

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

February 14, 2023

10:00 a.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Sarah Vance, Chair  
Representative Kevin McCabe  
Representative CJ McCormick  
Representative Ben Carpenter  
Representative Craig Johnson  
Representative Louise Stutes  
Representative Rebecca Himschoot

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

All members present

**OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT**

Representative Dan Ortiz  
Representative Mike Cronk

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Urging the United States Secretary of Commerce, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and other federal and state agencies to defend the state's fisheries, including the Southeast Alaska troll fishery.

- MOVED CSHJR 5(FSH) OUT OF COMMITTEE

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HJR 5

SHORT TITLE: ALASKA FISHERIES; TROLL FISHERIES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) HIMSCHOOT

02/10/23	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/10/23	(H)	FSH
02/14/23	(H)	FSH AT 10:00 AM GRUENBERG 120

**WITNESS REGISTER**

THATCHER BROUWER, Staff

Representative Rebecca Himschoot  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Outlined the litigation involved with the troller fishery during the hearing on HJR 5, on behalf of Representative Himschoot, prime sponsor.

AMY DAUGHERTY, Executive Director  
Alaska Trollers Association  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Gave invited testimony during the hearing on HJR 5.

CASEY MAPES, Commercial Fisher  
Yakutat, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Gave invited testimony during the hearing on HJR 5.

TIM O'CONNOR, Mayor  
City of Craig;  
Vice President  
Alaska Trollers Association  
Craig, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Gave invited testimony during the hearing on HJR 5.

TAD FUJIOKA, Fisher  
Sitka, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Gave invited testimony during the hearing on HJR 5.

AARON PETERSON, Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Natural Resources Section  
Civil Division (Anchorage)  
Department of Law  
Anchorage, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Answered questions during the hearing on HJR 5.

MARK ROBERTS  
Petersburg, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HJR 5.

MATT DONAHOE, President  
Board of Directors  
Alaska Trollers Association  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HJR 5.

ERIC JORDAN, Salmon Troller  
Sitka, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HJR 5.

DAVID RICHY, Commercial Troller  
Sitka, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HJR 4.

CHARLES "CHARLIE" DIERCY  
Ketchikan, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HJR 5.

JEFF FARVOUR, Board Member  
Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association  
Sitka, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HJR 4.

MICHAEL KOHAN, Science and Policy Director  
Sitka Salmon Share  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified in support of HJR 5.

LINDA BEHNKEN, Executive Director  
Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association  
Sitka, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** Testified during the hearing on HJR 5.

#### **ACTION NARRATIVE**

[10:00:32 AM](#)

**CHAIR SARAH VANCE** called the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Representatives Himschoot, Stutes, and Vance were present at the call to order. Representatives C. Johnson, McCormick, McCabe, and Carpenter arrived as the meeting was in progress.

#### **HJR 5-ALASKA FISHERIES; TROLL FISHERIES**

[10:01:13 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5, Urging the United States Secretary of Commerce, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and other federal and state

agencies to defend the state's fisheries, including the Southeast Alaska troll fishery.

[10:01:47 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT, as prime sponsor, presented HJR 5. She spoke of the prevalence of trollers in Southeast Alaska, noting that 85 percent of trollers in the fleet are Alaska residents. Trollers bring in approximately \$85 million to the Alaska economy. She continued by paraphrasing information from the sponsor statement, which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

The Southeast Alaska troll salmon fishery is threatened by a lawsuit filed by the Seattle-based Wild Fish Conservancy. House Joint Resolution 5 calls on the Federal Government and State of Alaska to continue to defend the Southeast Alaska troll fishery and do everything within their power to keep the fishery open should the judge rule in the Wild Fish Conservancy's favor. With overwhelming scientific evidence to the contrary, this suit seeks to hold the Southeast Alaska troll fishery responsible for the decline in southern resident killer whales, about 1000 miles to the south. While scientists estimate the trollers may take 3% of the Chinook salmon destined for rivers important to the southern resident killer whales, the lawsuit does not take into account threats from the pollution and habitat degradation in the home waters of the southern resident killer whales. Trolling is a low barrier, sustainable fishery where fishermen from nearly every community in Southeast Alaska catch each fish with hook and line. With approximately 1450 trollers contributing over \$85 million to the economies of coastal Alaska it is imperative the state defend this fishery, while continuing to support the scientific research that is foundational to good policy and good law. If the Wild Fish Conservancy is successful with this lawsuit it will set a dangerous precedent for a broad range of Alaska's fisheries. House Joint Resolution 5 urges the State of Alaska and Federal Government to do all they can to keep our sustainable fisheries in Alaska open.

[10:04:37 AM](#)

THATCHER BROUWER, Staff, Representative Rebecca Himschoot, Alaska State Legislature, on behalf of Representative Himschoot, prime sponsor of HJR 5, disclosed that during the legislative interim he works as a troller, and he serves on the board of the Alaska Trollers Association. He informed the committee that the Pacific Salmon Treaty is renegotiated every 10 years; the last negotiation took place in 2019. During that negotiation, the National Marine Fisheries Service is responsible for giving its biological opinion; it makes an "incidental take statement," which allows the fishers that are part of the treaty "to take a few endangered chinook salmon or chinook salmon that might potentially end up in the mouths of endangered species, such as the southern resident killer whales." He continued:

In addition to allowing that, they're also mitigating measures that are part of that incidental take statement, and ... one of the mitigating measures ... the National Marine Fisheries Service proposed was additional hatchery production of chinook salmon in Washington.

... In 2020, the Wild Fish Conservancy sued [the] National Marine Fisheries Service ... to invalidate the biological opinion. ... Part of that suit was to halt the production of chinook salmon.

MR. BROUWER explained that this action effected Alaska's fishery. He said, "Without this infidel take statement, the troll fishery's not allowed ... to proceed."

MR. BROUWER said that in September 2021, Magistrate Judge Peterson issued a report recommendation finding the analysis governing the Columbia River prey increase program was flawed, and the incidental take statement controlling the troll fishery was also deficient. In August 2022, Judge Jones adopted that report recommendation. Mr. Thatcher noted that a press release was included in the committee packet. He said the National Marine Fisheries Service is in the process of rewriting the biological opinion, as it has been asked to do, but that will take a couple of years to complete. He said since the adoption of the initial report recommendations, "they" are trying to figure out "how to account for the flaws in the biological opinion." In December 2022, Magistrate Judge Peterson again recommended the report recommendations that would invalidate the take statement for both the winter and summer troll fisheries.

MR. BROUWER said currently, Judge Jones is deliberating on the report recommendation put forward by Magistrate Judge Peterson, and Judge Jones' ruling is expected "any day now." Mr. Thatcher explained that there is no more room to appeal; the opportunity for interveners, such as the Alaska State Legislature and the Alaska Trollers Association, to submit comments on the report recommendations ended 1/25/23. Following Judge Jones' decision, the next step would be to appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. He added, "Whoever appeals the case would be able to request a stay that would allow the fishery to continue to be prosecuted while the Ninth Circuit Court considers the appeal."

[10:10:11 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE proffered that this is a complicated issue, but synopsisized that "the 3 percent of the chinook that might possibly result in a meal for a southern resident killer whale is what we're fighting for right now, and the rights of our 1,500 trollers to continue their livelihood." She said the State of Alaska has "joined in as an intervener of the suit," and there are resolutions in the committee packet from many Southeast communities. She remarked on the fundraisers that have taken place to support the trollers during this lawsuit. Additionally, "there have been a lot of private dollars flowing in to support the trollers." She noted there would be invited testimony.

[10:11:51 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE asked how many of the 1,500 trollers are home ported in Seattle, Washington.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT said she does not know how many are in Seattle, but 85 percent are home ported in Southeast Alaska. She added that 100 percent of the catch of these 1,500 trollers is caught in Alaska, regardless of where each fisher is home ported.

[10:12:37 AM](#)

MR. BROUWER, in response to Representative McCabe, said the Wild Fish Conservancy is located in Seattle.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE asked if HJR 5 is "all we're doing."

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT said HJR 5 encourages the actions already undertaken by the State of Alaska. She indicated there may be more lawsuits forthcoming.

[10:13:22 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STUTES asked whether the troll fishery in Southeast Alaska is a limited entry fishery.

MR. BROUWER answered yes. In response to a follow-up question, he estimated the permit value is \$10,000 for a hand troll permit and \$30,000 for a power troll permit.

[10:14:17 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE announced the committee would hear invited testimony.

[10:14:41 AM](#)

AMY DAUGHERTY, Executive Director, Alaska Trollers Association, first gave a brief description of trolling and emphasized the dependence of trollers on chinook salmon, with some coho caught, and a chum fishery developing. She discussed the background of the lawsuit against the fishery, noting that the Alaska Trollers Association was named in the lawsuit. She commended the efforts of the community and fishers in raising awareness and funds in response to the lawsuit. She said most of the trolling businesses are family run; trollers run slowly with minimal, if any, impact to orcas [aka killer whales]. She said the board of the association has 13 members. She offered to answer questions.

[10:16:50 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE asked how long the fishery has been in existence.

MS. DAUGHERTY offered her understanding that the fishery goes back to 1924, and troll data dates back to 1911. There have been three treaties that have reduced the chinook harvest; however, the fishery supports conservation measures.

CHAIR VANCE asked whether there have been concerns regarding the orcas prior to this.

MS. DAUGHERTY answered, "Never." She offered her understanding that every other orca population "up and down the coast" is

healthy and increasing, with the exception of "this localized Puget Sound population." In response to a follow-up question, she said this morning she saw a bill proposed in the State of Washington that seeks to expand "the distance between whale watching ... vessels" in the area in order to protect the orcas. She saw that as a recognition that [whale watching vessels] are a factor in [adverse effects on the orca population]. She said, "We don't believe that any commercial fishing up and down the coast is really what's impacting the orca population; we believe that it's largely a toxicity issue. There's a lot of population down there; there's a lot of run-off."

[10:19:54 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE asked Ms. Daugherty, "Why did they pick you?"

MS. DAUGHERTY mentioned "low-hanging fruit" and said, "We have little means besides ... our will to defend ourselves." She remarked that bigger fisheries have more money and lobbyists. She added, "It's really just incomprehensible, ... the fact that such a low-impact fishery would be the target of this group."

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE said every fishery has by-catch issues. He asked about the meaning of "low-impact" as used by Ms. Dougherty.

MS. DAUGHERTY responded that the fishery has by-catch limits. Trollers, in general, have a conservationist mindset; they are aware that a fish that lives will come back [to be caught another day].

[10:22:27 AM](#)

CASEY MAPES, Commercial Fisher, began his invited testimony by stating that he has been a gillnetter, troller, and longliner for over 50 years. He said in Yakutat, after summer when the lodges are shut down, the only thing left to support the economy in winter is fishing. Trolling makes up two-thirds of his income. He said he is encouraged to see all the entities in his community stepping up to address this matter. He talked about chinook being part of the lifeblood of Native Alaskans. He gave the example of the spotted oil controversy in the Lower 48 starting with good intention but being reused "as a weapon," and he warned that if this current lawsuit is not squashed, the same bad precedent could be set. Referring to the previous question of "Why trollers?," he said it is because "we're sort of the

weak link of the fleet." He warned that this lawsuit is the start to something that could grow. He expressed concern that "we're going to be regulating out of the courthouse from now on." He concluded by stating that he is thankful that [the committee/legislature] is "considering helping us out."

[10:28:04 AM](#)

TIM O'CONNOR, Mayor, City of Craig;, Vice President, Alaska Trollers Association, began his invited testimony by sharing that he has been a troller and longliner since 2008. He noted the City of Craig has a population of just under 1,000, with 500 people living just outside the city. Prince of Wales Island has a population of approximately 4,000. He said the 21 million pounds of fish that enter the port in Craig are valued at \$22.7 million. Fishing is the mainstay of the City of Craig's economy. He said, "We stand to lose all of this if this Wild Fish Conservancy lawsuit is successful." He indicated the lawsuit could set a precedent that would end up effecting not only the trollers, but the subsistence fishers and the sport fishing industry. He said the Alaska Trollers Association and the City of Craig need the state's help and resources to stop the lawsuit and challenge the state's right to manage its own fisheries. He asked the committee to support HJR 5.

[10:31:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE noted that the lawsuit makes frequent use of the term "unsustainable." He asked Mr. O'Connor for his opinion whether the state is actually managing the resource for sustainability.

MR. O'CONNOR opined that the fishery is being managed for sustainability. To illustrate this, he talked about hatchery efforts. He added that the City of Craig would "shut down" without the troll fishery. In response to a follow-up question, he stated his assumption that orcas would eat hatchery fish "the same as they eat the wild fish." Regarding migration of fish, he remarked, "Our fish would be feeding their orcas."

[10:34:26 AM](#)

TAD FUJIOKA, Fisher, began his invited testimony by noting that although he is the chair of the board of his local cooperative, he was speaking on behalf of himself. He noted that he had provided handouts to the committee [included in the committee packet]. He said he has fished King salmon for the last 43

years, and became a commercial troller in 2010. Chinook effects this livelihood in his community. He spoke about the style of trolling allowing for fish to be caught one at a time and for bycatch to be thrown back. He noted the history of trolling in Alaska is shown on handout "A." He offered further history of the aforementioned treaties. He echoed the statements of previous speakers regarding the importance of troll fishing and the positive impact it has on the economy, and he warned that the fishery is threatened by the Washington-based Wild Fish Conservancy, which sued the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) [within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)], claiming that the 423 biological opinion pertaining to the treaty was insufficient, that the southern resident killer whales are not getting enough to eat, and that Alaska's [trolling] fishery - 700 miles away - is to blame. He said the fish most important to the southern resident orcas are the Puget Sound fall chinook, of which Alaska catches only 100 per year. He noted further information on a map on handout "B." He echoed the comments of a previous speaker that if the plaintiff wins this lawsuit, then no fishery will be safe. He pointed out that if Alaska's fishery was the reason orcas were in trouble, then there wouldn't be the steady rise in the number of orcas in the Alaska and British Columbia orca pods. He stated the real problem for the southern resident orcas is pollution in the Puget Sound. He noted that Governor Mike Dunleavy has said Alaska will appeal any adverse ruling. He said he appreciates that support and the support of the legislature for the fishery.

[10:41:15 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER pointed to the handout showing a graph and asked for the origin of that data.

MR. PUGIOKA answered that the Pacific Salmon Commission's Chinook Technical Committee has compiled the "abundance index" of chinook in Southeast Alaska annually since 1979.

[10:43:00 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE inquired why the state chose to intervene in this lawsuit and invited the person representing the Department of Law (DOL) to speak to this matter.

AARON PETERSON, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Natural Resources Section, Civil Division (Anchorage), Department of Law, stated that his office has been dealing with this issue for

a long time. The state intervened, he reported, because it is critical to defend the state's fisheries. He said the Department of Law's (DOL's) actions in fighting this lawsuit reflect a commitment from the state to protect its industries, including commercial fishing. He pointed out that DOL has been litigating this case since the beginning and that it has been working with a Washington state firm that is very familiar with litigating similar issues. He indicated that the involvement of outside resources attests to the importance of this matter.

[10:45:00 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE questioned the impact to the state if Alaska lost the case in court.

MR. PETERSON defined the concept of "lose" for this case to mean that the Article 3 judge adopts the report and recommendation on remedy as written. He said that there are opportunities to appeal this decision, which the governor has supported. He suggested that the worst-case scenario is the winter and summer troll fishery would be closed for a period of time. However, there are several steps that would have to happen to get to that point.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE asked if this case is similar to the Lower Kuskokwim fishery litigation, which deals with federal takeover of Alaska fishery management.

MR. PETERSON explained that it is not the same kind of litigation. The Lower Kuskokwim litigation is based on subsistence issues and deals with jurisdiction, while this current case deals with federal environmental law. He continued to detail specifics of the case and went into the history of the plaintiff, which shows that they usually target hatcheries rather than specific fisheries.

[10:48:47 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE C. JOHNSON inquired if this was a public interest litigation and asked who would be paying for it.

MR. PETERSON answered that it was not a public interest case.

MR. BROUWER added his belief that the Wild Fish Conservancy has been able to be reimbursed for similar suits regarding the Equal Access of Justice Act and that they could potentially be reimbursed this time as well.

REPRESENTATIVE C. JOHNSON responded that Mr. Brouwer answered his initial question, that the State of Alaska could be "on the hook" for the Wild Fish Conservancy's legal fees.

[10:50:08 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE opened public testimony on HJR 5.

[10:50:50 AM](#)

MARK ROBERTS, said he has been a troller from Petersburg for 45 years. He responded to Representative McCabe's question about the proper releasing of fish by mentioning that most trollers have new ways of "shaking and releasing" unwanted fish that keep the fish alive. He detailed an underwater method of shaking the fish that keeps them from ever breaking the surface. He closed his testimony by emphasizing that [the Wild Fish Conservancy] is going after Section 7, and if it were to succeed, it would hurt the entire state of Alaska.

[10:52:25 AM](#)

MATT DONAHOE, President, Board of Directors, Alaska Trollers Association, spoke on several different points related to the lawsuit. He brought up hiring issues in the processing plants due to the uncertainty caused by this suit. In relation to why the Wild Fish Conservancy is targeting trollers, he described them as "serial litigators" and insisted that they were making a lot of money off of the current suit. He addressed the issue of net harvest and referenced the Alaska Department of Fish & Game's (ADFG's) data that there are fewer than 600 Puget Sound King salmon caught in Alaska in a year. He said he attributes this to the path migration for most of these salmon not entering Alaska waters.

[10:54:59 AM](#)

ERIC JORDAN, Salmon Troller, testified in support of HJR 5 and relayed that he has been a salmon troller for decades, a profession passed down from his grandparents and on to his own grandchildren. He stated that he has been an activist to conserve, sustain, and enhance Alaska salmon runs for all of his career. He characterized the litigation against the trollers as the most vicious attack on Southeast Alaska fisheries he has witnessed since beginning as a fisheries activist. He echoed Mr. Donahoe's concern that uncertainty caused by this lawsuit is

making it extremely difficult to hire and plan for the season. He asked the committee to join the individuals, businesses, and communities that have rallied in support of this resolution.

[10:56:33 AM](#)

DAVID RICHY, Commercial Troller, reminded the committee about the biological opinion ("bio-op") issued by NMFS that he believed put all Alaska fisheries in legal jeopardy, and he agreed with a previous testifier, Ms. Dougherty, that the troll fishery was targeted because it was "low-hanging fruit." He emphasized that if the lawsuit prevails, it sets a precedent that makes every other King salmon fishery vulnerable to legal action. He commended the state's legal statements about the case and highlighted its argument that the Pacific Salmon Treaty supersedes any bio-op made by NMFS. In closing, he referenced the fact that there has been a continuous, uninterrupted, chinook run in Southeast Alaska for over 100 years to argue that the troll fishery is sustainable, contrary to the Wild Fish Conservatory's claims.

[10:58:47 AM](#)

CHARLES "CHARLIE" DIERCY responded to some of the committee's questions from earlier in the discussion. He reported that about 15 percent of [trolling] permits are from other states like Washington and California. He opined that Alaska King salmon, and specifically King salmon caught by trollers, is the best fish in the world, which this lawsuit [obliterate]. He emphasized the long history of data collection the trolling fishery has, especially in comparison to other fisheries. He continued with anecdotal information about the increase of the orca population in Ketchikan from his experience living there since the '70s, which he indicated proved that the decline in the Puget Sound orcas must be caused by other factors. To address the question of sustainability, he referenced the state's constitution and his belief that [trollers] have not violated it by having an unsustainable fishery. He wrapped up his testimony by calling the whole issue a "snow ball" that needs to be stopped before it gets too big.

[11:01:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE ORTIZ thanked Mr. Dersey for his testimony and longtime experience in the trolling industry.

[11:02:09 AM](#)

JEFF FARVOUR, Board Member, Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association, stated that trolling is in the top three of the most valuable commercial fisheries in Alaska. He explained that trolling provides year round employment, and other community benefits such as the raw fish tax. This tax goes to fishing communities and helps them with harbor upkeep and maintaining their working waterfronts. He referenced the broad support for HJR 5 he has seen in letters and other community-based resolutions. He emphasized that the range of both killer whales and their food is limited. In conclusion, he declared the lawsuit a publicity stunt by the Wild Fish Conservatory meant to further "eliminate marine fisheries."

[11:04:33 AM](#)

MICHAEL KOHAN, Science and Policy Director, Sitka Salmon Share, testified in support of HJR 5 based on her experience working with local fishers and processors in Alaska. Her company supplies Alaska seafood, including troll-caught King salmon, directly to home cooks across the country, and she shared that closing the chinook trolling fishery not only would impact fishing communities, but would have great economic impact to a variety businesses in Alaska. She maintained that her company supports efforts toward sustainability in the management of Alaska's resources and the impacted ecosystems but disagreed with the merits of the lawsuit, characterizing it as "lacking scientific basis, irresponsible, and likely irreversibly detrimental to the troll fleet."

[11:06:31 AM](#)

LINDA BEHNKEN, Executive Director, Alaska Longline Fishermen's Association, emphasized that the longevity of the 100-year-old troll fishery is a testament to its sustainability. She underscored previous comments about the economic impact of closing the fishery by mentioning the communities and members of her association that it would negatively affect without any real benefit to the orcas [in Puget Sound]. She referenced a study her association worked on to discover "what the real threats are" to the orcas in Puget Sound, which revealed that these killer whales are exposed to some of the highest concentration of industrial toxins of any marine mammal in the world. Among other threats to these whales, she listed noise pollution and general water pollution, but not commercial fishing. In comparison to Alaska's efforts to protect salmon habitats, she described the rest of the Pacific Northwest as "making

compromises" in these efforts since they lean towards industrialization by building dams and other infrastructure to support the "nearly 5 million people" now living in the [Puget Sound] area. She claimed that when it comes to salmon conservation, "Alaska has done their part and it is time for Washington to do theirs."

[11:09:40 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE, after ascertaining that there was no one else who wished to testify, closed public testimony on HJR 5. She announced that those who were unable to testify during the meeting could submit written testimony to the committee's e-mail.

[11:10:53 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 11:10 a.m. to 11:13 a.m.

[11:13:38 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE invited discussion of amendments.

[11:13:55 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT moved to adopt [Conceptual] Amendment 1 to HJR 5, as follows:

Page 2, line 16:  
Between "and" and "Columbia River"  
Insert "lower"

[11:14:15 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT explained the proposed amendment more accurately describes a physical area in the resolution by adding the word "lower" to "Columbia River".

[11:14:31 AM](#)

[REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER] objected for the purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT maintained that the purpose of the amendment is to give the utmost clarity as to which fish the resolution is referencing.

11:15:00 AM

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER removed his objection. There being no further objection, [Conceptual] Amendment 1 to HJR 5 was adopted.

11:15:25 AM

The committee took an at-ease from 11:15 a.m. to 11:16 a.m.

11:15:59 AM

CHAIR VANCE ascertained there were no other amendments to be offered.

11:16:14 AM

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE moved to report HJR 5, as amended, out of committee with individual recommendations and the attached fiscal notes. There being no objection, CSHJR 5(FSH) was reported out of the House Special Committee on Fisheries.

11:17:13 AM

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m.