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## Rolquitrerapatrteri patidic

Within government agencies:

- APA 1946 (5 USC 500)
- NEPA 1970 (42 USC 4321)
- The regulating body or agency "must affirmatively solicit... comments from those persons or organizations who may be interested or affected" when preparing an environmental impact statement (40 CFR 1503.1(4) 1993)


## How Voluntary Participation got into FMPs

- 1976 Fisheries Conservation and Management Act
- Main focus foreign fleets
- Regional control
- Senator Kennedy


## Assumptions

1) Stakeholders will participate and contribute to policy-making
2) Representative participation

## Slight correction...

 Heterogeneous environment (fishery) Advantage: Influence decisions in own backyard

## Disadvantages

- Participation higher for larger, closer, and more influential firms (Turner and Weninger 2004)
- Nonparticipation of moderates
- Overall low participation
- Sensitivity to attendance (Osborne et al. 2000)



## Study of the NEFMC

- Regulates 9 FMPs
- Sign-in sheets
- Policy 2003-06
- Part 1: Who attends
- Part 2: Who didn't attend
- Focus fisheries: Multi-species, Herring, Scallop
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## Who attended



## Results

## Practically significant?

## Representation?

- Do our attendance data reflect the industry?




## Industry

- Permits
- Landings
- Syrjala 1996: compare two spatial distributions
- Normalize observed densities
- Calculate cumulative distribution function from ordering and summing distances from an origin
- Squared difference of the cumulative distribution functions:
- Significance from randomization

A statistical test for a difference between the spatial distributions of two populations
Landings


## Area extent

- Beyond New England


## Distributions 2003-06

## Significant ( $\alpha<0.05$ )



## Face-value conclusions

- No significant difference between attendees and industry
- Attendance statistically similar or representative, spatially, of the industry
- Input at meetings and potential influence: accurate feedback for Council decisions


## Is that it?

- Not really
- Timing caveats

- Appropriate feedback
- Social
- Economic
- Ecological



## Assumptions

## Actual situation

|  | Homogeneous <br> distribution | Metapopulation <br> distribution |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Homogeneous <br> distribution | Sub-stock local <br> extinctions <br> possible |  |
| Metapopulation <br> distribution | More time and $\$$ <br> Increased <br> involvement | Great Job! |

## Conclusions

- Distance a factor in attendance
- Geographically biased or representative?
- Says representative
- Temporal conditions
- Real impacts
- Feedback on policy
- Human and resource dimensions
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## Who didn't attend?

- Syrjala (1996):
- Based on a bivariate generalization of Cramervon Mises nonparametric test for a difference $\mathrm{b} / \mathrm{t}$ two univariate probability distribution functions


## $\Psi$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\gamma_{i}\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)=\frac{d_{l}\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)}{D_{k}} \quad \Gamma_{i}\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)=\sum_{\forall x \in x_{k}, v y=y_{k}} \gamma_{i}(x, y) . \\
\Psi=\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left[\Gamma_{1}\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)-\Gamma_{2}\left(x_{k}, y_{k}\right)\right]^{2} .
\end{gathered}
$$

## Georges Bank, US

- 1994- emergency closures enacted by Secretary of Commerce
- Overfished groundfish stocks
- Made permanent by NEFMC
- Closed to all bottom-tending, mobile gear
- 1999- first access trips for scallop fishing
- Large biomass within closures
- Industry lobbying (Edwards 2002)
- Current catches (NMFS 2007)
- Mid-Atlantic and New England 2006 $>22$ million kg (84.1\%); \$324,785,138 (84.4\%)

