

**From:** Watson-Wright, Wendy <Watson-WrightW@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 9:19 AM  
**To:** Huard, Michaela <HuardM@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Davis, John (Pacific) <DavisJo@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Laplante, Alanna <LaplanteA@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Stringer, Kevin <StringerK@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Bevan, David <BEVAND@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Legault, Josée <LegaultJos@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Kirby, Sue <KirbyS@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>  
**Cc:** Carson, Sandy <CarsonS@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Lamar, Anne <LamarA@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Mojgani, Susan <MojganiS@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>; Ahluwalia, Pardeep <AhluwaliaP@DFO-MPO.GC.CA>  
**Subject:** RE: SARA Media Clips - "Endangered list biased, study says; Researchers claim animals with economic value not well protected" & More  
**Attach:** HutchingsSara conservn biol.pdf

---

Paper in question attached.

<<...>>

*Dr. Wendy Watson-Wright  
ADM Science/Sous-ministre adjointe des Sciences  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada/Ministère des Pêches et des Océans  
200 rue Kent St., Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6  
(613) 990-5123*

---

**From:** Huard, Michaela  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 17, 2007 11:52 AM  
**To:** Davis, John (Pacific); Laplante, Alanna; Stringer, Kevin; Bevan, David; Legault, Josée; Kirby, Sue; Watson-Wright, Wendy  
**Cc:** Carson, Sandy; Lamar, Anne; Mojgani, Susan; Ahluwalia, Pardeep  
**Subject:** RE: SARA Media Clips - "Endangered list biased, study says; Researchers claim animals with economic value not well protected" & More

John: while I completely agree with the points you raise, I think we need to think carefully about trying to set the record straight on a hugely complicated issue such as SARA. When you say a response to the report, I take it you mean not a response in the media but to the journal that published it -- without knowing which one I don't know what the odds would be of anyone in the general public seeing it and the damage will have been done there anyway. I do think that it is something that may very well be raised in SCOF0 next week given the environmental bent of opposition parties. When was the report published? A date might help us assess whether this seems to have legs or not. I assume too that the reporters did not attempt to contact us for our views before publishing??

Michaela Huard  
Assistant Deputy Minister - Policy Sector / Sous-ministre adjointe - Secteur des politiques  
613-993-1808 / Facsimile/Télécopieur 613-993-6958  
[huardm@dfo-mpo.gc.ca](mailto:huardm@dfo-mpo.gc.ca)  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada / 200 Kent St. Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6  
Pêches et Océans Canada / 200, rue Kent Ottawa, ON K1A 0E6  
Government of Canada / Gouvernement du Canada  
<mailto:huardm@dfo-mpo.gc.ca>

DFO-292793[00-01]

\\nats01\nsd\CDCI NCR Inquiry\Personal Drives\IXOS  
Files\MasterPSTFile\Cohen - David Bevan IXOS Email  
\\David Bevan IXOS Email1\

CAN264158\_0001

---

**From:** Davis, John (Pacific)  
**Sent:** April 17, 2007 11:08 AM  
**To:** Laplante, Alanna; Stringer, Kevin; Bevan, David; Huard, Michaela; Legault, Josée; Kirby, Sue; Watson-Wright, Wendy  
**Cc:** Carson, Sandy; Lamar, Anne; Mojgani, Susan; Ahluwalia, Pardeep  
**Subject:** FW: SARA Media Clips - "Endangered list biased, study says; Researchers claim animals with economic value not well protected" & More

The first article here is a significant one in that it is based on a published paper that is Co-authored by the past and present Chairs of COSEWIC. While it alleges bias, it fails to report that there are appropriate legal issues related to the need to work with the land claims processes and the Wildlife Management Boards in the North with respect to arctic mammals and that protective measures for marine species that were not listed are being suitably protected under the Fisheries Act which is complimentary legislation to SARA. We should consider if we want to put out some kind of response to address this paper or not. What this does do, is single out DFO and our stakeholders as an exception to how other endangered species in Canada are being dealt with. John Davis

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

**From:** Carson, Sandy  
**Sent:** April 17, 2007 6:17 AM  
**To:** Cook, Kathy (NCR); Carson, Sandy; McPherson, Arran; Belzile, Gilles; Pickett, Karolyne; O'Boyle, Robert; Tessier, Scott; Phelps, Anne; Huson, Bob; Currie, Chris; Ducros, Caroline; Owen, Ed; Lear, Henry; Legault, Josée; Cooper, Lara; Clemens, Marc; Kotyk, Mel; Steele, Paul; Lalonde, Pauline; Ferguson, Peter; Lamirande, Robert; Khwaja, Saba; Watkinson, Stephen; Lanteigne, Marc; Davis, John (Pacific); Chute, Christie; Savaria, Jean-Yves; Harrison, Nigel; Kulka, Dave; Forbes, Trudie; Barnhart, Randall; XCA-Grp, C&A SARA RWC; Lagacé, Anne; Nurse, Louvi; Tobin, Derek (Duke); Brothers, Gerald; Berube, Marthe; Rice, Jake; Geoffrion, Marie-Claude; Dussault, François-René; O'Grady, Liane; XCA-Grp, Communications; Blouin, Stéphanie; Bishop, Heather; XNCR, SARA-Secretariat; Round, Brian; Itorcheak, Ipeelee; Laplante, Alanna; Rose, Alwyn; Robichaud-Leblanc, Kimberly; Cullen, Lynn M. (BIO); Beanlands, Diane; Berthier, Jacinta; Landry, Martine; Osborne, Derek; Fowler, Tom; Collins, John; Webster, Cindy; Mojgani, Susan; Kinnaird, Katie; Romberg, Stefan; Simon, Patrice (Ottawa); Lindsay, Kate; Ahluwalia, Pardeep; Nadeau, Simon  
**Cc:** Lake, Diane; O'Meara, Colleen DFO; Haeberle, Viviane; Richard, Noella; Pittman, Erika; Fagan, Robert; Thiboutot, Chantale; Owen, Ed; Mactaggart, Renee; Jenkins, Phil; Petersen, Krista; Martin, Donna; Lessard, Richard; Galarneau, Sophie; Eisener, Tracie; Davies, Jennifer; Bouchard, Hugues; Park, Laura; Smith, Rachelle; LeGresley, Charles; Locke, Jackey; Garrett, Wanda; Maio, Armando

**Subject:** SARA Media Clips - "Endangered list biased, study says; Researchers claim animals with economic value not well protected" & More

Clips:

1) "Endangered list biased, study says; Researchers claim animals with economic value not well protected" (CanWest, Ottawa Citizen)

\*\*This CanWest article also appeared in the Vancouver Sun, Calgary Herald and the Leader-Post (Regina)

2) "Natives cancel beluga hunt" (The Province)

3) "Voracious Puntledge River seals steer clear of electrical field" (Times Colonist)

4) "States seek to kill sea lions for salmon" (AP, ENN)

**IDNUMBER** 200704170170

**PUBLICATION:** The Ottawa Citizen

**DATE:** 2007.04.17

**EDITION:** Early

**SECTION:** News

**PAGE:** A5

**ILLUSTRATION:** Photo: Canadian Press / The researchers report a trend against protecting marine and northern species, like the beluga whale. ; Photo: Edmonton Journal ; Courtesy Micheline Manseau / The grizzly bear and the Peary caribou were also among the list of animals denied legal protection. ;

**BYLINE:** Margaret Munro

**SOURCE:** The Ottawa Citizen

**WORD COUNT:** 603

\\nats01\nsd\CDCI NCR Inquiry\Personal Drives\IXOS  
Files\MasterPSTFile\Cohen - David Bevan IXOS Email  
\\David Bevan IXOS Email1\

CAN264158\_0002

## Endangered list biased, study says; Researchers claim animals with economic value not well protected

Canada's process for protecting endangered species is heavily biased in favour of creatures like slugs, lichens and butterflies while offering little protection for Canadian icons like the polar bear, caribou and Atlantic **cod**, say biologists who are calling for better protection of the imperilled creatures.

"Listings under the current law seem to discriminate against the fuzzier, tastier endangered species," says Arne Mooers, a biologist at Simon Fraser University. He is lead author of a report in *Conservation Biology* this week detailing which endangered and threatened creatures have won legal protection from the Canadian government.

Mr. Mooers and his colleagues looked at 30 species recommended for protection by independent expert panels but rejected by the federal government between 2003 and 2006, and compared them with 156 species that were given legal protection.

All 26 at-risk reptiles and amphibians including warty jumping slugs and milk snakes won legal protection, but 12 of 30 mammals recommended for listing were denied, including the Peary caribou, polar bear, wolverine, grizzly bear, beluga whale and the Atlantic harbour porpoise. While 12 proposed endangered birds were accepted, only one of 11 imperilled marine **fish** was included.

"We document here a pattern consistent with bias against marine and northern species," report the scientists. They go on to say the process appears to favour animals with little economic value while offering little protection to creatures exploited by hunters, fishers and northern communities.

Caribou, grizzlies, polar bears, **salmon** and **cod** are among Canada's most valued and celebrated creatures. "If you ask anybody, they'd been in the top 10 iconic Canadian animals," Mr. Mooers said in an interview from Germany, where he is on study leave. "It is ironic that they happen to be the ones the government is rejecting. It's painful when you think of it."

The list of little-known creatures the government has legally protected include slugs, snakes and snails, as well as the flooded jellyskin, a tree lichen, and the stoloniferous pussytoes, a grassland flowering plant.

"The decisions make it look as if Canadians value milk snakes and dromedary jumping slugs more than they value polar bears, beluga whales and coho **salmon**," says Mr. Mooers.

The government should have a "darn good reason" for rejecting recommendations from expert panels that recommend which species deserve protection, he says. But reasons for rejection are unclear in the current "murky" process that the scientists want Parliament to re-evaluate when the species at risk legislation comes up for review next year.

"Biodiversity conservation would be best served by strict, transparent, legislated timelines for all aspects of the listing process," they write, adding that the "full costs of extinction and the full benefits of recovery be quantified in externally reviewed reports."

Mr. Mooers and his co-authors -- Laura Prugh of the University of British Columbia, Marco Festa-Bianchet of the University of Sherbrooke, and Jeffrey Hutchings of Dalhousie University -- decided to look at which species get protection after the government rejected a recommendation to list Atlantic **cod** despite a population decline estimated to exceed 99 per cent.

"More worrisome, however, may be the 2006 decision not to list the porbeagle shark," which has experienced a near-90-per-cent reduction and is judged to be at high risk of extinction, they say.

The scientists say there is a small porbeagle **fishery**: "By the government's own reckoning," one or two fishers are economically dependent on the porbeagles and listing the species might have lead to a loss of eight jobs and an economic reduction of two per cent to a single community.

The decision not to list the porbeagle appears "to reflect an implicit policy not to list any marine **fish** perceived to be of economic value, no matter how small," they say.

**IDNUMBER** 200704170062  
**PUBLICATION:** The Province  
**DATE:** 2007.04.17  
**EDITION:** Final  
**SECTION:** News  
**PAGE:** A40  
**KEYWORDS:** WHALES; AQUARIUMS; ENDANGERED SPECIES  
**DATELINE:** WASHINGTON  
**SOURCE:** McClatchy  
**WORD COUNT:** 101

## **Natives cancel beluga hunt**

WASHINGTON -- Facing dwindling numbers of beluga whales in Cook Inlet, Alaska native hunters have agreed to cancel this year's subsistence hunt of two whales, federal officials announced yesterday.

The announcement came as officials from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration **Fisheries** Services are expected to announce soon whether the agency will propose that the Cook Inlet beluga whale population be listed under the Endangered Species Act.

Last year's estimate of 302 belugas continues a 4.1-per-cent annual decline since 1999, when the beluga harvest was regulated. In that time, Alaska native hunters took five beluga whales in Cook Inlet.

**IDNUMBER** 200704170050  
**PUBLICATION:** Times Colonist (Victoria)  
**DATE:** 2007.04.17  
**EDITION:** Early  
**SECTION:** Capital & Van. Isl.  
**PAGE:** B2  
**BYLINE:** Judith Lavoie  
**SOURCE:** Times Colonist  
**WORD COUNT:** 277

## **Voracious Puntledge River seals steer clear of electrical field**

Seals that have been picking off salmon in the Puntledge River are wary about an experimental electrical field that was installed in the water this week, but there is not yet proof it's deterring them from their evening feasts.

"The results are inconclusive so far. We've not yet been able to see whether there's an effect," said Bruce Adkins, head of the Department of **Fisheries** and **Oceans'** south coast habitat and enhancement branch.

Further tests will be done over the next few days to see whether the electrical field will deter the voracious seals, but for the tests to be successful, the seals have to co-operate.

"We can't ask the seals to be there. We have to take advantage of when they are there and that depends on tide

height and time," Adkins said.

The cable is now in the water and the seals were apparently aware that something had changed, he said. But it is not known whether they were reluctant to go into the area because of the device or whether they were staying away because of the unaccustomed activity, Adkins said.

The gang of about 20 seals has come up with a system of lying on their backs under the bridge in Courtenay. Street lights then reflect young salmon as they swim down the river to the ocean, making easy pickings for the lurking seals.

**DFO** and sports fishermen say action is needed to protect a fragile run of summer chinook salmon which, last year, was down to about 1,000 spawning fish.

Sports fishermen have suggested the seals be culled, as happened a decade ago. However, critics such as Andrew Trites, director of marine mammal research at the University of British Columbia, who has studied the Puntledge, said the seals are being scapegoated and the real culprit in declining salmon runs is degradation of the river by humans.

The experimental electric pulse system, which is being built by the company Smith-Root, is being watched with interest by the Pacific Salmon Commission and other groups.

If it is successful it could be used in areas such as the Fraser and Columbia rivers.

## **States Seek to Kill Sea Lions for Salmon**

*April 17, 2007 — By Associated Press*

TACOMA, Wash. -- So far, California sea lions have been winning their contest for survival with the Washington and Oregon salmon heading upstream to spawn. That may be about to change.

Washington, Oregon and Idaho are asking Congress for permission to kill more than 80 sea lions a year to protect the salmon they feast on.

Since federal rules that gave sea lions greater protection in the 1970s, the population of these salmon predators has grown as more gentle efforts called "nonlethal hazing" has not scared them away from their favorite meal.

Sea Lions on the Columbia River below Bonneville Dam have been blasted with rubber buckshot, chased by boats, harassed by firecrackers and rockets and subjected to noise from underwater speakers.

Both the sea lions and the salmon have potent allies. Backing the salmon are the three Northwest states, American Indian tribes and four of the regions members of Congress. Backing the sea lions is the 10 million-member Humane Society of the United States.

The confrontation involves two of the nations pre-eminent environmental laws: the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

"Its a frustrating dilemma," said U.S. Rep. Brian Baird, D-Vancouver, who supports eliminating some of the sea lions. "I am not happy about it, but the trend lines show salmon runs decreasing and sea lion populations growing."

State wildlife officials agree.

"As resource managers, we face choices that sometimes aren't desirable," said Guy Norman, the Washington state Department of Fish and Wildlife's regional director in Vancouver. "But we have to make these decisions."

Prior to the passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act in 1972, California sea lions were rarely seen in the 140-mile stretch of river between the Pacific Ocean and Bonneville Dam, the first of the 19 huge hydroelectric dams on the mainstream of the Columbia and its largest tributary, the Snake River.

The number of California sea lions dwindled to fewer than 10,000 before Congress acted. Until 1972, Washington and Oregon paid bounties for sea lions killed in the Columbia, and a state-sanctioned hunter was also employed.

Now an estimated 300,000 California sea lions live in the Pacific, chasing the food supply as far north as Puget Sound.

On a typical day, a dozen or so California sea lions can be spotted below Bonneville Dam, though as the spring chinook runs peak in late April, between 80 and 85 have been seen on a single day.

"There have always been some, but what is new is the number of sea lions and their aggressiveness," said Brian Gorman, a National Marine Fisheries Service spokesman in Seattle. "They are doing what God intended them to -- eating chinook. Salmon are easy pickings."

As the California sea lion population was expanding, salmon populations were in sharp decline. Once, an estimated 16 million salmon returned annually to the Columbia and its tributaries. Now, 13 salmon and steelhead species are protected under the Endangered Species Act.

"There is not a lot of room for error," Norman said of the effort to revive the most endangered runs. The California sea lions eat about 3,000 spring chinook each year right downstream from Bonneville. The salmon spend several days in the river below the dam before climbing the fish ladders, perhaps to rest or to adjust to fresh water.

Each returning female salmon carries 3,000 to 4,000 eggs, so the loss of even one fish is multiplied. In the mid-1990s, Washington state received a permit to kill some of the sea lions at the Ballard Locks, but Sea World in California took three of the worst offenders before they could be killed.

There have been no other applications for a license, besides the one submitted late last year by Washington, Oregon and Idaho.

"It is not the states contention that California sea lion predation is more significant than other sources of mortality to Columbia River ESA-listed salmonids, but simply it is significant and that it must be dealt with as are other sources of mortality," the application said.

Critics say the sea lion issue is just hiding the fact that little has been done to restore the salmon runs. "Its distracting attention from the real issues," said Sharon Young, the Humane Societys field director for marine issues. "If you kill sea lions, it looks like you are doing something meaningful, but it is meaningless. I want these people to stand up and get a spine, quit wringing their hands and do something meaningful."

Rep. Baird dismisses the criticism, saying the region has spent billions of dollars on salmon restoration, including changes in the operation of the dams and habitat improvements, along with fishing restrictions.

-----

Information from: The News Tribune, <http://www.thenewstribune.com>  
*Source: Associated Press*

**Sandy Carson**  
Consultant

\\nats01\nsd\CDCI NCR Inquiry\Personal Drives\IXOS  
Files\MasterPSTFile\Cohen - David Bevan IXOS Email  
\\David Bevan IXOS Email1\

Public Affairs and Strategic Communications  
Fisheries and Oceans Canada  
Email: carsons@dfo-mpo.gc.ca  
Tel: (613) 993-0993

\\nats01\nsd\CDCI NCR Inquiry\Personal Drives\IXOS  
Files\MasterPSTFile\Cohen - David Bevan IXOS Email  
\David Bevan IXOS Email1\