Wow, what a loaded question on the online-form. You take all the suspense out of wondering what kinds of answers you will get to this question. Rest assured your built in assumptions in the question will get the result you lacked last time. The question is so unfair you are guaranteed this time you will not have that pesky 50% of the vote against limits reductions.

I asked a retired State District Judge who doesn’t fish to look at the question and his remarks were telling. He would sustain a leading and assumes facts objection. His first remark was the question assumes as fact there is a downward trend in the other coasts. He also noted the statement claims or assumes as a fact that the LLM model fixed the same issue in the LLM. Of course with the assumption that there is a problem and with the assumption that a known fix is available what kind of answer do you expect to get? Just pass the thing and quit going through the motions.

*The regulations within the LLM were instituted to stop and reverse the downward trend in overall abundance and spawning biomass in the region, and to ensure that fish reach larger size classes. The fishery in the LLM has benefited from these regulations. As these regulations have proven beneficial in the LLM, the department is considering expanding these regulations, or a variation thereof, to other areas along the coast.*

Last go it was the Middle coast but that healed nicely as predicted. Help me with this downward trend we are trying to fix. Is it found anywhere in Robins status summary below?