



Newfoundland

The problem:

Newfoundland and Labrador has invested heavily in aquaculture development in recent years and has extensive coastline potentially suitable for aquaculture development. The wild salmon populations on the southern coast of Newfoundland have declined in recent years and their status has dropped to “threatened”. The population is presently being considered for a listing for protection under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) by the federal government.

Results:

Environmental Management

Criterion 2.1 – AVOID DAMAGE TO SEAFLOOR UNDER CAGES. NL partly meets criteria. Applicant submits a waste management plan, but no robust modeling system is required to establish an Allowable Zone of Effects (AZE) or equivalent.

Criterion 2.2 – MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY AROUND SITE. NL does not meet standard. No requirement for dissolved oxygen monitoring in regulations or policy documents.

Criterion 2.4 – AVOID DAMAGE TO CRITICAL HABITATS AND SENSITIVE SPECIES. NL partly meets standard. No legislation keeping salmon farms from all *High Conservation Value Areas*. Some evidence that additional farms will be sited to avoid registered salmon rivers.

Protecting Wild Stocks

Criterion 3.1 – PROTECT WILD SALMON AND SEA TROUT. NL partly meets criterion. There is bay management agreement associated with leases to break disease cycle, but no maximum sea lice loads, and no reporting to public

Criterion 3.3 – PROHIBIT GENETICALLY MODIFIED SALMON. Meets standard. No transgenic salmonids approved for use in NL, or elsewhere in Canada.

Criterion 3.4 – PREVENT ESCAPES. NL partly meets standard. No maximum number of escapes for loss of license. Site specific events not reported to public in timely fashion. NL Code of Containment has requirement to support research, availability of information to public on request, and annual reporting to province.

Parasite and Disease Management

Criterion 5.1 – MANAGE FISH HEALTH – NL partly meets criteria. There is weekly sea lice monitoring, but site numbers of sea lice not reported to the public weekly. As for all regions, NL falls short in limiting viral disease mortality and requiring a reduction plan

Criterion 5.2 – DOCUMENTING THERAPEUTANT USE – NL meets criteria with comprehensive fish health program

Criterion 5.4 – AVOIDING DISEASE SPREAD TO WILD POPULATIONS – NL partly meets criteria, but public reporting is not prompt.

Public Involvement



Criterion 7.1 – MEANINGFUL CONSULTATION AND COMPLAINT RESOLUTION - NL fails to meet criteria. The Act does not specify requirements for public consultation, and the Ministerial powers granted in the Act have not yet been used to prescribe public consultation procedures in the regulations. The Registrar holds all documents related to aquaculture leases, licenses, environmental reports etc., and must make these available to the public subject to specific confidentiality requirements identified in the regulations (for a fee). There are no provisions for public appeal of decisions or initiation of reviews or investigations.

Criterion 7.2 – ABORIGINAL CONSULTATIONS – NL partly meets criteria, but unlike BC, does not have numerous protocol agreements.

OVERVIEW

Criterion	NL
Avoid Damage to Sea Floor	Part
Maintain Water Quality Around Site	No
Avoid Damage to Critical Habitat and Sensitive Species	Part
Protect Wild Salmon and Sea Trout	Part
Prohibit Genetically Modified Salmon	Yes
Prevent Escapes	Part
Manage Fish Health	Part
Document Therapeutant Use	Yes
Avoiding Disease Spread to Wild Salmon	Part
Meaningful Consultation and Complaint Resolution	No
Aboriginal Consultations	Part

The Province of Newfoundland and Labrador achieved a score of 50, against a best possible score of 100.

Conclusions and Recommendations

- Newfoundland is the second lowest rated jurisdiction in achieving the standards associated with the ASC criteria
- See principal backgrounder for recommendations, both general and specific