

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
SENATE RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE

January 29, 2018

3:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Cathy Giessel, Chair
Senator John Coghill, Vice Chair
Senator Natasha Von Imhof
Senator Bert Stedman
Senator Kevin Meyer
Senator Bill Wielechowski

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Click Bishop

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Urging the Alaska Congressional delegation to introduce bills to provide for the exemption of legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory from laws that ban the sale, use, and possession of ivory.

- MOVED CSSJR 4 (RES) OUT OF COMMITTEE

CS FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12 (FSH)

Opposing the United States Food and Drug Administration's approval of AquaBounty AquAdvantage genetically engineered salmon; and urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that requires prominently labeling genetically engineered salmon and salmon products with the words "Genetically Modified" on the product's packaging.

- MOVED CSHJR 12 (FSH) OUT OF COMMITTEE

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: SJR 4

SHORT TITLE: AK LEGALLY ACQUIRED IVORY USE EXEMPTION

SPONSOR(S): SENATOR(S) OLSON

02/01/17 (S) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS

02/01/17 (S) CRA, RES
03/28/17 (S) CRA AT 3:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)
03/28/17 (S) Heard & Held
03/28/17 (S) MINUTE(CRA)
04/04/17 (S) CRA AT 3:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)
04/04/17 (S) Moved SJR 4 Out of Committee
04/04/17 (S) MINUTE(CRA)
04/05/17 (S) CRA RPT 4DP
04/05/17 (S) DP: BISHOP, GARDNER, MACKINNON, STEDMAN
01/29/18 (S) RES AT 3:30 PM BUTROVICH 205

BILL: HJR 12

SHORT TITLE: OPPOSING GEN. ENGINEERED SALMON

SPONSOR(s): REPRESENTATIVE(s) TARR

02/22/17 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/22/17 (H) FSH, RES
02/28/17 (H) FSH AT 10:00 AM GRUENBERG 120
02/28/17 (H) Moved CSHJR 12(FSH) Out of Committee
02/28/17 (H) MINUTE(FSH)
03/01/17 (H) FSH RPT CS(FSH) NT 5DP 1NR
03/01/17 (H) DP: FANSLER, TARR, CHENAULT, KREISS-
TOMKINS, STUTES
03/01/17 (H) NR: EASTMAN
03/13/17 (H) RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124
03/13/17 (H) Scheduled but Not Heard
03/14/17 (H) RES AT 3:00 PM BARNES 124
03/14/17 (H) -- Continued from 3/13/17 Meeting at
1:00 PM --
03/20/17 (H) RES AT 7:00 PM BARNES 124
03/20/17 (H) Scheduled but Not Heard
03/22/17 (H) RES AT 6:00 PM BARNES 124
03/22/17 (H) Moved CSHJR 12(FSH) Out of Committee
03/22/17 (H) MINUTE(RES)
03/24/17 (H) RES RPT CS(FSH) NT 5DP
03/24/17 (H) DP: PARISH, WESTLAKE, DRUMMOND, TARR,
JOSEPHSON
04/05/17 (H) TRANSMITTED TO (S)
04/05/17 (H) VERSION: CSHJR 12(FSH)
04/06/17 (S) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
04/06/17 (S) RES
01/29/18 (S) RES AT 3:30 PM BUTROVICH 205

WITNESS REGISTER

JACQUELYN BOYER, staff to Senator Olson
Alaska State Legislature

Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided a brief overview of SJR 4 for the sponsor.

VERA METCALF, Director
Eskimo Walrus Commission (EWC)
Kawerak, Inc.
Nome, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Supported SJR 4.

CANDACE CAHILL, representing herself
Skagway, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Supported SJR 4.

AKIS GIOLOPSOS, staff to Senator Giessel and the Senate
Resources Committee
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Reviewed the five changes in the CS to SJR 4.

ALICE BIOFF, member
Alaska State Council on the Arts
Community Planning Development
Kawerak
Nome, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Supported SJR 4.

MELANIE BAHNKE, President & CEO
Kawerak, Inc.
Nome, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Supported SJR 4.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Sponsor of HJR 12

VAL GIDDINGS, consultant
Biotechnology Innovation Organization

POSITION STATEMENT: Opposed HJR 12.

FRANCES LEACH, Executive Director
United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA)
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Strongly supported HJR 12.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[3:30:13 PM](#)

CHAIR CATHY GIESSEL called the Senate Resources Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Present at the call to order were Senators Coghill, Wielechowski, Von Imhof, Meyer, and Chair Giessel. Senator Bishop was excused.

SJR 4-AK LEGALLY ACQUIRED IVORY USE EXEMPTION

[3:30:45 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL announced consideration of SJR 4, version 30-LS0109\D, exempting Alaskan's legal ivory crafts, a staple of the Alaska Native community, from the blanket ivory ban targeting poaching operations in Africa and Asia. This resolution is sponsored by Senator Olson.

JACQUELYN BOYER, staff to Senator Olson, sponsor of SJR 4, Alaska State Legislature, briefed the committee that this issue was brought to Senator Olson by various constituencies who face serious negative impacts from some states that have banned ivory.

Some bans vary from being very specific like listing the species and sub-species of what they ban to just banning all ivory. Constituents' concern is that more states will initiate bans and imposing harsh consequences on legal artists in Alaska who obtain ivory through the by-products of subsistence or fossilized ivory product.

[3:33:00 PM](#)

SENATOR STEDMAN joined the committee.

MS. BOYER said the proposed committee substitute (CS) reflects Skagway artists' concerns who are non-Native and use ivory legally.

[3:34:31 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL opened invited testimony.

VERA METCALF, Director, Eskimo Walrus Commission (EWC), Kawerak, Inc., Nome, Alaska, supported SJR 4. She said the commission represents about 19 coastal communities in North Slope, northwest Arctic, Bering Straits, Bethel, and Dillingham.

She stated that the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) allows harvest of Pacific walrus for Alaska Native coastal residents. This exemption was included because it is a fundamental and culturally important activity. Utilizing all the gifts from the harvest of marine or other wildlife resources is also very fundamental to the cultural values of Alaska Native people. If the use and value of walrus ivory is generally outlawed, Alaska Natives could stop retaining walrus ivory, which could be considered wasteful take under the MMPA unless the take is for subsistence purposes and if such take is done for the purposes of creating and selling authentic Native handicrafts and clothing. If there is no market for creating and selling Alaska Native ivory art and handicrafts, Alaska Natives probably won't continue to create them. The economic and cultural impacts of walrus ivory remain critical to Alaskan communities.

[3:37:17 PM](#)

CANDACE CAHILL, representing herself, Skagway, Alaska, supported SJR 4. She is a small business owner and artist and was asked to speak on behalf of Skagway's larger artist population and non-Native users of ivory. She urged the committee to consider how this resolution and the laws impacts Alaskans who are non-Native. Considerable efforts have been directed toward protecting the rights of Alaska Natives, which is right, to be able to harvest and utilize the walrus ivory as well as protecting their rights to collect and use extinct ivories from mammoths and mastodon, but the concerns of non-Native users of fossil materials has been largely overlooked. Her artwork, her husband's, and many of the people she represents use fossil walrus, mastodon, and mammoth ivory, much of which is collected by and bought from Alaska Natives. So, it's an income source for them, as well. But as a non-Native, she can only use fossilized ivory, because the animals have been dead for hundreds or thousands of years. It is the only type of ivory that is legal, because collecting it hasn't harmed any animals. Banning it would essentially shut them down.

MS. CAHILL said much of the business they do is generated from tourism, and over the past several years there has been an increase in awareness of the protection of elephants and the legality of ivory as a whole. As a result, she and other in the industry spend a great deal of time trying to educate people about fossil ivory and how it takes hundreds of years for the ivory to show fossilization, the differences between fresh walrus ivory versus fossil, and address the significant differences between modern elephant ivory and ancient mammoth and mastodon ivory.

MS. CAHILL said she also has an on-line business but is currently prohibited from selling work that incorporates fossil ivory in the four states that have outlawed it, and there is the potential to lose many more states over the next couple of years if Congress doesn't act. They need to be able to sell their work or their business and many others like it around Alaska will fail. Without the ability to work with fresh ivory, a lot of the fossil ivory will simply disintegrate and be lost. Artists are preserving the beauty and extraordinary qualities of these types of fossilized ivory.

[3:41:28 PM](#)

MS. CAHILL said in preparing to talk today, she reviewed the U.S. Senate Bill 1965, The Allow Alaska Ivory Act, that was introduced in Congress last year by Senator Sullivan, but she was concerned about the wording as it does nothing to take concerns of non-Natives into consideration. She wants to do all in her power to ensure that their concerns are addressed and to be certain that it specifically includes language that protects the use of fossil ivories by all, not just Alaska Natives.

[3:42:37 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL, finding no questions, said that concluded invited testimony.

SENATOR COGHILL moved to adopt CSSJR 4 (RES), version 30-LS0109\0 as the working document.

CHAIR GIESSEL objected for purposes of discussion. She invited committee staff to explain the changes in the committee substitute.

[3:43:45 PM](#)

AKIS GIALOPSOS, staff to Senator Giessel and the Senate Resources Committee, Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, reviewed the five changes in the CS as follows:

Senate Resources Committee Substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 4 Summary of Changes from Version D to Version O

1. Page 1, Lines 1-3: Deletes the title language from the previous version (Page 1, Lines 1- 2), and inserts a new title with the following language: "Urging the United States Congress to pass legislation providing for the exemption of legally acquired walrus, mammoth,

and mastodon ivory from laws that ban the sale, use, and possession of ivory."

2. Page 1, Lines 11-12: Adds a new Whereas clause with the following language: "WHEREAS, non-Native individuals in the state use legally acquired mammoth ivory to make handicrafts, jewelry, and artwork; and"

3. Page 2, lines 6 and 11: Deletes the word 'Native' from the previous version (Page 2, Lines 4 and 9)

4. Page 2, Line 17: Add the words "legally acquired..."

5. Page 2, Lines 20-27: Deletes the language from the previous version sending copies to various dignitaries (Page 2, Lines 18-20). Adds new language listing the dignitaries receiving copies of the resolution.

MS. BOYER said Senator Olson requested these changes consisting of neutral language to cover all Alaskans.

CHAIR GIESSEL removed her objection. Finding no further objection, she announced that version 0 was before the committee. She opened public testimony.

[3:46:29 PM](#)

ALICE BIOFF, member, Alaska State Council on the Arts, Community Planning Development, Kawerak, Nome, Alaska, supported SJR 4. She is a tribal member of the Native Village of Koyuk and grew up there and in Nome (for the last 18 years). Through her work at Kawerak she is privileged to work with artist entrepreneurs within the community, so they can sustain themselves, their families, and their communities.

She said that walrus ivory harvested during subsistence hunting is one of the main materials artists use to carve into unique traditional artwork that has been recognized for its amazing craftsmanship throughout the world. Most importantly, the arts and crafts keep traditional practices alive and strong beautiful work being passed down from one generation to the next. She said: "Our art is weaved into who we are as indigenous people and having access to the materials to continue that art is vital."

[3:49:48 PM](#)

MELANIE BAHNKE, President & CEO, Kawerak, Inc., Nome, Alaska, supported SJR 4. She is also the daughter of an Alaska Native artist and her two brothers carve ivory to make a living. She wanted to make it clear to Congress that the State of Alaska supports it Alaska Native artists. But this isn't just about Alaska Native artists; an entire community within the state

relies on ivory, bone, and mastodon one way or another to support themselves and their families and contribute to the Alaska economy.

She proposed amending the word "non-Native" in reference to mammoth ivory to "Native and non-Native". Language in the current proposed amendment sounds as though only non-Natives can work with mammoth ivory. She also recommended adequate review by legal staff where something is restricted to Alaska Natives, so that the proposal isn't in conflict with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA).

In conclusion, she asked the members to image what would happen if Alaska salmon was being banned in the other states, or crab and halibut. She said, "Ivory is a unique product that comes from our state and we need to protect it and also promote it on par with our salmon and our crab and fish."

[3:52:11 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL, finding no further comments, closed public testimony.

SENATOR COGHILL moved Amendment 1, labeled 30-LS0109\O.1

30-LS0109\O.1
Laffen/Bannister
1/29/18

AMENDMENT 1

OFFERED IN THE SENATE

BY SENATOR GIESSEL

TO: CSSJR 4(), Draft Version "O" Page 1, line 11:
Delete "mammoth"
Insert "fossilized"

CHAIR GIESSEL objected for discussion purposes.

[3:54:20 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL invited committee staff to come forward and comment on the concern that both Native and non-Native needed to be specified in terms of the fossilized ivory.

MS. BOYER responded the intent behind deleting "Native" was to encompass all artists in Alaska, because some use legally acquired ivory.

MR. GIALOPSOS explained at the behest of the bill's sponsor the term "mammoth" was replaced with "fossilized," because of the concern that simply putting in the word "mammoth" would be prohibitive, because non-Natives artists are allowed to use fossilized mammoth, walrus, and mastodon. This just clarifies that non-Native artists have access only to all fossilized ivory.

CHAIR GIESSEL removed her objection to Amendment 1, and finding no further objection, announced that Amendment 1 was adopted.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if Congress could preempt this issue.

MR. BOYER answered yes, it can.

[3:58:00 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if the sale of these products is not authorized under the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

MS. BOYER replied that the MMPA is ambiguous and that is the basis of this resolution.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if any of the ivory that is being proposed to be sold meets any of the two requirements in the Hawaii bill that read: 1. On appendix 1 or 2 of the Convention of International Trade and Endangered Species or 2. As endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

MS. BOYER said she didn't know. In deference to the recent Supreme Court decision not to take up the listing of the ringed seal appeal, Alaska Natives can harvest seal whether they are endangered or not, because of their subsistence rights.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if whale and walrus ivory is not an endangered species.

MS. BOYER said she didn't know the answer to that.

CHAIR GIESSEL asked Ms. Boyer to find answers to Senator Wielechowski's questions and forward them to her and she would distribute them to the committee.

[4:01:15 PM](#)

SENATOR COGHILL moved to report CSSJR 4, as amended, from committee with individual recommendations and attached zero

fiscal note. There were no objections and so CSSJR 4 (RES) moved from committee.

[4:01:53 PM](#)

at ease

HJR 12-OPPOSING GEN. ENGINEERED SALMON

[4:03:57 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL announced consideration of HJR 12 [CSHJR 12 (FSH), version 30-LS0276\D, was before the committee].

[4:04:09 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR, Alaska State Legislature, sponsor of HJR 12, thanked the committee for hearing the resolution.

THATCHER BROWER, staff to Representative Tarr, Alaska State Legislature, Juneau, Alaska, introduced himself.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR said HJR 12 is not a new topic for the legislature. When she first started working on it in 2013, they were still pushing the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) to not approve genetically modified salmon. That changed with the November 2015 decision to allow genetically modified salmon. The reason for her continued concern is that this is the first time the FDA has approved a genetically modified animal for human consumption. Genetically modified plants were approved for human consumption in the early 90s.

She said AquaBounty Advantage Salmon uses Ocean pout DNA that makes fish grow year-round and Chinook salmon DNA making fish grow bigger faster for its genetic modifications.

[4:06:22 PM](#)

She showed pictures of a wild salmon compared to a GM salmon and said Alaska is proud of its strong fisheries policies that manage for sustainability, so this renewable resource will be around for years to come. It is important for the state's economy but also for its culture. Our relationship with salmon is different than the company that is promoting the GM salmon. A picture of the AquaBounty website revealed that the business is not so much about sustainability as it is about growing a product faster.

[4:07:26 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR said the fact that the salmon are grown in an indoor facility is one of the reasons people say it may be

less risky, but that may not be the case. This highly mechanized indoor operation does not say sustainable fishery management to her. Besides risk to human health and the state's economy, escapement still poses a threat to wild salmon. These GM salmon are produced in three different countries. She has visited the facility on Prince Edward Island [in the Bay of Fortune, Nova Scotia] where the eggs are produced. The eggs are shipped to Panama to grow into fish. Then they are sold for consumption in the U.S. The regulatory oversight is "strange" because all these jurisdictions are involved. In a broader sense, Alaska fishermen have caught Atlantic farmed salmon and there are risks associated with that.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR said Prince Edward Island has a tourism-based economy and when she first visited in 2013 some people were concerned that "Frankenfish" came up first when Prince Edward Island was googled, and they didn't want to be branded that way given the controversy around it. They didn't know if people would want to visit. That is what made them interested in the work she was doing in Alaska; they have since filed a lawsuit.

She said the AquaBounty facility was really concerning because it was so closely situated to a water body where native Atlantic salmon live. Farmed salmon can also spread more disease and a scientific study found that when they cross-breed with wild fish the new hybridized fish could out-compete and outgrow the wild variety within several life cycles.

[4:12:14 PM](#)

The FDA approved genetically modified salmon under the veterinary medicine component of the FDA rather than as a food product, and people have questioned whether that is the appropriate way to test if one is testing for human health concerns. The lack of rigorous scientific examination of what the human health risks are is a big part of the opposition to this particular proposal even for folks that may be supportive in the end.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR explained the price of wild salmon took a huge dip when farmed salmon was introduced. The legislature's response was creating the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI) to market Alaska's wild salmon. It has been very successful in doing that. It has been reported that wild Alaska salmon is the second most recognized brand on restaurant menus. But absent labelling, the introduction of this genetically modified salmon will undermine people's confidence in our

product. The fishing industry is the largest private sector employer in Alaska and we want to keep jobs rather than lose jobs. Alaskans are not alone in opposing GM salmon. Major retailers, like Fred Meyer and Costco, where Alaska buy a lot of their food have said they will not sell the GM salmon, but its approval is still a challenge and it can be sold almost anywhere.

[4:15:46 PM](#)

She said there is also international opposition. When the approval first was made, the Prince Edward Island filed a lawsuit for the way the Canadian government approved the production of the GM eggs. Panama is where the fish are actually grown, and the company was fined by the Panamanian government because of escapement issues. One can see the potential jurisdictional problems, because this industry involves three different countries. Some U.S. fishing, environmental, and consumer safety groups filed a lawsuit on March 31, 2016 questioning how it was approved in the first place.

[4:17:26 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR applauded the Alaska Congressional delegation for their leadership as outspoken advocates for Alaska wild salmon. On July 11, 2017, Senator Murkowski introduced legislation to mandate the labeling of genetically engineered (GE) salmon. The bill requires an independent third-party scientific review of the FDA's environmental assessment for all GE fish for human consumption. This would be additional protection.

She said the AquaBounty website used to list a whole number of species that they were interested in having genetically modified from shrimp to crab to other fish. So, questions around the regulatory framework used (rather than a focus on human consumption) and concerns for the marine environment need to be understood before the flood gates are opened to many more applications. Senator Murkowski's bill, S1528, has been referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and has not received a hearing, yet. It is co-sponsored by Senator Dan Sullivan, Senator Maria Cantwell of Washington, and Senator Jeff Merkley of Oregon.

[4:19:40 PM](#)

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if the resolution opposes just AquaBounty or all GE salmon.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR replied theirs is the only application that has been approved at this time, and the application is specific to this three-country scenario of eggs, growing the fish, and the marketing of the fish.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI said the next resolve urges the same legislature or the U.S. Congress to enact legislation that requires prominently labeling GE salmon and asked if it would be possible for Congress to outright ban the sale of GE salmon.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR answered that Congress could ban it, because that decision would supersede the FDA decision. Alaska is limited by the Interstate Commerce Clause to what it can say. However, she has introduced a bill that would ban the sale of GE salmon in Alaska. The way a company would have to show harm is to say that it violates the Interstate Commerce Clause. So, they would have to prove that barring this law they would stand to make a lot of money in Alaska. But Alaska would have a strong argument that Alaskans probably aren't going to buy this fish if they know that it is genetically modified, probably for the same reasons that a lot less farmed salmon is sold here. Alaskans prefer to catch it themselves or get it from a friend. Her thought was to poke at that a little bit at the state level.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI said that 50 percent of restaurants say their salmon is wild but it's not and asked if there is any way to address that issue.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR answered that ASMI does a lot to educate retailers and restaurant owners on where to buy their products and to have a chain of custody to know that it is really wild Alaska salmon, but it needs to be addressed more thoroughly. It is a problem if people are using the brand that Alaska has worked so hard to build to sell farmed salmon; if people get an inferior product they won't buy it again.

[4:24:06 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL opened public testimony.

[4:24:11 PM](#)

VAL GIDDINGS, consultant, Biotechnology Innovation Organization, said he specializes in the regulation and policy related to biotechnology and these were his views. He is an angler and loves the wilderness. He shares their concerns for the safety and sustainability of Alaska's salmon fisheries, "a crown jewel in our national heritage of incalculable value, and they face a number of threats."

Unfortunately, the AquaAdvantage salmon framed in this bill is the opposite of one of these threats, he said. To the extent it is successful, it will reduce the threat from farmed salmon to Alaska's wild salmon. These salmon are intended to be grown in terrestrial systems far from where they can escape. This is exactly the method for growing Atlantic salmon that the Monterey Seafood Watch Program has rated as "the best choice." The data show that if these salmon did escape, their biology and behavior would make it highly unlikely that any would survive. If they survive, they are sterile and incapable of reproduction.

MR. GIDDINGS said if commercial sea pens of Atlantic salmon in the Pacific Northwest were all replaced by these indoor circulating tanks the concerns that the sea pens raised for wild salmon will be completely negated. Even if the AquaAdvantage salmon were capable of reproduction, eggs and fry require fresh water and can't live in the ocean.

Another concern raised by the legislation is equally unfounded. The FDA chose to do a more thorough review of this salmon under the new animal drug provisions of the Veterinary Biologics law before allowing it to be introduced into the food supply. All of FDA's analyses were made available for multiple rounds of public comment including an independent third-party review. He has read all the comments and documents to this docket and followed the process from the beginning and after this unprecedented analysis, the FDA concluded that this salmon is indistinguishable from other salmon. It is at least as safe to eat as any other salmon and the way it will be grown gives it the smallest environmental impact of any farmed salmon.

[4:28:33 PM](#)

FRANCES LEACH, Executive Director, United Fishermen of Alaska (UFA), Juneau, Alaska, strongly supported HJR 12. UFA strongly opposes genetically modified salmon and requests that GM seafood products be clearly labeled as such. According to a New York Times poll, over 90 percent of Americans would prefer that their food is labeled to reflect the content containing GM ingredients; 37 percent of those surveyed expressed concern that GMO in their food may cause cancer and allergies; 75 percent of respondents said they would not eat genetically modified fish.

[4:30:38 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL, finding no further comments, closed public testimony.

SENATOR COGHILL asked the sponsor to respond to language on page 2, line 8, saying AquaAdvantage salmon "could devastate native fish populations."

REPRESENTATIVE TARR replied that what she saw peer-reviewed scientific papers showing that this interbreeding took place and why it was such a concern. For example, in Panama, the company was fined for escapement issues. Unpredictable things happen, like an earthquake, that could result in a major release into an adjacent water body.

SENATOR COGHILL commented it's an obvious area of dispute.

SENATOR WIELECHOWSKI asked if she agreed that GE fish are sterile.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR replied that it's not true 100 percent of time, and that is why there is a concern.

SENATOR COGHILL moved to report [CSHJR 12(FSH)], version 30-LS0276\D, from committee with individual recommendations and attached zero fiscal note. There were no objections and it was so ordered.

[4:33:58 PM](#)

CHAIR GIESSEL, finding no further business to come before the committee adjourned the Senate Resources Standing Committee meeting at 4:33 p.m.