a strategic maintenance program; and
- Nets will be fully replaced at a minimum each 2 years.

### **Contingency**

In the event of a mooring failure, a warning will be broadcast to the Marine and Safety Authority and to local shipping. Where safe to do so some temporary mooring will be set up to secure the cages until a permanent replacement can be constructed. Measures will be taken to attempt to locate and retrieve any stray net or mooring materials which may have drifted away.

## **9.10 Hydrodynamics**

### **Risk Ranking – Medium Risk**

#### **Mitigation and Management**

The nets, moorings and barge design options chosen for Snake Bay and discussed in previous sections have had as their main focus the aim of minimizing water drag. Minimizing water drag will consequently minimize potential disruptions to the hydrodynamic processes.

Changes to the locations of the net mooring arrays may occur periodically and this will alleviate any potentially localized scouring of the sea floor sediments that may occur around the mooring anchors.

#### **Monitoring**

The farm will ensure that any complaints received by locals regarding potential disruptions to the hydrodynamics in the bay are registered and that an assessment of possible modifications to the operational set up is made if required.

Monitoring for potential seafloor scouring around the mooring anchors should be included in the mooring inspections carried out six monthly by the diving teams.

## **9.11 Water and Sediment Quality**

### **Risk Ranking – Low Risk**

#### **Mitigation and Management**

The proposed location for the barramundi farm is within a channel within the bay which is flushed by high currents. This channel was chosen in part because of its strong currents which will allow for good oxygenation of the nets and abundant oxygen input for optimum

growth of the fish. It is therefore considered that the water quality will not suffer depletion of oxygen levels, eutrophication, etc. As discussed in earlier sections, there will generally be no inputs of chemicals, excess feed will be very minimal and is likely to be eaten by local wildfish, and faeces will be predominantly washed away and diluted by the strong currents. The main mitigation and management methods will include:

- Managing feed input to ensure minimal excess feed is lost to the environment;
- Managing and monitoring fish health to minimise the need for chemical use and input;
- Ensuring that effluent from the barge is treated to appropriate standards;
- Ensuring that no other wastes are disposed to the marine environment;
- Regular monitoring of receiving environments, i.e. water and sediments;
- Comparative assessment of regular monitoring results with baseline data; and
- Implementation of a procedure to immediately respond to any indications that the farm may be impacting on water or sediment quality.

### ***Monitoring***

Aquenal Pty Ltd carried out baseline investigations at Snake Bay which included water sampling and sediment sampling at target sites. This work is summarised in Section 5.3. Aquenal Pty Ltd is well regarded in the field of marine, estuarine and fresh water environmental analysis.

Monitoring outlined below will be assessed against the baseline investigation results reported by Aquenal Pty Ltd.

#### ***Regular Monitoring***

Daily monitoring of water temperature and oxygen levels will take place at the farm. In addition regular monitoring will also be carried out which will entail monitoring fortnightly during the dry and every two months during the wet. Parameters monitored will include:

- Taking water samples from the Snake Bay sampling sites from the top and bottom of the water column;
- Measuring temperature and salinity of the water at those locations at several minutes interval;
- Taking photos of mangrove roots;
- Taking algal samples as necessary; and
- Submitting water samples for analysis for nitrite, nitrate, ammonia, pH and chlorophyll  $\alpha$ .

#### ***Annual or Biennial (every 2 years) Monitoring***

The periodical monitoring will entail sampling from the same locations as those sampled during the Snake Bay baseline survey by Aquenal and reported in November 2005. The locations included six sampling locations (labelled F1 to F6) within the Snake Bay estuary as well as six control sites (labelled C1 to C6) within the Mirikauyunga Creek estuary, situated 3 kilometres to the west of Snake Bay.

Samples and observations will be collected for the following parameters:

- sediment description,
- redox,
- particle size,
- photography of mangrove root assemblages,
- mangrove stand structure and condition,
- benthic infauna,
- water borne nutrients,
- chlorophyll, and
- water quality parameters (temperature, salinity, pH and dissolved oxygen).

## **9.12 Management of Predators**

### ***Risk Ranking – Serious to High Risk***

The risk ranking is serious to high based on the potential injuries which could be incurred from encounters with crocodiles.

### ***Management and Mitigation***

The main management and mitigation methods will include:

- As part of the induction process, all staff, visitors and contractors to the farm will be briefed on the potential dangers from crocodiles;
- Feeding of any wild animals by any farm staff, visitors, contractors, etc. will be prohibited;
- Disposal of any wastes to water, in particular food wastes, will be prohibited;
- Avoidance of crocodiles anywhere near or on the water;
- Regular maintenance of farm nets; and
- Inclusion of crocodile attack management procedures in the emergency procedures for the farm.

### **9.13 Bird, Reptile, Fish and Mammal Habitats**

#### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

The main mitigation and management methods will include:

- Running the operation predominantly during daylight hours.
- Minimising noise from the operation by limiting the use of outboard motors, pump generators, etc. to only the required usage period, and ensuring that all engines and generators are the quietest available and are well maintained.
- Limiting night operations to an absolute minimum.
- Use of low impact night lighting at all other times.
- Ensuring fish do not escape.
- Ensuring water and sediment quality is maintained via management of feed, wastes, chemicals, etc. (as outlined in sections above).
- Quarantine regulations in place at the Darwin wharf will be strictly adhered to by the Tiwi Barge Company or any other barge company that would come to the site. This procedure is aimed at preventing the invasion of the Islands by weed and feral animal species.
- Ensuring procedures are in place to immediately and effectively manage any spills or other event which may impact on the environment.

#### ***Monitoring***

The main monitoring measures will include the following.

- Keeping a detailed log of all farm operations so that links to any potential complaints or impacts can be made or discarded;
- Logging of all animal deaths found near or in the lease;
- Logging and responding to any complaints received regarding potential disturbance to local habitats; and
- Monitoring of water, sediments and flora at regular intervals as outlined in Sections 9.11 and 9.14.

## 9.14 Flora

### **Risk Ranking – Low Risk**

#### **Mitigation and Management**

Mitigation and management methods will include the following:

- Implementation of methods outlined in Sections 9.4 to 9.12 will prevent most potential indirect impacts to flora;
- Induction of staff into the need to prevent and avoid any direct impacts to local flora from outboard motorboat uses, from beach usage for net building, or any other;
- Monitoring of mangroves and seagrasses extents and health, as noted below.

#### **Monitoring**

##### *Seagrasses*

Direct mapping and monitoring of seagrasses' extent and health would need to be designed to minimize safety issues arising from potential crocodile attacks. A number of options will be considered and the most effective, safe and reproducible method(s) will be selected based on the site's characteristics. These will be detailed in the site's Environmental Management Plan. The options considered would include those listed below.

- Use detailed aerial photography to map the locations and outlines of any existing seagrass beds within Snake Bay/Curtis Haven.
- Use an underwater remotely operated vehicle (ROV), equipped with a video camera and a positioning system. The ROV could be used to map the extents of the seagrass beds beneath and in the vicinity of the proposed farm, and could be used periodically, in predetermined monitoring locations, to check on the health of the seagrasses.
- Use surrogate plastic strips attached to steel weights and subsurface buoys, which would be dropped in target seagrass beds located in the vicinity of the proposed farm, or in areas likely to accumulate nutrients potentially sourced from the proposed farm. These would be changed at regular intervals and checked for epiphytic algal growth.

Appropriate control sites would also be nominated to be included within the monitoring program for whichever method is eventually chosen.

If seabed surveys show that seagrass beds are only minimally developed in Snake Bay, then periodical monitoring may not be required. However consideration will need to be given to seasonal variations, as some species of seagrasses have seasonal growth cycles, and to potential impacts from storm and cyclonic events which can cause dramatic reductions in seagrass areas.

### ***Mangrove Stands and Roots***

It is proposed that annual surveys of monitoring locations in coastal mangrove stands be carried out to check on the health of the mangrove stands and to assess the potential growth of epiphytic algae on the mangrove roots. The results will be compared to the baseline results obtained at Snake Bay by Aquenal in 2005 (refer to Section 5.3). This will help to provide early indicators of potential nutrient accumulation in the quieter embayments of Snake Bay.

## **9.15 EPBC Act-listed Threatened and Migratory Species**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

Proposed mitigation and management measures to minimise risk of any potential impacts to EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species include the following measures.

- Inducting all staff, visitors and contractors about the need to avoid disturbance to any wildlife encountered in the bay, in particular any dugongs and turtles;
- No feeding of wildlife will be permitted;
- Implementation of the mitigation, management and monitoring measures listed in Sections 9.2 to 9.14 to help minimise potential impacts on EPBC Act-listed threatened and migratory species; these include:
  - Implementing strict management of feed and wastes;
  - Limiting boat speeds on the bay to less than 5 knots;
  - Fitting guards around the outboard motors to prevent injuries from potential boat strikes;
  - Maintaining nets in good order;
  - Minimising disruption to fauna and flora;
  - Employing minimal and low impact night lighting;
  - Minimising night-time operations; and
  - Minimising noise from operations and occupation of the site.

#### ***Monitoring***

Monitoring measures will include:

- monitoring of water, sediment and flora quality and health as per Sections 9.11 and 9.14; and

- recording any complaints, reports or sightings of dugongs and turtles or any other wildlife presence or death.

## **9.16 Land Surface**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

The following management measures will be put in place to prevent and mitigate any potential impacts to land surfaces.

- The temporary land base will restrict its operations to pre-existing footprints within already established premises;
- The management of hazardous materials will follow methods outlined in Section 9.8;
- Vehicles will be kept to marked tracks and roads and will drive at or less than the nominated speed limit. If the surface is unsealed, vehicle speed will be reduced to limit either dust generation when dry or rut formation when wet;
- Construction of farm nets on the beach opposite the proposed marine lease will be limited to areas of mobile sand on the foreshore and will be kept away from any soils or embankments; and
- Monitoring of unsealed surfaces where active farm operations take place, and taking corrective actions (i.e. remediation of land surface and operations procedure changes) if any impacts are identified.

#### ***Monitoring***

The proposed monitoring measures for the farm's potential impacts on land surfaces will include:

- Carrying out regular (weekly) inspections of all unsealed surfaces within the temporary land base;
- Carrying out an inspection of unsealed surfaces upon vacating the temporary land base; and
- Recording any complaints received regarding any potential impacts to land surfaces, and taking corrective actions as appropriate.

## **9.17 Air Quality, Noise, Lighting and Visual Amenity**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

##### *Noise*

Use of equipment and motor boats during construction and operation will be limited as much as possible to daylight working hours, and where possible, will be kept at a distance from residential buildings. The equipment will generally be protected from sun and rain with at least some temporary roofing, as a result the sound will generally be muffled.

Where possible, the generator will be positioned so as to minimise exposure to noise and odour emissions to the local residential buildings. The generator will also be protected from sun and rain with, at a minimum some roofing, which will have some sound muffling effect. Marine Harvest will investigate the use of a purpose-built sound-proofing enclosure for the generator.

Marine Harvest will endeavour to use the quietest outboard motors available and will ensure that they are maintained in optimal running order to minimise noise. The motors will be fitted with guards to prevent injury to marine wildlife in the event of an impact, and it is anticipated these guards may provide some noise muffling.

Outboard motor boats will only be used as needed by the operation and their speed will be limited to less than 5 knots in the bay.

Marine Harvest will endeavour to use the quietest pumps available for the fish and feed pumps. These will be maintained in optimal working order and will only be used when needed. The use of sound muffling boxes around the pumps will be investigated by Marine Harvest.

##### *Odour*

Dead fish which float will be removed daily from the pens and placed immediately into the ensiler, which is a closed unit and contains powerful chemicals for the digestion of fish. No persistent odours from dead fish would be expected.

Steel nets are used up to 2 years and then cut up and either used for erosion control or returned to Darwin and sold to metal recyclers. Prior to transport and disposal, used steel net components will be stored in a way to minimise odour generation or impacts.

All generators, pumps, and outboard motors will be kept in optimum working order to ensure that their emissions are as low as possible.

##### *Lighting*

Use of lighting at night will be kept to a minimum. Flashing corner lease markers are required for navigational safety reasons. Night work and light use will be required around once a month due to work requirements combined with tidal cycle parameters (height

and current strength) and barge availability for harvesting, however, lighting will be focussed internally onto the barge.

#### *Visual Amenity*

The farm presence is low profile, with only 0.5 metres of the nets protruding above the water surface. The barge design will be a single storey building. Low impact colours will be used whenever possible and appropriate.

#### **Monitoring**

- A log book of operating hours will be kept for all equipment;
- All motorised equipment will follow a maintenance schedule set according to the number of hours of operation; and
- A record book will be kept for any complaints related to potential impacts from noise, to air quality, from lighting and to visual amenity. Procedures will be put in place to ensure corrective actions are taken immediately.

### **9.18 Social and Recreational**

#### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

Management methods will be put in place to ensure all staff are effectively introduced into the local cultural ways. In the main, staff will be on a fly-in fly-out roster and will remain on the barge for the major part of their work roster.

Staff and contractors working at the fish farm generally have a positive social framework and socialise readily after work hours, though interactions at Milikapiti are expected to be limited due to long work days and low staff numbers. Options for recreational activities include:

- social activities in Milikapiti or within the fish farm group,
- fishing,
- walks on existing tracks, and
- boat trips to other areas of the islands.

Marine Harvest will consider organising regular fishing days around the cages if they find that there is local interest in this activity. Marine Harvest will also organise Open Days at regular intervals.

#### ***Monitoring***

Monitoring will be based on providing an easily available complaints and incident reporting procedure to record any potential social problems either internally or between

farm staff and locals. A procedure will be put in place to ensure that all complaints are dealt with immediately and corrective actions taken.

## **9.19 Archaeological, Historical, Cultural and Aboriginal Sites**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Management and Mitigation***

The staff, visitor and contractor induction procedure will include a segment on the presence of the 'imunga' sites on either side of the farm lease. Although Marine Harvest has received clearance from the Tiwi Land Council to set up its lease in the vicinity of these sites, Marine Harvest will ensure that any people associated with the farm will not impact upon these areas. In particular, it will endeavour to ensure that motor boat traffic does not traverse those areas and only skirts around their perimeter.

The temporary land-based facility will be located within pre-existing premises and is not expected to overlap any sacred or spiritual sites.

#### ***Monitoring***

Records of any potential complaints will be kept and corrective action will be taken immediately by farm management if any potential impacts to archaeological, historical, cultural or aboriginal sites are reported.

## **9.20 Marine Traffic**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

Speed restrictions should be applied to all boats visiting the farm, eg. less than 5 knots. Any propeller driven boats used by the operation should be fitted with a propeller guard to limit the damage to marine animals in the unlikely event of a boat strike. All farm staff will need to be trained in the safe use of outboard motor boats and the general rules for maritime traffic and jetty usage. Whenever possible, motor boat use should be limited to daylight hours and to periods of better visibility and safer seagoing conditions. Marine Harvest will ensure that the Northern Territory Marine Act (1981) is followed.

#### ***Monitoring***

Records will be kept of any marine-traffic related incidents potentially related to the farm's operations, and corrective actions will be taken immediately by farm management to ensure procedures are implemented to minimise future incidents.

## **9.21 Mitigation of Nuisance and Health Risks from Pest Insects**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

Induction procedures will make staff aware of the dangers of these insect-borne diseases and will inform staff about precautions such as the use of repellent and covering at night. Mosquito nets will be provided to limit exposure to insects at night.

If immunisation to communicable diseases is available, staff will be informed about this. When and where possible, Marine Harvest will use light bulbs that minimise the attraction of insects.

#### ***Monitoring***

Staff members, visitors and contractors will be encouraged to report any problems they have with pest insects, or any health problems which could potentially be related to pest insect bites. Management procedures will be amended as required by farm management.

## **9.22 Personnel Emergencies**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low to Serious Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

The following management measures will be put in place by Marine Harvest.

- Safe operating procedures will be drawn up for all operations on the farm and all staff, contractors and visitors will be trained in each of the relevant procedures prior to carrying out any of the tasks;
- Staff, visitors and contractors will not operate alone or out of sight of another farm worker;
- Marine Harvest will draw up a clear emergency procedure;
- All staff, visitors and contractors will be briefed in the details of the emergency procedure at the time of their inductions; and
- Regular emergency training exercises will be carried out.

In the event of a medical emergency, a judgement decision will be made as to whether the local clinic at Milikapiti will be sufficiently equipped to handle the situation or whether the Medivac procedure will be required. The Medivac procedure requires that the District Medical Officer be called, and in turn a plane would be called to be dispatched with a paramedic to the Milikapiti airstrip. The person would then be airlifted to the hospital in Darwin.

### ***Monitoring***

Detailed records will be kept of any incidents, accidents and emergencies. All events will be assessed and corrective actions will be implemented immediately by farm management.

## **9.23 Management and Monitoring of Quality of Farmed Barramundi**

### ***Risk Ranking – Low Risk***

#### ***Mitigation and Management***

Management of the quality of the farmed barramundi will be based on:

- obtaining juveniles from locally sourced broodstock,
- managing the quality of the feed (refer to Sections 3.8.2 and 9.6),
- maintaining optimum ambient water quality, and
- minimising stress on the fish, via minimal handling, optimum feeding and lack of overcrowding.

#### ***Monitoring***

Monitoring measures to ensure quality of farmed barramundi will include:

- daily monitoring of their health,
- daily removal of any dead fish,
- testing of dead fish for potential diseases, and
- regular monitoring by the Government Veterinary Laboratories at Berrimah.

## 10 Environmental Management

A detailed Environmental Management Plan (EMP) will be drawn up for the project after it has progressed to the next stage of the approval process. The EMP for the site will detail all aspects of the environmental management for the site including construction. The EMP will build on the mitigation, maintenance and monitoring described in Section 9.

The following sections set out some of the preliminary aspects of the EMP for the site.

### 10.1 Company Health Safety Environment and Quality Policy

Nutreco's company Health Safety Environment and Quality (HSEQ) Policy applies to all its business units, of which Marine Harvest is a part.

#### **Nutreco HSEQ Policy**

*For Nutreco, Quality is a core value. This is valid for the quality of products, the health and safety of operations, and the quality of its environmental performance. Nutreco believes this to be an integral part of responsible, efficient and profitable business management.*

*Nutreco strives to participate in a responsible manner in the food chain, with sustainability, based on quality and safety, as a governing principle.*

*Therefore, Nutreco is committed to the following Principles:*

- *Ensure that working environments are safe and appropriate for employees, suppliers and third parties*
- *Contribute to food safety and quality at all points of the food chain where Nutreco is active*
- *Apply the principle of sustainability as a driver towards continual improvements in environmental performance*
- *Be conscious of and attentive to the impact activities may have on neighbours, the local community and the interests of society in general.*

*We consider quality awareness and commitment to the HSEQ principles as the pillars of the future success of our Company.*

*The HSEQ policy is valid for all companies and activities where Nutreco has a managerial or operational role.*

### 10.1.1 Objectives

Underpinning the HSEQ Policy, the objectives of Marine Harvest are:

- To minimise the impact of its operations on the surrounding environment;
- To ensure that conservation of the biodiversity is not impacted by Marine Harvest operations;
- To ensure that environment programs are developed and implemented in consultation with the Tiwi Land Council;
- To minimise the footprint of the development; and
- To maintain a low impact facility.

Marine Harvest will operate its Snake Bay facility in line with these objectives.

## 10.2 Operational Standards

Based on its experience at its Port Hurd pilot barramundi fish farm on Bathurst Island, Marine Harvest is familiar with what is required to resource and implement an appropriate environmental management system tailored to the requirements of the tropical environment on the Tiwi Islands.

Marine Harvest operates in a large number of countries and climates and farms a wide array of fish species. It has developed a number of operational standards which it follows, namely:

- Marine Harvest is continuously seeking to achieve more sustainable production — neither depleting resources beyond their capacity, nor introducing into the environment materials or substances that are detrimental.
- Marine Harvest is aware of the significant economic and social role it has to play in the remote communities where it operates. It therefore participates in initiatives and makes continuous efforts to develop positive relationships in the communities – these include programs such as nature conservation work, environmental initiatives, sponsorship of local sports and cultural events.
- The Marine Harvest code of practice has a section specifically addressing animal welfare. The objective is described in the following words:

*Wherever our practices infringe on the “five freedoms” of animals under our management, efforts should be made to achieve improvements. The “Five freedoms” as defined by the Farm Animal Welfare Council and relevant to aquaculture, cover freedom from:*

- *hunger and thirst,*
- *discomfort,*

- *pain, injury or disease,*
- *fear and distress, and*
- *freedom to express normal behaviour.*

### **10.3 Standard Operational Procedures**

Marine Harvest has developed a number of operating procedures for all aspects of its Port Hurd farm. These are to be found in Appendix K. These standard operating procedures (SOPs) will be reviewed and modified for the Snake Bay site operation prior to commissioning. The SOPs will be incorporated into the Maintenance and Monitoring Manual identified in Section 9.1. In addition, site specific procedures will be developed for Snake Bay as they relate to the operation of the barge facility.

### **10.4 Monitoring and Reporting Strategies**

A baseline monitoring report for Snake Bay was prepared for Marine Harvest by Aquenal in November 2005. This report provides the background against which future monitoring results will be compared and assessed. The report results were summarised in Section 5.3 and a full copy of the report is provided in Appendix E.

A detailed monitoring and reporting plan will be drawn up as part of the EMP for the site, however an outline of the strategies is listed below.

The objectives of the monitoring program include:

- gathering data of sufficient quality and quantity to be able to meaningfully compare to the baseline survey;
- being able to assess whether changes observed are significant and whether they are caused by the operation or by other outside factors; and
- providing enough information to guide the management of the marine farm.

The monitoring program will address the following:

- detect environmental impact caused by farming operations to the satisfaction of regulatory bodies and the farm operator;
- target areas most likely to be impacted by farming operations;
- include adequate controls to assess unrelated, widespread temporal variation;
- have a statistically rigorous sampling design; and
- assess long term and short term (seasonal) impact.

The parameters assessed will reflect fish farming impact and, if possible, be directly linked to fish farm outputs.

On a short term basis they will be the simplest and most cost effective parameters to measure while providing sufficient confidence that impact can be identified. They will identify short term changes and provide triggers for more extensive monitoring.

Long term monitoring will assess more subtle change through recognised indicators or environmental decline. The frequency of that monitoring will be related to risks, farming intensity, past performance and changes in short term parameters. The long term monitoring will be carried out under the supervision of competent scientists with credible track records and according to strictly defined, widely accepted and repeatable methodologies.

A summary of the monitoring requirements for the site is provided in Table 10.1. This will be used as the basis for the monitoring requirements to be included in the Environmental Management Plan for the farm.

**Table 10.1: Summary of Proposed Monitoring Requirements**

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
Construction	9.2	Meetings to be held with staff, contractors and farm management or construction manager. Meetings should cover procedures, incidents and corrective actions.	Weekly
Fish Escape	9.3	Inspection of nets and moorings	As noted
		Tide prediction software to be investigated	Daily or as needed
Disease and Parasite Transfer	9.4	Visual inspection of fish health	Daily
		Recording of mortality rate	Daily
		Analysis by Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory	As needed
		Visit by Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory	Annually
Faeces and Nutrients	9.5	Water sampling	Weekly
		Water, sediment, mangroves	Annually or biennially

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
Excess Feed and Feed Quality	9.6	Feed tested at the source by Skretting	As needed
		Underwater camera	During feeding
Wastes	9.7	Check all wastes are placed in dedicated containers, etc.	Ongoing/daily
		Records to be kept of all volumes and destinations of solid waste and prescribed waste disposed from the farm	Ongoing
Treated Sewage effluent	9.7.3	Water samples of effluent analysed for target parameters	Initially weekly then six monthly
Farm Fish Deaths	9.7.6	Check level on ensiler	Monthly and as needed
Chemical and Hazardous substances	9.8	Storage areas to be checked for leakages and storage integrity and compliance	Weekly
		Hazardous substances audit	Annually
Nets and Moorings	9.9	Moorings components checked by divers	Six monthly or as needed
		Nets monitored from surface	Daily
		Nets inspected by divers (from inside nets)	Fortnightly
		Diving inspection of nets and moorings (outside of nets)	Six monthly
		Nets and moorings replacement	Minimum every two years
Hydrodynamics	9.10	Seafloor inspections by divers for scouring around mooring anchors (same time as mooring inspections)	Six monthly

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
Water and sediments	9.11	Water temperature and oxygen levels	Daily
		Water sampling and mangrove roots	Fortnightly during the dry, two-monthly during the wet
		Water, sediment sampling and mangrove stands and roots	Annually or biennially
Bird, reptile and fish habitats	9.13	Record and review record of impacts and complaints	Ongoing
		Record all animal deaths in and around the lease	Ongoing
		Monitor water sediments and flora as noted	As noted
Flora	9.14	Seagrasses – best method still to be determined	To be determined
		Mangrove stands and roots	Fortnightly, two-monthly, annually or biennially
EPBC-Act listed Threatened and Migratory Species	9.15	Monitoring of water, sediment and flora as noted	As noted
		Recording and assessing any complaints, reports or sightings of dugongs and turtles and any other wildlife presence or death	Ongoing
Land surface	9.16	Inspections of unsealed surfaces during occupation of temporary land base	Weekly
		Inspections of unsealed surfaces upon vacating temporary land base	On vacating premises

Aspect	Reference Section No.	Monitoring Activity	Frequency
		Recording and assessing complaints	Ongoing
Noise, lighting, air quality and amenity	9.17	Log book of operating hours of all noisy equipment	Ongoing
		Maintenance schedule to be followed for all motorized equipment	According to equipment maintenance schedule
		Recording and assessing any complaints	Ongoing
Social and recreational	9.18	Review and assess complaints or incidents reported	Ongoing
Archaeological, historical, cultural and Aboriginal sites	9.19	Record and review any complaints	Ongoing
Marine traffic	9.20	Record any incidents or complaints and assess	Ongoing
Pest insects	9.21	Incident reports to be review and assessed	Ongoing
Personnel emergencies	9.22	Incident, accident and emergency reports to be kept and assessed	Ongoing
Quality of farmed barramundi	9.23	Monitoring of health	Daily
		Testing of dead fish	As needed
		Regular checks by Berrimah Government Veterinary Laboratory	Annually

## **11 Public Involvement and Consultation**

The proposed operation at Snake Bay has been in the public domain for a number of years now. Information regarding the proposal and the pilot project at Port Hurd has been disseminated through the newspapers.

In August 2005, the draft guidelines for this EIS were put up for public comment by the Minister for Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage of the Northern Territory, and feedback from this has been incorporated into the final guidelines for the EIS, a copy of which is provided in Appendix B. The structure and content of this report is based on these guidelines.

Formal public consultation was carried out in August and September 2005, and November 2005, details of which are provided below.

### **11.1 August to September 2005**

Meetings were held in August and September 2005 with a number of government, non-government organisations and private stakeholders, these included:

- Kate Hadden of the Tiwi Land Council,
- Snake Bay community people,
- Adele Pedder of the Environment Centre and Australian Marine Conservation Centre,
- Peter Robinson of the Northern Territory Environment Centre,
- Department of Lands, Northern Territory Government,
- Department of Primary Industries, Northern Territory Government,
- Northern Territory Environment Protection Authority, formerly the Office of Environment and Heritage,
- Bill Briscoe of Crab Claw Island, Bynoe Harbour, Port Patterson, Northern Territory,
- Chris Makepeace of Amateur Fishermen's Association of the Northern Territory, and
- Paspaley Pearls, Bynoe Harbour, Port Patterson, Northern Territory.

Feedback from these meetings mostly centred on the need to answer all concerns raised regarding preservation of habitat and minimisation of risks to species of concern, namely turtles and dugongs. Concerns were also raised about the proposed farm's potential impacts on aesthetics and on game fishing; of particular concern was the possibility of wild fish aggregating under the farm's sea cages and therefore not being accessible to

amateur fishermen. Restrictions to access to the bays and changes to water current flows due to the presence of the fish farm were also noted as issues of concern.

Copies of photographs taken on 30 August 2005 during the meeting with the Snake Bay Community are provided in Appendix L.

### **11.2 November 2005**

An open day was held at Port Hurd on 22 November 2005. Around 70 people attended, a list of which is provided in Appendix L. A large number of the attendees were members of the Tiwi community on Melville and Bathurst Islands. The Tiwi Land Council has been very supportive of the project. Members of the Northern Land Council were also present at the open day. They have indicated preliminary support for the other fish farming operations planned by Marine Harvest, but want to have a detailed consultation once the EIS has been through the process. Legal advice is currently being sought about whether the Northern Land Council is required legally to approve the project.

Issues raised during the open day on 22 November 2005 included:

- maintaining the aesthetics of the surrounding environment,
- issue of wastes from the fish farm, and
- aggregation of wild fish beneath the sea cages.

At the Open Day it was also promised that a verbal presentation of the information would be given to the Snake Bay community following completion of the Snake Bay EIS.

The issues raised have been covered in the matters detailed in this EIS.

### **11.3 Future Consultation**

Marine Harvest has maintained active consultation with the Tiwi Land Council throughout all of the Port Hurd pilot operation. Marine Harvest will continue formal and informal liaison with the Tiwi people during the operation of the Snake Bay site.

Marine Harvest will continue to brief the Land Council at its meetings about proposed initiatives for potential changes to the operation which could impact on the local people and will seek advice about any considerations they require about the operation. Open Days at the farm will be held from time to time and fishing days around the cages will occur.

## 12 Conclusions

Marine Harvest has been operating a pilot barramundi sea-cage fish farm at Port Hurd, on Bathurst Island in the Northern Territory, since 2000. That farm operates within an environment very similar to that which will be encountered at Snake Bay on Melville Island, located to the east of Bathurst Island.

At Port Hurd, between 2000 and 2006, Marine Harvest has:

- Developed an Environmental Management Plan to cover all aspects of its operation. This includes Standard Operating Procedures applicable to operations; and
- It has carried out environmental monitoring within Port Hurd, including control sites within Port Hurd and Gullala Inlet.

During this period, Marine Harvest has fine-tuned its operations to adapt procedures and infrastructure to the demands and pressures of tropical sea-cage fish farming. It is therefore familiar with what is required to resource and implement an appropriate environmental management system tailored to the requirements of the tropical environment on the Tiwi Islands.

Environmental monitoring over the last two years by well-regarded aquatic environmental analysts Aquenal Pty Ltd, has shown that the Port Hurd pilot farm has not resulted in measurable increases in nutrient concentrations in the water column, in sediments or on mangrove roots.

The Snake Bay farm will have several differences in infrastructure with the Port Hurd operation; these include the use of an onsite barge, reduced net sizes, reduced number of nets per mooring cluster, and an increase in the number of moorings per net.

Qualitative risk assessments have been carried out for all identified aspects and impacts of the proposed Snake Bay barramundi farm. Only four aspects have been assessed as having a risk ranking of 2 or 1, i.e. having serious or high risks. These are:

- fish faeces and nutrient loads,
- wastes and hazardous materials,
- predators, and
- personnel emergencies.

These aspects have been assessed to have high risks due to factoring in the worst possible consequences. However, all of these aspects, have a low likelihood of causing significant impacts due to the use of previously tested infrastructure and management procedures, and site specific-management measures.

As part of these site-specific management measures, the proposed Snake Bay barramundi farm will develop and implement:

- a site specific Environmental Management Plan, which will include a detailed environmental monitoring schedule and a thorough staff and contractors' induction procedure;
- a site specific Maintenance and Monitoring Manual; and
- site specific Standard Operating Procedures.

Marine Harvest is committed to the following objectives and will operate its Snake Bay facility in line with these:

- minimising the impact of its operations on the surrounding environment; and
- ensuring that environment programs are developed and implemented in consultation with the Tiwi Land Council.

Marine Harvest believes that through its commitments and via the implementation of predominantly proven management methods, the proposed Snake Bay farm can be operated with very low risks of impacting the immediate or surrounding environment of Snake Bay.

Marine Harvest has built up a good working relationship with the Tiwi people since the inception of its pilot farm at Port Hurd, and it aims to foster this relationship through ongoing constructive communication with the Tiwi Land Council and the local population, and through the provision of employment and business opportunities for the Tiwi people. It is also committed to maintaining good relationships with other local operators and users of the bay and will endeavour to proactively address any issues that may arise.

## 13 References

**Aquenal Pty Ltd:** Biennial Environmental Assessment of the Biological Impact of Nutrients Released from Marine Harvest's Aquaculture Operations in Port Hurd, Bathurst Island, October 2003 – October 2005, reported in January 2006.

**Australian Marine Conservation Society (2005):** Submission on Northern Territory Fish Farm and Aquaculture Environmental Assessments, Letter to the Referrals Section (EPBC Act) of the Department of Environment and Heritage, 15 June 2005.

**Boyra, A, Sanchez-Jerez, P, Tuya, F, Espino, F, Haroun, R. 2004:** *Attraction of wild coastal fishes to Atlantic subtropical cage fish farms*, Gran Canaria, Canary Islands. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 70:393-401.

**Dempster, T, Sanchez-Jerez, P, Bayle-Sempere, JT, Gimenez-casaldeuro, F, Valle, C. 2002:** *Attraction of wild fish to sea-cage fish farms in the south-western Mediterranean Sea: spatial and short-term temporal variability*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 242:237-252.

**DIPE (2003):** *Draft Management Program for the Dugong (Dugong dugon) in the Northern Territory of Australia – 2003-2008*, published by Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of Infrastructure Planning and Environment.

**Marshall, Carina Rynn Ecremen (2005):** *Evolutionary Genetics of Barramundi (Lates Calcarifer) in the Australian Region*, a PhD thesis at Murdoch University, 2005.

**Milikapiti Community Government Council (1999):** *Clean Seas - Addressing High Sediment Load Stormwater Discharge into Snake Bay – Milikapiti* under the Northern Territory Coasts and Clean Seas Projects 1999-2000.

**Milikapiti Community Government Council (2001):** *Weed Control and Native Revegetation – Milikapiti Foreshore and Surrounds* under the Northern Territory 2001-2002 Coastcare Projects.

**NRETA (2006)(a):** *Territory Environments – Mangroves*, published by Natural Resources, Environment and the Arts – Northern Territory, reviewed 2 March 2006.

**NRETA (2006)(b):** *Tiwi-Cobourg Bioregional Description*, published by Natural Resources, Environment and the Arts – Northern Territory, reviewed 2 March 2006.

**Western Australia Department of Fisheries, 1999:** *The Translocation of Barramundi – a discussion paper*, published July 1999, updated November 2004.

**Tiwi Land Council, 2004:** *Tiwi Islands Regional Nature Resource Management Strategy 2004 (Tiwi RNRMS)*, published by the Tiwi Land Council in 2004.

## **Limitations**

# Information

Important information about your **Coffey** Environmental Site Assessment

*Uncertainties as to what lies below the ground on potentially contaminated sites can lead to remediation costs blow outs, reduction in the value of land and to delays in the redevelopment of land. These uncertainties are an inherent part of dealing with land contamination. The following notes have been prepared by Coffey to help you interpret and understand the limitations of your environmental site assessment report.*

## **Your report has been written for a specific purpose**

Your report has been developed on the basis of a specific purpose as understood by Coffey and applies only to the site or area investigated. For example, the purpose of your report may be:

- To assess the environmental effects of an on-going operation.
- To provide due diligence on behalf of a property vendor.
- To provide due diligence on behalf of a property purchaser.
- To provide information related to redevelopment of the site due to a proposed change in use, for example, industrial use to a residential use.
- To assess the existing baseline environmental, and sometimes geological and hydrological conditions or constraints of a site prior to an activity which may alter the sites environmental, geological or hydrological condition.

For each purpose, a specific approach to the assessment of potential soil and groundwater contamination is required. In most cases, a key objective is to identify, and if possible, quantify risks that both recognised and unrecognised contamination pose to the proposed activity. Such risks may be both financial (for example, clean up costs or limitations to the site use) and physical (for example, potential health risks to users of the site or the general public).

## **Subsurface conditions can change**

Subsurface conditions are created by natural processes and the activity of man and may change with time. For example, groundwater levels can vary with time, fill may be placed on a site and pollutants may migrate with time. Because a report is based on conditions which existed at the time of the subsurface exploration, decisions should not be based on a report whose adequacy may have been affected by time. Consult Coffey to be advised how time may have impacted on the project and/or on the property.

## **Interpretation of factual data**

Environmental site assessments identify actual subsurface conditions only at those points where samples are taken and when they are taken. Data derived from indirect field measurements and sometimes other reports on the site are interpreted by geologists, engineers or scientists to provide an opinion about overall site conditions, their likely impact with respect to the report purpose and recommended actions. Actual conditions may differ from those inferred to exist, because no professional, no matter how well qualified, can

reveal what is hidden by earth, rock and time. The actual interface between materials may be far more gradual or abrupt than assumed based on the facts obtained. Nothing can be done to change the actual site conditions which exist, but steps can be taken to reduce the impact of unexpected conditions. For this reason, parties involved with land acquisition, management and/or redevelopment should retain the services of Coffey through the development and use of the site to identify variances, conduct additional tests if required, and recommend solutions to unexpected conditions or other problems encountered on site.

## **Your report will only give preliminary recommendations**

Your report is based on the assumption that the site conditions as revealed through selective point sampling are indicative of actual conditions throughout an area. This assumption cannot be substantiated until project implementation has commenced and therefore your report recommendations can only be regarded as preliminary. Only Coffey, who prepared the report, is fully familiar with the background information needed to assess whether or not the report's recommendations are valid and whether or not changes should be considered with redevelopment or on-going use of the site. If another party undertakes the implementation of the recommendations of this report there is a risk that the report will be misinterpreted and Coffey cannot be held responsible for such misinterpretation.

## **Your report is prepared for specific purposes and persons**

To avoid misuse of the information contained in your report it is recommended that you confer with Coffey before passing your report on to another party who may not be familiar with the background and the purpose of the report. In particular, a due diligence report for a property vendor may not be suitable for satisfying the needs of a purchaser. Your report should not be applied for any purpose other than that originally specified at the time the report was issued.

## **Interpretation by other professionals**

Costly problems can occur when other professionals develop their plans based on misinterpretations of a report. To help avoid misinterpretations, retain Coffey to work with other professionals who are affected by the report. Have Coffey explain the report implications to professionals affected by them and then review plans and specifications produced to see how they have incorporated the report findings.



---

## Important information about your **Coffey** Environmental Site Assessment

---

### **Data should not be separated from the report**

---

The report as a whole presents the findings of the site assessment and the report should not be copied in part or altered in any way.

Logs, figures, laboratory data, drawings etc. are customarily included in our reports and are developed by scientists, engineers or geologists based on their interpretation of field logs (assembled by field personnel), field testing and laboratory evaluation of field samples. This information should not under any circumstances be redrawn for inclusion in other documents or separated from the report in any way.

### **Contact Coffey for additional assistance**

---

Coffey is familiar with a variety of techniques and approaches that can be used to help reduce risks for all parties to land development and land use. It is common that not all approaches will be necessarily dealt with in your environmental site assessment report due to concepts proposed at that time. As a project progresses through planning and design toward construction and/or maintenance, speak with Coffey to develop alternative approaches to problems that may be of genuine benefit both in time and cost.

### **Responsibility**

---

Environmental reporting relies on interpretation of factual information based on judgement and opinion and has a level of uncertainty attached to it, which is far less exact than other design disciplines. This has often resulted in claims being lodged against consultants, which are unfounded. To help prevent this problem, a number of clauses have been developed for use in contracts, reports and other documents. Responsibility clauses do not transfer appropriate liabilities from Coffey to other parties but are included to identify where Coffey's responsibilities begin and end. Their use is intended to help all parties involved to recognise their individual responsibilities. Read all documents from Coffey closely and do not hesitate to ask any questions you may have.



## **Figures**

## **Appendices**

## **Appendix A**

---

**Environmental Impact Statement Requirement Letter from Northern Territory  
Natural Resources, Environment and Heritage**

## **Appendix B**

---

### **Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines for Snake Bay Proposed Aquaculture Farm**

## **Appendix C**

---

### **Tiwi Islands Regional Natural Resource Management Strategy Selected Maps**

## **Appendix D**

---

### **Snake Bay Bathymetry**

## **Appendix E**

---

### **Snake Bay Baseline Report by Aquenal Pty Ltd**

## **Appendix F**

---

### **Port Hurd Biennial Report by Aquenal Pty Ltd**

## **Appendix G**

---

### **Paspaley Pearls Oyster Trials at Port Hurd**

## **Appendix H**

---

### **Greenhouse Gases Calculations**

## **Appendix I**

---

### **Tiwi Land Council Letter**

## **Appendix J**

---

### **Fish Feed Residue Monitoring**

## **Appendix K**

---

### **Marine Harvest Port Hurd Standard Operating Procedures**

## **Appendix L**

---

### **Community Consultation Records**