

From: Bradford, Mike
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2004 11:14 AM
To: Schubert, Neil <SchubertN@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Folkes, Michael <FolkesM@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Grout, Jeff <GroutJ@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Hume, Jeremy <HumeJ@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>; Wood, Chris <WoodC@pac.dfo-mpo.gc.ca>
Subject: RE: Cultus Socio-Economic Analysis

Hello, these are my quick thoughts on what we discussed yesterday. I can't comment on the use of the boxcar model, but transparency (documentation) would seem to be key.

1. Simplistic view of the implications of SARA listing. S73 of SARA prohibits harm that jeopardizes survival or recovery, but that doesn't necessarily mean no fishing. Recovery will occur with a positive generational growth rate. In my view growth is more important than a 'hard' 500 fish limit. No catastrophic events will occur at 499 spawners. The analyses presented to date seem to suggest that only heroic actions are SARA compliant when the population is below 500. More thought and analysis is required, and there are likely alternatives (from a risk-based perspective) that will be less disruptive, yet make progress towards recovery. The black-white view of this problem indicated in the report (and espoused by greens too) will not lead to solutions.
2. Additional benefits of reduced fishing rates in the short term. The analysis does not account for the potential for rebuilding runs that will occur if restrictions are imposed, which could lead to larger catches in the future.
3. Powerpoint presentation doesn't provide enough information, but clearly the analysis is different from the Gislason report. Uncertainty in biology and economics is not projected. The so-called 20-25% and 10-12% ER options reflect fishing on specific sectors of the run, as the total catch appears to be greater than would be expected under these ER's and the run sizes projected.
4. The powerpoint doesn't mention that according to Gislason the salmon fleet loses money under all scenarios.
5. Although we are not economists, there is a large biological and fishery management component to this analysis. Given the importance of the advice to senior officials it would seem reasonable to document the biological component to the usual scientific standards and subject it to review. Independent economists can be brought in to examine (or conduct) that part of the work.
6. There are some useful sections of the Gislason report that speak to some of the uncertainties and inadequacies of the approach. See 2.22, 2.23, 2.26, 4.2-2.5. See 3.23-2.26 with respect to my point #1 above, and the misinterpretation of SARA impacts.
7. In the short-term, I think it would be fruitful to think about the types of fisheries management schemes that would lead to compliance under s73 of SARA (my point #1). This might involve
 - ٗ Targets for population growth rates to meet persistence criteria
 - ٗ Using forecasts to obtain distribution of run sizes and thus growth rates
 - ٗ Calculating probabilities of meeting growth rate targets for different given forecasts and implementation uncertainties
 - ٗ Estimate consequences to whole fishery from this process
 - ٗ Consider effects of alternative management activities for increasing growth rates.
 - ٗ Project this process into the future.

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

From: Schubert, Neil
To: Bradford, Mike; Folkes, Michael; Grout, Jeff; Hume, Jeremy; Wood, Chris
Sent: 05/10/2004 9:36 AM
Subject: RE: Cultus Socio-Economic Analysis

Group: Lets go for Wednesday, 3 pm at the number below. Talk to you then. Neil

> -----Original Message-----

DFO-173794

\\svbcbvnp01\Cohen-Comm\Personal_Drives\Cohen - G
rout\Groutj-pre2007\SARA\Cultus Sockeye\

CAN086733_0001

>From: Schubert, Neil
>Sent: Monday, October 04, 2004 3:57 PM
>To: Bradford, Mike; Folkes, Michael; Grout, Jeff; Hume, Jeremy;
>Wood, Chris
>Subject: Cultus Socio-Economic Analysis
>
>Group: I think we should discuss the Cultus socio-economic analysis in
>advance of the meeting that Paul Ryall has set up for this Friday.
>Could you let me know how your schedule looks for some time on
>Wednesday afternoon. I will have a couple of hours available before
>the open house session of the consultations in Prince Rupert. If this
>is do-able, I suggest we use the standard conference call number:
>
>* Telephone Number: 1-888-440-5452;
>* Pass code: 6668452#
>
>Please let me know by close of business tomorrow. Neil
>
>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
>