

Summary of potential impacts of the March 2008 MPA proposals on commercial and recreational fisheries in the North Central Coast Study Region

Condensed Summary of the Final Draft, 18 April 2008

Astrid Scholz, ajscholz@ecotrust.org, Sarah Kruse, Matt Weber, Charles Steinback and Mike Mertens

In order to conduct an analysis of the relative effects of Marine Protected Area (MPA) proposals on fisheries that are conducted in the waters in the North Central Coast Study Region (NCCSR), we use data layers characterizing the spatial extent and relative stated importance of fishing grounds for eight commercial fisheries and five recreational fisheries. This information was collected during interviews in the summer of 2007, using a stratified, representative sample of 174 commercial fishermen and a stratified solicited sample of 101 recreational fishermen whose individual responses regarding the relative importance of ocean areas for each fishery were standardized using a 100-point scale and normalized to the reported fishing grounds for each fishery.

Using the normalized data described above, we 1) evaluate the potential impacts on the commercial and recreational fishing grounds and 2) conduct a socioeconomic impact analysis on commercial fisheries in order to assess the relative effects of the three MPA proposals (Proposal 1–3, Proposal 2–XA and Proposal 4). Results are reported at both the study region and port group levels for the commercial fisheries and by sub-region and use group for the recreational fisheries.

It should be noted that this document is a condensed summary of a more comprehensive document, entitled “Summary of potential impacts of the March 2008 MPA proposals on commercial and recreational fisheries in the North Central Coast Study Region [Final Draft, 16 April 2008]. Please refer to this document for additional details on both methods and results.

Results for Commercial Fisheries

We summarize here the results derived from a series of analyses conducted to evaluate the potential impacts on commercial fisheries (i.e. California halibut, coastal pelagics, market squid, deeper nearshore rockfish, nearshore rockfish, urchin, Dungeness crab and salmon).

▫ *Potential Impacts on Fishing Grounds (Area and Value)*

MPA proposals vary considerably in their effects, both between and across fisheries. All packages affect the eight commercial fisheries differently, with the smallest effects in terms of both value and area affected generally evidenced in Proposal 2–XA. On average, under all three proposals, the fisheries most likely to see the largest potential impacts across all ports in terms of percentage area and value of total commercial fishing grounds affected are the deeper nearshore rockfish, nearshore rockfish and urchin fisheries.

In terms of **total area** of the fishing grounds potentially impacted for the 28 port-fishery combinations investigated, several patterns emerge from the analysis of the three proposals:

- Proposal 1–3 has the least potential impact on five fisheries and the highest potential impact on one fishery.
- Proposal 2–XA has the least potential impact on 21 fisheries and the highest potential impact on zero fisheries.
- Proposal 4 has the least potential impact on zero fisheries and the highest potential impact on 25 fisheries.
- All three proposals have the same impact on one fishery (i.e. Half Moon Bay – nearshore rockfish)
- There are nine port-fishery combinations where there is $\leq 1\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, Point Arena – salmon, Bodega Bay – Dungeness crab and salmon, Bolinas – salmon, San Francisco – Dungeness crab and salmon, and Half Moon Bay – coastal pelagics, nearshore rockfish, and salmon.
- There are seven port-fishery combinations where there is $\geq 10\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, Point Arena – deeper nearshore rockfish, Bodega Bay – California halibut, Bolinas – California halibut, San Francisco – urchin and Half Moon Bay – California halibut, market squid, and deeper nearshore rockfish.

In terms of **total value** of the fishing grounds potentially impacted for the 28 port-fishery combinations investigated, several patterns emerge from the analysis of the three proposals:

- Proposal 1–3 has the least potential impact on seven fisheries and the highest potential impact on one fishery.
- Proposal 2–XA has the least potential impact on 19 fisheries and the highest potential impact on two fisheries.
- Proposal 4 has the least potential impact on zero fisheries and the highest potential impact on 23 fisheries.
- All three proposals have the same impact on one fishery (i.e. Half Moon Bay – nearshore rockfish)
- There are eight port-fishery combinations where there is $\leq 1\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, Bodega Bay – salmon, Bolinas – salmon, San Francisco – California halibut and salmon, and Half Moon Bay – coastal pelagics, nearshore rockfish, and Dungeness crab and salmon.
- There are eight port-fishery combinations where there is $\geq 10\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, Point Arena – deeper nearshore rockfish, nearshore rockfish, Bodega Bay – nearshore rockfish, and urchin, San Francisco – urchin, and Half Moon Bay – California halibut, market squid, and deeper nearshore rockfish
- Proposal 1–3, has $\leq 10\%$ potential impact on 15 of the 28 port-fishery combinations, compared 19 for Proposal 2–XA, and 11 for Proposal 4.
- All three proposals are estimated to have $\leq 5\%$ impact on the 10 following fishery/port group combinations: Bodega – salmon, Bolinas – Dungeness crab and salmon, San Francisco – California halibut, Dungeness crab, and salmon, and Half Moon Bay – coastal pelagics, nearshore rockfish, Dungeness crab, and salmon (2 additional fisheries (i.e. California halibut and market squid) for Proposals 1–3 and 2–XA have $\leq 5\%$ impact in Half Moon Bay)

▫ *Consideration of Existing Closures*

For the commercial deeper nearshore and nearshore rockfish fisheries, we evaluate the additional impacts that potentially occur when considering the existing fishery management area closures and/or fishery exclusion zones (i.e., Rockfish Conservation Area, 2007–2009). The fishing grounds, as defined by the fishermen through the interview process, represent the total area and value regardless of these existing or potential fishery management closures and/or fishery exclusion zones. In order to evaluate the effect of such closures, the fishing grounds that fall inside those areas were removed, and the value associated with the removed area were redistributed to the remaining fishing grounds outside the closed areas. For example, after the value associated with the fishing grounds that falls inside the 2007 closure is removed, the impact to the Bolinas deeper nearshore rockfish fishing grounds is 60.8%, in terms of value. Similarly, 72.3% impact to the fishery from the 2008 fishery closures and 81.2% impact in 2009. Using the same method described above, we determine the percentage change in value by the intersection of each MPA proposal with the total fishing grounds now constrained to areas not inside the closed areas (i.e., the “available fishing grounds”). Across all proposals, the difference in percentage value of commercial deeper nearshore and nearshore rockfish fishing grounds by landing port affected by MPA proposals when comparing the available fishing grounds summarized for all MPAs with the same effects for those fisheries without consideration of fishery management closures were minimal for Point Arena, San Francisco and Half Moon Bay. Conversely, we see a substantial increase in impacts to the deeper nearshore rockfish fishery for Bolinas across for Proposals 1–3 and 4. This increase in impacts is largely due to the value that Bolinas deeper nearshore rockfish fishermen associate with the Farallon Islands. More specifically, the percentage differences in potential impact (i.e. considering total fishing grounds and considering only grounds available outside of Rockfish Conservation Areas) are 2.86%, 23.86% and 29.46% under Proposals 2-XA, 1–3 and 4, respectively. When comparing the impacts of a proposal between the total fishing grounds and the available fishing grounds, where there is marginal or no percentage difference also indicates that there is a high degree of overlap between the proposed MPAs and the existing closed areas. Where there is a large percentage difference between the impact on the total fishing grounds versus on available fishing grounds, this indicates that the MPA proposal is impacting additional fishing grounds that are not already impacted by the existing fishery management closures.

Summary of potential impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries in North Central Coast Study Region

▫ *Potential Impacts on Individual Fishermen*

We also conducted an analysis to assess whether or not there are individual fishermen who would be disproportionately affected by a specific MPA proposal. It should be noted that the results of the individual impact analysis suggest that one fisherman will be disproportionately impacted by all three proposals being considered. In other words, according to the information he provided for all fisheries in which he participates, his annual individual impact under each of the proposals is estimated to be:

- Proposal 1–3: between 20-40% loss of ex-vessel revenue and \$15K-\$20K loss
- Proposal 2–XA: between 20-40% loss of ex-vessel revenue and \$15K-\$20K loss
- Proposal 4: between 40-60% loss of ex-vessel revenue and >\$20K loss

According to our analysis, this fisherman is the only individual who appears to fall into higher categories of both percentage and dollar value loss.

▫ *Potential Socioeconomic Impacts*

We also estimate "worst-case scenario" or maximum potential economic impact of each MPA proposal. As seen previously in the other analyses, proposals vary considerably in their effects on ports and fisheries. Table 1 summarizes the results across all fisheries for each port group. As can be seen, Proposal 4 has the highest potential socioeconomic impact across all ports. Proposal 1–3 has the lowest estimated impact for the ports of Point Arena and Bolinas, while Proposal 2–XA is estimated to have the lowest impact of the three proposals for the ports of Bodega Bay, San Francisco and Half Moon Bay. Proposal 2–XA is also estimated to have the lowest socioeconomic impact across the study region as a whole, with an estimated 4.8% reduction in total annual profit, compared to 5.6% and 8.3% under Proposals 1–3 and 4, respectively (see Table 1). The estimated annual net economic impacts of all three proposals, broken out first by port group and then by fishery, compared in Tables A.1–A.6 (Appendix: Socioeconomic Impact Assessment Results).

Table 1: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) by Port Group

Port	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Net Economic Impact under each Alternative (% reduction in Dollars)		
			Proposal 1-3	Proposal 2-XA	Proposal 4
Point Arena	\$798,750	\$465,016	\$59,510	\$67,139	\$83,332
Bodega Bay	\$4,654,206	\$2,457,152	\$207,776	\$161,318	\$314,474
Bolinas	\$151,214	\$78,783	\$3,297	\$4,192	\$5,988
San Francisco	\$6,059,387	\$3,166,680	\$110,421	\$95,387	\$168,861
Half Moon Bay	\$4,110,888	\$2,122,436	\$84,149	\$68,786	\$123,439
NCC ¹	\$15,889,348	\$8,336,602	\$465,157	\$396,826	\$696,099

Port	Net Economic Impact (% reduction in Profit)		
	Proposal 1-3	Proposal 2-XA	Proposal 4
Point Arena	12.8%	14.4%	17.9%
Bodega Bay	8.5%	6.6%	12.8%
Bolinas	4.2%	5.3%	7.6%
San Francisco	3.5%	3.0%	5.3%
Half Moon Bay	4.0%	3.2%	5.8%
NCC	5.6%	4.8%	8.3%

Results for Recreational Fisheries

We summarize here the results derived from analyses conducted to evaluate the potential impacts on recreational fisheries (California halibut, Dungeness crab, salmon, rockfish/lingcod complex, and striped bass –

¹ It should be noted that the "all fisheries" estimates for annual net economic impact for the NCCSR do not equal the sum of all port's "all fisheries" estimates due to rounding differences.

Summary of potential impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries in North Central Coast Study Region (pier/shore only). The recreational fisheries are broken out by user group (i.e. commercial passenger fishing vessels, private vessels, kayak based, and pier/shore based) and by sub-region (i.e. Region 1 - Ocean Beach in San Francisco County, Region 2 - San Francisco Bay access points to Point Reyes and Region 3 - Point Reyes north to Alder Creek).

□ *Potential Impacts on Fishing Grounds (Area and Value)*

MPA proposals vary considerably in their effects, both between and across fisheries. All packages affect the recreational fisheries differently, with the smallest effects in terms of both value and area affected generally evidenced in Proposal 2–XA. On average, under all three proposals, the fishery most likely to see the largest potential impacts across all user groups and sub-regions in terms of percentage area and value of total recreational fishing grounds affected is the rockfish/lingcod fishery. Additionally, there are fisheries with specific user group/region combinations that have relatively large impacts, and those fisheries are further detailed in the description below.

In terms of **total area** of the fishing grounds potentially impacted for the 46 user group-region-fishery combinations investigated, several patterns emerge from the analysis of the three proposals:

- Proposal 1–3 has the least potential impact on seven fisheries and the highest potential impact on six fisheries.
- Proposal 2–XA has the least potential impact on 30 fisheries and the highest potential impact on zero fisheries.
- Proposal 4 has the least potential impact on zero fisheries and the highest potential impact on 37 fisheries.
- There are 17 user group-region-fishery combinations where there is $\leq 1\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, CPFV - Region 3 - salmon, CPFV - Region 2 – Dungeness crab and salmon, CPFV - Region 1 – Dungeness crab and salmon, Private vessels - Region 3 – salmon, Private vessels - Region 2 – salmon, Private vessels - Region 1- Dungeness crab and salmon, Kayak – Region 3 – California halibut and Dungeness crab, Kayak – Region 2 – California halibut, Kayak – Region 1 – rockfish/lingcod and salmon, and Pier/Shore – Region 2 – California halibut and Dungeness crab, Pier/Shore – Region 1 – salmon.
- There are 10 user group-region-fishery combinations where there is $\geq 10\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, CPFV – Region 2 – California halibut, rockfish/lingcod, CPFV – Region 1 – California halibut, Kayak – Region 2 – rockfish/lingcod, and Pier/Shore – Region 3 – rockfish/lingcod and striped bass, Pier/Shore – Region 2 – rockfish/lingcod and striped bass, Pier/Shore – Region 1 – rockfish/lingcod and striped bass.

In terms of **total value** of the fishing grounds potentially impacted for the 46 user group-region-fishery combinations investigated, several patterns emerge from the analysis of the three proposals:

- Proposal 1–3 has the least potential impact on eight fisheries and the highest potential impact on seven fisheries.
- Proposal 2–XA has the least potential impact on 27 fisheries and the highest potential impact on zero fisheries.
- Proposal 4 has the least potential impact on one fishery and the highest potential impact on 34 fisheries.
- There are 13 user group-region-fishery combinations where there is $\leq 1\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, CPFV – Region 3 – salmon, CPFV – Region 2 – salmon, CPFV – Region 1 – salmon, Private vessels – Region 3 – salmon, Private vessels – Region 2 – Dungeness crab and salmon, Private vessels – Region 1 – rockfish/lingcod and salmon, and Kayak – Region 3 – California halibut and Dungeness crab, Kayak – Region 2 – California halibut, Kayak – Region 1 – rockfish/lingcod and salmon.
- There are eight user group-region-fishery combinations where there is $\geq 10\%$ variation between the potential impacts of each Proposal relative to the other two. Specifically, CPFV – Region 3 – Dungeness crab, CPFV – Region 1 – California halibut, Private vessel – Region 1 – California halibut, Kayak – Region 2 – rockfish/lingcod, and Pier/Shore – Region 3 – rockfish/lingcod and striped bass, Pier/Shore – Region 1 – rockfish/lingcod and striped bass.
- Proposal 1–3, has $\leq 5\%$ potential impact on 29 of the 46 user group-region-fishery combinations, compared 29 for Proposal 2–XA, and 20 for Proposal 4 (all three Proposals have a $\leq 5\%$ potential impact for those 20 fisheries).

APPENDIX: SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT RESULTS**Table A.1: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) for Point Arena**

Fishery	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (\$ reduction in Profit)		
			1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	—	—	—	—	—
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	\$1,424	\$699	\$337	\$77	\$346
N. Rockfish	\$64,259	\$31,544	\$13,440	\$5,296	\$13,977
Urchin	\$608,226	\$366,963	\$33,273	\$49,288	\$54,609
Dungeness Crab	\$46,951	\$24,201	\$4,901	\$4,004	\$5,888
Salmon	\$77,890	\$41,610	\$7,558	\$8,474	\$8,511
All Fisheries	\$798,750	\$465,016	\$59,510	\$67,139	\$83,332

Fishery	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (% reduction in Profit)		
	1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	—	—	—
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	48.3%	11.1%	49.5%
N. Rockfish	42.6%	16.8%	44.3%
Urchin	9.1%	13.4%	14.9%
Dungeness Crab	20.2%	16.5%	24.3%
Salmon	18.2%	20.4%	20.5%
All Fisheries	12.8%	14.4%	17.9%

Summary of potential impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries in North Central Coast Study Region

Table A.2: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) for Bodega Bay

Fishery	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (\$ reduction in Profit)		
			1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	\$19,928	\$10,772	\$1,244	\$1,641	\$1,787
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	\$24,772	\$12,160	\$3,943	\$2,860	\$4,480
N. Rockfish	\$40,634	\$19,946	\$3,908	\$3,965	\$7,474
Urchin	\$247,530	\$149,343	\$34,369	\$12,306	\$78,979
Dungeness Crab	\$2,322,504	\$1,197,122	\$103,992	\$91,819	\$158,770
Salmon	\$1,998,838	\$1,067,809	\$60,320	\$48,726	\$62,984
All Fisheries	\$4,654,206	\$2,457,152	\$207,776	\$161,318	\$314,474

Fishery	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (% reduction in Profit)		
	1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	11.6%	15.2%	16.6%
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	32.4%	23.5%	36.8%
N. Rockfish	19.6%	19.9%	37.5%
Urchin	23.0%	8.2%	52.9%
Dungeness Crab	8.7%	7.7%	13.3%
Salmon	5.6%	4.6%	5.9%
All Fisheries	8.5%	6.6%	12.8%

Summary of potential impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries in North Central Coast Study Region

Table A.3: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) for Bolinas

Fishery	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (\$ reduction in Profit)		
			1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	\$22,897	\$12,376	\$2,266	\$2,809	\$2,438
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	\$2,147	\$1,054	\$445	\$396	\$474
N. Rockfish	—	—	—	—	—
Urchin	—	—	—	—	—
Dungeness Crab	\$109,192	\$56,282	\$41	\$384	\$2,535
Salmon	\$16,978	\$9,070	\$544	\$603	\$542
All Fisheries	\$151,214	\$78,783	\$3,297	\$4,192	\$5,988

Fishery	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (% reduction in Profit)		
	1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	18.3%	22.7%	19.7%
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	42.3%	37.5%	44.9%
N. Rockfish	—	—	—
Urchin	—	—	—
Dungeness Crab	0.1%	0.7%	4.5%
Salmon	6.0%	6.6%	6.0%
All Fisheries	4.2%	5.3%	7.6%

Summary of potential impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries in North Central Coast Study Region

Table A.4: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) for San Francisco

Fishery	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (\$ reduction in Profit)		
			1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	\$203,044	\$109,750	\$1,179	\$1,228	\$1,621
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	\$59,192	\$29,056	\$9,179	\$6,912	\$10,439
N. Rockfish	\$44,442	\$21,816	\$4,113	\$2,001	\$5,203
Urchin	\$8,827	\$5,326	\$1,309	\$515	\$2,451
Dungeness Crab	\$3,608,592	\$1,860,029	\$61,335	\$57,282	\$111,321
Salmon	\$2,135,290	\$1,140,703	\$33,307	\$27,449	\$37,826
All Fisheries	\$6,059,387	\$3,166,680	\$110,421	\$95,387	\$168,861

Fishery	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (% reduction in Profit)		
	1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	1.1%	1.1%	1.5%
Coastal Pelagics	—	—	—
Squid	—	—	—
D. N. Rockfish	31.6%	23.8%	35.9%
N. Rockfish	18.9%	9.2%	23.9%
Urchin	24.6%	9.7%	46.0%
Dungeness Crab	3.3%	3.1%	6.0%
Salmon	2.9%	2.4%	3.3%
All Fisheries	3.5%	3.0%	5.3%

Table A.5: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) for Half Moon Bay

Fishery	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (\$ reduction in Profit)		
			1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	\$33,896	\$18,322	\$55	\$71	\$7,377
Coastal Pelagics	\$16,757	\$6,703	\$64	\$40	\$63
Squid	\$204,407	\$81,763	\$865	\$736	\$22,876
D. N. Rockfish	\$20,367	\$9,998	\$1,734	\$1,051	\$3,057
N. Rockfish	\$3,262	\$1,601	\$48	\$48	\$48
Urchin	—	—	—	—	—
Dungeness Crab	\$2,299,793	\$1,185,416	\$47,871	\$40,295	\$53,382
Salmon	\$1,532,405	\$818,633	\$33,512	\$26,545	\$36,635
All Fisheries	\$4,110,888	\$2,122,436	\$84,149	\$68,786	\$123,439

Fishery	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (% reduction in Profit)		
	1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	0.3%	0.4%	40.3%
Coastal Pelagics	1.0%	0.6%	0.9%
Squid	1.1%	0.9%	28.0%
D. N. Rockfish	17.3%	10.5%	30.6%
N. Rockfish	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Urchin	—	—	—
Dungeness Crab	4.0%	3.4%	4.5%
Salmon	4.1%	3.2%	4.5%
All Fisheries	4.0%	3.2%	5.8%

Table A.6: Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact (NEI) for the NCCSR²

Fishery	Baseline GER	Baseline NER (Profit)	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (\$ reduction in Profit)		
			1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	\$279,764	\$151,220	\$4,744	\$5,750	\$13,224
Coastal Pelagics	\$29,804	\$11,926	\$69	\$45	\$68
Squid	\$303,466	\$121,386	\$865	\$736	\$22,876
D. N. Rockfish	\$107,902	\$52,967	\$15,638	\$11,296	\$18,796
N. Rockfish	\$152,597	\$74,907	\$21,510	\$11,310	\$26,703
Urchin	\$867,381	\$523,320	\$68,950	\$62,109	\$136,040
Dungeness Crab	\$8,387,032	\$4,323,049	\$218,139	\$193,783	\$331,896
Salmon	\$5,761,401	\$3,077,826	\$135,242	\$111,798	\$146,497
All Fisheries	\$15,889,359	\$8,336,602	\$465,157	\$396,826	\$696,099

Fishery	Estimated Annual Net Economic Impact of MPA Proposals (% reduction in Profit)		
	1-3	2-XA	4
Ca. Halibut	3.1%	3.8%	8.7%
Coastal Pelagics	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%
Squid	0.7%	0.6%	18.8%
D. N. Rockfish	29.5%	21.3%	35.5%
N. Rockfish	28.7%	15.1%	35.6%
Urchin	13.2%	11.9%	26.0%
Dungeness Crab	5.0%	4.5%	7.7%
Salmon	4.4%	3.6%	4.8%
All Fisheries	5.6%	4.8%	8.3%

² It should be noted that the "all fisheries" estimates for annual net economic impact for the NCCSR do not equal the sum of all port's "all fisheries" estimates due to rounding differences.