

From: Rosenberger, Barry <Barry.Rosenberger@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 6:32 PM
To: Hargreaves, Brent <Brent.Hargreaves@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Thomson, Andrew <Andrew.Thomson@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Farlinger, Susan <Susan.Farlinger@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Cc: Ryall, Paul <Paul.Ryall@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: URGENT - Science budget impacts

Sue/Andy

In addition to the comments below I add the following:

My understanding is Fraser STAD is asked to find \$800-1 mil of the cuts. This equates to all or nearly all of the non-sockeye projections. To not assess chinook given the recent changes in domestic chinook fisheries and the proposed broader south coast chinook plan is inconsistent. This would likely hold true for reductions to other south coast chinook programs. Coho assessment have been greatly reduced in recent years and any further changes would give us no understanding of stock status. The only pink program for this year was the down stream fry which is complete. STAD conducts most of the Fraser creel programs and not assessing the sport fisheries for sockeye and chinook would be strongly criticized by everyone and counter to the goal of standards for all fisheries. Without an option to transfer to the users this does not seem to be an option for savings. Chum assessments have been the most reduced in recent years but small savings may be possible. Costs for all field programs and supporting work such as GSI have risen significantly in recent years with no increase in funds to meet demands, thus the reductions in field programs. Sockeye has reduced costs by transitioning to Didson from mark recapture methods, fences have been reduced, fry programs cut back and changing of standards to 75k before more intensive methodology. A framework identifying core requirements and an impact statement against this level of assessment is required to fully understand the implications and allow for a meaningful joint FAM/STAD meeting. The whole Region is facing tough budget decisions Taking on new programs such as Qualark without a clear objective and funding source is an example of adding to our problems. This project should be cut before others if as it seems it would be cut next year.

thanks
Barry

From: Hargreaves, Brent
Sent: Wednesday, June 16, 2010 3:02 PM
To: Thomson, Andrew
Cc: Ryall, Paul; Rosenberger, Barry
Subject: URGENT - Science budget impacts

Andy:

Paul Ryall and I reviewed and discussed this document.
Our comments are summarized below.

Regarding the 4 "internal pressures" for specific pressures that are identified on page 1:

800K for additional escapement monitoring for Fraser sockeye.
220K for Qualark acoustic monitoring
145K for SARA for programs resulting from decisions not to list under SARA (e.g. Cultus)
105K for Cohen Inquiry

Comment:

We agree with the requirement to continue, and high priority for funding, the first 3 items above.
However, the fourth item does not seem correct.

Funding will be provided from Ottawa to the Region to the cover the salary costs for staff who are seconded full-time from each Branch to directly support the Cohen Inquiry. Therefore the salary cost for Al Cass should be covered, and should not be an additional pressure.

DFO-345937

\\svbcvafp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\FAM\Andrew Thomson\Email_001\COHEN_Production_AndrewThomson\Aquacultureemail2010unfiled\

CAN161834_0001

There also should be no additional costs to "backfill" this position, as the salary dollars for this position should be already included in the Science budget.

Regarding the "Potential sources for re-allocation" that are identified on page 2:

1. reprofile expected minor capital.

Comment: sounds reasonable

2. Deferred staffing

Comment: this represents a substantial reduction in Science capacity, which would have a significant negative impact on the support that FAM requires to deliver its programs and responsibilities. The specific impacts on FAM will depend on what positions in Science are not re-staffed, or the duration of the delay in staffing. Deferred staffing in some areas (e.g. Stock Assessment) would have more significant affects than in other areas (e.g. pure research not directly related to fisheries or aquaculture management). We recommend that FAM request an opportunity to provide some input into any deferred staffing decisions, to identify and discuss how the negative impacts on FAM programs might be mitigated as much as possible.

3. Reduced travel:

Comment: Likely minimal impact on FAM

4. Transfer Broughton sea lice program to aquaculture industry.

Comment: About \$300K has been allocated each year for the Broughton sea lice program. However, Brent's understanding is that this allocation was "off the top" of the region funding, rather than A-base or B-base Science funding. The 150K identified for continuing this work in 2010 could likely be reduced by 20-30K, but we agree the assessments of adult escapements is important and needs to continue for 1 or 2 more years.

5. Cancellation of salmon monitoring programs (savings of about 800K)

Comment: This proposed reduction is very significant and likely would have a major negative impact on FAM. Proposed reductions of this magnitude to escapement monitoring and test fisheries for pink, chum, coho and chinook would seriously impact FAMs ability to deliver core programs and responsibilities. A few of the impacts of the proposed reductions are identified in the memo and we concur with this list. However, numerous other impacts to FAM are also likely, depending on exactly how the funding cuts are applied (which salmon species, stocks, etc.). The memo implies that some escapement assessments and test fisheries may be cancelled entirely, which would not be acceptable to most client groups. All of the annual funding to support salmon test fishing in the Pacific Region is allocated to Science, rather than FAM, so the impacts would be severe. The annual costs are substantial (e.g. 250K for chum test fisheries, 300K for pink assessments), so FAM could not absorb these cuts and carry on these programs without the funding from Science. The memo says: " We intend to discuss these plans with Fisheries management and the regional Salmon Working Group and develop an agreed regional approach to the reductions". In our opinion this discussion is critical and needs to begin as soon as possible. The next regional Salmon Working Group meeting is scheduled for June 23-24, and we recommend this topic should be added to the agenda.

6. Other direct program impacts:

Comment: Likely minimal impact on FAM

-----Original Message-----

From: Thomson, Andrew
Sent: June 16, 2010 11:35 AM
To: Ryall, Paul; Rosenberger, Barry; Hargreaves, Brent
Subject: URGENT - Science budget impacts
Importance: High

As per Sue's direction she would like your very quick assessments of the proposed science cuts and impacts to FAM programs. Do not distribute further.

\\svbcv\anfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\FAM\Andrew Thomson\Email_001\COHEN_Production_AndrewThomson\Aquacultureemail2010unfiled\

<< File: 2010-11 Budget impacts Pacific Science.doc >>

Andrew J. L. Thomson

Director - Aquaculture Management Division | Gestion de l'aquaculture
Fisheries and Aquaculture Management | Direction des peches et de l'aquaculture
Fisheries and Oceans Canada | Peches et Oceans Canada
200 - 401 Burrard St. | 401, rue Burrard, bureau 200
Vancouver, BC V6C 3S4 | Vancouver (C.-B.) V6C 3S4
Telephone | Telephone: (604) 666-3152
Fax | Telecopieur: (604) 666-1076
Email | Courriel: Andrew.Thomson@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

From: Farlinger, Susan
Sent: June 16, 2010 8:23 AM
To: Thomson, Andrew
Cc: Fitzgerald, Monica
Subject: Science budget impacts

Andy

Could you make sure that this doc gets to Ryall, Rosenberger and Brent (but not to be distributed further) for their brief comments?

Susan Farlinger
Regional Director General - Directrice générale régionale
Pacific Region - Région du Pacifique
Suite 200 - 401 Burrard Street - 401, rue Burrard, Pièce 200
Vancouver, B.C. - C.-B. V6C 3S4
Telephone - téléphone (604) 666- 6098

\\svbcv\anfp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\FAM\Andrew Thomson\Email_001\COHEN_Production_AndrewThomson\Aquacultureemail2010unfiled\

CAN161834_0003