

From: Sv Indefatigable <sv.indefatigable@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 5:30 PM
To: Senate Finance Committee <Finance.Committee@akleg.gov
Subject: Lisa Radke's comment on SB 92 / HB 386

I am opposed to SB 92. I would like to second the views of Andy Deering regarding his concerns about SB 92.

In addition, I would like to add a few of my own. I read with interest the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document on SB 92. (<http://www.akleg.gov/basis/Bill/Detail/30?Root=sb%2092> and http://www.akleg.gov/basis/get_documents.asp?session=30&docid=42090)

1. One of the statements made several times in slightly different ways in the FAQ state that "it is only - prudent - that the State join the 26 other states around the country (including Washington) in requiring federally documented vessels to also register with the state." (My emphasis on "prudent.")

I would remind the legislature that you represent the State of Alaska, not any "other state around the country (including Washington)." I resent the author(s) of this FAQ - Rachel Lord with the AK Association of Harbormasters and Port Administrators - using this tactic to pressure me and my representatives.

I live in Alaska because I do not want to live under the laws of "other" states - though they may be more "prudent."

2. Cost of registration is stated as "no charge to the system of boat registration except a fee increase of \$6 every three years." What? This must be a typo. Please check the "unlimited" aspect of this fee increase.
3. A title program is "rolled out"...cost not stated but seems to be in addition to the registration cost. Penalty for not having the title is the same as no registration (\$50).

I would remind you that more legislation mandating penalties come at the cost of enforcement. I would bet that the average person on Prince of Wales is poorer than the average person living in Juneau.

Additional state registration costs, title costs, and possible fines, may have more impact on locals here than in Juneau or other urban areas.

AND legislation that increases conflicts between law enforcement and individuals should be looked at very closely for the possible consequences of physical and fiscal anguish felt by someone who is "stopped" for a violation.

Your laws have consequences.

4. I'm sure the harbormaster association and port administrators would like to have nice and tidy state fees and laws to "help" their enterprise funds, but why haven't they used all these years of easy oil money and moorage rates to set aside funds for derelict boats.

To quote the FAQ - this seems to me to be "irresponsible at best."

Thanks.
Lisa Radke, Craig, AK