

From: [Schubert, Neil](#)
To: [Davis, John \(Pacific\)](#)
Cc: [Wild, Jim](#); [Perry, Ted](#); [Richards, Laura](#)
Subject: Socio-Economic Analysis for Cultus Sockeye
Attachments: [Cultus Socio-Economic Analysis.msg](#)
Importance: High

John: Further to my October 12 e-mail (attached), I would like to provide you an update on this issue. At the October 9 meeting with fisheries management staff, Paul Ryall made a commitment to continue technical discussions at the Fraser Panel meeting in Richmond on October 12. Because these discussions did not occur, I am concerned now that the requested exchange of information (we have received only a PowerPoint presentation and the April version of Gord Gislason's report) and further evaluation will not occur, and that more accurate advice will not be available to the policy makers.

Our initial review convinced Work Group members that the analysis overstates the economic impact of listing Cultus sockeye, and probably significantly so. To recap some of our concerns:

- * Assumption that listing means complete fishery closures (< 5% ER): The analysis assumes that listing will require exploitation rates of less than 5%. This is not consistent with the draft Recovery Strategy, which states that harvest can occur during recovery provided Objective 1 (minimum generational average of 1,000 spawners and 500 on any cycle) and Objective 2 (positive generational growth) are met.
- * Failure to consider cycle-specific issues: Based on current run sizes, objectives 1-2 likely can be achieved with considerable latitude for fishing on two cycles, the Adams dominant and subdominant cycles. Fishing would likely be restricted for 2005 but probably not for 2009. There may be no impact on the weak 2004 cycle because the collapse of co-migrating stocks will likely eliminate fishing in 2008 and severely restrict it in 2012. None of these cycle-specific issues are considered in the analysis.
- * Linking Sakinaw and Cultus: The analysis does not consider listing Cultus but not Sakinaw (something that is quite possible given the large economic impact of addressing the Sakinaw Recovery Strategy objectives in the face of the extremely low levels of abundance). Linking the two populations results in an overstatement of the impacts from a Cultus listing alone.
- * Limiting analysis to a four year time period: Given the benefits expected from the captive breeding, hatchery supplementation and predator control projects, the population is expected to quickly move away from critically low levels of abundance. Consequently, by far the largest impacts will occur in the next four years; impacts over eight or twelve years are expected to be much lower.
- * Failure to consider non-traditional fishing options: It is likely that management flexibility in developing non-traditional fishing options would permit a number of fishing opportunities that would not impact Cultus sockeye; none are considered in the analysis.

Based on the above, we are concerned that the advice provided to the policy makers and subsequently to the politicians is based on a flawed analysis that overstates the economic impacts that will arise from the legal listing of Cultus sockeye. We are concerned that this analysis will become public following the publication in the Gazette of the Governor in Council decision and that the reputation of the Department

will be damaged. Further review should be considered. Neil

<<Cultus Socio-Economic Analysis>>

Neil D. Schubert
Chief of Stock Assessment
Lower Fraser Area
Tel: 604-666-8452
FAX: 604-666-7112
e-mail: Schubertn@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca