

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE TRANSPORTATION STANDING COMMITTEE**

April 5, 2001

1:10 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Vic Kohring, Chair  
Representative Beverly Masek, Vice Chair  
Representative Drew Scalzi  
Representative Peggy Wilson  
Representative Albert Kookesh

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Scott Ogan  
Representative Mary Kapsner

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

COMMITTEE WORK SESSION ON CRUISE SHIP DISCHARGES

**PREVIOUS ACTION**

No previous action to record

**WITNESS REGISTER**

MIKE KRIEBER, Staff  
to Representative Kohring  
Alaska State Legislature  
Capitol Building, Room 24  
Juneau, Alaska 99801

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented an overview of the issue of  
cruise ship discharges.

MICHAEL CONWAY, Director  
Division of Statewide Public Service  
Department of Environmental Conservation;  
Coordinator, Alaska Cruise Ship Initiative  
410 Willoughby Suite 105  
Juneau, Alaska 99801-1795  
POSITION STATEMENT:

COMMANDER BOYCE BINGHAM  
U.S. Coast Guard - Juneau

POSITION STATEMENT: Discussed the U.S. Coast Guard's role with cruise ship discharges.

STEVE TOROK  
Environmental Protection Agency  
410 Willoughby Avenue, Suite 100  
Juneau, Alaska 99801  
POSITION STATEMENT:

**ACTION NARRATIVE**

TAPE 01-26, SIDE A  
Number 0001

CHAIR VIC KOHRING called the House Transportation Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Representatives Kohring, Masek, Scalzi, and Kookesh were present at the call to order. Representative Wilson arrived as the meeting was in progress. Representative Kerttula was also in attendance.

COMMITTEE WORK SESSION ON CRUISE SHIP DISCHARGES

CHAIR KOHRING announced that the committee would discuss the issue of the cruise ship discharges. He explained that this hearing would provide information to committee members prior to the hearing of Representative Kerttula's legislation. [This meeting] will cover the history and the status of the cruise ship industry as well as the government's efforts with regard to discharges and pollutants in Alaskan waters. The other purpose of this work session is to become familiar with U.S. Senator Murkowski's recently passed legislation that addresses cruise ship discharges.

Number 0234

MIKE KRIEBER, Staff to Representative Kohring, Alaska State Legislature, informed the committee that Representative Kerttula's bill is HB 22, the governor's bill is HB 183 and its companion bill is HB 134. Also Senator Halford's bill, SB 18, addresses many of these concerns. However, he echoed Chair Kohring's statement that this meeting will not discuss any of the pending state legislation. On the other hand, Mr. Kriebler announced that he would discuss the committee packet that includes some history and current reports regarding this issue.

MR. KRIEBER began by informing the committee that in December 1999, the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) convened a forum that addressed the concerns with the cruise ship industry. There was particular concern with regard to wastewater discharges as well as smoke. [There was also concern/discussion] regarding "doughnut holes," which are areas in which cruise ships could legally discharge untreated waste into the water without having to meet any treatment criteria because of the area's distance from Alaskan waters.

Number 0437

MR. KRIEBER directed the committee's attention to A-1 in the committee packet, which lists 34 questions and issues that were discussed at the December 1999 forum sponsored by DEC. The categories of those items were as follows: air emissions, wastewater discharges, solid and hazardous waste management disposal, and oil spill preparedness. The result of that forum was the formation of the following four work groups: Air Quality Management, Oil Pollution Response, Wastewater and Solid Waste, and Environmental Leadership. Mr. Kriebler pointed out that the committee packet includes the websites for those particular groups, which can be found in A-1 through A-5. There is further detail at the DEC website and thus he recommended that the committee review that information.

MR. KRIEBER identified the following specific mandates of the work groups: to identify the waste streams and spill risks that could impact Alaska's air and water resources; to develop pollution prevention and waste management solutions that would eliminate or reduce impacts, including better technology, management practices, and shoreside capacity; to access what process is needed to verify and monitor compliance; and to keep Alaskans informed.

Number 0564

MR. KRIEBER informed the committee that in May 2000 the Cruise Ship Initiative produced their Part 1 report. That report [recommended] the development of a plan for random third party wastewater sampling of all cruise ships, the development of a plan for air monitoring in downtown Juneau, the survey of the waste stream discharges and solid waste handling practices for all cruise ships, the identification of proposals and pilot projects from the cruise ship industry for a number of these new technologies, and approved maintenance and operation plans for the oil spill response activities. He recalled that the first

bill heard in the House Transportation Standing Committee was the Oil Spill Prevention & Response legislation, HB 55, that has already been signed into law. Therefore, that work group will not be discussed today.

MR. KRIEBER turned to the Air Quality Work Group, which oversaw the air monitoring program that was conducted last year in downtown Juneau. Three locations were selected. The dock area monitoring was actually below what would have received the smoke stack discharges. He referred to the dock area sampling as a "background sample" [that includes] the combustion of the vehicles in town, heating systems, et cetera. Another monitoring area was by the Baranof Hotel, which is located uphill and thus would catch some of the smoke stack plume. The Capital School area was also monitored. All three sites were tested for very fine particulates, 2.5 micron size pieces of stuff in the air. That is a potential health concern when it enters the lungs. There was also testing for sulfur dioxide and oxide to nitrogen that are by-products of combustion. The highest recorded levels from any of these monitoring efforts were significantly below any of the health standards established by federal and state agencies. The Air Quality group recommended continued monitoring during the 2001 cruise ship season in order to ensure that there weren't any abnormal situations that would have prohibited detection. For instance, the sampling was performed during the wet part of the season. Therefore, the Air Quality Work Group wanted to obtain some sampling during the early part of the summer when there isn't as much moisture in the air, which reduces the count of particulates and other potential contaminants.

MR. KRIEBER continued with the second concern with air quality, which is the smoke or rather, opacity. Opacity is the "blackness" of the smoke. He explained that a good engine burning good fuel will have cleaner smoke whereas black smoke would be produced by an engine that is burning lesser quality fuel or the improper fuel for that engine. The department had a long-term program to measure opacity, but that program was dropped in 1997 due to budget constraints. However, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) started and DEC participated in [taking] opacity readings a couple of years ago. Approximately 50 percent of the readings taken were in violation of standards and both the federal and state governments issued citations.

Number 0821

MR. KRIEBER explained that the cruise ship industry has responded to these problems with new technologies and alternative ways of generating power while in port. For instance, Princess Cruise expects to be able to use shoreside power instead of running the main engines when docked in [Juneau]. The Royal Caribbean and Celebrity Cruise Lines will each have a gas turbine cruise ship coming to Alaska. Gas engines burn fuel with less visible emissions. Also Carnival Cruise Lines will have a cruise ship that will use electronically controlled fuel injection. Furthermore, numerous retrofits are being made on direct steam injection and lube oil consumption monitoring both of which have been shown to reduce emissions up to 40 percent. Mr. Kriebler clarified that he was reading from a DEC draft report, the Alaska Cruise Ship Initiative Part 2 report, that will be finalized and presented tomorrow.

Number 0889

MICHAEL CONWAY, Director, Division of Statewide Public Service Department of Environmental Conservation; Coordinator, Alaska Cruise Ship Initiative explained that tomorrow comments will be taken and he imagined those would be available in a couple of weeks. In response to Mr. Kriebler, Mr. Conway affirmed that the draft report is on the website now. The draft report won't be changed until all the comments are received, after which the finalized version will be available on the website.

MR. KRIEBER continued with the Wastewater and Solid Waste Management Work Group that is found on page A-4 in the committee packet. The primary concern for that group is in regard to wastewater because there haven't been too many concerns raised by communities regarding the improper disposal of solid waste. Therefore, Mr. Kriebler turned to wastewater. He explained that ballast water is discharged when a vessel takes on fuel; that is done stateside [and thus] there are no indications of any discharges of ballast water here in Alaska to be concerned about. Therefore, the wastewater being focused on is sewage. There are two types of [sewage]: graywater and blackwater. He explained that blackwater primarily comes from toilet waste while graywater comes from sink water, laundry, and miscellaneous uses of water. Many people don't realize that graywater can be quite polluted. However, DEC regulations define graywater and blackwater as the same because both carry fecal coliform bacteria as well as other pollutants. Graywater includes other types of pollutants that make treatment a bit more difficult than treatment for direct blackwater.

MR. KRIEBER pointed out that since the 1970s there have been some minimum treatment levels of blackwater for marine sanitation devices. However, last year the monitoring program highlighted that the marine sanitation devices aren't "up to snuff." Furthermore, it was discovered that the graywater had high levels of contamination. Therefore, these issues need to be addressed. Mr. Kriebler informed the committee that the cruise ship industry has come forward with new treatment systems and innovative technologies that appear to be promising. The industry has done some testing on some initial systems that have reported very low levels of bacterial discharge. These [systems] are using chlorination techniques and ultraviolet disinfection as well as some filtration technology.

MR. KRIEBER informed the committee that the wastewater streams were also tested for toxic hazardous compounds. The Phase 2 report contains a fairly comprehensive table of various compounds for which they tested. For the most part, there were no signs of hazardous waste being mixed with the wastewater streams. However, he emphasized that he wasn't saying that there aren't chemicals in the wastewater streams that need to be addressed. He pointed out that some of the testing protocol that has been recommended for the next year will attempt to identify [the chemicals in the wastewater streams] through the analytical process. He cited dissolved metals versus total metals as an example and explained that dissolved metals are viewed as being more easily taken in by an organism. However, total metals aren't viewed as a carcinogen or toxic material.

Number 1129

MR. KRIEBER also informed the committee that all 21 large cruise ships were sampled for these priority pollutants for hazardous waste. He reiterated that the primary concern of the wastewater discharges is related to what is typically thought of as contaminants from blackwater, although graywater includes those contaminants as well. These contaminants are things such as fecal coliform, total suspended solids, and biochemical oxygen demand. He explained that biochemical oxygen demand is the discharge of an organic substance that will take oxygen from the water, which is of high concern when dealing with very sensitive environments. He identified other contaminants such as ammonia, pH, and chlorine. He reiterated that there are no indications of any hazardous substances being mixed with the wastewater stream. However, the report does discuss a couple of the sample results that were reported as hazardous chemicals, but those

were determined to be lab cross-contamination. Mr. Kriebler turned to federal regulations and pointed out that only blackwater discharge is regulated, that is in regard to discharge limits. If graywater is mixed with the blackwater, then it is viewed as blackwater and thus subject to the same regulatory requirements.

Number 1224

MR. KRIEBER continued by informing the committee that last year the cruise lines volunteered to eliminate their in-port discharges and to discharge at a distance of at least 10 miles from the port of call or departure. He reiterated that graywater is of concern because it contains chemicals that are detrimental to the environment. Therefore, the cruise lines and proposed legislation are addressing graywater. He also reiterated that the cruise line industry is looking at some new technologies and the industry has done some initial installation and testing with some of this technology. That information is detailed in the Phase 2 report.

Number 1330

MR. KRIEBER turned to the Environmental Leadership Work Group, which is looking for innovative ways to prevent pollution. He likened this work group to the Green Star program, which performs the aforementioned as well as outreach to the communities, individuals, and businesses outside their group in an attempt to avoid the use of hazardous materials. The information on that is contained on page A-5 of the committee packet. He pointed out that the information on page A-5 illustrates the spectrum of the groups involved with this work group.

Number 1390

MR. KRIEBER then addressed the federal legislation, B in the committee packet, that was passed and signed by former President Clinton in December 2000. He said that the U.S. Coast Guard and the EPA will address what they see as their respective roles in promulgating regulations and enforcing these federal codes. He pointed out that the committee packet, C-1 through C-3, includes some EPA documents regarding what they are doing locally and nationally. There is a summary of a September 2000 workshop here in Juneau.

Number 1462

COMMANDER BOYCE BINGHAM, U.S. Coast Guard - Juneau, began by saying that much has been accomplished in the partnership between the state and federal governments as well as the cruise ship industry and the community. He said, "I think it's safe to say that the water of Alaska will be less impacted in 2001 by the cruise industry than they were before, much because of the joint efforts." Commander Bingham turned to the federal legislation and noted that the legislation directs several issues at the U.S. Coast Guard while others are directed to the EPA. For the portion concerning the U.S. Coast Guard, the U.S. Coast Guard has drafted regulations and is awaiting signatures in the Department of Transportation. He specified that [these regulations] are in the form of a notice of proposed rule-making. Initially, there was review of an interim rule that would have allowed the regulations to go into effect immediately. However, there were some concerns at the department level regarding the fact that this was not urgent enough in nature to bypass the public comment process. Therefore, when the notice of proposal comes out, there will be a 30-day comment period after which the comments will be addressed. Once those comments are satisfactorily addressed, a final rule will be issued. Commander Bingham informed the committee that he anticipates that those regulations will be in place at some point during this cruise season.

COMMANDER BINGHAM informed the committee that he had been in contact with the cruise ship industry, which has said that it will continue with its efforts in the voluntary sampling and testing program that was in place last year. Therefore, the U.S. Coast Guard will continue to oversee that process. The [federal legislation] also contains several portions that are self-executing. He identified those self-executing portions as follows: Section 1403, which prohibits the discharge of untreated sewage into Alaskan waters; Section 1404(a), Section 1404 (c) and Section 1407, which describes the standards that have to be met.

COMMANDER BINGHAM, in response to Representative Scalzi, reiterated that the standards are included in Section 1407 of U.S. Senator Murkowski's legislation. Commander Bingham confirmed that the standard is a fecal coliform bacterial count of less than 200 [colonies] per 100 milliliters or suspended solids less than 150 milligrams per liter. The other self-executing portion would allow a vessel proceeding at more than six knots from a location more than a mile from the shore to discharge treated sewage.

Number 1698

REPRESENTATIVE SCALZI turned to the purpose of the federal legislation and remarked that the language isn't very specific in that it only refers to the navigable waters of the United States [within the State of Alaska] except for the specific references to Alexander Archipelago and the Kachemak Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve. Representative Scalzi asked, "Is there other areas of the country that the Senator did not want to include at this time?"

COMMANDER BINGHAM answered that he didn't know what the intention was at the federal level. However, this [language] covers all of Alaska's waters, which is out three miles, and basically closes the doughnut holes of the Inside Passage. Commander Bingham pointed out that in Alaska when a cruise ship enters Alaska's waters, it does so for several days at a time whereas the cruise ships in the Lower 48 merely disembark and embark passengers and return to international waters. Therefore, the time a cruise ship remains in a body of water in Alaska is different [than the time it spends in the Lower 48].

Number 1775

CHAIR KOHRING asked if Commander Bingham had any information in regard to the number and size of the cruise ship vessels that have been experienced in Alaska. He inquired as to the growth of the cruise ship industry over the last decade.

COMMANDER BINGHAM deferred to the cruise ship industry, although he recalled that this season 23 vessels intend to call on Alaska. In further response to Chair Kohring, Commander Bingham said that the U.S. Coast Guard is encouraged by the new wastewater systems that the cruise ship industry is reviewing. He said that he has the impression that the cruise ship industry is fully committed to reviewing all available technologies in order to find a technology that would process sewage and fit on the vessel itself. The [cruise ship industry] is making progress and he estimated that it would only be a few years before this goal is achieved.

Number 1861

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked if the U.S. Coast Guard will actively stop vessels and check these [discharges] once the [regulations] are in place.

COMMANDER BINGHAM explained that the draft regulations provide for the following: testing within 30 days of the vessel's arrival in Alaska's waters; testing of the blackwater; random testing of the graywater for priority pollutants; and ongoing testing throughout the season.

REPRESENTATIVE SCALZI asked if the federal legislation addresses any air quality standards.

COMMANDER BINGHAM answered that air quality isn't addressed by U.S. Senator Murkowski's legislation.

Number 1932

CHAIR KOHRING inquired as to Commander Bingham's opinion of the draft regulations.

COMMANDER BINGHAM explained that U.S. Senator Murkowski's legislation provides direction for the U.S. Coast Guard in regard to the areas to focus on in creating regulations to implement the will of the Congress and ultimately, the will of the people. Commander Bingham, a co-writer of the regulations, felt that the regulations are comprehensive and were written with foresight in regard to allowing new technology while addressing the concerns of the Congress.

Number 1984

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH remarked that most federal standards that he has seen aren't the strictest but rather are minimal standards. Therefore, he asked if the U.S. Coast Guard would review the state's standards, especially if those are stricter than the federal standards.

COMMANDER BINGHAM agreed that [the state's standards] would be reviewed. He also noted that U.S. Senator Murkowski's legislation contains a stricter standard with regard to fecal coliform counts than that contained in the EPA standards.

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH emphasized that he was speaking in general that the federal standards are minimal. Therefore, he didn't want to give the impression that the federal regulation should be accepted as the regulation to live by. He pointed out that he lives in a village where the cruise ships pass and thus the villages aren't impacted by their dollar. Therefore, his

concern is in making standards that are sufficient so as to not impact "us as a people."

COMMANDER BINGHAM said that he, as a fellow Alaskan, shared that concern. He noted that it would be helpful to have some analysis regarding the impact of 200 fecal coliform on 150 total suspended solids (TSS) on the water.

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH said that is his point exactly because no matter where the standards are set, they may not be good enough. Therefore, he wanted to ensure that there is room to change the standards later, if necessary.

COMMANDER BINGHAM pointed out that the standards in U.S. Senator Murkowski's legislation are interim standards that allow for the EPA to review that and possibly develop different standards.

Number 2137

STEVE TOROK, Environmental Protection Agency, began by providing the committee with an overview of the EPA's activities related to the cruise ship issues. He informed the committee that the EPA has been involved with the Department of Justice in various investigations over the past several years. In March 2000 the EPA received a petition from the Blue Water Network that was co-signed by 53 other environmental organizations across the country. The petition requested that the EPA conduct an assessment and investigation of the cruise ship industry and the discharges and pollution coming from the cruise ships. The EPA agreed to do such an assessment. Prior to that, the EPA joined the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation and the U.S. Coast Guard in participating in the Alaska Clean Water Initiative. He remarked that the EPA views the assessment and the initiative as complimentary activities not duplicative.

MR. TOROK said that work has continued with regard to collecting information and the EPA has relied heavily on the Alaska Cruise Ship Initiative, which has been very valuable. Originally, the EPA intended to have a draft report available in the late Fall, but that has been delayed. However, he anticipated that the draft report will receive public notice in a few weeks. Mr. Torok returned to the petition, which specifically requested the identification of various wastewater streams, the assessment of the impacts of those streams and the quantity and quality of those discharges as well as the treatment technologies that are currently being used. The EPA has attempted to do that. He pointed out that [the EPA] has much more knowledge now than it

did two years ago thanks to the Clean Water Initiative. However, he acknowledged that "we" don't know enough because there is still much information to be gathered, specifically ship by ship in regard to the quantities of discharges from each ship, the quality of the discharges from each ship, and the [routes] of the various wastewater streams within the ship.

Number 2279

MR. TOROK commended the participation of the cruise ship industry as well as their efforts in relation to advancing technology. He noted [the EPA's] support of the industry's goal of having no pollutant discharge. He acknowledged that these ships are getting larger. In response to the earlier question regarding the growth of the industry, Mr. Torok estimated that there has been an increase from about 350,000 in crew and passengers in 1990 to about 1 million in crew and passengers last year. He said, "A million people on these ships for about ... five to seven days generating the waste. So, it is an issue that deserves attention." He pointed out that U.S. Senator Murkowski's legislation does authorize EPA to work with the U.S. Coast Guard in the implementation of Title 14, specifically the legislation authorizes the EPA to establish affluent standards for both blackwater and graywater. The legislation also reinforces the EPA's authority to grant no discharge zones as requested by the governor. Therefore, there are provisions under the Clean Water Act and under Title 14 that provide a mechanism for the governor and the state to declare areas no discharge zones.

MR. TOROK announced that the EPA's draft assessment on cruise ship discharges will address the EPA's recommended intentions with regard to Title 14. Specifically, [the draft] will address whether the EPA will or will not pursue affluent standards. The draft will also lay out a series of recommendations for public review and comment with regard to other actions that can be taken by the EPA with regard to enforcement and redefinitions of blackwater under the current Clean Water Act. To this stage, it has been accepted that cruise ship discharges are exempt from the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program. Within the petition of the Blue Water Network, there was the request to reevaluate that exemption and consider bringing cruise ship discharges under NPDES for permitting purposes. He explained that the advantage of a permit system is that it requires the discharger to monitor and thus sample the discharges regularly and to report those sample results.

Therefore, "we" begin to learn what is discharged and how much is being discharged. Currently, that is unknown.

Number 2435

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON inquired as to why the cruise ships were exempt from the NPDES permit program.

MR. TOROK explained that this goes back to the early 1970s. He noted that he could speak to what the EPA was thinking at that time because he was with the EPA. In the early 1970s the NPDES permit program was just beginning. There were a number of ...

TAPE 01-26, SIDE B

MR. TOROK said, "... that had a wastewater discharge and [had] previously been unregulated from a permitting perspective." Through the Clean Water Act in the early 1970s, the EPA was given the authority to establish a permit system. [The EPA] recognized that it could not require and establish permit parameters and write permits for every discharger in the country. Therefore, a "pecking order" was established and the worst polluters were addressed first. At that time, discharges from ships weren't considered to be a large threat and thus they were placed lower on the list. In order to relieve the EPA of its legal and regulatory burden of having those ships operate without a permit, those ships were exempted from the NPDES permit program.

Number 2415

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON inquired as to the increase Alaska has experienced with the cruise ship industry since that time.

MR. TOROK replied, "Tremendous." The cruise ship industry of today is much different than the industry that existed in the 1970s.

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH asked if the EPA works with the State of Alaska in regulating other industries in Alaska such as the mining, timber, or fishing industry.

MR. TOROK replied, "Yes." He explained that NPDES permitting system hasn't been delegated to the State of Alaska and thus the EPA retains the authority to issue permits to those large industries. The State of Alaska is required to certify those permits. The EPA relies on the state to ensure that the permit

that is being written for that facility will meet state water quality standards. In further response to Representative Kookesh, Mr. Torok agreed that there are state statutes in the aforementioned three industries with which the EPA already works.

Number 2354

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH identified the cruise ship industry as a new industry for which there are no regulatory statutes. Therefore, he surmised that it would be "natural" for the [state] to be considering cruise ship laws in Alaska Statutes, statutes similar to those used for timber, mining, and fishing industries.

CHAIR KOHRING inquired as to Mr. Torok's opinion regarding whether the cruise ship industry's efforts are moving in the correct direction.

MR. TOROK answered that he believes that the cruise ship industry has given every indication that it is moving in the correct direction and exploring newer technologies. He reiterated the cruise ship industry's stated goal of "no pollutant discharge" and having the ability to recycle water onboard and reuse that water. Mr. Torok commented that the cruise ship industry is in the best position to do this because they have 100 percent control over what happens on the ship. On the other hand, a local sewage treatment plant doesn't have that advantage because that plant has to deal with whatever the public has put down the drain; it is much more complicated to deal with [pollutants at the end point rather than the insertion point].

Number 2274

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH related his belief that this work shouldn't be viewed as the standard but rather the work with the industry should be ongoing and has to be within the parameters that Alaskans feel comfortable. While Representative Kookesh noted his appreciation of the cruise ship industry's work and innovation, he reemphasized his belief that it is not the standard.

MR. TOROK informed the committee that the Blue Water Network modified its petition to the EPA in June to include air quality emissions. He also informed the committee of the EPA's fairly extensive public participation program and consultation with the

tribes, which the EPA will continue to do as the draft report is released.

MR. KRIEBER summarized that today's discussion has highlighted some concerns raised regarding the discharges from the cruise ships. The committee has also heard that the cruise ship industry is addressing some new technologies. Furthermore, there is pending federal legislation. Mr. Kriebler indicated a commitment to hear Representative Kerttula's bill, HB 22, on April 19 as well as hearing the governor's bill the following week. Mr. Kriebler reminded everyone that DEC's website houses a lot of information. He then requested that Mr. Conway inform the committee of the Cruise Ship Initiative Steering Committee's agenda for tomorrow.

Number 2150

MR. CONWAY affirmed that tomorrow is the Spring meeting of the Alaska Cruise Ship Initiative Steering Committee. He noted that Michele Brown, Commissioner, DEC; Admiral Barrett; the President of the North West Cruise Ship Association; Acting Regional Administrator of the EPA; Lauren Gerhard, Executive Director, Southeast Conference will be in attendance. This group has been working since last summer in order to compile the information of the results obtained through the Cruise Ship Initiative work, which will be the first item of business. The Phase 2 report is on the web and thus it is the opportunity for the steering committee to review it, provide feedback, and wrap up the 2000 season.

MR. CONWAY informed the committee that the volunteer efforts to review the results of last summer have [recommended] work that needs to be performed for the following cruise ship season. Mr. Rogers, DEC, has spearheaded the efforts on air and water quality. There is a plan to do work this summer in order to follow-up on issues that were identified last season. This is a comprehensive group of individuals, who will present an overview of their plan for this coming season. The U.S. Coast Guard will present its plan for implementing the federal legislation for this summer. The final item on the agenda is to discuss the pending cruise ship legislation.

MR. CONWAY emphasized that the steering committee is a high-level group that can provide checks and balances and provide direction to the work group efforts. The meeting is scheduled from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in the DEC conference room. He noted that the meeting will be teleconferenced.

Number 1993

REPRESENTATIVE KOOKESH commented that he wasn't too enthusiastic about this work session; however, now he appreciates it. He noted his appreciation of the committee scheduling Representative Kerttula's bill and the governor's bill because he would rather have the Alaska State Legislature determine where the cruise ship industry is going in Alaska. Representative Kookesh thanked the representatives from the EPA and the U.S. Coast Guard.

CHAIR KOHRING noted his appreciation for all those in attendance. He said, "We are not here to 'beat up' on the cruise ship industry. I want to recognize there are good things that you bring to the state of Alaska. You really bolster our economy wonderfully." He noted the need to be cognizant of the cruise ship industry's concerns with the pending legislation.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Transportation Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:09 p.m.