

HB


208

SFIN

FILE

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 5/6/02



FURTHER:

DATE TURNED IN TO OFFICE: 05/11/02

Finance Committee considered CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 208(RES)

HB 208 AQUATIC FARMS FOR SHELLFISH

"An Act relating to aquatic farming of shellfish; and providing for an effective date."

and recommends:

Senate Bill:

be replaced with _____ CS _____ (_____)

same title

adopt previous _____ CS _____ (_____)

new title

House Bill:

attached amendment(s)

same title

technical title

adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee

new: SCR # _____

further referral to _____ Committee

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#
DEC	2/21/02		✓	1
DNR	3/12/02	98.3		
FoG	4/24/02	50.0		

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#
ADF+G	3/5/02	72.5		4

APPROPRIATION - no fiscal note

SIGNATURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:	DO PASS	DO NOT PASS	NO REC	AMEND
<i>Linda Green</i>			✓	
<i>Ellen Austin</i>	✓			
<i>Tom Hoff</i>	✓			
<i>W. Collins</i>	✓			
<i>Gregg Walker</i>			✓	
<i>Loren J. Jensen</i>	✓			
COCHAIR: <i>[Signature]</i>			✓	✓
COCHAIR: <i>[Signature]</i>			✓	

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2002 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 1
 Bill Version: CSHB 208(FSH)
 (H) Publish Date: 3/6/02

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: Environmental Conservation
 Title: An Act Relating to Aquatic Farming of Shellfish BRU: Environmental Health
 Component: Food Safety and Sanitation
 Sponsor: Representative Scatzi
 Requester: House Fisheries Component No. 2343

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Personal Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Travel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Contractual	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Supplies	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Equipment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Land & Structures	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Grants & Claims	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL OPERATING	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

FUND SOURCE	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
1002 Federal Receipts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1003 GF Match	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1004 GF	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1005 GF/Program Receipts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1037 GF/Mental Health	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other (Specify Type-Do not abbreviate)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2002) cost: 0.0
 Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2003 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

POSITIONS	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Full-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0	0
Temporary	0	0	0	0	0	0

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This fiscal note was developed using information from testimony on the Senate companion bill (SB 141). During this testimony, it became clear that "suitable" did not mean already certified as a growing area under the National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP), therefore the department does not expect any increased costs during the years covered by this fiscal note. Certification under the NSSP normally takes place shortly before commercial harvesting begins. Currently the industry pays for part of the cost to certify growing areas and we would expect that to be the case if this bill passes. However, even with industry support for some of the certification costs, there will be an increased cost to the department when any of the growing sites permitted under this legislation need to be certified under the NSSP.

Prepared by: Janice Adair, Director
 Division: Division of Environmental Health
 Approved by: Kurt Fredriksson Deputy Commissioner
 Agency: Department of Environmental Conservation

Phone: (907) 269-7644
 Date/Time: 2/28/02 3:49 PM
 Date: 2/28/2002

FISCAL NOTE

**STATE OF ALASKA
2002 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

Fiscal Note Number: _____
 Bill Version: CSHB 208 (RES)
 () Publish Date: _____

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): 4/19/2002 Dept. Affected: Fish and Game
 Title: Aquatic Farms For Shellfish BRU: Commercial Fisheries
 Component: Fisheries Development
 Sponsor: Representative Scalzi
 Requester: Senate Resources Component No.: 1942

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Personal Services	40.0	25.0	*	*	*	*
Travel	5.0	5.0	*	*	*	*
Contractual			*	*	*	*
Supplies	5.0	3.0	*	*	*	*
Equipment		2.0	*	*	*	*
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	50.0	35.0	*	*	*	*

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()						
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	50.0	35.0				
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
TOTAL	50.0	35.0	*	*	*	*

Estimate of any current year (FY2002) cost: 0.0

Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2003 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time						
Part-time						
Temporary	2					

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

ADF&G is required to provide consultation to DNR regarding the suitability of various sites before they are offered for lease. The Mariculture Program Leader and Assistant will lead and coordinate, in conjunction with industry nominations, the selection of sites to survey as well as field activities with ADF&G regional staff, and staff from other participating agencies. To accomplish site surveys for suitability, ADF&G will conduct dive surveys on potential sites. Personnel costs include funding for a seasonal Fisheries Biologist I, certified divers associated with dive surveys and inspections at proposed aquatic farm sites, and laboratory testing of samples taken from the sites. Travel costs include per diem and transport of department staff, including certified divers, to proposed and existing farm sites.

(Continued)

Prepared by: Doug Mecum Phone: 465-6100
 Division: Director Date/Time: 4/19/02 11:00 AM
 Approved by: Gordy Williams for Commissioner Frank Rue Date: 4/21/2002
 Agency: Fish and Game

FISCAL NOTE

STATE OF ALASKA
2002 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. CS HB 208 (RES)


ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

Supplies include materials necessary for dive surveys, scientific supplies and data processing, and assistance with regional mariculture plan development.

Additional time and funding needed to complete the work associated with identification of new areas in FY 2004 are roughly estimated at 50% of the FY 2003 costs.

* There will also be increasing costs associated with any large increases in mariculture permitting and support. Many services, such as water quality and product testing, currently provided at little or no cost to aquatic farm operators by various state facilities, resources, and personnel, will probably not be fiscally possible as the number of mariculture operations increases unless funding is provided. These are essential to meet statutory requirements. Since such impact is completely contingent on the number of new farms and the size of the farms, these costs are impossible to estimate. This fiscal note merely identifies the likelihood of additional long-term costs.

NOTE: ADFG Division of Habitat and Restoration has also submitted a fiscal note.



STATE OF ALASKA
2002 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number:

Bill Version:

CSHB 208(RES)

() Publish Date:

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): 3/12/2002

Dept. Affectu.

Natural Resources

Title: Aquatic Farms for Shellfish

BRU:

Minerals, Land & Water Dev

Component:

Claims, Permits and Leases

Sponsor: Rep. SCALZI, Chenaux, Lancaster, Harris, Hudson, James

Requester: (H) FIN

Component Number:

2480

Expenditures/Revenues

(Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Personal Services	82.8	110.4				
Travel	5.0	10.0				
Contractual	2.5	2.5				
Supplies	1.0	1.0				
Equipment	7.0	0.0				
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	98.3	123.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()	0.0	13.9	27.8	41.7	55.5	55.5
------------------------	-----	------	------	------	------	------

FUND SOURCE

(Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	98.3	123.9				
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Other (Specify Type)						
TOTAL	98.3	123.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Estimate of any current year (FY2002) cost: none

Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY2003 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	2	2				
Part-time						
Temporary						

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

This bill creates a one-lease disposal program of at least 90 aquatic farm sites and requires DNR to condition leases for sites that culture wild stocks of indigenous shellfish to restore the wild stock upon termination or expiration of the lease to the population level that existed prior to issuance of the lease. It provides an attempt at a new type of mariculture program - one that is modeled on DNR's existing land disposal program where state agencies do all of the up-front work and an applicant bids for a site. DNR and OF&G would solicit nominations; pick the areas and sites; prepare best interest finding and coast zone consistency, then put the sites up for bid. With respect to the DNR lease, the applicant could, in the best of circumstances, bid for the site, submit an operating plan and obtain the site with little or no additional work by the agency. This is very different than the 9-month long process currently required of an applicant. As the agencies do the work up front, significant up-front expenses are necessary.

[CONT.]

Prepared by: Bob Looffler

Division: Mining, Land and Water

Approved by: Pat Pourchot

Agency: Natural Resources

Phone 269-8600

Date/Time 12-Mar-02

Date 12-Mar-02

ANALYSIS: (continued)

DNR's current aquatic farm program, which is very different from the procedures envisioned in this bill, operates with one employee and brings in approximately \$48.0 a year. It would continue to operate while this bill is implemented.

DNR's current mariculture staff consists of one person who is working at full capacity with the current program. Implementing the bill would require a new unit consisting of two employees to pick sites and complete the work.

Total estimated costs for DNR's portion of a one-time mariculture disposal: \$222,200, over two fiscal years.

Changes in revenue (annually): \$13,900+ for the first year, eventually reaching \$55,500+ over a period of 3-4 years.

It is unlikely that the market could absorb 90 aquatic farmsites at once. We come to this conclusion because the average number of applications received during an opening is approximately 15 to 20. For purposes of projecting revenue, we estimate that one-quarter of the sites, or 22, would be taken the first year, and the remainder would be taken "over the counter" over the subsequent three years. Rent for 22 three-acre sites would total approximately \$13,900. If half of the 90 sites, or 45, are taken initially, the possible annual revenue could be \$27,800. The total annual revenue after 90 sites are taken would be \$55,600. This estimate is based on an average 3-acre suspended culture site x 60 sites = \$33,000 and an average of 5-acre on-bottom culture site x 30 sites = \$22,500. (As of August 2, 2001, the aquatic farm lease fee was adjusted to \$350 for the first acre, plus \$100 for each additional acre.)

Personal Services New Position Detail

Department of Natural Resources

DRAFT

Scenario: DNR FY2003 Fiscal Notes - for Positions (2481)
 Component: Claims, Permits & Leases (2460)
 BRU Name: Minerals, Land, and Water Development (330)

PCH	Job Class Title	Time Status	Retire Code	Barg Unit	Location	Salary Sched	Range & Steps	Budgeted Months	Split / Annual Count	Annual Salary	COLA	Premium Pay	Annual Benefits	Total Costs
10-#075	Natural Resource Mgr I	FT	A	GG	Anchorage	2A	18C	9.0		35,154	565	0	12,959	48,678
Justification: HB208										Funding Detail:				
										1004	General Fund Receipts		100.00%	48,678
										Total Funding:		100.00%	48,678	
10-#077	Natural Resource Tech II	FT	A	GG	Anchorage	2A	12C	9.0		23,247	373	0	10,519	34,139
Justification: HB208										Funding Detail:				
										1004	General Fund Receipts		100.00%	34,139
										Total Funding:		100.00%	34,139	

Component Summary:

Total New Positions: 2

Fund Description	Fund Percent	Fund Amount
1004 General Fund Receipts	100.00%	82,817
Total Funding:	100.00%	82,817

Note: If a position is split, an asterisk (*) will appear in the Split/Count column. If the split position is also counted in the component, two asterisks (**) will appear in this column.

REPORTED OUT
FISCAL NOTE
 MAY 11 2002

STATE OF ALASKA
 2002 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Fiscal Note Number: 4
 Bill Version: CSHB 208(RES)
 (H) Publish Date: 3/13/02

Revision Date/Time (Note if correction): _____ Dept. Affected: ADF&G
 Title Aquatic farms for shellfish BRU Habitat and Restoration
 Component Habitat
 Sponsor Representative Scalzi
 Requester House Resources Component No. 486

Expenditures/Revenues (Thousands of Dollars)

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Personal Services	65.5	33.0	*	*	*	*
Travel	5.0	2.5	*	*	*	*
Contractual	2.0	1.0				
Supplies						
Equipment						
Land & Structures						
Grants & Claims						
Miscellaneous						
TOTAL OPERATING	72.5	36.5	*	*	*	*

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

CHANGE IN REVENUES ()

FUND SOURCE (Thousands of Dollars)

1002 Federal Receipts						
1003 GF Match						
1004 GF	72.5	36.5	*	*	*	*
1005 GF/Program Receipts						
1037 GF/Mental Health						
Interagency Receipts from DNR						
TOTAL	72.5	36.5	*	*	*	*

Estimate of any current year (FY2002) cost: 0.0
 Check this box (X) if funding for this bill is included in the Governor's FY 2003 budget proposal:

POSITIONS

Full-time	1				
Part-time					
Temporary	2				

ANALYSIS: (Attach a separate page if necessary)

CSHB 208 (FSH) creates a one-time offering of at least 90 aquatic farm sites for lease.

In addition to the requirements in the bill, the requirements of other State and Federal statutes may affect sites that could be offered. These may include, but are not limited to, the Alaska Coastal Management Plan, District Plans, legislatively designated areas statutes and regulations, and 16.40.100-199 which requires that the physical and biological characteristics of a site be suitable for shellfish farming, that a farm site not require significant alterations in traditional fisheries or other existing uses of fish and wildlife resources, and may not affect fisheries, wildlife or their habitats [cont]

Prepared by: Chip Dennerlein Phone 465-3065
 Division Habitat and Restoration Date/Time 3/5/02 12:30 PM
 Approved by: Gordy Williams for Commissioner Frank Rue Date 3/5/2002
 Agency Fish and Game

FISCAL NOTE

**STATE OF ALASKA
2002 LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

BILL NO. CSHB 208(RES) - FN#4

ANALYSIS CONTINUATION

in an adverse manner. ADNR aquatic farm statutes and guidelines have specific requirements for such things as avoidance of eagle nests, marine mammal and seabird rookeries, and commercial seining areas. ADF&G maintains this information.

Identifying and evaluating 90 permittable lease sites will require intensive effort and additional staff will be needed. A Habitat Biologist III is needed to work with ADNR, ADEC, and ADF&G CFMD to identify potential lease sites. Existing fish and wildlife, habitat and public use data on sites will be collected and evaluated. Potential lease sites will be identified and surveyed in the field to determine suitability. The biologist will: review land use plans, coordinate with ADF&G Wildlife Conservation and Subsistence Divisions, ADNR, ADOL, local governments, and federal agencies; prepare site reports; attend public meetings and hearings; and issue Special Area permits as necessary. A 3-month FT III will aid in habitat site evaluations in the field, and one month of Cartographer 2 time will be needed to enter data into the GIS system.

* Costs for administration and oversight of additional levels of mariculture activity in subsequent years may be significant, but are difficult to quantify at this time.

POSTAGE PAID

To: Respective Legislators:
Regarding SB 104 & HB 208

3/13/02

"An act relating to the aquatic farming of shellfish"

From: Gary R. Zaugg
519 Pittenger St.
Ktn, Ak. 99901.
(907) 225-2089

Dear Senators & Representatives,

During recent weeks I have watched the respective bills move through committees'. I have listened to the public comments of support from legislators, administrators, sections of industry and the likes. With all due respect to the individuals supporting this bill, you are attempting to fix a part of the aquatic farm program that is not broken. There is no problem with the current review process under the Alaska Coastal Management Plan, Best Interest Finding and subsequent lease program. There is no need to identify areas that are 'suitable' for aquaculture because that is already being done, by industry, within the current review process under the concepts of "conflicting use". The current process may not be perfect but I can guarantee you, all the pieces are in place and this part of the process is working.

I feel I am in a unique position to comment on this issue. First, I am a principle litigant in the administrative appeal surrounding the 1999 aquatic shellfish application period. The 1999 application period, which resulted in the appeal, was a fiasco for everyone. But it was only because of a "conflicting use" concern by ADF&G regarding utilization of "natural set" stock by aquatic farmers within the boundaries of a farm. This issue will be resolved by the Supreme Court within one year and the results will be superimposed on top of the current mariculture program. I would like to ask you this. What is going to happen if the Supreme Court rules that aquatic farmers are a legitimate "commercial user group"? No less or no more a "commercial user group" than the limited entry fishers? In other words there will be no "preferential use" given to limited entry fishers resulting in a "conflicting use", over aquatic farmer on "natural set" stocks that have never been utilized in the history of modern man. Will this current legislation hold any water in this situation. The answer is no and there is no deference given to this highly probable situation in this bill.


Second, I am one of six individuals in the state who will be issued permits for on bottom geoduck mariculture within the next few weeks. These permits are being issued after going through the 2001 aquatic shellfish application period. The 2001 application period went well, and at this time I believe no appeals are pending. My current site is inside the boundaries of a "limited entry fisheries". How is that? You might ask. The answer is simple and is also why the current system works. The answer is; there is no current "conflicting use" because the limited entry fisheries, under sustainable yield, has harvested the natural set stocks to 30% of the original volume and has been shut down by regulations of the Board of Fish. Does the system work? You bet it does. I would further suggest the system will always work, because under the Alaska Coastal Management Plan Review process if there is a legitimate "conflicting use" it is dealt with under the rule of law. This bill would change the way these established processes work. How can ADF&G guarantee an applicant prior to undergoing the ACMP review process that the application will be approved? Is the ADF&G going to take into consideration public, municipal and federal concerns prior to telling DNR what sites it can offer for competitive bidding for lease? Is the ADF&G going to become the overseer of the Alaska Coastal Management Plan? Is the DNR willing to be put in the position of being sued because it offered sites that have no guarantee of being approved under the ACMP? Would the applicant have to go through the ACMP process? I would caution you here as "conflicting use" is not up to just the ADF&G.

Instead of fixing something that's not broken the legislature needs to address the "conflicting use" issue of "natural set" within the boundaries of an approved farm. How is the ADF&G to deal with "natural set" within the boundaries of a farm? The legislature needs to instruct the ADF&G, within the current statutes, to review applications that contain "natural set" stock under a utilize and replace concept. It's just that simple. Aquaculture leases have this unique ability. So far the legislature has not exerted its **constitutional right** and in this case **constitutional obligation** to define what is acceptable to the administrative review at the ADF&G. In my opinion unless the legislature recognizes aquatic farmers as a legitimate "user group" that has a right to utilize and replace "natural set" stock within the boundaries of an approved site for, among other things, the development of this industry, you are not doing your job. It is a mistake to leave this to the courts when this is well within your realm of authority.

As an aquatic farmer I am trying to **develop an industry**. I'm not asking for \$867,000 dollars of general fund money over two years to create another layer of questionable policy like the current bill. But I am purposing a business that in essence is asking you for a short-term loan of the resource. As legislators you have to be looking at ways to further the coastal community economies. Utilizing and replacing the resource to aid in the start up of these farms is an excellent concept that the industry can guarantee. It costs you nothing. Everyone knows that utilizing the resource is exactly what happens in the development of industry. But in this case we are proposing to replace the resource to 100% of its original volume at the termination of a lease. What other industry offers to replace what it uses? This language is already stipulated in the coastal consistency and the best interest finding that I have had sitting idle on my desk since 2000. Seven additional sites from 1999 are in the same position. The problem is we have no working operational permit from the ADF&G because ADF&G has no guidance from the legislator that the concept of utilize and replace the resource is a legitimate "use" approved by the legislature. The legislature needs to be clear to the agency that has raised a "conflicting use" concern by defining and incorporating a utilize and replace system within the boundaries of an aquatic farm lease. That is the only issue that should concern you at this time.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,


Gary R. Zaugg

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 4/25/02

FURTHER: Finance

DATE TURNED IN TO OFFICE: 5/3/02

Judiciary Committee considered CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 208(RES)

~~HB 208 AQUATIC FARMS FOR SHELLFISH~~

An Act relating to aquatic farming of shellfish and providing for an effective date."

and recommends:

- be replaced with _____ CS _____ (_____)
- adopt previous _____ CS _____ (_____)
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to _____ Committee

Senate Bill:

- same title
- new title

House Bill:

- same title
- technical title
- new: SCR # _____

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#
PNR	3/1/02	✓		2
DEFB	5/5/02	✓		3
DEFB	3/5/02	✓		4

APPROPRIATION - no fiscal note

SIGNATURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:	DO PASS	DO NOT PASS	NO REC	AMEND
<i>John Conroy</i>			✓	
<i>Gene Herrault</i>			✓	
<i>[Signature]</i>	X			
<i>[Signature]</i>				
<i>[Signature]</i>				
CHAIR: <i>John L. Taylor</i>	✓			

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

DATE: 4/18/02

FURTHER: Judiciary
Finance

DATE TURNED IN TO OFFICE: 4/24/02

Resources Committee considered CS FOR HOUSE BILL NO. 208(RES)

~~HB 208-AQUATIC FARMS FOR SHELLFISH~~

"An Act relating to aquatic farming of shellfish, and providing for an effective date."

and recommends:

- be replaced with _____ CS _____ (_____)
- adopt previous _____ CS _____ (_____)
- attached amendment(s)
- adopt Letter of Intent by _____ Committee
- further referral to _____ Committee

Senate Bill:

- same title
- new title

House Bill:

- same title
- technical title
- new: SCR # _____

NEW FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#

PREVIOUS FISCAL NOTE(S):

Department	Date	Fiscal	Zero	FN#
ADF+G	3-5-02	✓		4
ADFG	3-5-02	✓		3
DNR	3-1-02	✓		2

APPROPRIATION - no fiscal note

SIGNATURES AND RECOMMENDATIONS:	DO PASS	DO NOT PASS	NO REC	AMEND
<i>Adrian Taylor</i>	✓			
<i>Ben Stevens</i>	✓			
<i>Sam [unclear]</i>	✓			
<i>[unclear]</i>			✓	
CHAIR: <i>[unclear]</i>	✓			

HB 208-AQUATIC FARMS FOR SHELLFISH
SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

SIGN-IN

✓ NAME: Doug Mecum ADFG Subject/Bill No: 208
Co./Dept./Title: DIRECTOR Commercial Fisheries Phone: 465-4210
Address: Juneau AK Fish & Game HQ Zip: 99801

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: Rodger Painter Subject/Bill No: 208
Co./Dept./Title: Alaska Shellfish Growers Phone: 463-3600
Address: Box 20704 Juneau AK Zip: 99807

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

✓ NAME: PAUL Fuhs Subject/Bill No: _____
Co./Dept./Title: AK TRADEMARK SHELLFISH Phone: _____
Address: _____ Zip: _____

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

NAME: _____ Subject/Bill No: _____
Co./Dept./Title: _____ Phone: _____
Address: _____ Zip: _____

Do you wish to testify? Yes No Respond To Questions

