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Overview of Framework 32

- Range of measures in this action. Focus areas in **bold**.
  - **Action 1: OFL and ABC**
  - **Action 2.1: NGOM – Partial closure of Stellwagen Bank to Protect Small Scallops**
  - **Action 2.2: NGOM – NGOM TAC**
  - **Action 3.1: Scallop Fishery Allocations & Rotational Management**
  - **Action 3.2: Full time Limited Access Trip Exchanges**
  - **Action 4: Access area trip allocations to the LAGC IFQ component**
  - **Action 5.1: RSA compensation fishing**
  - **Action 5.2: Seasonal Closure of CALI AA to reduce impacts on GB YT and Northern Windowpane**
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Updating Economic Models (Price & Trip Cost): Dr. Naresh Pradhan
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Outline of the Affected Environment

5.6 Human Communities.

5.6.1 Economic Trends in the Sea Scallop Fishery. (p.115)

5.6.1.1 Trends in landings, prices and revenues. (p.115)

5.6.1.2 Trends in effort allocations and LPUE. (p.123)

5.6.1.3 Trends in the meat count and size composition of scallops. (p.127)

5.6.1.4 Trends in permits by permit plan and category. (p.129) - May be a place to streamline.

5.6.1.5 Trends in limited access (LA only) and “IFQ only” permits by home and primary state. (p.133)

5.6.1.6 Foreign trade (import, export, and re-export) of scallops in FY2017-FY2018. (p.136)

5.6.1.7 Trip and Fixed costs. (p.137)

5.6.2 Fishing Communities. (p.137)

Serves as a baseline, Provides annual time series economic statistics for the Atlantic sea scallops in federal fisheries.

Data: Primarily from the GARFO database, NMFS Commercial Fishery Trade Data

TOR #1 – Relevant information for Council decision makers? Other metrics that should be defined (1a/1b), not needed (1c)?
Elements in the Affected Environment (Economic) in FW32

5.6.1.1 Trends in landings, prices and revenues*
- Total landings by LA and LAGC permit category (Fig 18)
- Total revenue and ex-vessel price (LA & LAGC fisheries) (Fig 19)
- Total landings (by permit category), total revenues, and average prices (Tab 33/Fig 18-19)
- Average landings and revenues per vessel for FT and FT SMD vessels. (Tab 34/Fig 20-21)
- Total landings (& proportions) by LA vessels (by permit/gear category) (Fig 35-36)

5.6.1.1.2 Trends in landings for the LAGC IFQ vessels
- LAGC IFQ active vessels and landings (excludes LA vessels with IFQ permits (Tab 37))
- Average landings and revenue per vessel for LAGC IFQ only boats (Fig 22)

5.6.1.2 Trends in effort allocation and LPUE
- DAS and access area allocations per FT vessel (Tab 38)
- Total DAS-used and LPUE by LA vessels (Fig 23)
- LPUE for FT vessels by permit category (Fig 24)
- LPUE and DAS-used for LAGC-IFQ only vessels (Fig 25)

5.6.1.3 Trends in scallop meat counts and size composition
- Landing & size composition by market category (Tab 39/40)
- Composition of scallop revenue by size (Tab 41)
- Price of scallop by market category (Tab 42)

*Revenues and Prices are mostly in real dollar terms
Elements in the Affected Environment (Economic) in *FW32* contd...

5.6.1.4 Trends in permits by permit plan and category (fishery participation)
- No. of LA vessels by permit category and gear (Tab 43)
- LAGC permits held by limited access (LA) vessels by permit category (Tab 44)
- Unique scallop permits and category by application year (Tab 45)
- LAGC permits counts (includes LAGC permits held by LA vessels) (Tab 46)
- LAGC permits after Amendment 11 implementation (excludes LAGC permits held by LA vessels) (Tab 47)
- LAGC permits after A11 implementation (excludes LAGC permits held by LA vessels) (Tab 47)
- No. of Active LA vessels (by permit category) (Tab 48)
- No. of active LAGC vessels (by permit category (excludes LA vessels with LGC permits) (Tab 49))

5.6.1.5 Trends in LA only and IFQ only permits by home and primary port state
- No. of LA only and IFQ only permits by home and primary port state (Permit data) (Tab 50-53)

5.6.1.6 Scallop Foreign Trade FY2017 and 2018 (Tab 54)

5.6.1.7 Trip and Fixed Costs (Ref. *FW32 Economic Appendix*)
Affected Environment - communities

• Scallop fishing communities were not explicitly defined (or used consistently) in actions up through Framework 29 (2017).

• PDT developed criteria in November 2018 to identify primary and secondary scallop port communities "substantially dependent on or substantially engaged in the harvesting or processing of fishery resources" (MSFCMA).

• At the time, there were only NMFS fishing community engagement and reliance indicators for the scallop IFQ fishery. The PDT decided to not incorporate indicators until available for the entire fishery.

• New Bedford had about 80% of the scallop revenue, but the PDT felt it was important to recognize and communicate fishery dependence and diversity.

• Confidential ports have been combined with adjacent non-confidential ports.
### Affected Environment – primary ports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary port criteria</th>
<th>Ports</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least $5M average annual revenue of scallops, 2010-2017.</td>
<td>10 ports</td>
<td>Recognizes engagement as broader than one port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of average annual fishing revenue was from scallops, 2010-2017 (with $500K as a minimum scallop revenue); or</td>
<td>8 ports</td>
<td>Recognizes dependence, pulling up more ports into the primary category. In practice, it didn’t change the list of primary ports, but keeping it as a criterion gave a nod to dependence. There were 2-3 ports below $500K with &gt;50% dependence, but they were &lt;$250 which seemed too small to be &quot;primary.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A top 10 port by percent of landings each year for either the limited access or the limited access general category scallop permit categories, 2013-2017.</td>
<td>8 ports, 1 other</td>
<td>Recognizes diversity. Lifted one port from secondary to primary, Provincetown MA. PDT was using these data already.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 11 primary ports comprise 92% of total fishery revenue, 2010-2017.
## Affected Environment - communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary port criteria</th>
<th>Ports</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least $500K average annual revenue of sea scallops, 2010-2017.</td>
<td>12 ports</td>
<td>Below this, there were too many confidential ports. There are 5-6 ports in Washington County, ME that are non-confidential but below the $500K threshold. Washington County (ports combined) is above the threshold. PDT agreed to revisit once scallop-specific NMFS indicators are available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The 12 secondary ports comprise about 4% of total fishery revenue, 2010-2017.
- There are about 165 other ports that have had more minor participation (4%) in the fishery recently.
- These criteria used in Frameworks 30 – 33.
Affected Environment - communities

- Include tables
  - Showing how ports meet criteria.
  - Port revenue and revenue dependence.

- **UPDATE:** In early 2020, NMFS scallop Fishing Engagement and Reliance Indicators were available. Used in Amendment 21, adding 1 primary port (Hobucken, NC) and 2 secondary (Cutler and Beals, ME).

### Table 56 – Communities of Interest (primary and secondary ports) in the sea scallop fishery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Average revenue, 2010-2017&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Top 10 landing port, 2013-2017&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Primary/Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;$500K</td>
<td>&gt;$5M</td>
<td>% scollops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provincetown</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harwich/Harwichport/Barnstable</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairhaven</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Narragansett/Pt. Judith</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Stonington</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New London</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Montauk</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampton Bays/Shinnecock</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Point Pleasant</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnegat Light/Long Beach</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wildwood/Avalon</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape May</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Ocean City</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Hampton/Seaford</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*

<sup>a</sup> Inflation adjusted to 2017 dollars.

<sup>b</sup> A top 10 port by percent of landings each year for either the LA or LAGC permits, 2013-2017.
Social impacts

• Logistics/Organization
  • Organized separately (after) economic impacts.
  • Writing simultaneously to other analysts, at times trailing; checking for cohesion.

• Focus
  • Focus on fishery (vessels and shoreside), potentially other stakeholders.
  • Focus on what is being considered in the action vs analyzed in prior actions.

• NEPA compliance
  • Lead with the concluding NEPA terms (e.g., negligible).
  • Each alternative needs its own NEPA conclusion and comparison to other alternatives.
  • Balance concision with thoroughness (lean towards concision).
Social impacts

• Introduction (<1 page)
  • Social impact factors from NMFS (2007) guidelines for SIAs (size and demographics; attitudes, beliefs and values; social structure and organization; non-economic social aspects; historical dependence and participation).
  • Brief discussion of the general impacts of the type of action on human communities and the communities impacted.

• Some impact analysis considerations
  • Any short-term vs. long-term impact differences (recognize bio impacts)?
  • Who vs. how much (recognize economic impacts)?
  • Fishery components (LA, IFQ, LA-only, LA+LAGC, NGOM-only, etc….)?
  • Geographic range of ports (ME to NC).

Credit: D. Boelke.
Social impacts – some questions to address (largely qualitative)

• Catch limits
  • Would the limit provide a degree of stability and/or predictability?
  • Could the limit sustain the current workforce?
  • If best available science indicates another limit is justified, how would that impact attitudes towards management? Long-term viability of fishery?

• Area closures, allocations, rotational management, trip exchanges
  • How would vessel flexibility and safety be impacted?
  • How would fishing opportunities change (number of DAS, crew limits, efficiency)?
  • How perceptions of wasted resources (discards) be impacted?
  • Would fishermen perceive the distribution of fishing opportunities to be fair?
  • Would long-term benefits outweigh short-term constraints?
§6.6.1 Methods in the Economic Impact Analysis in FW 32

- Generally, utilizes standard cost-benefit analysis framework and also follows NMFS guidelines for economic analysis.

- Evaluates net economic impacts or incremental benefits to the economy

  Ideally, benefit cost analysis is carried out to evaluate the net social benefit arising from changes in consumer and producer surpluses to occur upon implementation of a regulatory action.

- Quantitative methods used for the specification actions (prioritized for SSC review) vs.
  Qualitative methods (used for other management measures/actions (not discussed))

- Assess Short vs Long-term economic impacts

- Economic paradigms and analysis may slightly vary specific to situations or environment, e.g., small-mesh multispecies spec with choke or non-target species; or in bycatch management; salmon management with draughts and dams, etc.
§6.6.1 Economic Indicators Considered in Economic Impact Analysis

- Some of the economic indicators to look for in the analysis are listed but not limited to below:
  - Landings (okay)
  - Revenues (good-great)
  - Net Revenues (before fixed costs) (great)
  - Net Revenues (inclusive of fixed costs) (super)
  - Producer Surplus (PS) (ideal)
  - Consumer Surplus (CS) (ideal)
  - Total Economic Benefit (PS+CS) (ideal)
  - Assess Incremental Benefit across alternatives compared to SQ (required/ideal)

- Other economic indicators
  - Price
  - Efficiency or Productivities (revenue/effort)
  - Employment
Some economic models and Key outcomes in EIA (Economic Appendix)

Economic Models

- Price model (§1.1.1)
  - Price Model (U10) (Tab 1)
  - Price Model (11+) (Tab 2)

- Trip variable cost model (§1.1.2 Tab 3-4)

- Fixed cost model (§1.1.3 Tab 7-8)

Expected Outcomes

- Revenues / Net Revenues
- Profits and Crew Incomes (§1.1.4)
- Consumer Surplus (§1.1.5)
- Opportunity cost of K and L (§1.1.6)
- Producer Surplus (§1.1.7)
- Total Economic Benefits (§1.1.8)
- Incremental Economic Benefits (Tables 68, 70, 71, 73)

Credit: B. Lybarger
Economic simulation (primarily for 2020/21 Spec. EIA in §6.6.1.3)

Estimates from economic models and other economic information feed into:

- Biological Data (ts) (non-monetary)
  - $\text{alt 1}$
  - $\text{alt n}$

- Transformed economic variables (unmonetized and monetized)
  - $\#\#\#\#$

- Final Economic Indicators or Outcomes (monetized)
  - $\$$
  - $\$$
  - $\$$
## Economic Impact Analysis for Specification Actions

**Action 3.1: 2020/2021 Specifications for FY2020 and 2021 (default)**

### Table 11- Comparison of allocations with each specification alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Overall F rate</th>
<th>Open area F</th>
<th>Annual Projected Landings (APL) (Action 3.1)</th>
<th>APL w/ set-asides removed</th>
<th>LA Share (94.5%)</th>
<th>LAGC IFQ Share (5.5%) (Action 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.1</td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>27,593,057</td>
<td>25,292,158</td>
<td>23,901,089</td>
<td>1,391,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.2.1</td>
<td>CAII ext Open 22 DAS</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>50,353,581</td>
<td>48,052,682</td>
<td>45,409,784</td>
<td>2,642,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.2.2</td>
<td>CAII ext Open 24 DAS</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>52,046,731</td>
<td>49,745,832</td>
<td>47,009,811</td>
<td>2,736,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.3.1</td>
<td>CAII ext Closed 22 DAS</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>49,972,181</td>
<td>47,671,282</td>
<td>45,049,361</td>
<td>2,621,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.3.2</td>
<td>CAII ext Closed 24 DAS</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>51,619,034</td>
<td>49,318,135</td>
<td>46,605,638</td>
<td>2,712,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.4*</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>44,881,707</td>
<td>42,580,808</td>
<td>40,238,864</td>
<td>2,341,944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Status Quo” refers to Framework 30 preferred measures and is provided in the alternatives section of Framework 32 to provide continuity and context for the reader but is not an option proposed for Council decision.
§6.6.1.3 Short-term Economic Impacts of the proposed specification alternative for FY2020 and 2021 (default) (Action 3.1)

Table 70. Economic Impacts for 2020: Estimated landings (Mill.lb.), revenue and economic benefits (Mill. $, in 2019 dollars), and price (in 2019$/lb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bio. Sections</th>
<th>4.3.1.1</th>
<th>4.3.1.2.1</th>
<th>4.3.1.2.2</th>
<th>4.3.1.3.1</th>
<th>4.3.1.3.2 (preferred)</th>
<th>4.3.1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values\ RUN</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>xop22</td>
<td>xop24</td>
<td>xcl22</td>
<td>xcl24</td>
<td>SQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Projected Landings mil lbs.</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$280.1</td>
<td>$479.0</td>
<td>$491.4</td>
<td>$475.4</td>
<td>$487.4</td>
<td>$436.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Difference from SQ</td>
<td>-$156.6</td>
<td>$42.3</td>
<td>$54.7</td>
<td>$38.7</td>
<td>$50.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Surplus</td>
<td>$201.7</td>
<td>$378.5</td>
<td>$388.5</td>
<td>$374.9</td>
<td>$384.5</td>
<td>$341.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Surplus</td>
<td>$9.2</td>
<td>$41.0</td>
<td>$43.3</td>
<td>$40.8</td>
<td>$43.1</td>
<td>$32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$210.9</td>
<td>$419.5</td>
<td>$431.8</td>
<td>$415.7</td>
<td>$427.6</td>
<td>$374.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits Difference from SQ</td>
<td>-$163.1</td>
<td>$45.5</td>
<td>$57.8</td>
<td>$41.8</td>
<td>$53.7</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§6.6.1.3 Long-term Economic Impacts of the proposed specification alternative for FY2020 and 2021 (default) (Action 3.1)

Table 71 - Long-term Economic Impacts (2020-2034): Cumulative present value of revenues, producer surplus and total economic benefits net of Status quo values (million $ in 2019 dollars, 7% Discount rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values/RUN</th>
<th>4.3.1.1</th>
<th>4.3.1.2.1</th>
<th>4.3.1.2.2</th>
<th>4.3.1.3.1</th>
<th>4.3.1.3.2 (preferred)</th>
<th>4.3.1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landings mil lbs.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>xop22</td>
<td>xop24</td>
<td>xcl22</td>
<td>xcl24</td>
<td>SQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price $/lb</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$5700.59</td>
<td>$5830.93</td>
<td>$5835.80</td>
<td>$5820.41</td>
<td>$5824.75</td>
<td>$5797.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Difference from SQ</td>
<td>-96.58</td>
<td>33.76</td>
<td>38.63</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Surplus</td>
<td>4517.85</td>
<td>4635.48</td>
<td>4639.21</td>
<td>4626.05</td>
<td>4629.27</td>
<td>4605.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Surplus</td>
<td>694.43</td>
<td>687.14</td>
<td>686.94</td>
<td>684.74</td>
<td>684.43</td>
<td>683.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>5212.28</td>
<td>5322.63</td>
<td>5326.15</td>
<td>5310.79</td>
<td>5313.71</td>
<td>5289.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits Difference from SQ</td>
<td>-76.81</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>37.06</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Economic Impact of the LAGC IFQ TAC for FY2020 (Action 3.1)

## Table 73. Impacts of the LAGC IFQ TAC for 2020 fishing year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Run</th>
<th>LAGC IFQ Share (pounds)</th>
<th>LAGC IFQ Share (mt)</th>
<th>Revenue (2019 $ mil)</th>
<th>Percent change in revenue relative to SQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.1</td>
<td>No Action</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,391,069</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>-37.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.2.1</td>
<td>CAII ext Open 22 DAS</td>
<td>xop22</td>
<td>2,642,897</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>$25.1</td>
<td>11.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.2.2</td>
<td>CAII ext Open 24 DAS</td>
<td>xop24</td>
<td>2,736,021</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>$25.8</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.3.1</td>
<td>CAII ext Closed 22 DAS</td>
<td>xcl22</td>
<td>2,621,921</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>$24.9</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.3.2</td>
<td>CAII ext Closed 24 DAS (pref)</td>
<td>xcl24</td>
<td>2,712,497</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>$25.6</td>
<td>14.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.4</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>SQ</td>
<td>2,341,944</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>$22.5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

• Tailor presentations for the PDT, Advisory Panel & Committee, and Council.
  • Level of detail varies by group, and timing in the process.
  • PDT Chair presenting work of the Scallop PDT.
• How is the message getting across? What points seem to get picked up on by the public and Council members?
  • Stakeholders seem to focus on changes in the projected landing and revenue year to year.
  • Mental models of how biological data translates to economic and social impacts. Challenge: many parts of the fishery (LA, IFQ, NGOM).
• Decision document is prepared for the Council. Very high level, with (maybe) NEPA conclusions presented (- or +).
• Little deliberation at the final Council meeting on preferred alternatives. For specifications, Council looks to advice of the Advisory Panel and the Committee.