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HB 21 recognizes that the herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers used by commercial resorts and other developments may provide significant sources of non-point source pollutants to the coastal waters. This bill would appropriate $25,000 to study the effects of these discharges from resort developments.

Our statement on this bill does not represent an institutional position of the University of Hawaii.

We concur with the rationale for HB 21 that focuses attention on species uptake of potentially hazardous substances in areas where near-shore marine life is collected for human consumption. In addition to analyzing marine life for herbicides and pesticides, water quality analyses will also be needed to measure possible nutrient enrichment. Furthermore, both biological and water quality analyses will be needed to identify pathways of pollutant substances.

We would like to call your attention to a related but narrowly focused study being pursued by Sea Grant at the University of Hawaii. They propose to evaluate the proportion of potential pollutant materials applied on land that reach the nearshore marine environment as non-point
source discharges and to assess the fate of these discharges within the nearshore zone. We suggest that recognition of this related study be given in HB 21 and that the designated lead agency for the study be directed to consult and coordinate with Sea Grant to assure maximum joint cooperation.

As presently drafted HB 21 would appropriate funds to the governor's agricultural coordinating committee. We suggest that the Department of Health may be a more appropriate lead agency inasmuch as they have the statutory responsibility for this type of activity.

We believe that $25,000 will probably be insufficient to cover the purposes of this act as presently described. The study would require considerable field sampling and laboratory work. Chemical analyses for pesticides are very expensive and can cost several hundred dollars per sample. Field studies can involve airfare and per diem for investigators in addition to personnel costs. We suggest that the scope of work be more clearly defined to assure that adequate funds will be appropriated.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on HB 21.