

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE RESOURCES STANDING COMMITTEE**

March 4, 2022

1:03 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Josiah Patkotak, Chair
Representative Grier Hopkins, Vice Chair
Representative Calvin Schrage
Representative Sara Hannan
Representative George Rauscher
Representative Mike Cronk
Representative Ronald Gillham
Representative Tom McKay

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative Zack Fields

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

PRESENTATION: ALASKA'S COMPETITIVE POSITION BY GAFFNEY CLINE

- HEARD

HOUSE BILL NO. 347

"An Act relating to the confidentiality of certain state records relating to animals; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 347

SHORT TITLE: CONFIDENTIALITY OF ANIMAL RECORDS

SPONSOR(s): REPRESENTATIVE(s) RAUSCHER

02/22/22	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/22/22	(H)	RES
03/02/22	(H)	RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124
03/02/22	(H)	-- MEETING CANCELED --
03/04/22	(H)	RES AT 1:00 PM BARNES 124

WITNESS REGISTER

MIKE CLINE, Strategy Advisor/Legal Counsel

Gaffney, Cline & Associates
Houston, Texas

POSITION STATEMENT: Co-provided a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Alaska's Competitive Position."

NICK FULFORD, Senior Director
Gas/LNG-Carbon Management-Energy Transition-Americas
Gaffney, Cline & Associates
Houston, Texas

POSITION STATEMENT: Co-provided a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Alaska's Competitive Position."

RYAN MCKEE, Staff
Representative George Rauscher
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented the sectional analysis for HB 347, Version I, on behalf of Representative Rauscher, prime sponsor.

AMY SEITZ, Executive Director
Alaska Farm Bureau
Soldotna, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided invited testimony in support of HB 347.

CHRISTINA CARPENTER, Director
Division of Environmental Health
Department of Environmental Conservation
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided invited testimony in support of HB 347.

MIKE CLINE, Strategy Advisor/Legal Counsel
Gaffney, Cline & Associates
Houston, Texas

POSITION STATEMENT: Co-provided a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Alaska's Competitive Position."

ACTION NARRATIVE

[1:03:37 PM](#)

CHAIR JOSIAH PATKOTAK called the House Resources Standing Committee meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Representatives McKay, Cronk, Hopkins, Rauscher, Hannan, Gillham, and Patkotak were present at the call to order. Representative Schrage arrived as the meeting was in progress.

Presentation: Alaska's Competitive Position by Gaffney Cline

[1:04:19 PM](#)

CHAIR PATKOTAK announced that the first order of business would be a presentation on Alaska's Competitive Position by Gaffney Cline Consultants.

[1:04:48 PM](#)

MIKE CLINE, Strategy Advisor/Legal Counsel, Gaffney, Cline & Associates, co-provided a PowerPoint presentation [hard copy included in the committee packet], titled "Alaska's Competitive Position." He presented slide 3, "Volatility, Disruption & Supply in the Oil & Gas Industry," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- The oil & gas industry has been battered by deeply disruptive events in recent years leading to volatility.
 - Oil price collapse of 2014-2016 and Covid-19.
 - Deep cost cutting, project delays and cancellations will have long term supply implications.
 - The impact of energy transition on the energy mix and related shift in the long-term prospects of the industry.
 - Most recently dramatic price increases as the global economy emerges from Covid-19 against a backdrop of geopolitical concerns in Eastern Europe and the Middle East.

- Oil and gas companies have generally performed poorly and investors have demanded better capital discipline, improved financial performance and action on climate change.

[1:08:57 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked whether the information in the PowerPoint accounted for the recent Russian invasion of Ukraine.

MR. CLINE replied that the slides were prepared before the invasion, but at a time when the situation was looking "dire." He said he would comment on the demand for oil resulting from sanctions, as well as from the decreased demand in Ukraine.

[1:11:07 PM](#)

MR. CLINE presented slide 4, "Energy Demand Outlook," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- World energy demand is expected to grow but many different scenarios are being discussed with key differentiators being:
 - Costs of energy supply particularly fossil fuels vs renewables/low carbon.
 - The nature of governmental and private initiatives to decarbonise.
 - The pace of change.
- Under all scenarios significant investment is needed to meet demand and offset existing oil & gas decline.

[1:13:23 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked whether the drop in demand in 2020 was due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

MR. CLINE confirmed Representative Rauscher's understanding was correct.

[1:14:02 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN pointed out the differentiation between hydroelectric power and renewable energy. She asked whether hydroelectric power is considered renewable energy.

MR. CLINE answered that hydroelectric projects were considered renewable and added that he saw no reason not to consider small scale hydroelectric projects as viable.

[1:15:35 PM](#)

MR. CLINE presented slide 5, "Energy Transition," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- The global energy mix is decarbonizing and the pace of change is accelerating.
 - COP26 UN Climate Change Conference more than 140 nations committed to eliminate 90% of GHG emissions.

- 2050 Net Zero GHG Targets: US net zero no later than 2050 with a 50-52% reduction from 2005 levels by 2030.
- 2030 Methane Reduction Target: Over 100 countries commit to reduce methane emissions by 30% by 2030.

- Investment dollars will flow disproportionately into clean energy.

- The Bipartisan Infrastructure Deal includes US\$6.5 Bn for national network of EV chargers and US\$65 Bn in clean energy transmission and electric grid in support of a 100% pollution-free power sector by 2035.

- International finance: 25 countries, including the US, and 5 financial institutions pledged to end new international finance for unabated fossil fuel energy by the end of 2022.

- Hydrocarbon producers with the highest cost and the highest carbon emission intensity products will be the first to be impacted.

[1:20:05 PM](#)

CHAIR PATKOTAK asked how much access infrastructure would be necessary to reach Alaska's natural resources.

MR. CLINE emphasized the importance of developing Alaska's resource infrastructure and explained how easier access to its resources would be beneficial to the state.

[1:24:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked if other countries with natural resources were facing similar issues with regard to a lack of resource infrastructure.

MR. CLINE explained that Alaska's technically challenging, high cost developments were really only comparable to places like Norway. He said that he used Norway as an example due to its similarly high cost of development.

[1:28:09 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked for a more detailed explanation of the term "supermajor" company.

MR. CLINE pointed to Chevron, British Petroleum, Shell, and Total as examples of supermajor gas companies.

[1:29:37 PM](#)

MR. CLINE resumed the presentation on slide 7, which detailed how various countries worked to respond to changing global gas market conditions. He emphasized Alaska's capacity to adapt to changing global markets due to its underdeveloped position.

[1:37:33 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked why Canada was different than Norway with regard to the operation of its oil and gas investment.

MR. CLINE said that oil and gas investment in arctic regions is generally disfavored if it can be avoided, therefore Canada has invested mainly in its heartland region.

[1:41:01 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRAGE shared his understanding that instability in Alaska's oil and gas industry was influenced by federal legislation.

MR. CLINE confirmed Representative Schrage's understanding and explained that tax stability would be a net-positive for Alaska's oil and gas industry.

[1:44:02 PM](#)

MR. CLINE resumed the presentation on slide 9, which gave a detailed outlook on the future of the oil and gas industry in Alaska. He moved to slide 10, which compared Alaska's natural resource infrastructure to the "Lower 48" natural resource infrastructure and continued to slide 11, which outlined the state revenues achieved by oil and gas production.

[1:48:07 PM](#)

MR. FULFORD picked up the presentation on slide 13, which gave a broad overview of the volatility of the price of natural gas between 2020 and 2022.

[1:54:15 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER asked how the price of natural gas had behaved in the previous 4 months.

MR. FULFORD answered that the price of natural gas had stabilized in the previous 4 months.

[1:56:23 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked how long it generally took natural gas to hit the market once it was extracted.

MR. FULFORD answered that it might take up to five years to sell gas after it had been extracted.

[2:00:13 PM](#)

MR. FULFORD resumed the presentation on slide 14, which detailed the global market context of Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) development.

[2:03:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRAGE asked if there were any "non traditional ways" that states had advertised their oil and gas programs.

MR. FULFORD pointed to the importance and social power of advertising gas processing and the conversion to more environmentally friendly fuels as a way to push forward a conventional LNG project.

[2:10:00 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked what the cost of developing gas at an LNG plant would be.

MR. FULFORD explained that the price of gas would be similar to most other LNG.

[2:13:03 PM](#)

MR. FULFORD resumed the presentation on slide 15, which displayed a graph that gave a complex comparison of high level guideline project economics in Alaska versus China.

[2:16:46 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY asked if it could be possible to avoid constructing an LNG pipeline by utilizing icebreaker ships.

MR. FULFORD answered that both the literal and metaphorical climate for shipping LNG has greatly improved in the last 10 years.

[2:19:06 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRAGE asked about the viability of an LNG project in Alaska's arctic if it were to be such an environmentally challenging project to move forward.

MR. FULFORD explained that an LNG plant could produce as much as 1 gigawatt of waste energy in the form of heat and pointed to regasification as a potential antidote to the concern.

[2:21:10 PM](#)

MR. FULFORD continued the presentation on slide 16, which compared the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of LNG investment in Alaska.

[2:23:07 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked why Alaska is considered to have different geopolitical stability compared to the Lower 48.

MR. FULFORD replied that Alaska is in a more vulnerable position geopolitically than the contiguous United States.

[2:24:12 PM](#)

MR. CLINE proceeded to the next part of the presentation with slide 17, "Alaska's Competitive Factors," and presented slide 18, "OPEX/CAPEX Comparison," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- Alaska is a relatively high cost environment:
 - Most development statements and data suggests US\$8-15/Bbl of development costs, which is comparable to other high cost developments (ongoing unconventional developments & deepwater).

- Operating costs are dependent on existing facilities, remoteness, weather and accessibility but broadly observed to be between US\$7-12/Bbl.

- Significant transport costs of US\$8-\$10/Bbl, which is higher than most other upstream opportunities. - Unit costs further challenged due to gas and NGL monetization limitations.

MR. CLINE presented slide 19, "Fiscal Comparison," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- Chart illustrates general \$/bbl cash breakdown and tax burden for select jurisdictions over an oil & gas development's life cycle
 - Assumes characteristics with new development in Alaska, including constant cost environment
 - In reality each jurisdiction will have numerous unique characteristics (development timeframe, cost environment, infrastructure/market proximity etc.)
- Alaska has relatively high government take compared to select jurisdictions
- Worth noting that some fiscal elements are considered more burdensome than others
 - Non-Income based taxes, such as royalty, carry elevated risk to investors because of timing and it is not responsive to development/operating costs
- Many other competing jurisdictions, particularly non-western, implement asset level contracts
 - Popular for oil and gas dependent governments
 - Allows for fiscal terms specific to assets and reflecting current economic conditions
 - Often contains various risk mitigations including fiscal stabilization

[2:29:09 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked about Australia's "government take."

MR. CLINE explained that the oil and gas tax rate was close to 60 percent.

[2:30:11 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRAGE commented that there is a great need to look at the federal regulatory environment that governs oil and gas development in Alaska.

[2:31:12 PM](#)

MR. CLINE presented slide 20, "Alaska Competitiveness Globally," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- Alaska's upstream investment has faired reasonably in line with global trends:
 - Some major Alaska operators, such as Conoco and Hillcorp, have clearly increased Alaska exposure as a percentage of total capital budgets in recent years.
 - Exploration has been healthy in last 10-12 years.

- A key challenge for Alaska and the companies will be maturing discoveries into developments.

- The projects take years to progress to the investment decision and years from that decision to reach production.

- Alaska is entering a critical phase that will be decisive in long-term production trends.

[2:35:22 PM](#)

MR. CLINE proceeded to the section of the presentation titled "Alaska Oil Moving Forward," and he presented slide 22, "Alaska Development Scenarios," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- There is strong potential for major new developments, as well as smaller incremental developments built around existing or new infrastructure hubs.

- To understand the potential contribution of new investments to Alaska state revenues and to gauge the downside risk if new investments are curtailed, indicative profiles have been developed representative of Alaska new investment opportunities:

- A significant new development justifying a new infrastructure hub, similar to the Pikka or Willow developments.
- A smaller incremental development tying into an existing infrastructure or infrastructure associated with a new development.

- The evaluation summarizes the estimated 'investor return' and generated 'state revenue' under the current and proposed tax changes as well as under a variety of sensitivities.

MR. CLINE presented slide 23, "Pikka Scale Development," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- Material new developments could create new infrastructure hubs with numerous benefits
 - Development generates material new state revenue, US\$6-7 Billion over 20 years.
 - Enables numerous additional incremental developments (in this example Pikka Phase 2 and Quokka) detailed on following slide.
 - Potentially extend TAPS infrastructure life.
- However, developments are more challenging due to:
 - Significant development risks, capital and time during the development period.
 - Up to 20-year time horizon to realize expected economic returns means perceptions of market, fiscal and regulatory risk heightened.

[2:41:13 PM](#)

MR. CLINE presented slide 24, "Incremental Developments," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- Incremental developments tie into existing infrastructure and benefit from shorter development periods.
- The returns on the assumed incremental development are attractive under current prices.
- Each development of this size could add over US\$150 MM+ per year in peak years and US\$1.5 Bn of total state revenue.

MR. CLINE concluded the presentation on slide 25, "Concluding Remarks," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

- Alaska oil & gas faces many challenges going forward but it remains an attractive oil & gas province.
- New developments are required to offset the historic downward trend in production and revenues.
 - Without new developments there is also a risk of reaching TAPS minimum production threshold
 - New developments will generate jobs and economic activity throughout value chain
- New developments will be costly and challenging and operators, investors and lenders need regulatory visibility and fiscal stability to support financial decisions for these long-term projects.
- Giant projects are unlikely but new material developments with numerous smaller tie-backs to infrastructure hubs offer a path to reversing the decline.
- The global competition for new investment is fierce and maintaining an attractive fiscal, regulatory and administrative environment will be key.

[2:44:46 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked about the choice of words on slide 25.

MR. CLINE responded that specific wording was used in concern for specific detail to Alaska's oil and gas development.

[2:46:20 PM](#)

CHAIR PATKOTAK thanked the presenters for their time and commented his belief that Alaska must "do what it can" to make itself more attractive to foreign oil and gas development.

[2:47:22 PM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 2:47 p.m. to 2:51 p.m.

HB 347-CONFIDENTIALITY OF ANIMAL RECORDS

[2:51:29 PM](#)

CHAIR PATKOTAK announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 347, "An Act relating to the confidentiality of certain state records relating to animals; and providing for an effective date."

CHAIR PATKOTAK stated that the sponsor has requested the committee to adopt a proposed committee substitute.

[2:51:55 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HOPKINS moved to adopt the proposed committee substitute (CS) for HB 347, Version 32-LS1471\I, Bullard, 2/28/22, as the working document. There being no objection, Version I was before the committee.

[2:52:18 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER, as prime sponsor of HB 347, paraphrased from the sponsor statement [included in the committee packet], which read [original punctuation provided]:

HB 347 is an act allowing confidentiality to all owner's quadruped animals when getting their animals tested for things like contagious viruses.

The bill allows information on the results of those tests to be made available to those that ask, however, the owner's name and location is redacted for safety's sake. It allows the data needed to make accurate assessments from DEC [Department of Environmental Conservation] and or the State Veterinarian to move forward in case of an outbreak but keeps the name of the owner from being made public.

The bill has taken 5 years to get this far, and the current version is accepted by most hunting groups and farmers alike.

Groups such as the Farm Bureau, SCI [Safari Club International], the Alaskan Sheep Foundation, and the Department of Environmental Conservation all support its passing.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER noted that HB 347 also allows the public to give consultation or opinion on the collected data as it pertains to moving forward.

[2:54:29 PM](#)

RYAN MCKEE, Staff, Representative George Rauscher, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Rauscher, prime sponsor of HB 347, gave the sectional analysis for Version I [included in the committee packet], which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Section 1: AS 03.05

It is amended by adding a new section, AS 03.05.084, Confidentiality of Certain Information, Exceptions. It states that a record containing information about an animal that is maintained by the Department of Environmental Conservation will carry out the requirements of this chapter including the record of sale, movement, unique identification number, or owner of an animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under AS 40.25.100-40.25.295, if the record identifies a particular animal, breed of an animal, business, or individual; contains test results, or a record of test samples, for a particular animal; or contains trade secrets or proprietary business or financial information. It also states the Department of Environmental Conservation may disclose this information to state, federal, local government, or regional health corporation if the department feels there is a health or safety threat of an animal or to the public. The Department of Environmental Conservation shall, upon request, publicly disclose records subject to this section in a manner that prevents identification of a particular animal, individual, or business.

Section 2: The uncodified law of the State of Alaska, Transition: Regulations

This is amended by adding a new section. The Department of Environmental Conservation may adopt regulations necessary to implement this Act and takes effect under AS 44.62 (Administrative Procedure Act), but not before the effective date.

Section 3: Section 2 of this act takes effect immediately under AS 01.10.070(c).

CHAIR PATKOTAK [opened invited testimony on HB 347, Version I.]

[2:57:07 PM](#)

AMY SEITZ, Executive Director, Alaska Farm Bureau, provided invited testimony in support of HB 347. She said the Alaska Farm Bureau's mission is to ensure the economic wellbeing and expansion of agriculture and to enrich the quality of life for all Alaskans. She noted that the bureau's 400 farming and ranching members drive the bureau's positions on policy issues, and today she is speaking in support of HB 347.

MS. SEITZ related that for each of the last five years the bureau's members have said it is important to protect the personal, business, and individual animal information housed within DEC from release to the public. Because this information is currently subject to the Public Records Act, many farmers are reluctant to have the information go through the state. In some situations, state or federal law requires specific information; for example, importing animals [to Alaska] and running tests in Grade A dairies [in Alaska] must go through DEC. There are situations where it is voluntary as to what information goes through, but it would be helpful to have the information, like participating in disease surveillance programs. These programs are designed to be pro-active in identifying a disease and being able to take steps to mitigate before there becomes an outbreak. The bureau wants its farmers to feel comfortable working with state agencies and having security in knowing their personal, business, or financial information isn't going to be released to the public, or information identifying specific animals.

MS. SEITZ said that in this time when Alaska needs to be increasing its food production it's important to have these protections in place. Having more farmers participating in testing can help produce a higher quality product and increase efficiency in production. Also, it could help with early detection of a possible outbreak, which would give agencies time to respond appropriately. There would still be access to general information and people would still know what's being imported and whether any diseases, pathogens, or parasites are being found. It would be like COVID-19 reporting - the number of positives in a region is known but who has it is unknown.

MS. SEITZ addressed why it is important to protect this information. She said livestock farmers in other states have sometimes been harassed by anti-livestock organizations. During

COVID-19 some states had problems with pilfering on the farms. Some Alaska farms have had issues with people stealing their animals. There have also been situations where someone has a grudge against a farmer and can access testing information and spread a rumor that a certain farmer has an unclean farm because the farmer is testing for a certain pathogen. Ms. Seitz further noted that in addition to farmers and ranchers being impacted by this, kennels have testing that goes through DEC.

[3:03:34 PM](#)

CHRISTINA CARPENTER, Director, Division of Environmental Health, Department of Environmental Conservation, provided invited testimony in support of HB 347. She noted that the Division of Environmental Health includes the Office of the State Veterinarian (OSV) which is tasked with oversight of the animal records impacted by this legislation. She stated that HB 347 strikes a perfect balance by allowing DEC to keep its animal owner information confidential while keeping the public informed about known animal disease outbreaks. The bill will strengthen the agriculture community by encouraging increased surveillance testing which will in turn protect Alaska's wildlife resources. She thanked the sponsor for bringing forth the bill.

[3:04:44 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRAGE asked whether the volume of documents would be large enough to result in a fiscal note for the redacting process that will be needed for keeping some of this information confidential.

MS. CARPENTER replied that the fiscal note for HB 347 is zero as DEC doesn't anticipate increased needs for its staff since it is a relatively small number of documents. She drew attention to the Certificate of Export provided to the committee, which includes the shipper's information, receiver's information, and specific information about the animal and test results. She explained that if HB 347 were passed, DEC would be able to provide general information to the public along the lines of "nine reindeer were exported from Alaska in 2021 and all tested negative for tuberculosis prior to movement."

[3:06:56 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked whether other states have confidentiality like that proposed in HB 347, especially those states with much higher livestock management.

MS. CARPENTER responded that most states do have confidentiality legislation or allowances in statute. When researching this previously, DEC looked to the statutes of Oregon and Washington.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN surmised Alaska has far more kennels with veterinary needs than cattle with veterinary needs, yet HB 347 was drafted in terms of agriculture and farming. She recalled Ms. Seitz stating that the bill would lead to more voluntary testing. She inquired about which tests are mandated in statute and which are optional and further asked whether the sharing of data is mandatory or voluntary for transmissible diseases like kennel cough and rabies.

MS. CARPENTER answered that the only testing currently mandated through statute or regulation is when importing an animal into the state; DEC has requirements for several species. When there is a known or suspected disease outbreak throughout the state or in a certain region, the state veterinarian, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) veterinarian, and the Health and Social Services veterinarian work with animal owners and private veterinarians. The department believes that HB 347 will encourage more surveillance testing so that when a dog or livestock already in the state display symptoms the proper actions can be taken to get that animal tested and respond appropriately. The department has a list of reportable diseases in statute and in regulation so that an animal testing positive through a private veterinarian is reportable to the state veterinarian. She offered to provide those details to members.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN stated she would like to receive this information because she is curious about what the state's reporting requirements are. She said she isn't opposed to the idea of confidentiality but wants to ensure there are no unintended ripple effects.

[3:12:47 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CRONK offered his understanding that the main purpose of HB 347 is to ensure that Alaska's wild game populations don't get these diseases.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER responded that the worry in Alaska for five-plus years has been over keeping [Mycoplasma ovipneumoniae (Movi)] away from Dall sheep and mountain goats. An outbreak occurred in the Lower 48 where there is free range farming. Since that cannot be done in Alaska due to wild predators,

farmers put up fencing but contact between domestic and wild animals is still a possibility. Given that Movi is a life-threatening disease for these wild animals, farmers are probably going to want to get their herds tested, but currently farmers are afraid to test because the information about their farms may become public and then there could be a reaction against the farmer, the farm, or the animals themselves. So, what is trying to be done with HB 347 is encourage the testing for every one of these because the most important part is to get this data recorded, who the farmer is isn't important. The information that needs to be acquired is the location and whether an animal has contracted the disease. This bill entices the farmer because he/she won't be found out and the information is as important to the farmer as it is to the herd in the wild. What comes across the border is already being taken care of because they must be tested, HB 347 makes sure that the herds within the state are taken care of. He offered his understanding that about 2,000 [domestic] animals are in Alaska.

REPRESENTATIVE HANNAN asked if testing for Movi is currently required or whether that will be contemplated once there is confidentiality of records. If testing is voluntary, she said, there is no guarantee that testing will be done.

REPRESENTATIVE RAUSCHER replied that current regulation requires an animal be tested before being brought into the state. A regulation is done by DEC, so it is a possibility that when this bill passes the answer to the question may be yes.

MS. CARPENTER responded that, currently, once an animal is in Alaska, surveillance testing is completely voluntary. At this time, she continued, there are no plans to implement mandatory testing for Movi or any other pathogen.

[3:17:41 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE SCHRAGE thanked the sponsor for bringing forth the legislation.

[3:18:04 PM](#)

CHAIR PATKOTAK announced that HB 347 was held over.

[3:18:47 PM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Resources Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.