

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

February 13, 2020

11:08 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Louise Stutes, Chair  
Representative Bryce Edgmon  
Representative Chuck Kopp  
Representative Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins  
Representative Geran Tarr  
Representative Sarah Vance

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Mark Neuman

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE BILL NO. 199

"An Act relating to certain fish; and establishing a fisheries rehabilitation permit."

- HEARD & HELD

HOUSE BILL NO. 218

"An Act relating to salt water sport fishing operators and salt water sport fishing guides; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HB 199

SHORT TITLE: FISHERIES REHABILITATION PERMITS

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) TALERICO

|          |     |                                 |
|----------|-----|---------------------------------|
| 01/21/20 | (H) | PREFILE RELEASED 1/17/20        |
| 01/21/20 | (H) | READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS |
| 01/21/20 | (H) | FSH, RES                        |
| 02/13/20 | (H) | FSH AT 11:00 AM GRUENBERG 120   |

BILL: HB 218

SHORT TITLE: SALT WATER FISHING: OPERATORS/GUIDES

SPONSOR(S): RULES BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

01/27/20 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS  
01/27/20 (H) FSH, RES, FIN  
02/06/20 (H) FSH AT 11:00 AM GRUENBERG 120  
02/06/20 (H) Heard & Held  
02/06/20 (H) MINUTE (FSH)  
02/13/20 (H) FSH AT 11:00 AM GRUENBERG 120

**WITNESS REGISTER**

REPRESENTATIVE DAVE TALERICO  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** As prime sponsor, introduced HB 199.

FLIP PRYOR, Aquaculture Section Chief  
Division of Commercial Fisheries  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered questions pertaining to HB 199.

TOM TAUBE, Deputy Director  
Division of Sport Fish  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Offered a summary on HB 218.

MATTHEW DONOHOE, Fisherman  
Sitka, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Asked questions pertaining to HB 218.

FORREST BRADEN, Executive Director  
Southeast Alaska Guides Organization  
Ketchikan, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Offered testimony in support of HB 218.

RACHEL HANKE, Legislative Liaison  
Office of the Commissioner  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Offered an explanation on the fiscal note for HB 218.

DAYNA MACKEY, Administrative Services Director  
Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
Office of Management Budget  
Office of the Governor

Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Explained line items on the fiscal note for HB 218.

**ACTION NARRATIVE**

[11:08:24 AM](#)

**CHAIR LOUISE STUTES** called the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting to order at 11:08 a.m. Representatives Stutes, Edgmon, Kopp, Tarr, and Vance were present at the call to order. Representative Kreiss-Tomkins arrived as the meeting was in progress.

**HB 199-FISHERIES REHABILITATION PERMITS**

[11:09:13 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 199, "An Act relating to certain fish; and establishing a fisheries rehabilitation permit."

[11:10:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE DAVE TALERICO, Alaska State Legislature, as prime sponsor, introduced HB 199. He stated that he represents House District 6, which covers Tanana on the Yukon River all the way to the Canadian border of the Yukon River. He said that District 6 is the size of West Virginia and contains a very large water system. He stated that HB 199 is a natural fish population enhancement bill and "you can't go wrong with more fish for Alaskans." He expressed that salmon is one of the most precious resources Alaska has, and many people are not aware that it is available in a lot of places throughout the state. He stated that the Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G) is not currently counting the fish populations in some of the rivers in Interior Alaska, including the: Nenana, Tanana, and upper Yukon Rivers. He said that locals in those areas can attest that fish populations are not nearly what they used to be. He referenced that he has relationships going back 50 years with people who have fished those locations for several generations, and the river system is a major resource for them, but the river system does not produce fish the way it used to.

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO explained that HB 199 would allow individuals, corporations, school districts, and other organizations to apply for a fish enhancement permit through

ADF&G. He stated that if the commissioner grants a permit, the individuals, school districts, and other organizations would be allowed to collect a limited amount of fish, fertilize and hatch the eggs, and then place the unfed natural fish back - only into the water from which they were taken. He explained that this would not be a transplant program; these fish would have to stay within the watershed from which they were taken. He expressed that this would not be "bucket biology," but would be under the auspices and guidance of ADF&G. He said that this program would boost the natural fertility rate of the eggs from approximately 5 percent to 90 percent.

[11:13:49 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO stated that some king salmon have up to 50,000 eggs, and in the natural process sometimes only 5,000 of those eggs are fertilized, hatch, and become fry; moist air incubation could change the number of salmon fry from 5,000 to 45,000. He pointed out that similar types of fish enhancement permits are currently allowed by ADF&G for scientific research and educational purposes, but they are limited. He expressed that HB 199 would allow the private sector and the ADF&G to work together in a responsible collaborative effort to increase the natural salmon numbers and scientific data collection throughout the state. He summarized that HB 199 would provide Alaska one more tool to ensure that resources are maximized, for both today and the future as stated in the state's constitution, and thus benefit from Alaska's natural fish resources and feed its families. He added that for the people in his district, traditionally, fishing has been food security for hundreds of years.

[11:15:17 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES asked what the requirements would be to allow someone to acquire the permits needed to harvest the fish eggs and incubate them.

[11:15:38 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO answered that the application process would have a form and an application, which would be prescribed by ADF&G. He expressed that a "fish plan" would be required describing why the applicant wants to pursue a project and what the feasibility of the project would be. He added that there would be an historical data requirement to validate the project. He pointed out, referencing page 2, of HB 199, that the

conditions for justifying a project are laid out in the proposed bill. He stated that a project would require maintained communication with ADF&G and would require research into any other possible federal, state, and local permitting requirements.

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO stated that an applicant would then need to provide a detailed management plan which describes how the project would be managed, personnel who would be involved, resources available, a budget, and a schedule with an overall goal for the project. He stated that ADF&G would be monitoring this process. He expressed that it would be expensive to get into a project of this kind; the equipment required up front to incubate the eggs properly is very expensive. He explained that there would be a genetics management aspect to the program, which would check to ensure that there are no bacteria or viral infections in fish being released into Alaska's waters. He stated that there would also be a watershed habitat rehabilitation plan and an application fee of \$100.

[11:19:46 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO stated that given the way HB 199 is structured and written, it will probably require professionals, such as a fish biologist and a hydrologist, to be involved in the construction of a good management plan. He emphasized that he thinks ADF&G would take all the language laid out under HB 199 seriously. He summarized that a properly managed facility can produce a lot of eggs in a small facility. As an example, he referenced the Gulkana hatchery, which he describes as looking like a "tool shed with a sluice box on it," and its ability to put out over 30 million salmon fry on a fairly regular basis. He summarized that it would take a substantial amount of work to get to the point where an application was ready for submission, which he said he thinks is appropriate.

[11:21:15 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES commented that she noticed Flip Pryor was present from the Aquaculture Section of ADF&G, and she would like to hear him state the ADF&G's position on HB 199.

[11:21:37 AM](#)

FLIP PRYOR, Aquaculture Section Chief, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, replied that ADF&G has reviewed HB 199 and has no opposition to the proposed

legislation. He stated that ADF&G had submitted some draft language which he thinks was adopted.

[11:22:02 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE asked whether Mr. Pryor feels that the \$100 application fee is enough, and whether the proposed timeframe for the application review process is within the current means of ADF&G.

[11:22:35 AM](#)

MR. PRYOR replied that ADF&G thinks the process could be handled with current staff; it would be very similar to existing aquatic resource permits and would require the same review process. He explained that this process starts first with local area biologists, then goes to a regional office, and finally gets sent to the headquarters where it is analyzed by a geneticist and a pathologist. The geneticist and pathologist then issue their opinions of the project on a review site and, ultimately, the commissioner decides whether to issue a permit or not.

[11:23:16 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE asked whether ADF&G would have to implement any new processes, or if the proposed projects would fit into the current format.

MR. PRYOR answered, "Yes, it fits right in."

[11:23:38 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR commented that a concern had arisen previously as to how this proposed legislation would impact native stocks of fish. She asked whether Mr. Pryor could comment on whether the hatchery fry being reintroduced back into an area might outcompete the native stock and put it at a disadvantage.

[11:24:18 AM](#)

MR. PRYOR responded that there is always a possibility, with an enhancement project, that it could affect genetic diversity; however, he said that these projects would be heavily scrutinized by ADF&G and its genetic experts. He explained that the proposed projects would be dealing with local stocks, a minimum number of broodstock, and most likely a maximum number

of broodstock. He expressed that there would be mitigation measures in place to reduce risk.

[11:24:59 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR referred to processing companies that "pick up the tab" when there is no state funding for research, and she said she is concerned about "who actually is going to have the information" as "things get a little more piecemeal." She asked Mr. Pryor whether he could see a way to strengthen the proposed legislation and establish a program with a public/private partnership that is directed through ADF&G.

[11:26:13 AM](#)

MR. PRYOR answered that he thinks this is already built into the process, in that these permits require the applicant to submit the data ADF&G needs to move forward with the application. He explained that if ADF&G finds that it needs more data, it requires the applicant to submit it before the permit is issued. Once a permit is operating, he explained, unforeseen circumstances can arise that require permits to be reviewed; and mitigation measures are taken when appropriate, or permits can be revoked.

[11:26:58 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR expressed that there could be concerns regarding whether operations of hatcheries could be undertaken in a way that benefits private interest over the public good. She asked whether there should be a concern with the possibility that the process could have less oversight than if it were an official program operated through ADF&G.

[11:27:52 AM](#)

MR. PRYOR answered that he is comfortable with how the process would work as proposed, as it works the same way as the current aquatic research permits, and ADF&G is in communication with the program operators. He said that ADF&G receives annual reports from operators and most permits require renewal after one or two years. He summarized that he feels that oversight is already built into the system.

[11:28:30 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP asked whether Mr. Pryor could explain the range in scope and how involved the operations of these proposed permitted facilities might be.

MR. PRYOR replied that the operations proposed under HB 199 would be limited to 500,000 eggs. He explained that this is a small amount compared to existing hatcheries, which are hatching millions of eggs a year; in the case of pink salmon it is hundreds of millions of eggs. He expressed that the proposed facilities would be small, as Representative Talerico had mentioned earlier, like sheds with a sluice box on the front of them. Current hatchery projects are designed to augment fisheries, whereas the projects proposed under HB 199 would be small and focused on rehabilitation. He summarized that he sees the projects proposed by HB 199 as smaller than a hatchery program, but larger than a research program.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP asked Mr. Pryor which fish stocks he expects would be targeted under HB 199 and whether he anticipates that hatcheries could be overdoing it with rehabilitation numbers in certain fishery stocks, such as pink salmon.

MR. PRYOR answered that concerns which have been discussed were that there were a lot of limitations on harvest in order to pass more fish. He expressed that the proposed legislation would help with small projects which would reintroduce eggs to an area and try to boost the number of fish by a small amount. He explained that out of the 500,000-egg limit, approximately 5,000 would produce fish on average; in an exceptional cycle that number could be up to 15,000 fish. Adding 5,000 fish to a small stock could be significant in rebuilding that stock faster than leaving it alone and not allowing any fish to be harvested.

[11:32:18 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked how long the review and permitting process takes for an aquatic resource permit, as described by Mr. Pryor earlier.

[11:32:37 AM](#)

MR. PRYOR replied that the review process for those permits typically takes around 45 days. He explained that a lot of the projects ADF&G approves permits for are repeat projects and research projects that are very small in scale; some of the projects are classroom incubation projects that consist of 500 eggs in an aquarium. He stated that the projects proposed under

HB 199 would be more in depth than the smaller existing projects, and he estimated it would take several months to approve one of these new projects.

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked how permitting for these proposed projects would compare to permitting for a newly proposed hatchery.

MR. PRYOR replied that the hatchery process is much more involved. He explained that there is a direct Regional Planning Team (RPT) review, a public comment period, and several different steps that might not necessarily be involved with the process for projects proposed under HB 199. He said that the hatchery process typically takes up to a year and a half.

[11:34:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR observed that the language in [subsection(g)] in the [Sectional Analysis for HB 199] read "collect no more than 500,000 eggs for fertilization", while subsection(g) in HB 199 read "collect not more than 500,000 eggs for fertilization under a single permit". She asked whether the words "under a single permit" were added because it was thought that one operator could have multiple permits, or whether it was a suggestion from Legislative Legal Services.

MR. PRYOR responded that he was not sure of the reason for the change. He expressed that he did not see a situation where there would be permit stacking involved in the proposed review process.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR asked whether the \$100 fee was a realistic amount to cover the cost of all of the staff work involved in the permitting process, or whether a \$500 fee would better cover the cost yet still be attainable for individuals who would like to apply for one of these projects.

MR. PRYOR answered that he wasn't sure that he was the one who "should answer that question."

[11:35:39 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS remarked that he understands that it isn't Mr. Pryor's "call for what the permit fees should be," but he asked whether Mr. Pryor could speak to the staffing needs and resources involved, and the reasoning behind a zero fiscal note.

MR. PRYOR replied that ADF&G already has a system for permit reviews in place, in which one person acts as a permit coordinator and puts the permits out for review online on a shared website where every reviewer can see every review at the same time. He explained that when he first started in the department this process was done through the mail, and it was a much slower process in which it was harder to ascertain what another reviewer had said about the permit. He summarized that the process requires one person to coordinate six to eight reviewers and it can be done very efficiently. He added that ADF&G anticipates that the projects proposed under HB 199 would only add a "handful of permits" annually, which would not put much strain on the current system. In response to a follow-up question from Representative Kreiss-Tomkins, he said that the basis for the assumption that there would only be a "handful of permits" issued annually is that he doesn't see it as being very popular. He explained that there is a lot of science involved in the hatching process, it can be much harder than it appears, and there will be areas where it might seem like it could work but would be unsuccessful.

[11:37:49 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR asked Mr. Pryor whether he thinks that the process would self-select for the right permittees to engage in the opportunity.

MR. PRYOR responded that that is correct.

[11:38:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE EDGMON asked whether it would have to be an organization or corporation, and not a "mom and pop operation," undertaking these proposed projects given the time, money, and effort which would be required.

[11:39:10 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TALERICO answered that there has been interest expressed in undertaking projects like this by the Tanana Chiefs Conference (TCC), because of the lack of fish in its area. He added that he was open to suggestions and recommendations from the committee on the amount that would be required for permits and the number of eggs allowed with each permit.

[11:39:44 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE VANCE asked whether the 500,000-egg limit per permit would justify the effort, and whether an increase in the limit would change the ADF&G's ability to manage the permitting. She asked what the threshold would be for ADF&G.

[11:40:20 AM](#)

MR. PRYOR answered that he thinks the 500,000-egg limit was chosen because of current aquaculture propagation permit regulations, which state a goal of no more than 5,000 returning adult fish. This would be a 1 percent return out of 500,000, which would be considered a very successful program. He said that this number was chosen for the proposed legislation under HB 199 because of its similarity to existing programs.

[11:41:01 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked whether there was anything problematic, regarding genetics and other management considerations, about the ratio of fish that would be returning from the proposed rehabilitation programs to that of the fish returning from existing natural populations. As an example, he referenced the sockeye salmon stock in Klawock Lake, which is seeing small returns on sockeye, such as 800 per year. He suggested that if a permit were issued to this area under the proposed bill, and there were 5,000 returning adults from the permit, there would be a 5:1 ratio of fish from the program to wild occurring fish.

MR. PRYOR responded that this would not pose a concern, as every project under the proposed legislation would have to pass through a genetics review and meet all state policy requirements. He stated that in the case proposed by Representative Kreiss-Tomkins, where there were 800 returning fish, the project would receive a permit for only 10 or 20 percent of the available brood stock; the permit would be dialed down in this case to address genetic concerns.

[11:43:20 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR asked Mr. Pryor whether he could point to an introductory place to start limiting the number of permits which would be available under the proposed legislation, which would allow the program to be established in a way that would ease initial concerns.

MR. PRYOR replied that he thinks this could be incorporated into the proposed legislation, but he does not think it would be necessary.

[11:43:59 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES, after ascertaining that there were no further questions, announced that HB 199 would be held over for further review.

**HB 218-SALT WATER FISHING: OPERATORS/GUIDES**

[11:44:57 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 218, "An Act relating to salt water sport fishing operators and salt water sport fishing guides; and providing for an effective date."

[11:46:02 AM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease at 11:46 a.m.

[11:46:18 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES asked whether ADF&G had any comments it would like to make before she opened public testimony.

[11:46:44 AM](#)

TOM TAUBE, Deputy Director, Division of Sport Fish, Alaska Department of Fish & Game (ADF&G), offered a summary on HB 218. He stated that HB 218 would reinstate the salt water sportfishing guide and operator license standards, fees, and salt water logbook reporting requirements, which sunset in 2018. He explained that since that time, ADF&G has continued the salt water registration and logbook program with funds from ADF&G sportfishing license sales. He explained that ADF&G is required by the federal government to collect salt water logbook data in order to meet obligations for various treaties, such as the Pacific Salmon Treaty and the Pacific Halibut Treaty, which has left ADF&G with an unfunded mandate. He stated that if Alaska fails to perform these obligations, the federal government will institute a logbook program of its own, infringing on the state's right to manage. He added that logbook data is critical to fisheries management and other ADF&G functions, such as issuing emergency orders, informing the Board of Fisheries in

its decision making processes, and informing the local advisory committees: Fisheries Disaster Declarations, the Federal Subsistence Board, and the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Saltwater Angler Registry.

[11:48:20 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES opened public testimony on HB 218.

[11:48:39 AM](#)

MATTHEW DONOHOE, Fisherman, asked whether "barebones" charters had been considered under HB 218. He explained that "barebones" means that an individual, either resident or nonresident, can charter a vessel and take it out without a guide. He expressed that these charters have been growing throughout Southeast Alaska and have an impact on fisheries that is largely undocumented. He expressed that barebones charters are significant in Ketchikan and Yakutat, and he stated that he thinks if the purpose is to gather information on fishing charters, then barebones charters should be investigated.

[11:50:33 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS commented that the situation discussed by Mr. Donohoe appears to be a rapidly growing issue in Southeast Alaska, and a large amount of halibut is being harvested through these barebones charters. He requested that at the end of public testimony ADF&G address this issue.

[11:51:35 AM](#)

FORREST BRADEN, Executive Director, Southeast Alaska Guides Organization (SEAGO), offered testimony in support of HB 218. He stated that logbooks and accounting are important for the fleet, since the logbooks have been in place SEAGO has been able to keep track of "good numbers coming in." He stated that SEAGO recognizes the need to meet treaty obligations, as explained previously by Mr. Taube. He expressed that initially SEAGO was slightly concerned about the fees being doubled, but after analyzing the proposal mathematically it was able to determine that the printing, labor, and entry costs justify the increased fees. He added that when the logbooks transition completely to an electronic format, it is his understanding that the Information Technology (IT) costs will replace the manual expenses for ADF&G. He expressed that these logbooks are very

important and SEAGO supports efforts for improvement to the system, so long as they are cost neutral moving forward from HB 218.

[11:53:12 AM](#)

CHAIR STUTES, after ascertaining that there was no one else who wished to testify, closed public testimony on HB 218.

CHAIR STUTES asked for an explanation on the fiscal note for HB 199.

[11:54:28 AM](#)

RACHEL HANKE, Legislative Liaison, Office of the Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, offered an explanation on the fiscal note for HB 218. She pointed out that the increase in fees would provide for approximately \$400,000 in revenue. She referenced expenditures and said that personal services were for \$356,000, travel was \$1,900, services were 38,100, and commodities were \$3,500.

[11:55:12 AM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease at 11:55 a.m.

[11:55:50 AM](#)

DAYNA MACKEY, Administrative Services Director, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Office of Management Budget, Office of the Governor, explained line items on the fiscal note for HB 218. She explained that: personal service costs are related to existing staff's time processing the registrations and conducting data entry; a small amount of travel is necessary for program staff to travel to guide meetings and explain annual modifications to logbooks; services costs are necessary for printing vessel decals and logbooks; and commodities are for postage and mailing decals and logbooks as a necessary part of the program.

[11:56:52 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked Mr. Taube whether he could comment on how data is acquired from fishing efforts related to barebones charters.

[11:57:21 AM](#)

MR. TAUBE replied that barebones charters have neither been captured in the past nor is there a plan to capture it with logbook data through ADF&G. He said that this issue has been taken up by the North Pacific Fishery Management Council for the past two or three years, and ADF&G has been involved with those discussions. He expressed that there is some difficulty when trying to pin down which vessels are being used for sportfishing versus recreational use or hunting. He explained that, given the definition of sportfish guiding is "an individual providing assistance to an angler," barebones charters do not fall under this definition, as they are only providing the vessel and possibly some of the gear. He expressed that there are some hybrid operations that provide Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates or have a "mothership where these little boats are going out with just the private anglers, and then returning back to the mothership." He added that operations like that would be considered guided and would be required to have a logbook. He summarized that the barebones charter operations are treated as private anglers and would not be captured under the logbook program.

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked how ADF&G assesses fishing efforts from barebones charters, whether they are treated as private anglers.

MR. TAUBE replied that this would be captured by a statewide harvest survey and, if a barebones operation were to go through a public dock or port, it might also be captured by a krill survey.

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS asked whether an unguided fisherman who is provided GPS coordinates on where to take his/her vessel to fish constitutes a guided charter.

MR. TAUBE answered that that is correct because the barebones charter operator is providing fishing assistance. He explained that it is a "little bit of a gray area" because the guide isn't physically on the vessel. He expressed that he does not believe any cases have been tried in which someone has been cited for this specific violation, and he said he thinks this might be an area where the regulations could be "shored up" a little bit.

REPRESENTATIVE KREISS-TOMKINS commented that his understanding of what happens with barebones charters is that providing coordinates and gear is commonplace, and if this constitutes guided fishing, perhaps it could be clarified or codified in

some way. He summarized that he thinks this is probably an issue for another day and he appreciates the testimony on the topic from ADF&G.

[12:01:07 PM](#)

CHAIR STUTES asked whether it was the will of the committee to move HB 218 out of committee, or would it like to hold it for further discussion.

[12:01:26 PM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease at 12:01 p.m.

[12:01:45 PM](#)

CHAIR STUTES announced that HB 218 would be held over for further review.

[12:01:59 PM](#)

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting was adjourned at 12:02 p.m.