

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE  
HOUSE RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 15, 2017  
4:09 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Andy Josephson, Co-Chair  
Representative Geran Tarr, Co-Chair  
Representative Dean Westlake, Vice Chair  
Representative Harriet Drummond  
Representative Justin Parish  
Representative Chris Birch  
Representative DeLena Johnson  
Representative George Rauscher  
Representative David Talerico

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Mike Chenault (alternate)  
Representative Chris Tuck (alternate)

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE BILL NO. 46

"An Act relating to the state and municipal procurement preferences for agricultural products harvested in the state and fisheries products harvested or processed in the state; relating to the sale of milk, milk products, raw milk, and raw milk products; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 172

"An Act relating to the regulation and production of industrial hemp; relating to industrial hemp pilot programs; providing that industrial hemp is not included in the definition of 'marijuana'; and clarifying that adding industrial hemp to food does not create an adulterated food product."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 87

"An Act relating to participation in matters before the Board of Fisheries and the Board of Game by the members of the respective boards; and providing for an effective date."

BILL HEARING CANCELED

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 46

SHORT TITLE: PROCURE AK FISH/AG PROD.; ALASKA GROWN

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) TARR

01/18/17	(H)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/13/17
01/18/17	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/18/17	(H)	STA, RES, FIN
03/08/17	(H)	SPONSOR SUBSTITUTE INTRODUCED-REFERRALS
03/08/17	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/08/17	(H)	RES, FIN
03/15/17	(H)	RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124

BILL: HB 172

SHORT TITLE: INDUSTRIAL HEMP PRODUCTION LICENSES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) DRUMMOND

03/10/17	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
03/10/17	(H)	RES, JUD
03/15/17	(H)	RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124

**WITNESS REGISTER**

JOHANNA HERRON, Development Specialist  
Division of Agriculture  
Department of Natural Resources  
Palmer, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 46.

BRYCE WRIGLEY, President  
Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc.  
Delta Junction, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 46.

AUTHUR KEYES, Director  
Division of Agriculture  
Department of Natural Resources  
Palmer, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 46.

PATRICK FITZGERALD, Staff  
Representative Harriet Drummond  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** On behalf of Representative Drummond, sponsor, introduced HB 172.

ROB CARTER, Program Manager  
Plant Materials Center  
Division of Agriculture  
Department of Natural Resources  
Palmer, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered questions during the hearing of HB 172.

BRYCE WRIGLEY, President  
Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc.  
Delta Junction, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HB 172.

SARA CHAMBERS, Acting Director  
Juneau Office  
Alcohol & Marijuana Control Office  
Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered a question during the hearing on HB 172.

#### **ACTION NARRATIVE**

[4:09:58 PM](#)

**CO-CHAIR ANDY JOSEPHSON** called the House Resources Standing Committee meeting to order at 4:09 p.m. Representatives Josephson, Birch, Parish, Talerico, Drummond, Johnson, Tarr, and Westlake were present at the call to order. Representative Rauscher arrived as the meeting was in progress.

#### **HB 46-PROCURE AK FISH/AG PROD.; ALASKA GROWN**

[4:10:44 PM](#)

**CO-CHAIR JOSEPHSON** announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 46, "An Act relating to the state and municipal procurement preferences for agricultural products harvested in the state and fisheries products harvested or processed in the state; relating to the sale of milk, milk products, raw milk, and raw milk products; and providing for an effective date." [Before the committee was Sponsor Substitute for House Bill 46, read across the House floor on 3/8/17.]

4:10:51 PM

CO-CHAIR GERAN TARR, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor, informed the committee HB 46 amends the Alaska products preference statute and gives receipt authority to the Division of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), so that it may market the Alaska Grown logo on certain items to support its operations. She said a short history of the topic is included in the committee packet, noting that there are many organizations in the state interested in agriculture issues - including the Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc. (Farm Bureau) and the Alaska Food Policy Council - that are working on food security and improving opportunities in the agriculture industry. The organizations brought to her attention the Alaska products procurement preference statute [AS 29.71.040], which currently establishes a 7 percent preference.

CO-CHAIR TARR explained state procurement rules require that purchases using state dollars must be for the lowest cost items. However, the product preference statute was enacted to recognize that Alaska Grown agricultural and fisheries products cost more than those purchased Outside due to economies of scale and food distribution systems. To complete the research needed for the bill, in 2014 she submitted an audit request to the Legislative Budget and Audit Committee, and the audit [provided in the committee packet, labeled Audit Control Number 02-30080-15, 7/10/15, 2015], concluded that the existing 7 percent preference is not enough of a deferential to provide an opportunity for purchasing Alaska Grown products, and she gave an example. Page 20 [Exhibit 5] of the audit showed prices for Alaska Grown products compared to non-Alaska items may be up to 30 percent more. The audit also concluded that the procurement preference statute is not well-understood, and the sponsor, with the guidance of the Farm Bureau, seeks to ensure more farmers are on the list of vendors and to keep information current on the availability of their products. As an aside, Co-Chair Tarr noted that a state procurement officer is working to update the request for proposal (RFP) to clarify the product preference statute and thereby encourage proposals from local applicants.

CO-CHAIR TARR, returning to the bill, stressed that individuals, the state, and municipalities spend billions of dollars on food, and purchasing food produced in Alaska is good for local economies, local businesses, and is healthier. Because relying on sales at farmers' markets is a challenge, Alaska farmers broaden their customer base through community supported agriculture (CSA) programs. However, if the state were to act

as an "anchor tenant" and significantly increase demand, farmers could grow more and rely on a contract from a state entity to purchase their fresh produce. Thus, [sections 2-5] of the bill raise preference percentages from 7 percent to 15 percent, which may enable business owners to provide high volumes of products for a stable customer. Turning attention to [section 1] of the bill, she said all the state agencies are seeking efficiencies and methods to decrease state funding. However, DNR does not have receipt authority, and thus receives no benefit from the licenses it grants to private businesses for the use of the very popular Alaska Grown logo; the bill gives DNR the authority to market merchandise directly through the Division of Agriculture, in the same manner as the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (Alaska State Parks), DNR.

[4:21:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PARISH asked how much more economic activity would result from local food purchases that would be enabled by the legislation.

CO-CHAIR TARR responded that if Alaskans bought \$5 more per week of Alaska Grown products, it would bring an additional \$188 million into the Alaska economy. Currently, Alaskans spend over \$4.5 billion each year on food, but spend only 5 percent on food produced in the state. At one point Alaskans produced over 50 percent of the food consumed in the state, and now there is a renewed interest in supporting local farmers through sales at farmers' markets.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH asked for clarification on whether the state, school districts, and municipalities are required to pay a 15 percent premium on affected products.

CO-CHAIR TARR said there is no requirement that the aforementioned entities would have to purchase Alaska Grown products, or to purchase a 15 percent volume of certain products; the bill permits said entities to choose other than the lowest cost item if it is an Alaskan Grown product.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH estimated a 15 percent preference would cost entities "\$100 million in mark-ups, if you will." He opined the merits of Alaska Grown products sell themselves, and he cautioned against compelling the state, a municipality, or a school district to pay a premium and jeopardize its budget.

CO-CHAIR TARR agreed that entities should not be required to participate.

[4:26:34 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON asked for an estimate on the volume of products that are purchased at 7 percent "above the competition."

CO-CHAIR TARR returned attention to page 20 [Exhibit 5] of the above referenced audit, and pointed out the amount purchased at 7 percent is minimal because 7 percent is too low, and she further described the preference program. [To provide an example of why 7 percent is too low] she explained that the audit indicated that the price for Alaska Grown broccoli is over 30 percent higher than broccoli from an Outside source. Her research indicated that the increase to 15 percent would allow entities to "spend a few dollars more to purchase this Alaska Grown product."

REPRESENTATIVE DRUMMOND observed that denser products are cheaper; in fact, Alaska Grown potatoes are almost 50 percent cheaper than imported. She stated her support and related her experience that Alaska procurement preference is unlawful when pertaining to products that are not manufactured in Alaska. She added that Alaska Grown products are healthier, and with the price savings on carrots, cabbages, and potatoes, buyers should be able to make up for the difference in price.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER expressed his interest in the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON directed attention to Section 5 and questioned whether a 15 percent preference needs to apply to fish.

CO-CHAIR TARR explained both fisheries and agricultural products are in the same section of existing statute, so yes. She recalled there was a special grant program for school districts' lunch programs, which was expanded to include fish products; however, grant dollars were applied to both.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON cautioned against the government supplementing its income by competing against local businesses, because the government is an unfair competitor to a private individual. Her general stance is that it is an unfair business practice for government to compete against a private individual.

CO-CHAIR TARR acknowledged the same concern arose pertaining to previous legislation affecting Alaska State Parks. She pointed out private manufacturers would produce products for state entities to market at a slight increase in price. In addition, a strong marketing program raises interest in aspects of government such as state parks.

[4:35:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO also recalled the legislature's approval last year of the [marketing receipt] license for Alaska State Parks and acknowledged [the state marketing of merchandise] is a sensitive issue.

CO-CHAIR TARR informed the committee the Alaska State Parks legislation was chosen as a model for HB 46 because it was highly scrutinized; however, any program is subject to future review. She related how interest in agriculture has increased in the past 20 years.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH inquired as to what revenues are derived by the state from [agriculture].

CO-CHAIR TARR replied that the Plant Materials Center, Division of Agriculture, DNR, provides inspections of forestry products for export and inspections of seed potatoes, which are necessary to ensure seed potatoes are disease-free.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH directed attention to the bill on page 2, line 2, which read [in part]:

from either an Alaska bidder or a person that employs  
prisoners

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH inquired as to the "backstory" of the foregoing language.

CO-CHAIR TARR advised at one time the state had stronger programs for people incarcerated and working in correctional industries. For example, there are people working in a meat packing facility and there is a program for low-risk individuals to work in fishing processing on the Kenai Peninsula.

REPRESENTATIVE PARISH asked for affirmation that in section 1, the bill provides the commissioner of DNR with the authority to sell Alaska Grown trademarked goods, and to license the

trademark, for a fee, to private businesses in order to provide an incentive to market the trademark.

CO-CHAIR TARR clarified that a marketer must have specific receipt authority [in order to market trademarked merchandise].

[4:41:19 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PARISH continued that the remainder of the bill provides authority to municipalities, schools, and the state to purchase Alaska Grown products at a slightly higher price differential. He questioned the sponsor's 30 percent estimate pertaining to the growth of local economies, because local economies would not grow only by \$750 million, due to the "multiplier effect after that"; in fact, there would be more farmers able to purchase goods and services, and he asked if the multiplier, and the number of jobs created thereby, are known.

CO-CHAIR TARR observed that a firm would need to be hired to assess the multiplier effect; however, the factors provided in the sponsor statement reflect statewide Alaska purchasing for individuals, institutions, municipalities, and school districts. She spoke of the potential benefit [of increased agriculture and fisheries] on the younger generation of Alaskans, and those who live and work in agriculture.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON redirected attention to the bill on page 2, line 2 [text previously provided] and asked whether AS 33.30.191(b) relates to Alaskan prisoners.

CO-CHAIR TARR said yes.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER inquired as to the DNR commissioner's opinion of the bill.

CO-CHAIR TARR said the commissioner of DNR, the director of the Division of Agriculture, and staff have indicated support for the bill.

[4:45:18 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked how many prisoners are employed statewide.

CO-CHAIR TARR explained there are fewer programs of this type than in the past due to budget cuts; she added that the programs

provide training for prisoners and would hopefully lead to gainful employment and less recidivism.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER reported Sutton has utilized prisoners and agreed they need an opportunity to work in society.

REPRESENTATIVE DRUMMOND, speaking as a graphic designer, assured the committee the Alaska Grown logo produced for the Division of Agriculture earned a high price, and added that digital artwork deteriorates and requires money to maintain its quality. She stated the fact that Alaska only produces 5 percent of the food consumed in the state is a food safety and food security issue, and importing vegetables over many miles is a nutritional issue.

CO-CHAIR TARR agreed that food security is a critical issue. In response to Representative Birch, she said brewery products carry the Made in Alaska brand and are not an Alaska Grown product.

[4:50:42 PM](#)

JOHANNA HERRON, Development Specialist, Division of Agriculture, DNR, agreed that food security is an issue, along with food safety, which is enhanced by the consumption of local products. She pointed out that the state has many small growers who are unable to buy marketing materials due to their expense and/or inconvenience; in the past, the division has supplied marketing materials - such as twist ties and stickers - from its budget or through federal funds, and does not seek to compete with [private] marketers. The goals of the bill are: enable consumers to differentiate between local and nonlocal products; supply marketing materials; provide a method for the division to recover the costs of administering the program.

[4:52:24 PM](#)

BRYCE WRIGLEY, President, Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc. (Farm Bureau), informed the committee he is also a producer farming in Delta Junction, and expressed his support for both components within HB 46. In response to Representative Parish's question about a multiplier of economic benefit, he said agriculture earns one of the highest multipliers of any industry, however, the economic impact is contingent upon how closed the local economy is, the flow of commerce, and the types of products available. He advised that in most of the Lower 48, the multiplier used is 4-5 and can be as high as 8. He characterized Alaska as a closed economic system and said the

Farm Bureau uses a conservative multiplier of 2.13 to determine the value of local products, thus \$2.5 billion may be increased by \$750 million potential farm gate sales, which after a multiplier is applied, grows to \$1.6 billion in economic activity. Mr. Wrigley added that the bill would also create many jobs and opportunities for youth to participate in the expansion of the market for agricultural products. The Farm Bureau's goal is to create a more sustainable and secure food future for Alaska, and he cautioned about the devastating effect of a natural disaster; for example, in 1989 access to the Port of Anchorage froze for one week and supplies in the stores were depleted, and in 2012 the Alaska Highway was flooded for four days, which affected food supplies in Fairbanks. However, he pointed out that after a return to normal, worries about food security are forgotten, and Alaska remains very vulnerable in an emergency.

MR. WRIGLEY said the bill is one component in an effort to stabilize and secure a local food system that will generate jobs, encourage stability in rural areas, provide opportunities, and secure food safety in an emergency. Turning to product preference, he cautioned that although there is a cost, local food in Alaska is a strategic resource unique to Alaska, because every 3-4 years an event occurs that threatens the transportation of food. He stressed the state's greatest challenge is access to markets, and product preference is an opportunity for producers to access markets that have been dominated by distribution lines from the Lower 48; reaching the goal of 25 percent of food coming from local markets and flowing into the food chain would ensure that in an emergency the food supply would be maintained. Mr. Wrigley advised that if small producers are unable to gain access to distribution lines, the state's buying power is necessary; in fact, most other states have local marketing programs to promote and foster local foods. He concluded that the state's influence in providing a market larger than the farmers' markets will lead to more planting by growers. Finally, he said the Farm Bureau is very interested in having the Division of Agriculture hold receipt authority, as it is very expensive for individual farmers and business owners to purchase logo items.

[5:03:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked what percentage of products that are grown in Alaska is currently sold in supermarkets.

MR. WRIGLEY said he was unsure; 5 percent is used, but 1-2 percent is closer, he opined, and even fewer participate in the Alaska Grown program. In further response to Representative Rauscher, he stated most supermarkets do not carry Alaska Grown, and a few chains carry produce, but less in meat, milk, and flour products. Most of the products from his business are sold in mom and pop stores or state chain groceries; although larger chains express interest, it remains a challenge to have products distributed by large chain supermarkets.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked how much more products would cost at a local store in a rural area.

MR. WRIGLEY restated some items are less expensive, such as potatoes and cabbage. In villages, grocery stores are private businesses and rural areas must deal with transportation constraints, and he gave an example. Currently, some local producers are working with major suppliers on access to distribution lines to villages.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON expressed her support of the division director and the Alaska Grown program.

[5:12:25 PM](#)

AUTHUR KEYES, Director, Division of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), stated that HB 46 provides a tremendous opportunity for agriculture.

[5:13:13 PM](#)

CO-CHAIR JOSEPHSON announced HB 46 was held over.

**HB 172-INDUSTRIAL HEMP PRODUCTION LICENSES**

[5:13:34 PM](#)

CO-CHAIR JOSEPHSON announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 172, "An Act relating to the regulation and production of industrial hemp; relating to industrial hemp pilot programs; providing that industrial hemp is not included in the definition of 'marijuana'; and clarifying that adding industrial hemp to food does not create an adulterated food product."

REPRESENTATIVE DRUMMOND, speaking as prime sponsor of HB 172, urged for passage of the bill.

5:14:34 PM

PATRICK FITZGERALD, Staff, Representative Harriet Drummond, Alaska State Legislature, speaking on behalf of Representative Drummond, prime sponsor, informed the committee HB 172 would define industrial hemp under AS 03.05.100 as "all parts and varieties of Cannabis sativa L. containing no more than 0.3 percent delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol (THC)," which would classify hemp as a crop for the Division of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and allow the cultivation of hemp products through a regulated pilot program. Section 7606 of the federal [Agricultural Act of 2014] allows industrial hemp to be grown through a pilot program, and over 30 states have taken advantage of the pilot program to explore domestic and international markets. Although hemp shares many similarities with marijuana, marijuana is used medically and recreationally due to its high concentration of delta 9 THC; however, under the classification within HB 172, hemp must have less than 0.3 percent delta 9 THC. Mr. Fitzgerald explained that the percentage of delta 9 THC is affected by how the plants are grown; for example, marijuana requires delicate care in order to produce a psychoactive effect. However, industrial hemp would be planted, cultivated, and harvested in a manner similar to that of wheat or barley, and thus have low THC concentrations as stipulated by the legislation. Hemp has been grown successfully in Alaska in the past, and the stock, seed, and roots are sold for industrial use. He concluded that the passage of HB 172 would incorporate a hemp crop into the state's economy, which would expand markets in multiple industries, create jobs, and raise state revenue.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH asked why hemp cannot be grown now.

MR. FITZGERALD responded that hemp is currently classified as a controlled substance through the Alcohol & Marijuana Control Office. In further response to Representative Birch, he said the bill will reclassify hemp with the Division of Agriculture - and not as a controlled substance - as long as the percentage of delta-9 THC remains below 0.3. In further response to Representative Birch, he said it is against the law to grow hemp as an industrial crop.

5:19:14 PM

REPRESENTATIVE WESTLAKE questioned why a registrant would be required to retain sales records for three years.

MR. FITZGERALD explained the records are to comply with the pilot program regulated by the federal Agricultural Act of 2014.

REPRESENTATIVE DRUMMOND added that federal law also requires the hemp farmer register the global positioning system (GPS) coordinates of the crop location with the Division of Agriculture.

[5:20:25 PM](#)

MR. FITZGERALD directed attention to a presentation entitled, "HB 172 - Industrial Hemp," included in the committee packet. He said the main points of the bill are:

- allows the host of the pilot program the opportunity to grow, cultivate, transport, process, and market industrial hemp
- changes the definition from the [Alcohol & Marijuana Control Office] to the Division of Agriculture
- industrial hemp grows from the same plant as marijuana but they are two distinct strains made by differences in planting, habitat, cultivation, processing, and use
- hemp is mainly used for industrial purposes such as textiles, farming, furniture, and livestock feed
- the cropping of hemp that HB 172 would allow is strictly for industrial purposes and there is no intent to produce marijuana to be sold for recreational consumption
- hemp has very low THC concentration, is versatile, and its product is mostly derived from stock fibers
- marijuana has high THC concentration, requires specific growing conditions, and the product is extracted from the flower
- any hemp products above 0.3 percent delta-9 THC would not be valid for production
- farmers must register GPS coordinates of crop locations
- licensing must be renewed annually
- three years of records must be kept by registrant
- introduction of industrial hemp to Alaska's economy would create jobs, spur revenue, and incorporate a growing industry
- hemp products are produced from every part of the plant
- rapid growth yields paper, textiles, and other products more efficiently than timber, and leaves a smaller footprint

- hemp products come from seeds, stalk, leaves, and roots, but not the flower
- hemp was successfully grown in Alaska in the early 1900's
- HB 172 would benefit the state with economic expansion and career opportunities

CO-CHAIR JOSEPHSON asked whether the bill would result in the production of value-added finished products or in shipping unfinished hemp out of the state.

MR. FITZGERALD said the pilot program allows both; the crop could be marketed to local industries and the Division of Agriculture would be authorized to ship the crop out of state.

CO-CHAIR JOSEPHSON asked about the current "culture surrounding hemp and the acceptance of it."

[5:25:24 PM](#)

ROB CARTER, Program Manager, Plant Materials Center, Division of Agriculture, DNR, expressed his belief that nationally and internationally, industrial hemp is "gaining ground" after being outlawed in the U.S. since 1932; members of the agricultural community are interested in the crop as an addition to their farm management plans.

REPRESENTATIVE PARISH directed attention to the fiscal note [Identifier: HB172-DNR-PMC-03-10-17] that anticipates 25 farms would apply for licenses, and asked for the locations of the farms.

MR. CARTER said recently interest in farming hemp has been growing, and he has been contacted by potential applicants from Juneau, the Delta and Nenana regions, and the Matanuska-Susitna valley.

REPRESENTATIVE PARISH asked for an estimate of how many people would be directly employed by the farms.

MR. CARTER, based on his experience with farming, estimated a 5-10 percent growth in agricultural workers; large growth would result if processing facilities opened and exports of raw industrial hemp and processed products began.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON directed attention to the bill on page 3, line 8, which read:

(c) The department may adopt regulations to implement this section.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON asked what agency, department, or institution would issue the aforementioned regulations.

[5:30:43 PM](#)

MR. CARTER opined the Division of Agriculture is best qualified to draft and complete the regulations.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON suggested the sponsor insert the regulatory agency in the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE WESTLAKE related his interest in producing energy from biomass, noting that above the Arctic Circle willow regrows in about five years. He asked about the growth rate for hemp, and whether the crop could become a viable biomass product that could be used to bring down the cost of energy in villages.

MR. FITZGERALD said the pilot program would determine the growth rate of hemp in each location.

MR. CARTER added there is high potential; last year research in Sweden showed significant production of biomass [from hemp]: approximately 8,000 pounds per acre as a biodiesel fuel product - a traditional producer such as canola produces about 120 gallons of oil per acre - and hemp seeds produced over 300 gallons per acre, along with a byproduct of 3 to 3.5 tons of hemp meal supplement per acre.

[5:34:21 PM](#)

BRYCE WRIGLEY, President, Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc., expressed amazement that the state recently voted to allow the production of marijuana, yet continues to apply restrictions on the production of hemp. Speaking from the prospective of farmers, he said farmers seek to produce any viable crop, and urged for passage of the bill.

[5:36:14 PM](#)

SARA CHAMBERS, Acting Director, Juneau Office, Alcohol & Marijuana Control Office, Department of Commerce, Community & Economic Development, in response to Co-Chair Josephson, explained the Marijuana Control Board has not issued an opinion on HB 172 but anticipates that there would be a strong working

relationship with the Division of Agriculture to draw jurisdictional lines between the sister agencies through regulations.

CO-CHAIR TARR announced public testimony would be heard at a future meeting.

[HB 172 was held over with public testimony open.]

[5:38:39 PM](#)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Resources Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.