

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FISHERIES

April 16, 2024
10:03 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

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

PRESENTATION(S): FISHING FOR KELP

- HEARD

HOUSE BILL NO. 297

"An Act establishing the sport fishing angler access account; establishing the sport fishing angler access surcharge; and providing for an effective date."

- HEARD & HELD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: HB 297

SHORT TITLE: SPORT FISHING ANGLER ACCESS ACCT/SURCHARG

SPONSOR(S): RULES BY REQUEST OF THE GOVERNOR

01/26/24	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/26/24	(H)	FSH, FIN
03/21/24	(H)	FSH AT 10:00 AM GRUENBERG 120
03/21/24	(H)	-- MEETING CANCELED --
04/02/24	(H)	FSH AT 10:00 AM GRUENBERG 120
04/02/24	(H)	Heard & Held
04/02/24	(H)	MINUTE (FSH)
04/04/24	(H)	FSH AT 9:00 AM GRUENBERG 120
04/04/24	(H)	Heard & Held

04/04/24 (H) MINUTE (FSH)
04/16/24 (H) FSH AT 10:00 AM GRUENBERG 120

WITNESS REGISTER

NICK MANGINI, Kelp Farmer
Kodiak Island Sustainable Seaweed
Kodiak, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Fishing for Kelp."

JOSEPH FELKL, Legislative Liaison
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: On behalf of House Rules by request of the governor, answered questions on HB 297.

DOUG VINCENT-LANG, Commissioner
Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: On behalf of House Rules by request of the governor, answered questions on HB 297.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[10:03:33 AM](#)

CHAIR SARAH VANCE called the House Special Committee on Fisheries meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Representatives Himschoot, McCabe, Stutes, McCormick and Vance were present at the call to order. Representatives C. Johnson and Carpenter arrived as the meeting was in progress.

PRESENTATION(S): Fishing for Kelp

[10:04:18 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE announced that the first order of business would be a mariculture presentation, titled "Fishing for Kelp."

[10:04:35 AM](#)

NICK MANGINI, Kelp Farmer, Kodiak Island Sustainable Seaweed (KISS), gave a PowerPoint presentation, titled "Fishing for Kelp," [hard copy included in the committee packet]. He shared the background of KISS. On slide 2, he showed a map of the location of the 61 [mariculture] farms in the state, with 26

being kelp only. He noted that currently there are 746 acres of kelp in the state. In 2017, these farms produced around 18,000 pounds of kelp, while in 2022 the recorded number rose to around 872,000 pounds.

[10:06:18 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that there are 61 total mariculture farms in the state. He explained that these include both kelp and oysters, with 26 being only kelp and 8 being a combination. He deduced that there are 26 farms that produce only oysters.

[10:07:42 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI stated that Kodiak has had two processors, but because of more funding there will be five to six processors. He moved to the next slide and discussed how KISS was created in relation to his personal goals of staying and working in Kodiak. On slide 4, he discussed the objective of KISS and types of his projects. On slide 5, he showed an aerial map, which indicated the location of the KISS farm in Kodiak. He stated that he chose the site because of the research opportunity, and he expressed surprise at the business's success up to this point. He suggested that his farm is successful because he was one of the first in the industry in Alaska, as others who are starting now are having more of a struggle. He moved to slide 6 and slide 7 and discussed the life cycle of kelp.

[10:11:16 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that the system is complex, but he has only farmed mariculture and has not been involved with hatchery techniques. He stated that there are flow through systems and closed loop systems for mariculture. He expressed the understanding that the setting of seed would usually be in a closed loop system, and he explained this.

MR. MANGINI pointed out the picture of workers seeding the farm in Kodiak. He noted the regulations put into place by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Natural Resources. He moved from slide 8 to slide 10 and discussed the cantilevered design of the operation, which relies on the same design as a suspension bridge. He stated that this design allows for reducing the number of anchors needed, which saves in

costs. He added that this also allows for pleasure boats to run over the operation.

[10:15:31 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that the farm is located about 100 yards offshore and around 60 feet deep. He stated that the depth is important, and Kodiak is a good location because of its shallow depths and flat sea bottom. In response to a follow-up question, he expressed uncertainty concerning the ideal depth; however, having a deep farm would become more expensive.

MR. MANGINI moved to slide 12, which showed pictures from the growing season. He noted that the farms add to the ecosystem surrounding the area, giving a place for salmon fry to hide and shrimp to feed on microorganisms. He moved to the next slide, which depicted how rapidly the kelp grows.

[10:19:51 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that early in the season he does not tend the farm as much. He suggested that every two weeks would be the minimum of monitoring.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question on the growing season, stated that several different timeframes have been tried, and the best growing period is when there are more nutrients in the water. He added that this is a learning process and noted that planting during the darkest periods of the year has been unsuccessful. He expressed the desire to try multiple harvests, pointing out that he has followed Maine's example.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, pointed out that there are a number of different methods for harvesting different types of kelp. He discussed several different types of kelp, including sugar kelp, dragon kelp, and macrocytosis. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that because of the herring spawn in Sitka, there are laws restricting kelp farms. He added that the spawn negatively affects the look of the kelp. He noted that Prince William Sound may be a viable place for farms, as this could help the herring rebound there.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a follow-up question on how the herring spawn interacts with kelp farming, expressed

uncertainty. He acknowledged that a herring spawn had ruined another kelp farmer's crop.

[10:28:24 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI moved to slide 14, which showed an underwater perspective of a kelp line. He moved to slide 15 and slide 16 and noted the different harvesting processes that he had used when first starting the operation.

[10:30:28 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, pointed out that the picture shows salmon seine web being used and a bag to catch the kelp. He stated that now he uses NOMAR bags with a lid. He explained the reasons different harvesting methods work better, pointing out how things have changed over the last six years. He moved to slide 20, which outlined details about KISS. He pointed out the four varieties of kelp he is growing and the entities he is working with. He discussed a project where kelp was fed to pigs, noting the increased reproduction of the sows. In response to a committee question on this project, he stated that he supplied the biomass but was not involved in which animals were fed. He noted that this had worked on pigs in Europe, increasing the piglet mortality. He noted that the kelp biomass is also good for swine-gut biomes, as less antibiotics were needed on the pigs.

[10:35:35 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question concerning the uses for the types of kelp KISS grows, stated that he mostly grows two types. He stated that these two types are what is grown all over the world. He expressed interest in utilizing the different kelp that grows specifically in Alaska. In response to a follow-up question on the uses for ribbon kelp, he stated that this is used in miso soup, and he discussed Korea's kelp market.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a follow-up question on emerging markets, stated that a major shoe company has inquired on kelp's uses. He pointed out that this was mostly about the carbon footprint of kelp, as companies are looking to meet carbon goals. He continued that textiles, leather, cellophane, and packaging is being looked at, noting that kelp products are compostable. He stated that there are new markets for oysters as well, as oysters are very profitable.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, noted that shipping kelp out of state is one of the largest barriers, as the product can contain water. He stated that finding creative ways to ship kelp or finding economical ways to dry kelp are the best ways forward. He noted that much of the nutritional value in kelp is in the water. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that the need to dry kelp would be in relation to its intended use. He discussed this in detail.

[10:42:11 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question concerning the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute (ASMI), suggested that the oyster market does not need promotion, explaining, "Kelp needs a lot of help and oysters already sell themselves." He noted that many of the companies buying kelp are startups, and with the federal Build Back Better Act, more of these companies will be doing business in Alaska. He suggested that sharing facilities would be helpful to the industry, as a large outlay for a processing plant would be impossible for startups. He suggested that the marketing would be up to the buyers of the kelp. He advised that a strategy needs to be made on marketing Alaskan kelp.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee comment that ASMI is opening up to the idea of mariculture, discussed the oyster market in Alaska.

[10:47:47 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI played a video on kelp farming in Alaska.

[10:57:16 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that currently his product is mostly blanched and frozen to go in an ingredient market for human food. He noted a composting trial he did last year, as Kodiak is working on composting for human waste and kelp was added to this. He discussed other opportunities for the kelp market. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that he does not have a strong enough market, as he is "juggling" three jobs. He noted that some of his work is through the Build Back Better Act, pointing out that this is like grant funding. He stated that he also works for a kelp processor. He expressed uncertainty about a kelp farm being self-sustaining.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that combo farms have the benefit of adding species to an existing farm. He discussed how some anchor changes would need to be made for combo farming. He pointed out there are signs that indicate mussels, oysters, and kelp would grow better together.

[11:02:31 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE reminded the committee of a presentation from a few years back on the Blue Ocean Strategy. He expressed the opinion that kelp farming could be a candidate for this, as it fits into the carbon sequestration models and developing new ways to use available resources.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that he recently participated in a nursery training to learn about the life cycle of oysters. He discussed the difficulties of shipping kelp within the state, as this has complicated the market.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that he does much of the farmwork on his own. He stated that the processor he uses employs around 14 employees for about a month and a half. He stated that because of the new funding available, he has been able to utilize some labor. He stated that he always has a highschooler on the farm with him. He added that he has never had a fulltime employee, as he mostly uses day labor.

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that there is a kelp drying facility being built next to the main processor. He expressed the understanding that there is not a large-scale drying facility in the state, but there is a small-scale facility. In response, he stated that there is a small-scale drying facility at the science center in Kodiak. He added that drying is very labor intensive, with a small-scale result.

[11:08:41 AM](#)

MR. MANGINI, in response to a committee question, stated that powder or flake kelp is created from the drying process and with this, the market is \$30 to \$40 a pound on the East Coast. He noted the wild harvest of Kelp that competes with the farmed product. He noted the large-scale dryer on the East Coast, expressing the understanding that Maine is not having a problem selling its kelp product. In response to a follow-up question,

he stated that today his goal was to educate legislators about KISS. He stated that if there are any future discussions on a program for this, energy costs should be considered. He expressed the desire that a strong kelp market would develop in the state.

MR. MANGINI offered closing comments.

[11:15:05 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 11:15 p.m. to 11:18 p.m.

HB 297-SPORT FISHING ANGLER ACCESS ACCT/SURCHARG

[11:18:25 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE BILL NO. 297 "An Act establishing the sport fishing angler access account; establishing the sport fishing angler access surcharge; and providing for an effective date."

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE moved to adopt Amendment 1 to HB 297, labeled 33-GH2500\A.1, Bullard, 4/11/24, which read:

Page 1, line 1, following "Act":

Insert "**relating to the duties of the commissioner of fish and game;**"

Page 1, following line 3:

Insert new bill sections to read:

*** Section 1.** The uncodified law of the State of Alaska is amended by adding a new section to read:

LEGISLATIVE INTENT. It is the intent of the legislature that the commissioner model the biennial report required under AS 16.05.050(c), added by sec. 2 of this Act, on the Department of Fish and Game's Professional Publication No. 08-01, titled "Economic Impacts and Contributions of Sportfishing in Alaska, 2007."

*** Sec. 2.** AS 16.05.050 is amended by adding a new subsection to read:

(c) The commissioner shall produce and disseminate to the public a biennial report on the economic impacts of sport fishing in the state."

Page 1, line 4:

Delete "**Section 1**"

Insert "**Sec. 3**"

Renumber the following bill sections accordingly.

Page 1, line 8, following "to":

Insert "production and dissemination of the biennial report on the economic impacts of sport fishing in the state required under AS 16.05.050(c) and"

Page 1, line 11, following "use.":

Insert "In allocating money from the account, the department shall apportion one dollar from the surcharge imposed on each license by AS 16.05.340(1) to the production and dissemination of the biennial report required under AS 16.05.050(c)."

Page 2, lines 22 - 31:

Delete all material and insert:

(1) resident sport fishing license	\$5
(2) resident hunting and sport fishing license	5
(3) resident hunting, trapping, and sport fishing license	5
(4) nonresident 14-day sport fishing license	26
(5) nonresident seven-day sport fishing license	21
(6) nonresident three-day sport fishing license	11
(7) nonresident one-day sport fishing license	6
(8) nonresident annual sport fishing license	41
(9) special nonresident military small game and sport fishing license	5
(10) special nonresident military sport fishing license	5"

Page 3, line 7:

Delete "Section 4"
Insert "Section 6"

Page 3, line 8:

Delete "sec. 5"
Insert "sec. 7"

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER objected for the purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE explained that the amendment would add \$1 to the proposed surcharge amount. He stated that the intent for this added amount would be for an [impact report on sport fishing in the state].

[11:20:18 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT questioned whether the report would have any time requirements.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE responded that the proposed amendment would make no requirements. He expressed the understanding that the commissioner of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) has said that the report is needed. He offered the understanding that if sport fishers know this is part of the legislation, they would be insistent on having the report done periodically. He noted that the report would be about \$380,000; however, because the report has been done before, it may not be this expensive. He suggested that because of this the funds may be available sooner to do the report. Per what the document would consist of, he deferred the question to ADF&G.

[11:23:10 AM](#)

JOSEPH FELKL, Legislative Liaison, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, on behalf of House Rules by request of the governor, answered questions on HB 297. He responded that from discussions with the commissioner and with the Division of Sport Fish, it was decided that it would be a biannual report. He stated that the initial report would be statewide, and after this, regional reports would be done, while refreshing the statewide report periodically. He noted that the statewide report would be like the large report the committee was given as an example.

[11:23:53 AM](#)

DOUG VINCENT-LANG, Commissioner, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, on behalf of House Rules by request of the governor, answered questions on HB 297. He concurred with Mr. Felkl, stating that the statewide survey would be done every four or five years, and the regional surveys would be done with any additional money. He noted that this information would be critical to the management of the fisheries.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT expressed support for Amendment 1; however, she questioned whether the language on the funding would be descriptive enough for future commissioners to understand the intent.

COMMISSIONER VINCENT-LANG responded that ADF&G takes the legislative intent for funding seriously. He expressed the understanding that if ADF&G does not follow this, the funding will no longer be provided. He expressed the opinion that the intent is clear and future commissioners would understand.

[11:25:59 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER pointed out that the proposed legislation is a licensing bill, and it concerns the sport fishing license fees. He noted that this would not pertain to commercial guides, for example. He questioned whether the proposed report would cover any commercial sport fishing activities.

COMMISSIONER VINCENT-LANG responded that the report would capture the value of both guided and unguided sport fishing, and this is because everyone who is guided would also need a license. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that there are numerous reports put out on the value of commercial fishing in the state done by a variety of different bodies. He added that much of this work is done outside of the department, and the department would build on this.

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER expressed the understanding that ADF&G does not directly report on commercial activities.

COMMISSIONER VINCENT-LANG responded that the department would not directly report on commercial fishing activities using these specific dollars. He stated that personal use fisheries would most likely be evaluated using this money, because currently there is not economic assessment of this, and these participants would also be using a sport fishing license. In response to a follow-up question, he stated that a report on the economic value of commercial fishing would not be done based on the license fee structure for sport fishing.

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER questioned whether ADF&G could use the proposed fee increment to evaluate the value of commercial fishing in the state.

COMMISSIONER VINCENT-LANG suggested that an overall value of the fishing resource in the state would be better understood, as currently the piece on personal use and sport fishing is missing.

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER referenced anglers on the Kenai River who have not been able to fish for a few years, adding that this has been an economic hardship for the community. He expressed the opinion that it would be unfair for the legislature to address the value of one fishing group and not another.

[11:31:05 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE stated that the proposed amendment is focused on personal use fishing because it has no advocacy group, while the commercial fishermen have many groups producing many of these reports.

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER explained that he is not opposed to a report; rather he is looking for policies that would treat all fishermen equally. He noted that sport fishermen or personal use fishermen have not been barred from participating in the fishery as some commercial fishermen have.

[11:32:43 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STUTES expressed appreciation for these comments, but she pointed out that the Board of Fisheries and ADF&G are both advocates for commercial fishermen. She advised that if the discussion is on the ability to fish, this is a different topic than what the proposed legislation is targeting.

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER responded in disagreement with the comments. He expressed the understanding that the report would communicate to the public the value of sport fishing. He suggested that if this were the only report the public sees, there would be the understanding that this is the only value of the fishing industry in the state. If the value of commercial fishing is not communicated, he suggested that there would be a decline in the interest of commercial fishing.

REPRESENTATIVE STUTES expressed the understanding that this has been done, because commercial fishing is the largest private employer in the state. She continued that several entities could point out how much commercial fishing contributes to the state and the economy of the state. This information is

available in relation to commercial fisheries; however, this is not available for the sport fisheries.

[11:34:48 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE pointed out that in Cook Inlet the situation is different. She expressed disagreement with the sponsor of the amendment, arguing that there is an organization advocating for sport fishing and could fund this project, but this organization is not the department. She expressed the opinion that the bigger question would concern the addition of \$1 to every sport fish license, as this would pay for something that could be funded by a prominent, well-funded sport fish advocate. She stated that her district has all types of fishermen; therefore, she is not opposed to the amendment. She opined whether each fishing group would be treated equally, so there would be a full representation when determining the value of the state's fisheries. She suggested that the report would be a valuable tool; however, she expressed concern that Cook Inlet sport fishing would be given a higher value than commercial fishing there. She continued that any misuse of the tool would make many commercial fishermen in Cook Inlet dissatisfied, as this conflict between these two groups is longstanding. She pointed out that the bigger question is whether a \$1 surcharge should be added to the fee.

[11:37:34 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT pointed out that the Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission tracks the permit value for commercial fishing permits, and she questioned whether there is a similar agency for the sport fisheries. She expressed the understanding that sport fish data is less solidified. She expressed support for having maximum information, but she also expressed understanding for the concerns in Cook Inlet.

[11:39:02 AM](#)

MR. FELKL stated that ADF&G does not produce such a report for the commercial fisheries; however, the McKinley Research Group issues a report every two years, and the department has cited data from this report in the past. In response to a follow-up question, he expressed uncertainty on who funds the study and suggested it could be the industry.

[11:39:50 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE, in response to a question from Representative Stutes, acknowledged that the McKinley Research Group has reported on the commercial fishermen's issues in Cook Inlet; however, he argued that the closure of the entire Southcentral Alaska's sport fishing industry is no different than [the commercial closures in Cook Inlet], but these sport fishermen do not have an advocacy group. He discussed the Kenai River Sportfishing Association's focus, stating that it is only concerned with the Kenai River and not the rest of the state. He expressed disagreement that this group advocates for the entire state's sport fishing industry. He further discussed how the report would show the economic impacts of closing the sport fisheries in Southcentral, as the economic effects of this is unknown. He argued that the data needs to be gathered on this for the resource and its management.

REPRESENTATIVE STUTES expressed disagreement that the Kenai River Sportfishing Association is localized to the Kenai River. She stated that it is a "very well-heeled organization." She suggested that it could be asked to participate. She expressed support for Amendment 1, but also, she acknowledged Representative Carpenter's position as being valid.

[11:44:17 AM](#)

CHAIR VANCE expressed the opinion that Representative McCabe's arguments are valid concerning the economic value on management decisions, adding that this is the same argument Representative Carpenter is making. She questioned how the department would use the report for management decisions in relation to the economic value of the fisheries. She questioned the department's constitutional mandate and questioned whether sustaining the resource or sustaining the economy should come first.

COMMISSIONER VINCENT-LANG responded that his job is to manage the resource and sustain the yield so that not one generation would take more than future generations are allowed. He added that the department should do this in the best interest of the economy and the wellbeing of the residents. He stated that allocation decisions are made while factoring in economic information and the return on investment. He stated that the legislature should expect a return on the investment in natural resources. He advised that the bill was not introduced [as a way to fund the sport fish report], but the department does support this. He stated that compared with commercial fishing, the sport fish industry information is missing. He suggested

that this would be an opportunity to collect this information to inform regulatory bodies and the department on the value of these fisheries and the relative return on the investment in these resources.

MR. FELKL, speaking to an earlier question, stated that the McKinley Research Group's 2020 report was prepared for ASMI. He expressed uncertainty on the cost of the report, but he confirmed that it was prepared for a state entity.

[11:46:56 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER expressed support for gathering data on the sport fishery and the \$1 increase to the surcharge; however, he pointed out the lack of data on other fisheries, such as commercial fishing in his district. He added that subsistence issues have not been discussed. He opined that if the commissioner were only reporting on the economic impact of sport fishing in the state, this reporting would reflect just a portion of the economic impact of the resource. He argued that when this informs policy, commercial fishing and subsistence would be left out; therefore, the report would not represent the total value of the economic health of the resource. He suggested that the reports by other entities could be footnoted in the sport fisheries report to give a complete value of the fisheries.

CHAIR VANCE pointed out that until the amendment was passed, there was no statutory direction. She questioned whether the department needs statutory direction before it issues an economic impact report in any fishery, such as subsistence.

MR. FELKL responded that the department's subsistence team does issue a report on the value of subsistence food. He stated that the last one was a 2017/2018 report.

[11:51:15 AM](#)

COMMISSIONER VINCENT-LANG answered that the department does piece together the information provided by the different entities, such as ASMI and the McKinley Research Group. He reiterated that there is not a group who reports on the sport fisheries; however, there is an economic report on subsistence that is used to help develop the [expenditure] plans; however, there is not a report on the economic effects of the Cook Inlet sport fishery. He stated that a comprehensive report is not

annually done, but all these pieces would be put together to develop an [expenditure] plan.

[11:52:46 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER described a conceptual amendment that would change Amendment 1 to include "subsistence and commercial" along with sport fishing in line 14. He pointed out that data for a comprehensive report is already being collected, but with this conceptual amendment, any lacking data would then be supported by Amendment 1.

[11:53:47 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 1. He explained that this would add "subsistence, commercial," before the word "sport" on line 14, page 1.

[11:54:14 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE objected.

[11:55:29 AM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Stutes, Carpenter, Himschoot, McCormick, and Vance voted in favor of adopting Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 1. Representatives C. Johnson and McCabe voted against it. Therefore, Conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment 1 was adopted by a vote of 5-2.

[11:56:41 AM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease.

[11:57:39 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE C. JOHNSON moved to table Amendment 1, as amended.

REPRESENTATIVE CARPENTER objected. He noted that some members are interested in passing the amendment.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT questioned whether there would be resources to do three reports.

REPRESENTATIVE C. JOHNSON stated that 2017 was the last time a report was done for sport fish only, with the cost of around

\$300,000. He suggested that the amendment could easily triple this cost. He expressed the opinion that the proposed legislation would not cover this. He argued that this is not the place or time to address the other user groups.

11:58:53 AM

REPRESENTATIVE STUTES expressed support for tabling the amendment, as it would give time to the amendment's sponsor. She argued that the cost would not be tripled because the reports have been done, and they just need to be compiled into one. She stated that this understanding has come from comments made by the commissioner.

REPRESENTATIVE MCCABE interjected that 2007 was the last time a [sport fish] report was done, as the report done a decade later was only a subsistence report. He pointed out that ASMI recently received \$5 million, and this organization develops commercial fishing reports. He quoted the statute that directs that all fisheries be treated equally concerning the economy of the state. He argued that a sport fish [impact] report has not been done since 2007, and he argued that the \$1 added to the surcharge should not be for fixing all problems. This would only be for collecting and providing data to the Board of Fisheries and ADF&G, so statutory allocation decisions can be made. He expressed support for tabling the amendment.

12:01:20 PM

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to table Amendment 1, as amended. Representatives Himschoot, C. Johnson, McCabe, McCormick, Stutes, and Vance voted in favor of tabling the amendment. Representative Carpenter voted against it. Therefore, Amendment 1, as amended, was tabled by a vote of 6-1.

12:01:52 PM

CHAIR VANCE announced that HB 297 was held over.

12:02:18 PM

ADJOURNMENT

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