

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES**

May 4, 2007
8:41 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Paul Seaton, Chair
Representative Kyle Johansen
Representative Craig Johnson
Representative Gabrielle LeDoux
Representative Peggy Wilson
Representative Bryce Edgmon
Representative Lindsey Holmes

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

HOUSE BILL NO. 16

"An Act providing for an effective date by delaying the effective date of repeal of the authority of the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission to maintain the vessel-based commercial fisheries limited entry systems for the Bering Sea Korean hair crab and weathervane scallop fisheries, and the effective date of conforming amendments related to the repeal of those systems."

- HEARD AND HELD

SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 188

"An Act relating to the authority of the Board of Fisheries to allocate within fisheries; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD AND HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 16

SHORT TITLE: EXTEND LIMITED ENTRY SUNSET: CRAB/SCALLOP

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) SEATON

01/16/07	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/5/07
01/16/07	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/16/07	(H)	FSH, RES

04/04/07 (H) FSH AT 8:30 AM BARNES 124
04/04/07 (H) Heard & Held
04/04/07 (H) MINUTE(FSH)
05/04/07 (H) FSH AT 8:30 AM BARNES 124

BILL: HB 188

SHORT TITLE: BOARD OF FISHERIES' AUTHORITY

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) WILSON

03/12/07 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/12/07 (H) FSH, RES, JUD
04/27/07 (H) SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE INTRODUCED
04/27/07 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
04/27/07 (H) FSH, RES, JUD
05/02/07 (H) FSH AT 8:30 AM BARNES 124
05/02/07 (H) Heard & Held
05/02/07 (H) MINUTE(FSH)
05/04/07 (H) FSH AT 8:30 AM BARNES 124

WITNESS REGISTER

JOHN HILSINGER, Director
Division of Commercial Fisheries
Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G)
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 16, on behalf of
Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

ALAN AUSTERMAN
North Pacific Scallop Coop
Juneau, Alaska
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified on HB 16.

TERESSA KANDIANIS, President
North Pacific Scallop Cooperative (NPSC),
Bellingham, Washington
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 16.

SCOTT MCALLISTER, Member
Sitka Sac Roe Group
Southeast Seiners
Marketing Chair, United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA)
Juneau, Alaska
POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 16, on behalf of
the Sitka Sac Roe Group.

BOB THORSTENSON, President

United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA)
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in neutrality to HB 16, on behalf of the United Fishermen of Alaska.

SHAWN DOCHTERMAN, Vice President
Alaska Jig Association
Kodiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 16.

JULIE KAVANAUGH
Kodiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 16.

ALEXUS KWACHKA
Kodiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 16.

MAX HULSE
Eagle River, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of HB 16.

TOM GILMARTIN
Kenai, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in opposition to HB 16.

ACTION NARRATIVE

CHAIR PAUL SEATON called the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting to order at [8:41:54 AM](#). Representatives LeDoux, Johnson, Johansen, and Edgmon were present at the call to order. Representatives Wilson and Holmes arrived as the meeting was in progress.

HB 16-EXTEND LIMITED ENTRY SUNSET: CRAB/SCALLOP

[8:42:12 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 16, "An Act providing for an effective date by delaying the effective date of repeal of the authority of the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission to maintain the vessel-based commercial fisheries limited entry systems for the Bering Sea Korean hair crab and weathervane scallop fisheries, and the effective date of conforming amendments related to the repeal of those systems."

8:43:23 AM

CHAIR SEATON opened public testimony.

8:43:31 AM

JOHN HILSINGER, Director, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G), stated the department's official support for HB 16, paraphrasing from a prepared statement, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

ADF&G supported the vessel based limited entry system for scallops and Korean hair crab when it was adopted in 2004 because it provided conservation benefits, both for scallops and for crabs, that were not provided by an individual based limited entry system (9 scallop boats versus at least 27; 18 hair crab boats versus 47).

Scallops

At the current time there are 9 scallop vessels licensed in both state and federal waters. Four of those boats actually fish. (Six of the boats have formed a voluntary co-operative and three of those six boats fish).

Scallops are long lived slow growing animals that are not non-migratory as adults. Once the location of a scallop bed is identified, the same bed is fished year after year. Occasionally, new beds are discovered. Population estimates exist for only 2 of the 9 registration areas. Therefore, management must be precautionary and harvest rates must be kept very low to prevent over fishing. Harvests are kept well below estimated MSY levels.

King and tanner crabs are intermixed with scallops and some scallop beds are closed to protect depressed crab populations. Areas open to scallop fishing have crab bycatch limits because mortality of crabs caught in scallop dredges is high.

Guideline harvest ranges for the scallops are developed from observer data, catch per unit effort, and catch sampling. Observers also monitor crab

bycatch and fisheries may be closed if crab bycatch limits are met. Because of the limited number of boats fishing and the bycatch data collected, the vessels have been able to reduce crab bycatch and avoid premature closures.

Recent average scallop harvests for the state are somewhat less than 500,000 pounds of meat per year. Approximately 30%, or about 145,000 pounds, are estimated to come from state waters. These harvests are lower than they were in the late 1990s because the department is lowering guideline harvest ranges in order to sustain the stocks.

The vessel based limited entry program works together with the guideline harvest ranges, observer data, other sampling, closed areas, seasons, and gear limitations to provide a sustainable management program for scallops. It is not clear what will happen if one of those tools is removed, or what exactly could replace it without affecting the viability of the fishery.

If HB 16 does not pass, at best the department will need to seek regulatory changes through the Board of Fisheries. However, if there is a large influx of vessels it is possible some state water areas will not open.

A significant difficulty in implementing this fishery in the absence of the vessel based limited entry system is that the state waters boundary line cuts right cross the middle of many of these scallop beds requiring the state to consider managing a single scallop bed essentially as two separate areas.

In anticipation of HB 16 not passing, the department is considering what additional regulations might be necessary. These may include, but are not limited to, separate guideline harvest ranges for state and federal waters, recording catch separately for state and federal waters, vessel monitoring systems, shorter seasons, and pre-registration.

[8:48:39 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON clarified that a vessel monitoring system (VMS) is not a requirement for the scallop fleet.

MR. HILSINGER said that VMS would be necessary if the vessel limited entry program were not in place. The state opposes requiring VMS, because of the lack of access to the data. The federal government may make the data available in the future, which would change the department's outlook on this technology. The on-board observer is able to provide accurate information, although when they tow across the boundary line, it is difficult to ascertain from which area the scallops were dredged.

CHAIR SEATON queried how the tows are recorded, and the data reported, for tows in state waters.

MR. HILSINGER stated, "That's a good question, ... and I don't know precisely what they record. I assume that they probably record the start/stop location of the tow." Electronic data may not be available, he opined.

CHAIR SEATON asked if it would create a problem, should the state require electronic data be reported for the location of the tows.

MR. HILSINGER agreed that such a requirement could be an option. An alternative, which the department has considered, would be to disallow the dredging of state and federal waters at one time. If this program is not extended, the department will need to develop a complete package of regulations, which may include: separating the guideline harvest ranges, requiring a VMS, limiting the season to a shorter period, and imposing a pre-registration requirement.

CHAIR SEATON established that these are management tools that are currently available in regulation.

[8:53:13 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX inquired why these regulations were not considered prior to this program being implemented; a program that is a departure from the states standard practices.

MR. HILSINGER suggested that the program may have been implemented based on the traditional harvest levels of the beds. The technology has not been available to accurately ascertain the federal and state harvests. The viability of the fishery

may also have been a factor. To a follow-up question, he deferred to the limited entry witness.

[8:55:37 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON pointed out the sunset date of HB 16 as being December 2008, allowing ample time for the department to implement any necessary regulations, should the program not be extended.

[8:56:20 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked how long will it take to put regulations in place, if necessary.

MR. HILSINGER speculated that any necessary changes/actions could be implemented to coincide with the sunset date and the 2009 season. Responding to a committee question, he said that, pending a vote on the bill, the department will begin the process, in order to be prepared.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked whether the department supports a change in how this fishery operates.

MR. HILSINGER reiterated the department's support for extending the program.

[8:59:47 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON inquired if the department would have concern should the entire allocation be harvested by a single vessel, or is that regarded as a policy issue.

MR. HILSINGER responded that it would be a policy decision, which the department would not enter into.

CHAIR SEATON clarified that the number of vessels fishing is not part of the regulatory process that the state would be concerned with, as long as goals were being met.

MR. HILSINGER said that the allocation goals would be the primary concern, and he cautioned that many fishery management strategies evolve depending on how well they are working; predictability is not always possible.

[9:01:31 AM](#)

MR. HILSINGER continued, paraphrasing from a prepared statement, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Bering Sea Korean hair crab

Hair crab fishing in the Bering Sea has been closed since 2001. This stock has declined dramatically since the early 1980s. Since harvest rates in this fishery were always low, it is likely this decline is not related to the fishery.

Hair crab fishing is characterized by vessels fishing a large number of pots and achieving a relatively low catch per pot. Male hair crabs average just less than 1.5 pounds each.

Before the department considers reopening this fishery, the stock size needs to rebound to greater than 50 percent of the long term average biomass with adequate numbers of females and a size distribution of sub-legal and legal males that would ensure recruitment could replace harvest.

The more boats expected to participate in the fishery, the higher the bar would be. One particular concern of having a large fleet in this fishery is that because of the low catch rates, a larger fleet is likely to spread out over a larger area. This increases the likelihood of bycatch, especially blue king crabs, which are currently very depressed.

The smaller fleet under a vessel based limited entry program would increase the possibility of reopening the fishery sooner and it would decrease the likelihood of incidental catches impacting blue king crabs.

For these reasons, the Department continues to support the vessel based limited entry program as an important element in the overall management strategy to provide, or bring back, viable fisheries while also implementing necessary scallop and crab conservation measures.

[9:05:41 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON asked how many vessels left the crab fishery, during the crab buy out and consolidation.

MR. HILSINGER responded that loss of vessels is an issue, but he does not have a count to report. An assessment will be made, when a pending date for an opening is established.

CHAIR SEATON commented on how a vessel license permit could be fished by another fisherman; creating a healthy fleet, and maintaining the value of each permit.

[9:08:07 AM](#)

MR. HILSINGER offered that if the vessel based system goes away then it would become an open system, and any boat could participate. Prices, harvest limits, and other variables would then drive the viability of the fishery.

[9:09:10 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON queried whether the department could not reestablish this as a limited entry fishery; as it was originally announced.

MR. HILSINGER deferred to the limited entry witness. To a further question, he said he is looking forward to reviewing the recommendations contained in the committee packet.

[9:10:30 AM](#)

ALAN AUSTERMAN, North Pacific Scallop Coop, responded to the issues of crossing the state and federal lines, during a pull, stating that it is his understanding that this is tracked by the observers. He encouraged the committee to establish policy guidelines upon which ADF&G could base regulations, and a management plan. The department needs direction on this issue, he stressed. The department cannot set policy, and the BOF will set policy based on legislative action. The industry and managers need the tools provided by the legislature. The sunset date needs to be timed to allow adequate opportunity for the fleet to make adjustments, and adapt to any new system. A significant portion of the fishery occurs in the winter months, following the December 31, 2008, sunset date, and, if this bill is not passed, consideration will need to be given as to how the remainder of that season will be fished.

[9:16:45 AM](#)

TERESSA KANDIANIS, President, North Pacific Scallop Cooperative (NPSC), stated support for HB 16, and paraphrased from a prepared statement, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Correction of the CFEC list of Scallop permits attached to their memorandum of March 28, 2007: The Permit owned by Future Fisheries, Inc. of New Bedford, MA is NOT a member of the North Pacific Scallop Cooperative. The Carolina Boy permit is owned by a Washington corporation.

The NPSC requires members to maintain Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS) on their vessels even though it not required by regulation.

The NPSC requires members to make available all of their electronic fishing data to observers and to ADF&G even though this is not required by regulation. The NPSC has categorically, absolutely NOT offered to buy a vessel and/or a scallop permit.

The North Pacific Fishery Management Council (NPFMC) did a recent and thorough analysis of the viability of various scallop fishing gear configurations. This analysis is available on line at the NPFMC website and is included in the Fisheries Subcommittee back up information.

The 2008 scallop fishing season ends on February 15, 2009. The sunset of the Statewide Weathervane Scallop License program is December 31, 2008. Not extending the program beyond that date creates complexities in management for the 2008 fishing season.

Finally, sustainability and conservation of the scallop resource is the core of the North Pacific Scallop Cooperative. Its purpose and by-laws focus on conservation of the scallop resource and reduction of crab bycatch.

[9:19:55 AM](#)

SCOTT MCALLISTER, Member, Sitka Sac Roe Group, Southeast Seiners, Marketing Chair, United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA), testified that this is the classic conflict between market and

resource, of who may and who may not participate. Alaska is the last state with enough resources to manage for abundance base. A user group has been identified and balanced with the abundance of these resources. The groups he represents are primarily interested in how the stewardship of this resource is being handled, and how the commercial allocations are administered.

CHAIR SEATON asked if he had a position to express regarding the issuance of limited entry permits to individual fishermen vs. investors; individual or corporate vessel owners.

MR. MCALLISTER said, "No, we don't have a problem with that." The regulation occurred at the legislative level. "I think it works just fine the way it is," he finished.

[9:23:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX asked if UFA officially endorses the passage of HB 16.

MR. MCALLISTER clarified that he is not representing UFA on this issue.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX queried that neither he nor those he represents have a concern with individual fishing quotas in Alaskan waters.

MR. MCALLISTER responded that it does not effect the fishery of those he represents. Should it enter those waters, it would become a discussion point in the group. "We don't have a problem with [HB 16] going forward," he said. To a follow-up question he reiterated that he represents the Sitka Sac Roe Group.

[9:24:08 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON affirmed that he is recommending the passage of HB 16.

MR. MCALLISTER replied, "Yes."

[9:24:33 AM](#)

BOB THORSTENSON, President, United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA), provided an official neutral position from the organization. The legislation was fully vetted by UFA, he reported. The

narrow focus and compelling reasons that this legislation was enacted has proven acceptable and deemed necessary.

[9:27:57 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX noted that neutral does not indicate an endorsement.

MR. THORSTENSON said that any of the 36 independent UFA groups could have chosen to oppose this bill, however, none have.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX asked if the UFA had a board meeting where this was discussed to arrive at the neutral position.

MR. THORSTENSON responded, "Yes, both in 2002 and in January of this year."

[9:28:53 AM](#)

MR. THORSTENSON named the 18 hair crab fishery permit holders, and their locations; 33 percent are Alaskan. The hair crab and scallop fishery are probably the two Alaskan large boat fisheries that exist, he opined, and provided a brief summary of the Mr. Big incident. Today the scallops are harvested over a seven to eight month period, the by-catch is minimal, the environment is protected, and the catch product represents the highest quality scallop in the world. Because more fishing time is involved, more shore landings are made, which provides an influx of economic support to the ports of call. Additionally, he said these are programs that have been working. A philosophical argument exists that the permit must go with the person, however, there has not been abuse of this legislation, and he urged passage of HB 16.

[9:32:18 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX referred to the hair crab fishery and asked whether it has been fished.

MR. THORSTENSON affirmed that it has not been fished since 2001.

[9:32:49 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON asked how many limited entry programs have been instituted in Alaska, since this legislation was enacted.

MR. THORSTENSON deferred.

CHAIR SEATON noted that if none have been instituted, then no effect could be observed.

[9:33:22 AM](#)

SHAWN DOCHTERMAN, Vice President, Alaska Jig Association, stated opposition to HB 16. He said that he is not in tune with these fisheries, however the limited number of vessels that participate raises a concern. He pointed out the importance of the limited entry regulations and suggested that issuing the permit to the vessel is a type of rationalization. He stressed the importance of having "the boots on the deck, stay on the boat."

[9:35:14 AM](#)

JULIE KAVANAUGH said she is the owner of six limited entry permits. She stated opposition to HB 16, noting that this legislation serves a small special interest group. The bill could be challenged on a constitutional basis, she opined, but conceded that it has allowed better management of the stocks. Further, she said that using this as a model for other fisheries would be detrimental.

[9:37:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked whether she would fish either one of these fisheries.

MS. KAVANAUGH replied that it would be a possibility.

[9:38:46 AM](#)

ALEXUS KWACHKA stated opposition to HB 16, and cited a concern for corporate ownership of limited entry permits. He said:

Why did we stray so far from the operator to the vessel, and now we see ... consolidation across the state ... and it's going to wipe this community out. ... We've lost five or six businesses in the last year in this community alone. What I see is nine vessels ... consolidated down to three; I want to know what those other six vessels are doing. Are they off generating revenue somewhere else, or are they prosecuting another fishery. ... We have strayed too

far, and we're straying further. Let's get back on course here.

9:41:26 AM

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX noted that he stated how this bill is not bad in itself, but coupled with other things it is bad, and asked him to elaborate.

MR. KWACHKA restated his concern for moving away from CFEC to corporate ownership.

9:42:53 AM

MAX HULSE stated support for HB 16, commenting that he would not be in favor of large corporations owning the permit, or vessel oriented permits. He opined that the permit should be issued to the individual fishermen who actively participate in the fishery. He paraphrased from a prepared statement, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

To open the State scallop fishery to all would greatly impact our income from the scallop fishery. Looking at the total scallop quota for Alaska waters and the small percentage and concentration of scallops in just State waters, compared to Federal waters, makes the profit margin slim as is. Then to add more fishing pressure will surely reduce the profit margin in State waters to near zero.

When Federal Scallop Permits were issued in 1999 by the NMFS our vessel and another vessel, the F/V Kilkenney out of Homer were restricted to the use of one 6 foot dredge in federal waters, which we felt was unfair due to our extensive involvement in the scallop fishery since 1982.

The use of only one 6 foot dredge in Federal waters made it impossible to make a go of it, even though we could use two dredges in State waters. With the high cost of fuel, an onboard observer at \$325.00/day++ you need to be able to fish in both Federal and State waters with two dredges to make a reasonable profit.

In 2003 we took our 6 foot dredge situation back before the Council and they reversed our restriction

allowing us to use two 10 foot dredges in Federal waters starting in 2006.

Of the four vessels now actively involved in the Alaska fishery, the two Alaska based vessels - the F/V Wayward Wind and the F/V Kilkenney are much smaller and more susceptible to bad weather. Thus, during poor weather the two larger vessels would choose to fish longer in Federal waters, which have much denser beds of scallops, letting us fish in calmer State waters.

Also, it is our feeling that permits should not be issued to vessels, but to individual fishermen who have made the investment and actively participate in the fishery.

If the moratorium is not extended: 1. How would quota be divided between State and Federal waters? 2. Would there be a dredge size restriction as to the length of vessel? 3. How would enforcement handle adherence to the 2 mile limit - Federal and State scallop beds are close together. 4. Are moneys available to cover necessary surveys and enforcement?

[9:46:40 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON inquired whether there would be environmental damage to the ocean bottom, if this fishery were opened up.

MR. HULSE responded that he is unsure. However, the four questions, at the end of his prepared statement also need to be addressed, he said.

[9:48:12 AM](#)

TOM GILMARTIN, resident scallop fisherman, stated opposition to HB 16, paraphrasing from a prepared statement, which read as follows:

Because the scallop fishery rules and regulations are designed around a cooperative of mostly latent permits. I believe the time has come for the legislature to step in and open the fishery for the greater good.

WE need a BILL that:

- 1) Amends AAC 75.300 definitions in AS 43.75(4) "processing" does not include decapitating shrimp and gutting, gilling, sliming, or icing a fisheries resource solely for ... maintaining the quality of the fresh resource. And add shucking scallops to this definition.
- 2) [Gives] open access for all of those that hold a small vessel crab permit. This because crab stocks are most affected by scallop activities. This lets the crabbers participate and act as good [stewards] by fishing out of high crab areas. Or they may sell their scallop permit to any other fisherman if they choose.
- 3) Allows only one 12 foot dredge or smaller in state waters.
- 4) Imposes 1,000 Pound trip Limits per calendar day or twice a week on all trips for the small vessel operations. Possession over 1,000 pounds not allowed.
- 5) Imposes 15,000 Pound trip limits on the federally licensed vessels.
- 6) Require Electronic Vessel Monitoring Systems VMS on all scallop vessels including the federally licensed nine.
- 7) Require digital cameras on all scallop vessels decks in place of observers.
- 8) Require 10 percent observer coverage funded by adding extra pounds to each trip limit an observer is on board.
- 9) Stop training observers for regulatory compliance; they are on board for biology only.

A Bill like this would create lots of jobs.

[9:50:24 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON asked if he is an active scallop fisherman.

MR. GILMARTIN responded that he missed last season due to lack of operational funds. His outstanding observer bill has kept him tied to the dock.

REPRESENTATIVE WILSON queried what the benefit would be to have more scallop fishermen on the water.

MR. GILMARTIN suggested that people should have the opportunity to fish for 200 or 300 pounds everyday. They could pool their resources and work as a group. The current cooperative has two boats fishing.

[9:51:37 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON closed public testimony, and announced that HB 16 would be held.

HB 188-BOARD OF FISHERIES' AUTHORITY

[Contains discussion of HB 16.]

CHAIR SEATON announced that the final order of business would be SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 188, "An Act relating to the authority of the Board of Fisheries to allocate within fisheries; and providing for an effective date."

[9:52:14 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON said that the legal opinions attached to HB 188 state that there is a need for the legislature to make specific allowances if there is to be a fishery in which a person gains money without participating. That is the essence of the Grunert court decision: a person may not benefit from an Alaskan fisheries entry permit without participation in the fishery. The extension of HB 16 continues the legislation which allows someone to be paid for their participation in a coop, without being active in the fishery. These points are the equivalencies between these two bills.

[HB 188 was held.]

[9:53:22 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON, under other business, directed the committee's attention to a letter, in the committee packet, explaining how fishery participants can currently purchase more than one

commercial fishing permit per year. The question is whether the committee needs to establish policy on this issue. A recommendation could be made to not allow for sequential purchases, or that one of the licenses could not be a short term license, if two are purchased. Public comment is now being solicited by the department, and he urged people to send in comments.

[9:55:48 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX asked if this regulation only applies to out of state fishermen.

CHAIR SEATON said it applies to anyone. He clarified that this has come out as a proposed regulation change and needs the committee's consideration.

[9:56:50 AM](#)

CHAIR SEATON reiterated that both bills would be held.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting was adjourned at 9:57 a.m.