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Senate Bill 2003 proposes to restrict the commercial taking of aquatic life by any method to individuals who hold a valid aquarium fish permit and commercial marine license, and provides for the phasing out of commercial aquarium fish permits. The Department of Land and Natural Resources ("Department") appreciates the intent of this measure and offers the following comments.

A phase out of commercial aquarium fishing by statute is ultimately a policy decision based on societal values.

The Department provides the following comments and suggestions:

As written, subsections (a) and (b) may be interpreted to apply to the take of aquatic life for any commercial or non-commercial purpose, not just aquarium purposes. If the intent of this bill is to apply specifically to aquarium fishing, the Department suggests amending (Highlighted in yellow) subsections (a) and (b) as follows:

(a) Except as prohibited by law, the department, upon receipt of a written application, may issue an aquarium fish permit, not longer than one year in duration to use fine meshed traps, or fine meshed nets other than throw nets. It shall be unlawful to take any aquatic life for commercial purpose, any marine or freshwater nongame fish and other aquatic life by any
method of catch, including by use of fine meshed traps, fine meshed nets, or throw nets, for aquarium purposes without possessing a valid, non-lapsed aquarium fish permit and commercial marine license. [Provided that the taking is not otherwise prohibited by law]

(b) It shall be unlawful to take, for non-commercial aquarium purposes, marine or freshwater nongame fish and other aquatic life by use of fine meshed traps, fine meshed nets, throw nets, or other prohibited catch methods, and to take purposes, more than a combined total of five fish or aquatic life specimens per person per day.

Subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) are unclear because there are no valid aquarium fish permits currently in existence, and it is uncertain whether there will be any aquarium fish permits issued by July 1, 2018. Previously granted permits have been declared void and invalid as a result of a recent Supreme Court ruling, and applicants must undergo a lengthy environmental review process before being eligible to receive a new aquarium fish permit.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this measure.
Comments:

PRESENTATION OF THE

OAHU COUNTY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF HAWAII

TO THE COMMITTEE OF WATER AND LAND

THE SENATE

TWENTY-NINTH LEGISLATURE

REGULAR SESSION OF 2018

Friday, January 26, 2018

2:45 p.m.

Hawaii State Capitol, Conference Room 224

RE: Testimony in Support of SB 2003, RELATING TO AQUATIC LIFE

To the Honorable Karl Rhoads, Chair; the Honorable Mike Gabbard, Vice-Chair and Members of the Committee on Water and Land:

Good afternoon, my name is Melodie Aduja. I serve as Chair of the Oahu County Committee ("OCC") Legislative Priorities Committee of the Democratic Party of Hawaii. Thank you for the opportunity to provide written testimony on Senate Bill No. 2003, relating to Aquatic Life. The OCC Legislative Priorities Committee is in favor of Senate Bill No. 2003 and support its passage.

Senate Bill No. 2003, is in alignment with the Platform of the Democratic Party of Hawaii ("DPH"), 2016, as it restricts aquarium fish permits, commercial marine licenses, and its transfer or renewal.
Specifically, the DPH Platform provides as follows: “We encourage the responsible development of ocean resources in order to achieve sustainability of our marine resources, and ensure and improve the health of our reef and marine life. Recognizing the importance of the ocean as a life-sustaining resource, we much protect its ecological balance while promoting the cultivation of ocean resources as a step toward greater self-sufficiency. We support democratic participation of citizens and residents to protect (i) valuable coastal ecosystems and reefs from misuse and (ii) beaches for public use and recreation. The Hawai‘i Coastal Zone Management (CZM) law, HRS Chapter 205A, currently provides for public participation in management of coastal resources.” (DPH Platform, Lines 78-80, 90-91, 427-430 (2016)).

Given that House Bill No. 2003 restricts the taking of aquatic life by any method for commercial purposes to individuals who hold a valid, non-lapsed aquarium fish permit and commercial marine license; prohibits DLNR from issuing new aquarium fish permits; requires DLNR to renew existing aquarium fish permits that have not lapsed for commercial marine licenses and transfer existing aquarium fish permits to commercial marine licenses prior to July 1, 2023; allows for the taking of aquatic life for non-commercial purposes to a limit of five aquatic life specimens per permit per day, subject to certain conditions, it is the position of the OCC Legislative Priorities Committee to support this measure as it protects valuable coastal ecosystems, reefs and Hawaii’s environment from commercial and non-commercial misuse.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Melodie Aduja

Melodie Aduja, Chair, OCC Legislative Priorities Committee

Email: legislativepriorities@gmail.com, Tel.: (808) 258-8889
STRONGLY OPPOSE SB2003, Relating to Aquatic Life

HFACT is a not-for-profit, IRS 501c(5) organization, that advocates for small boat commercial, non-commercial, and recreational fishermen throughout Hawaii. HFACT board members sit on a number of international, regional, and federal fisheries management and endangered species advisory committees as well as state marine and coastal zone advisory committees; and, HFACT is thoroughly familiar with and participates in ocean and marine resource management in Hawaii and the western and central Pacific.

HFACT OPPOSES the intent of SB2003, Relating to Aquatic Life. The state has shown commitment to sustainable fisheries and this bill is counter to the state’s efforts to support sustainable use of marine resources. The aquarium fish collection fishery in Hawaii has been shown, via peer-reviewed scientific studies, as being sustainable.

HFACT believes SB2003 as written is simply another attack by animal rights organizations on fishing in Hawaii. While the bill mentions the aquarium fishing industry, in reality it is directed at all fishing in Hawaii, including commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing. Animal rights groups will not be satisfied until all people in Hawaii, be they a commercial fisherman, a non-commercial fisherman, a native Hawaiian, or a recreational angler, are prohibited from catching fish for food or for any other purpose.

HFACT believes that fisheries management decisions should be based on peer-reviewed science, stakeholder involvement, and guidance from the Department of Land and Natural Resources and its field biologists. If peer-reviewed science shows that strict management protocols need to be implemented, the Department of Land and Natural Resources has many statutory mandates to implement such management rules, simply put SB2003 is unnecessary. Passing SB2003 would set a bad precedent of managing fisheries resources on the basis of political opinion rather than on the bases of scientific monitoring of the fish stocks in the ocean.
HFACT objects to bills such as this that purport to be based on science, but are in fact based on political and personal agendas. There is absolutely no credible science to support SB2003. This is simply another attempt by special interest groups to take management of natural resources away from Hawaii, the Department of Land and Natural Resources, and the citizens that depend on these resources for cultural, subsistence, and economic reasons.

HFACT recommends that the Legislature support the Department of Land and Natural Resources adopt more science-based management of its fisheries rather than less, as implied in this bill. With the exception of the management of the aquarium fish collection and bottomfish stock management, Hawaii is behind the state-of-the-art in fisheries science compared to the rest of the nation, and also compared to many island nations. Adopting a science-based approach, as has been done with the aquarium fish collection fishery, is foundational to the proper management of irreplaceable natural resources.

The construction of Hawaii’s fisheries statutes, rules, regulations and policies should be made solely on the basis of the best peer-reviewed scientific and commercial data available. The careful evaluation of scientific evidence is fundamental to the management of all natural resources. The State should strive to make every effort to utilize scientific advances that improve our ability to understand nature and its processes. SB2003 flies in the face of fisheries management best practices.

HFACT thanks the chair, vice-chair, and committee members for this opportunity to provide comment and to assist in the conservation of Hawaii’s natural resources.

Sincerely and Aloha,

Phil Fernandez
President
TO: Honorable Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Gabbard, and Water and Land Committee Members, 1-26-18, 2:45 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Keith Dane, Hawaii Policy Advisor, State Affairs, Humane Society of the United States, kdane@humanesociety.org, Tel: 301-312-1489; and Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D., Senior Director, Wildlife Department, Humane Society International, ttelecky@hsi.org, Tel: 301.258.1430

RE: Comments on SB203, Relating to Aquatic Life

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and Humane Society International (HSI), have serious concerns with the current draft of SB2003 which would, if enacted, require an aquarium fish permit for the commercial take of aquatic life by any means for aquarium purposes, prohibit the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) from issuing new aquarium fish permits, require DLNR to renew or transfer aquarium fish permits, and prohibit the use of fine meshed nets for the recreational (i.e. non-commercial) capture of aquatic life for aquarium purposes while also limiting take for recreational aquarium purposes to five fish or other aquatic species per person, per day.

Our main concerns are as follows:

- The use of “shall” in subsections 188-31 (d) and (e) removes DLNRs discretionary authority to deny applications to renew or transfer the permits. In doing so, the court ordered environmental review for these aquarium permits under Hawaii’s Environmental Policy Act (HEPA), which resulted from a Hawaii Supreme Court decision in September 2017, would no longer apply.

- According to a 2017 poll, 83% of Hawaii voters want to see an end to the aquarium trade, with a majority citing the trade impacts to coral reefs as the primary concern. The provision for transfer of permits, which is currently not allowed, would extend the life of the aquarium permits for years, if not decades, and therefore is not a meaningful limit that addresses the public’s strong concern.

- Evidence shows that the aquarium trade continues to capture marine life in large numbers despite the October court ruling declaring that aquarium fish permits are invalid and illegal. The trade quickly adapted and is using other netting and capture techniques which currently do not require an aquarium fish permit. New language
requiring the permit for all methods of capture for aquarium purposes is urgently needed. Recommended language to achieve this end is attached.

HSUS and HSI sincerely thank the Committee for the opportunity to provide testimony and for considering our comments and recommended amendments.
**SB-2003**
Submitted on: 1/24/2018 8:10:15 AM
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Lodge</td>
<td>hawaii hunting association</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

This is way too broad to enforce, one, and doesn't make economic nor conservation sense either.
Oppose SB 2003

Although I agree with the intent of SB 2003, I can see that there is a major flaw in the wording of the bill. I therefore need to oppose this bill until appropriate changes are made.

Currently, there are no tropical fish collection permits issued due to a Supreme Court ruling that clearly states that no permits can be issued until a HEPA review is conducted.

I believe that the intent of the bill would not to “cut the legs off of the industry, but would allow it to exist another four years until 7/1/2023.

However, the bill clearly states that as of 7/1/18 “the DLNR shall not issue aquarium fish permits”. Since we currently have no aquarium permits, we would need to obtain new permits.

Worded in this fashion, the Bill would essentially make it impossible to get a new permit after 7/1/18.

Please reword this bill.

Respectfully,

Randy Fernley / Coral Fish Hawaii
Thank you for this opportunity to testify in opposition to SB2003

It has been well-established through peer-reviewed studies conducted by the Division of Aquatic Resources that tropical fish collection has not done any undue harm to Hawaii's coral reefs, and that the practice is sustainable.

On the other hand, it is well known that snorkeling tourists can do a great deal of harm to our near-shore habitats. Hundreds of thousands of visitors stepping on coral reef and stirring up silt in shallow waters, along with introducing potentially harmful sunscreen products into the water, have done a lot more long-term harm than professional tropical fish collectors have ever done. I have personally observed and documented how these fish are collected in water as much as 130 feet deep. When the collector left the spot, he left no signs of ever being there. Nothing was disturbed, and the number of fish on the sites didn't look diminished at all. A great deal of care is taken to make sure the fish are healthy from the start. Only the best specimens are collected, and then they're handled in a way that makes sure they have the best chance of making it to their destination in good condition. A tropical fish collector would quickly end up out of business if the fish they provided didn't survive. The very serious concern is that the fundamental principle of this bill can also be applied toward stopping all commercial fishing operations. And this is at a time when Gov. David Ige is trying to make our state less dependent upon imported food. These fish aren't just for ornamental purposes. They provide educational insights for those who aren't able to directly visit such habitats, especially young children. It opens their minds to worlds unimagined in a way that can't be conveyed by a printed page or TV screen. The regulation of our natural resources must be based upon carefully conducted and peer-reviewed science. And the science clearly indicates that this industry is not harming our environment nor causing undue or permanent harm to our fisheries.

Mahalo for your consideration. Dean Sensui, executive producer Hawaii Goes Fishing
SB-2003
Submitted on: 1/25/2018 8:39:16 AM
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Wintner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I, Robert Wintner, on behalf of Snorkel Bob's, Hawaii’s biggest reef outfitter, oppose SB2003 for the same reason I don't snorkel in murky water. It reads like gobbledygook--cobbled by mainland aquarium trade interests to entrench revenue rather than protect Hawaii reefs. Are you, Senator Rhoads, oblivious to the Supreme Court ruling with specific regard to spirit and intent? DLNR continues with obfuscation, subterfuge and violation of that ruling. The intent is to end the aquarium trade. SB1240 language was better, polling 90% public support. You could have used that language with improvements but declined. The legislature already voted to end commercial aquarium collection. Any new aquarium bill should require a permit to close the loophole that DLNR and the AG created after the Supreme Court ruling required state environmental review. Instead, you limit private take to 5 fish per day but fail to limit commercial take. The Ige administration fails to keep its promise on the SB1240 veto. Instead, DLNR, the AG and PIJAC colluded to evade Hawaii Constitutional law and Hawaii Supreme Court Law. Beyond that, should you not recuse yourself on this issue, given family ties to the Ige crew? This bill will bear negative consequence at all levels, beginning with just below sea level. Please kill it. Ill-advised,ill-conceived, politically motivated and hazardous to our health.
January 26, 2018

TO: Chair Rhoads, Vice-Chair Gabbard
Senate Committee on Water and Land
1/26/18, 245pm

FROM: Inga Gibson, Policy Consultant
For the Fishes
ponoadvocacy@gmail.com; 808.922.9910

RE: Comments on SB 2003; Relating to Aquatic Life

Dear Honorable Chair Rhoads, Vice-Chair Gabbard and Senate WTL Members

For the Fishes has serious concerns with the current language of SB2003, such as language removing the discretion of the Department of Land and Natural Resources to deny renewal of aquarium collection permits (shall vs may) based on certain criteria. Notably, in September the Hawaii Supreme Court prohibited the issuance of new permits and ruled that all existing aquarium collection permits are “illegal and invalid” pending Hawaii Environmental Policy Act (HEPA) review and assessment, which has yet to be conducted. It remains in question if and when any permits will be (re)issued in the future, and if so, how that will be handled by DLNR.

The current language of the proposed bill also allows for the transfer of aquarium collection permits, a practice that is not currently exercised by the Department. If the intent is to phase out permits following HEPA review then language extending the renewal of permits, rather than allowing for the transfer of permits, for a specified period of time (2-5 years), is recommended. As proposed it would take a decade or more to phase out this extractive industry. Our reefs and reef wildlife cannot wait that long to recover, especially given other pressures such as climate change.

Unfortunately, aquarium collection continues despite the afore-mentioned court ruling, therefore, an amendment to HRS 188-31, which currently only regulates the use of fine mesh nets, is in immediate order. In addition to the above comments, we recommend that the bill focus on bringing all methods of collection beyond fine-mesh nets, under HRS 188-31. Recommended language below:

§ 188-31. Permits to take aquatic life for aquarium purposes
(a) Except as prohibited by section 188-23 or any other provision of law, the department, upon receipt of a written application and completion of any environmental review required by HRS Chapter 343, may issue an aquarium fish permit, not longer than one year in duration, to harvest [use fine meshed traps, or fine meshed nets other than throw nets, for the taking of marine or freshwater nongame fish and other] aquatic life for aquarium purposes.

(b) It shall be illegal to harvest aquatic life for aquarium purposes without an aquarium fish permit issued pursuant to this section.

(c) Except as prohibited by law, the permits shall be issued only to persons who can satisfy the department that they possess facilities to and can maintain fish and other aquatic life alive and in reasonable health.

(d) It shall be illegal to sell or offer for sale any fish and other aquatic life taken under an aquarium fish permit unless those fish [and] or other aquatic life are sold alive for aquarium purposes.

The department may adopt rules pursuant to chapter 91 for the purpose of this section.

(e) For the purposes of this section:

(1) “Aquarium purposes” means to hold salt water fish, freshwater nongame fish, or other aquatic life alive in a state of captivity as pets, for scientific study, or for public exhibition or display, or for sale for these purposes; and

(2) “Aquarium fish permit” means a permit issued by the [board] department to harvest [for the use fine mesh nets and traps to take salt water fish, freshwater nongame fish, or other] aquatic life for aquarium purposes.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony and recommended amendments.
**SB-2003**  
Submitted on: 1/23/2018 10:29:32 AM  
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton Kealii Pang, Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Protecting our nearshore fisheries is important to Hawai'i's natural heritage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William K. Chang</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

I oppose this measure because it is not backed by scientific data.

thank you for allowing me to submit testimony.

Bill Chang
Submitted on: 1/24/2018 7:37:46 AM
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Tanaka</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

This bill is written poorly, it will affect regular food fish harvesting by creating a overall bag limit of 5 edible fish, it will ban thrownetting for edible fish and it proposes to place fish under the animal cruelty act where people would be then able to sue the state to stop certain types of fishing for edible fish if it causes "cruelty", such as with spearfishing. Please oppose this bill.
Aloha Chair Rhoads and Members of the Senate WTL Committee:

I am opposed to this measure as the ascertions cited in SECTION 1. are suspect and requires DLNR analysis and confirmation. Scientists have also spoken in opposition to the banning of the sustainable taking of aquarium fish and the basis of the Governor's veto. See: https://www.reef2rainforest.com/2018/01/18/pseudo-science-and-the-hawaii-fishing-ban/

The fishing community has consistently sought the implementation of peer reviewed science to ensure "verifiable" science is used to ensure the sustainable management of our marine resources. Until such time that the science is verified and validated by the DLNR, this measure should be held.

Respectfully,

Roy Morioka
Aloha a state of Hawaii.

It has been brought to my attention about the new law being introduced about aquarium fisheries and its negative affect on our islands. It is obvious after reading the law that the language included is wrong, and has negative affects on more fisheries then the aquarium commercial fishing industry. The way it's written is going to affect other commercial fisheries, and harvest of local fishermen who feed their ohana and friends with the fish from our islands. Though the issues of overharvesting for aquarium tradesman export might need to be addressed, it should not be a time for those laws to affect other fishing industries. If this law should continue its course of action, it should be reworded to include ONLY aquarium commercial fisheries, and not include other commercial and non commercial fishing rights.

Thanks for hearing my thoughts.

A hui hou

Edward "Ted" Clark.

Ted@glassartshawaii.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randall Nishimura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
SB-2003
Submitted on: 1/24/2018 10:42:50 AM
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shyla Moon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
I oppose the language in SB2003 and especially the section change inserting animal cruelty law.
SB-2003
Submitted on: 1/24/2018 7:27:52 PM
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byon Nakasone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
SB-2003
Submitted on: 1/24/2018 10:07:36 PM
Testimony for WTL on 1/26/2018 2:45:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Testifier Position</th>
<th>Present at Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tavini Sulusi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

This Bill is poorly written. It will affect non-commercial fisherman who use a throw net to supplement their dinner table.
Comments:

I hope that the legislature will take the time to review this proposal. Not only will it make my vocation more dangerous diving alone it will make it virtually impossible for me to sell my business in my old age. I am the longest running tropical fish collector on the island of Kauai. Most of the time I have been the only one in fact. One other diver came to live and dive here. But has since left the industry. I am all for a sound reef and take great care in my stewardship of the fish I catch. I catch one species of fish in a very small area of the south shore of Kauai. I fish less than 1/8th of the entire coastline. I also fish at depths that only scuba can reach. I avoid the tourist destination of the local dive industries and have a good rapport with them since 1988. I catch about 100-150 fish for the entire year. I catch only juvenile fish and have left the breeding size fish so that I can continue to ply my trade without inhibiting the reproductive cycle of this species of fish. I catch only as many as I need to pay my bills. Please do not create unsound and unreasonable legislation that will adversely affect my family. Not all islands are the same and they shouldn't be treated as such. I implore the legislature to wait and take more time to reasonably create a bill that will function for people as well as the environment.
Dear Senate and House Committee Members,

As a current Hawaii Commercial Fishing Licensee and Biologist B.S., I am writing this letter to strongly oppose S. B. 2003.

The Hawaii Marine Aquarium industry has been proven to be one of the most well managed, regulated, well monitored and sustainable fisheries in the world. This bill is based on emotion, falsehoods and assumptions, not fact or science. Contrary to the information in this bill, as a Hawaiian commercial licensee, we are required to provide a detailed catch report on a monthly basis and are limited to what species are collected and quantities.

It is unfortunate to see yet another bill portraying aquarists, scientists, biologists, and fisherman as reckless and uncaring. This is simply not true and is sickening. From collecting, to transport, to husbandry, we treat these animals with the utmost respect and care. We do NOT keep animals for amusement or ornamentation, this is simply an untrue emotionally written statement.

I urge you to oppose SB2003 and hope you will let the DNLR continue to manage the sustainable fishery as they have in the past.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Eigenbrode
Honorable members of the Senate Committee on Water and Land:

My name is Bruce Carlson. I have a Ph.D. in Ichthyology from the University of Hawai‘i and I am the former Director of the Waikiki Aquarium. I am now retired and I have no financial stake in the outcome of this issue, nor do I receive any remuneration in-cash or in-kind to support the Aquarium Fishery in Hawai‘i. I am motivated by my lifetime interest in aquariums, and in supporting science as the best way to resolve this issue vis-à-vis pseudoscience, anecdotes and hearsay evidence.

I am opposed to the provision in SB 2003 that aquarium fish collecting should be eliminated, however I agree that capping the number of collecting permits allowed in the fishery at any time is potentially a reasonable management measure, provided they do not lapse over time. And I am offering additional suggestions to improve this measure.

The premise of this bill is that the aquarium hobby has no value compared to leaving the fish on the reef. This position is a philosophical opinion and not based on science. All of the considerable scientific data collected by DLNR scientists since 1999 indicate that the aquarium fishery in Hawai‘i is having no adverse impacts on fish populations nor on the environment and is therefore, by definition, "sustainable". This is a position shared by many respected local and mainland scientists (see attached letter). In fact, in recent years, populations of the two most heavily collected species, the yellow tang and kole, have been increasing on the Kona coast (based on data collected by DLNR).

Since research has demonstrated that there are no detrimental environmental effects from aquarium fishing, the only benefit this bill provides will be for those who profit from taking divers underwater. In my opinion as a scuba diver, this bill ultimately caters to an elite group of people (many not from Hawai‘i) with the financial means and physical ability to dive, while ignoring many local residents who will lose their jobs. The State of Hawai‘i is in effect favoring one business over another.

This aquarium fishery and the hobby are indeed valuable:

- **The fishery provides income to many families** especially on Oahu and the Island of Hawai‘i, and secondarily provides revenue to the airlines and other supply businesses.
- **Prominent ocean conservation biologists in Hawai‘i and elsewhere were inspired** to become scientists through their interest in aquariums as a childhood hobby and after visiting public aquariums.
- Millions of **people worldwide can enjoy viewing and learning about Hawai‘i fishes** and coral reefs through home aquariums, and aquariums in hospitals, schools, zoos, and oceanariums, even though many of them will never have the opportunity to visit Hawai‘i.
- **For many people who cannot swim due to financial or physical limitations, aquariums are their only window to the ocean** – something that they will never have the opportunity to experience first-hand.
Assuming that the current court-ordered EA or EIS demonstrates that the aquarium fishery has no significant adverse environmental effects - a likely conclusion based on existing scientific data - then on what basis other than “philosophical” can the Legislature argue that this fishery must be phased out? Philosophy is an insufficient basis for depriving hard-working people of their livelihoods.

Given the significant economic and societal benefits from the aquarium fishery and the pursuit of aquarium-keeping, I recommend a compromise approach:

1. **Cap the number of collecting permits allowed in the fishery at any one time** at the number that were active in 2016-2017, and continue the requirement to report catch data and species status over time.

2. **Allow for the transfer of these permits** to new holders in future years.

3. **Establish a system of Fish Replenishment Areas** on every island where collecting occurs, following the model fishery established in Kona.

4. **Require a review of the fishery every five years by DLNR using well-established scientific methods to monitor the effects of the fishery.**

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinions through this testimony. References and opinion from other scientists are included below:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE - JUNE 28, 2017

An open letter to the legislators of the State of Hawai’i:

Aloha. We are writing this open letter to Hawai’i legislators to encourage you to uphold Governor David Ige’s proposed veto of Senate Bill 1240. We, the signers of this letter, are coral reef researchers and fish biologists working in Hawai’i and elsewhere. As Governor Ige noted in his statement on June 23, 2017, the best available scientific data do not support passage of this bill.

The Aquarium Fishery, especially in West Hawai’i, is an example of community involvement working with government to create a fishery management system that is a model for other fisheries. Regretfully, this opportunity to engage other fisheries in Hawai’i could be jeopardized if SB 1240 is signed into law, as it will effectively end commercial aquarium fish collecting in Hawai’i.

This issue of aquarium fishing was largely resolved through the passage of Act 306 in 1998. Following this legislative mandate, concerned members of the West Hawai’i community, fishermen, and DLNR biologists worked together to create a network of protected areas on the Kona coast, along with monitoring and management protocols. These agreements, rules, and regulations operated well until recently, when individuals and groups not involved in the years-long partnerships began a campaign to reignite this issue.

This campaign ultimately led to the passage of SB 1240. We are concerned with the level of false information and lack of data these individuals have used to support their assertions, and
the havoc they have created over a well-managed fishery that has benefited from the aforementioned good-will partnerships.

It is not possible to provide a detailed analysis of all the scientific methods, data, and conclusions available on this issue in this brief letter, but these peer-reviewed findings have been independently checked by researchers at multiple Universities across the country and have subsequently been supported by additional independent surveys performed by the Coral Reef Ecosystem Division of the federal National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Here are several key aspects of the fishery summarized from research papers listed at the end of this letter:

1. The dataset collected by the Hawai‘i Department of Aquatic Resources (DLNR) is remarkable for the time-span that it covers (1999 - present), and the resources required to conduct over 6,700 underwater surveys. These data clearly show the populations of yellow tang and kole (the two most heavily collected species) are not declining, and in recent years have increased. This is a clear indication that collecting is sustainable at the current level of fishing and in the present environmental conditions.

2. These data also show no significant differences in the adult population of yellow tang in fished areas versus closed areas. This is important because these large individuals represent the broodstock. Adult fish are not valued in the aquarium trade and are not collected. As of 2015, the total population of yellow tang on the Kona coast increased by 64.5% and is estimated to number 3.6 million fish, while the adult population is estimated to be greater than 2.5 million fish. Each female yellow tang can produce up to 20,000+ eggs per spawning event, and spawning occurs multiple times throughout the year. The large population of adults, coupled with their prodigious reproductive output is one important biological factor that makes this fishery possible.

3. Proponents of SB 1240 claim that because the fish species collected are herbivores, removal of these fishes will cause environmental harm. This is a reasonable hypothesis, but it is not a conclusion supported by current evidence. Drs. Tissot and Hallacher (2003) set out to test this hypothesis by comparing protected reefs with nearby fished reefs. They concluded:

   *There were no significant differences in damaged coral between control and collected sites to indicate the presence of destructive fishing practices. In addition, there were no increases in the abundance of macroalgae where the abundance of herbivores was reduced by aquarium collecting.*

DLNR has more recent data showing no significant differences in herbivore biomass or macroalgal cover between Fish Replenishment Areas and open areas.

The DLNR Report on the Findings and Recommendations of Effectiveness of the West Hawai‘i
Regional Fishery Management Area states:

- The Hawai‘i marine aquarium fishery is currently the most economically valuable commercial inshore fishery in the State with FY 2014 reported landings greater than $2.3 million.
- Biological and fishery results to date indicate the FRAs (fish replenishment areas) are clearly working and are expected to increase in importance as time progresses
- The effectiveness of the West Hawai‘i FRAs for aquarium fish suggests it would be prudent to establish MPAs (marine protected areas) for other resource species throughout Hawai‘i as a precautionary measure against overfishing and for restoration of marine resources. Currently, less than 1% of the Main Hawaiian Islands is fully protected by MPAs.

SB 1240 jeopardizes the livelihoods of many local fishermen across the State, and it could ultimately be counter-productive for the conservation of other Hawai‘i fisheries if this well-managed fishery is regulated out of existence. We urge policymakers to carefully evaluate arguments and testimonies on the basis of verifiable data, as well as consideration of the impact on jobs and the economy. Based on the best science and data available, we ask that you support Governor Ige’s proposed veto of SB 1240.

Mahalo,

**Brian Bowen**, Ph.D., Research Professor, Hawaii Institute of Marine Biology, U.H.  
**Bruce Carlson**, Ph.D., former Director, Waikiki Aquarium (retired)  
**Michael Domeier**, Ph.D., Director, Marine Conservation Science Institute (Kona)  
**Hunter, Cynthia**, Ph.D., Director, Marine Option Program & Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Biology, U.H.  
**Randall Kosaki**, Ph.D., Hawai‘i Coral Reef Biologist  
**Richard Pyle**, Ph.D. Associate Zoologist, Bernice P. Bishop Museum  
**John E. Randall**, Ph.D., Senior Ichthyologist, Bernice P. Bishop Museum (retired)  
**Andrew Rossiter**, Ph.D., Director, Waikiki Aquarium, U.H.  
**Andrew Rhyne**, Ph.D., Assoc. Professor, Roger Williams University  
**Leighton Taylor**, Ph.D., former Director, Waikiki Aquarium (retired)  
**Brian Tissot**, Ph.D., Director & Professor, Marine Biology Laboratory, Humboldt State University  
**Rob Toonen**, Ph.D., Professor, Hawai‘i Institute of Marine Biology, U.H.
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Comments:

Strongly oppose SB2003.
Testimony Submitted to the Senate Committee on Water and Land
By the Conservation Council for Hawai‘i
Hearing: Friday, January 26, 2018 2:45 pm
Room 224

Opposition to SB 2003 Relating to Aquatic Life

Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Gabbard, and Members of the Committee,

Aloha. The Conservation Council for Hawai‘i opposes SB 2003, which restricts the taking of aquatic life by any method for commercial purposes to individuals who hold a valid, non-lapsed aquarium fish permit and commercial marine license; prohibits DLNR from issuing new aquarium fish permits; requires DLNR to renew existing aquarium fish permits that have not lapsed for commercial marine licenses and transfer existing aquarium fish permits to commercial marine licenses prior to July 1, 2023; and allows for the taking of aquatic life for non-commercial purposes to a limit of five aquatic life specimens per permit per day, subject to certain conditions.

First, SB 2003 does not phase out aquarium collecting. Instead, it locks in the status quo of allowing unlimited commercial take by the industry. The legislature should be focused on getting the Department of Land and Natural Resources to determine what is sustainable, and then cap the number of permits that can be issued and the number of fish that can be caught accordingly, not continue to allow infinite take.

Second, there is no such thing as “non-lapsed” commercial permits, as the circuit court has declared all commercial permits illegal and void. There are no non-lapsed permits that could be renewed or transferred, as this bill intends. What is your intention here?

Third, the use of “shall” – as in DLNR “shall renew” and “shall transfer” – would make these permits ministerial, not discretionary, and take them out of HRS Chapter 343 Hawai‘i Environmental Policy Act purview. This would give the DLNR and commercial collectors grounds to argue they no longer need to complete HEPA review.

Concerned citizens, including CCH members, worked very hard to bring this case to the attention of the Hawai‘i Supreme Court, which ordered an environmental review of commercial aquarium collecting under HRS Chapter 343. Rather than undermine citizen efforts to protect public trust resources, the legislature should support the court order.

Please oppose SB 2003. Mahalo nui loa for the opportunity to testify.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Ziegler

Marjorie Ziegler
TO: Honorable Chair Rhoads, Vice Chair Gabbard, and Water and Land Committee Members, 1-26-18, 2:45 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY: Keith Dane, Hawaii Policy Advisor, State Affairs, Humane Society of the United States, kdane@humanesociety.org, Tel: 301-312-1489; and Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D., Senior Director, Wildlife Department, Humane Society International, ttelecky@hsi.org, Tel: 301.258.1430

RE: Comments on SB2003, Relating to Aquatic Life

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and Humane Society International (HSI), have serious concerns with the current draft of SB2003 which would, if enacted, require an aquarium fish permit for the commercial take of aquatic life by any means for aquarium purposes, prohibit the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) from issuing new aquarium fish permits, require DLNR to renew or transfer aquarium fish permits, and prohibit the use of fine meshed nets for the recreational (i.e. non-commercial) capture of aquatic life for aquarium purposes while also limiting take for recreational aquarium purposes to five fish or other aquatic species per person, per day.

Our main concerns are as follows:

- The use of “shall” in subsections 188-31 (d) and (e) removes DLNRs discretionary authority to deny applications to renew or transfer the permits. In doing so, the court ordered environmental review for these aquarium permits under Hawaii’s Environmental Policy Act (HEPA), which resulted from a Hawaii Supreme Court decision in September 2017, would no longer apply.

- According to a 2017 poll, 83% of Hawaii voters want to see an end to the aquarium trade, with a majority citing the trade impacts to coral reefs as the primary concern. The provision for transfer of permits, which is currently not allowed, would extend the life of the aquarium permits for years, if not decades, and therefore is not a meaningful limit that addresses the public’s strong concern.

- Evidence shows that the aquarium trade continues to capture marine life in large numbers despite the October court ruling declaring that aquarium fish permits are invalid and illegal. The trade quickly adapted and is using other netting and capture techniques which currently do not require an aquarium fish permit. New language
requiring the permit for all methods of capture for aquarium purposes is urgently needed. Recommended language to achieve this end is attached.

HSUS and HSI sincerely thank the Committee for the opportunity to provide testimony and for considering our comments and recommended amendments.
§ 188-31. Permits to take aquatic life for aquarium purposes

(a) Except as prohibited by section 188-23 or any other provision of law, the department, upon receipt of a written application and completion of any environmental review required by HRS Chapter 343, may issue an aquarium fish permit, not longer than one year in duration, to harvest aquatic life use fine meshed traps, or fine meshed nets other than throw nets, for the taking of marine or freshwater nongame fish and other aquatic life for aquarium purposes.

(b) It shall be illegal to harvest aquatic life for aquarium purposes without an aquarium fish permit issued pursuant to this section.

(cb) Except as prohibited by law, the permits shall be issued only to persons who can satisfy the department that they possess facilities to and can maintain fish and other aquatic life alive and in reasonable health.

(dc) It shall be illegal to sell or offer for sale any fish and other aquatic life taken under an aquarium fish permit unless those fish and or other aquatic life are sold alive for aquarium purposes.

The department may adopt rules pursuant to chapter 91 for the purpose of this section.

(ed) For the purposes of this section:

(1) “Aquarium purposes” means to hold salt water fish, freshwater nongame fish, or other aquatic life alive in a state of captivity as pets, for scientific study, or for public exhibition or display, or for sale for these purposes; and

(2) “Aquarium fish permit” means a permit issued by the department to harvest for the use of fine mesh nets and traps to take salt water fish, freshwater nongame fish, or other aquatic life for aquarium purposes.
Comments:

Although we support the concept - the very important preservation of our reef fishes, we feel that this bill does not go far enough - it allows continuing collection and death of fishes indefinitely. Please amend to cease the continuing of removing our native fishes immediately.
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Comments:
In opposition to SB 2003, relating to Aquatic Life

I work as a fisherman on Oahu, and have held an aquarium fish permit since 2007. I also have a Bachelors of Science degree in Marine Biology from the University of Hawaii and have participated in a number of research projects concerning coral reef conservation, fisheries monitoring, and marine exploration. As a fisherman, I am proud to be part of what I know is a healthy and sustainable fishery that contributes to our economy, while providing thousands of people in Hawaii and around the world an opportunity to enjoy the ocean and its creatures. I am strongly opposed to SB 2003, which has no scientific basis and would needlessly eliminate a vibrant and sustainable local industry.

As fishermen, our livelihoods depend on maintaining healthy reefs and healthy fish stocks, and we have no desire to see our resources depleted. I appreciate the intent of SB 2003 to limit the number of aquarium permits while still allowing us to fish, however it is significantly flawed and, as written, would fail to accomplish that goal.

For the following reasons, I am opposed to SB 2003:

The bill would immediately and permanently close the aquarium fishery in Hawaii

Since 1953, when the state began issuing aquarium permits, the aquarium industry has provided a livelihood for many Hawaii residents. These include not only fishermen such as myself, but also fish dealers, pet stores, aquarium maintenance personnel, and many others. These are legitimate businesses, licensed and regulated by the state. All told, hundreds of people in the state earn a living directly from the aquarium industry. These are local families, with children to feed, bills to pay, and elderly relatives to support. The passage of SB 2003 would take away our livelihoods and plunge many local families into unemployment and poverty.

At this time, our permits are presently invalid, pending completion of an environmental impact statement as mandated by the Hawaii Supreme Court. We are in the process of complying with the court order and completing the required environmental review. However, it is unlikely that this will be completed by July. If this bill is passed as written, our businesses will be permanently closed, despite our good faith efforts to follow the law.

SB 2003 would eliminate recreational aquarium permits, with no conservation benefit

As written, SB 2003 would eliminate recreational aquarium permits. This would unnecessarily criminalize the keeping of home fish tanks, which are a valuable tool for local families and educators. In many cases, it is the only way for children to experience the ocean. Non-commercial aquarium fishing has minimal effect on the environment and there is no reason for it to be eliminated.
The aquarium fishery has proven to be sustainable & compatible with healthy reefs

The state Department of Land & Natural Resources has been monitoring the aquarium fishery since the early 1970s. At no point in time has there been any evidence of a declining fishery, especially on Oahu where the fishery has remained extremely stable for the past ten years. On the Big Island, the most recent data from DLNR indicates that the fishery is very healthy, and the population of the most collected species has increased significantly over the past 15 years. We have been diving the same reefs for more than 40 years, and have not seen a long term decline in fish abundance - each year the fish return just as strong as before. If the supposed depletion of fish was true, we would have been out of business long ago.

Moreover, research conducted since 1998 in Kona, where the majority of fish collection occurs, has shown no difference in coral health or algal abundance between areas where the fishery is permitted and areas that are closed. It is clear that the fishery is not harmful to the health of the reef. This information is readily available from DAR should anybody be so concerned.

In summary, SB 2003 is a flawed and harmful bill. It would needlessly shut down a thriving local industry, put hundreds of Hawaii residents out of work, and deprive many people in Hawaii and around the world of an enjoyable, educational, and enriching hobby that fosters an appreciation for the marine environment like no other. The aquarium fishery has proven to be sustainable, it has proven to be compatible with healthy coral reefs, and it has proven to be compatible with the tourist industry. In the interests of responsible fisheries management, I urge the committee not to pass this bill.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify,

Matthew Ross