PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES GAME AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

MAIN CAPITOL
EAST WING
ROOM 60
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2010,
10:02 A.M.

BEFORE:

HONORABLE EDWARD STABACK, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE RONALD MILLER, MINORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE GARY HALUSKA HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA HONORABLE DAVID LEVDANSKY HONORABLE MICHAEL McGEEHAN HONORABLE BRYAN CUTLER HONORABLE KEITH GILLESPIE HONORABLE MARK KELLER HONORABLE DAN MOUL HONORABLE DAN MOUL HONORABLE JEFFREY PYLE HONORABLE TODD ROCK HONORABLE CURTIS SONNEY

ALSO PRESENT: HONORABLE ROBERT GODSHALL

HILLARY M. HAZLETT, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC

1		I N D E X	
2	WITNESS		PAGE
3	Carl G. Roe		3
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Now 10:00 a.m. having 1 2 arrived, we'll go on with the hearing. It is the House 3 Game and Fish Committee. Today, we will take testimony on the annual 4 report from the Pennsylvania Game Commission. 5 report will be given by Executive Director Carol Roe. 6 7 After his report, Members will be given an 8 opportunity to ask questions of Director Roe. 9 Before we get further started, I would like the Members to introduce themselves and the areas that we 10 11 represent starting on my far right. 12 REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: Representative Rock, 90th District, Franklin County. 13 REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Jeff Pyle, 60th 14 Legislative District, Armstrong, Indiana, the other side 15 of the glacier. 16 REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: Gary Haluska, 73rd 17 18 District, Cambria County, which just told me has the 19 worst roads. 20 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Bob Godshall, 21 Montgomery County. 22 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Curtis Sonney, Erie 23 County. 24 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Representative Dan Moul

from Adams County. We still have three and a half feet

25

1 of snow. REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Good morning. 2 3 Representative Mark Keller, the 86th District, which is all of Perry County and part of Franklin. 4 SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Ron Miller, Republican 5 Chairman of the Committee, York County. We do have lots 6 7 of snow. We can send to the Olympics, if needed. 8 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Ed Staback, Majority 9 Chairman, the 115th, which encompasses Northern 10 Lackawanna and Southern Wayne County. REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: Mike McGeehan from 11 12 Philadelphia. REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Good morning, 13 everybody, Chairman. Keith Gillespie, 47th District, 14 15 the eastern part of York County. REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: Good morning. Bryan 16 Cutler, Southern Lancaster County. 17 18 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you. I would further 19 add that Representative Godshall is sitting in today's 20 hearing. He is a guest of the Committee for today's 21 hearing. I would like to remind the Members that the 22 23 study of the White Tail Deer Management Program will be released. 24 Our Committee is scheduled to hold a public 25

hearing on that on March 9th. If there are any Members thinking of asking questions today or related to that study, I would ask that you hold your questions back until the March 9th hearing. That will be the more appropriate time to ask those questions.

With that, Carl, you have the floor.

MR. ROE: Thank you, Chairman Staback, Chairman Miller, members of the House Game and Fisheries

Committee. It is a great pleasure to appear before you today to offer the Pennsylvania Game Commission's Annual Report.

Before I get started, I would like to formally welcome Chairman Miller to the Committee and we look forward to working with you in the future to tackle our problems with the wildlife resources.

I would also like to introduce our

Commissioners that we have with us today, President of
the Board, Commissioner James Delaney, Commissioner Dave
Schreffer, Commissioner Tom Boop, Commissioner Putnam
are here with us, including many staff.

If you get to a level of detail beyond what I'm able to answer, we'll bring the staff up here to answer some of those questions for you.

This has been another productive year for the Game Commission as we faced many challenges and yet were

able to continue to improve some of our programs.

We were still not able to do all we would like for the Commonwealth's wildlife or the hunters and trappers due to the lack of resources to accomplish our objectives.

As you read through the annual report, you will, again, see that in the program accountability section, we built the report on the strategic plan objectives to give you an idea of how we manage towards the goals and objectives of the strategic plan.

Our public accountability section again addresses major program areas. The budget accountability is relatively self-explanatory.

In the law enforcement accountability section, we had five formal complaints compared to seven in 2008 and ten in 2007. Of the five, one was sustained and was a case of unprofessional demeanor.

Overall, our wildlife protection efforts were, again, strong as we increased apprehensions for illegal take of game by 5 percent, hunting over bait by 13 percent, hunting or taking game with a motorized vehicle 31 percent. Overall, we had 19,172 violations detected with 6,948 citations and 12,224 warnings.

Next, I would like to offer some comment in more detail on some of our programs. First, I would

like to address some administrative programs that started last year where automation was a significant reason for the improvement in the process.

The Pennsylvania Automated License Sales System commenced this past year, and it was an unqualified success.

Although there were some agent challenges early in the process, for the most part, it was a great success and was very popular with both the agents and the hunters.

Additionally, within the PALs system, we initiated a harvest reporting system over the Internet. We do not know the success of the system at this point or if it has increased the reporting rate, but we did receive many comments on the ease of the system.

We did have one complaint from a hunter who was frustrated that the system would not work for him. He stated that he tried to put the antler points in the system and it would not take them.

He said he could not report his 18-point buck because he had ten points on one side and we had only single digits for each of the numbers. We have fixed that.

Another area where we have used automation to increase information flow is the use of eBird. This is

a program where our citizen scientists can provide information on bird counts directly to a database being run by Cornell University.

This allows citizens who have an interest in birding and wildlife watching to directly participate into providing important information for those programs. This greatly assists the Christmas Bird Count and the Backyard Bird Count Programs.

We now provide both our Hunting Digest and Game News via NXTbook. This is a system that allows you to view both publications in an automated manner and allows for the interaction in many of our pages.

As you read the publication on the computer, you actually turn the pages. We provide this service free to all libraries and schools.

We believe this was particularly good for schools and allows for multiple students to read the Game News at the same time instead of only one person being able to read the hardcover magazine.

We also provided this service to all our land cooperators without charge. It is a very unique system that provides broader service at a minimal cost.

We continue to move forward with our wild pheasant reintroduction program that is a result of a great partnership with Pheasants Forever.

We are introducing pheasants again this year to our third wild pheasant restoration area in Somerset County.

Additionally, we had another area nominated for a pheasant restoration area in the southeast part of the state.

Although our pheasant management plan calls for four restoration areas, we believe that with continued success and assistance from Pheasants Forever and local landowners, we can exceed that objective.

Another program that we increased this year is our support for the Wounded Warrior Program. These are armed forces service members who want to hunt after spending time in Walter Reed or Bethesda Hospital. They want to come to Pennsylvania to hunt as a way of returning to normalcy.

We provided support to several groups this year across the state and are looking forward to keeping this program going and expanding with the support of many sportsmen's organizations.

Last year's hunting season was pretty good across the board. We do not have the results of the current deer season, but in 2008-2009 season, we had an estimated deer harvest of 335,850. Our bear kill this past fall was the second largest ever with approximately

3,499 beer being taken.

This past fall's elk season was an interesting challenge. We had the lowest success rate we ever had during our elk season.

We believe this was a result of a healthy mast crop in the area that changed the elk's feeding patterns from their normal grazing habitat.

They appeared to be able to stay in the woods and eat acorns instead of coming out into the grazing areas. It was much more difficult to pattern the elk.

With that in mind, we had the same concern coming into the deer season. It appeared, because of a large mast crop in many areas, it was more difficult to pattern deer this year as they did not have to move very far to get food. Some basically could move less than 100 yards and have plenty of eat from their cover areas. We will see how the harvest was this year and see if our concerns were founded.

Over the past few years, we have made a concerted effort to improve the communication about our deer program.

As we have for the past three years, we will be offering a series of open houses across the state in all of our regions.

All of our deer information and data is

available for the public to read and understand on our website.

Additionally, we publish the Deer Chronicle twice a year to keep the public updated on our program; and last, but certainly not least, is our Ask the Biologist site where the public can ask our biologists any question they have on their mind.

As a result of improved habitat in the northern tier, we have had repots of increase in grouse and snowshoe hare populations. The early successional growth has helped to provide adequate cover for these species.

Last year, we also introduced a Snow Goose

Conservation hunt that ran from the end of February to

the end of March. Hunters can apply for a no-fee permit

to take snow geese during this period.

Preliminary approval for changes in next year's hunting season includes a youth rabbit hunt for our junior license holders.

This year, there will be a major change to our bobcat program. We will move from a lottery system to a short, open season for bobcats.

Hunters and trappers with a fur taker license and a \$5 permit will be able to hunt or trap bobcats during that time.

We are also initiating a fisher season. Our trappers will be able to trap fisher in a short season in specific wildlife management units.

On the legislative front, the primary issue continues to be the license increase. It has been 11 years since our last increase.

As I always mention, I do not know of any company that is still surviving on a revenue stream based on 1999 values.

Certainly, the rest of state government has not been held to those levels. In fact, if our budget would have been allowed to increase at the same rate as the rest of the state, we would have been able to spend \$95.2 million instead of the roughly \$68 million we have spent for the last three years.

We have had numerous hearings across the state for the Senate Game and Fisheries Committee and all have been positive.

I am sure you have heard the expression that we do not deserve an increase. Some may think that a license increase will increase our pay and that not giving an increase is punishment to us.

A license increase does not increase the pay of anyone in the Commission. It does not provide any additional funding to individuals. However, without an

increase, it does limit how well we can do wildlife programs for the public.

A license increase is about funding the wildlife resources of the Commonwealth. It is about how you want to resource our efforts to take care of wildlife for the citizens of the Commonwealth.

In addition to no increase in revenues, we were also hampered to perform our mission by the hiring freeze and other actions.

We were not allowed to hire key personnel that we needed to address critical problems. Examples of that was not hiring members of our forest inventory team and delaying the hiring of our one geologist that does our oil, gas, and mineral activities.

What was difficult to understand was that our budget was approved, and we had monies to hire these important positions.

It was very frustrating and the reality is, since we have a separate special fund, it did not affect the bottom line of the general fund budget at all.

We were also not allowed to purchase much-needed vehicles last year; and so far this year, we have not been able to purchase vehicles again even though they are in the budget and approved.

This just complicates matters as we are

delaying needed infrastructure issues that will come due in the future.

There is another legislative issue that we would like to see and that is that owners of oil, gas, and mineral rights must notify the surface owner of any pending sale or transfer of those rights.

This would preclude a lot of confusion on both public and private lands. We have had several instances where owners of subsurface rights on game lands have sold or moved those rights without us knowing it and we would obviously have liked to have had the opportunity to gain those rights to protect the game lands. The most obvious of these types of subsurface sales occur through the county tax sales.

Since we are rapidly approaching the end of the session, we do not anticipate much legislative activity, as I am sure that the general state budget will be the primary focus of the body.

However, we do want to thank the Committee and Representative Staback for their strong support of House Bill 1859, more commonly known as the Poaching Bill or Increased Penalty Bill.

It is an important piece of legislation that will certainly assist in reducing the illegal take of wildlife.

We would also like to thank Representative Cutler for his piece of legislation that improves the understanding of the authority of our wildlife conservation officers and their wildlife protection activities.

I am sure there will be questions on Marcellus shale, so I will quickly address the subject.

During Fiscal Year 2008, the Commission approved three oil/gas leases within the Marcellus shale development areas of the Commonwealth.

These leases totaled 2,693 acres and were worth an average up-front payment of \$907 per acre in the Commission, constituting an additional 10 acres of state game lands acquisition as well as revenues to the game fund. The average royalty per acre of these leases was 23.08 percent.

During the Fiscal Year 2008, there were no Marcellus wells drilled on any of these leases, but there were four wells planned for drilling during this Fiscal Year.

On all other currently active leases on game lands, there were two Marcellus wells commenced and placed into production in 2008.

The Commission received a total of \$113,336 royalty revenues during Fiscal Year 2008 from Marcellus

gas production with the average approximate well production being only 250,000 cubic feet per day rather than the perceived or expressed possibility of 2,000,000 3,000,000 cubic feet per day's production.

Unfortunately, there have also been two separate environmental degradation incidents which occurred during these wells development causing the need for increased Commission coordination and oversight management scrutiny.

We believe we have had a very positive year in the Game Commission. There were many things in our strategic plan that we could not accomplish due to resource constraints, but we did continue to get a lot of things done.

We have updated our strategic plan, and that document will drive our programs and the objectives we want to accomplish for the next five years.

We continue to update our species management plans that will assist in our integrated state game lands plans.

We know what we need to do to improve conditions for wildlife and in turn provide great opportunities for our hunters and trappers.

We want to do more. This is not a matter of will, but a matter of resources available to get the job

1 done.

We are looking forward to a bright future for the wildlife resources of the Commonwealth; and with your assistance, we can do more.

I thank you for your attention, and I will be glad to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Carl, thank you for that presentation. As always, you hit on a number of topics that are of concern to all of us here and to hundreds of thousands of sportsmen across the Commonwealth.

For the most part, you did so using straight talking. I appreciate that. I'm sure the Members of the Committee appreciate that as well.

Before I start the first round of questioning, I do want to take a moment to draw special attention to the exceptional cooperation that I received from a couple of your staff during the course of the year when we were putting together House Bill 1859, the Penalties and Poaching Bills.

Director Richard Palmer and your legislative liaison, Steven Smith, were both good partners in working with my ideas along with the suggestion of the Members of this Committee from both sides of the aisle.

It was a pleasure to work with both of them and I certainly believe that both are an asset to your

agency.

As you know, the Bill that was passed in the House will treat poachers in a different way than they have been treated in the past. I look forward to the Senate passing that Bill in the near future.

I'm going to start the questioning today and then open the floor for the Members. We will have as many rounds as necessary to respond to concerns that all of the Members may have.

Before we start, I would like to acknowledge the presence of two more of our Members in the likes of Representative Kula and Representative Peifer.

Carl, last year in this report, you and I had an extended conversation regarding the mineral rights on the state game lands.

I was concerned about the overall number of acres of game lands that we actually had mineral rights to.

At that point in time, you were unable to respond to that question, indicating you were in the process of trying to make that determination.

Now a year has gone by and I'm wondering, has that study been completed and are you in a better position today than you were last year to respond to that question, which is simply, how many acres of game

lands do we have where we actually have the mineral rights to?

MR. ROE: We have made marginal progress at best. As I mentioned earlier, it took us a whole year to be able to hire the geologist for our oil/gas/mineral section to be a primary actor in that.

But above and beyond that, what we were able to do was hire a limited-term attorney to help us to do the deed research in the area of Marcellus shale. She is up in the northeast part of the state working on those issues right now.

We also developed a Request for Proposal to further alternate our real estate data -- there is not even a database for real estate. It is just on paper right now.

We put together the requirements for that. We think that may cost us between 1 million and 1.25 million fully for that process.

In other words, putting reams and reams and reams of paper into a database that will be available in the system.

We are moving forward with that slowly, obviously, driven by resources available. Again, the hiring freeze hurt us in many areas. That was one of the areas that hurt us.

We are focusing right now in that area where we know there is activity. It, we know in the northeast part of the state, as you know, spreads all the way back to the west part of the state with Marcellus shale. So marginal increase at best, no major leaps.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. So we're still -- I won't say no further ahead. You made some progress, but we still don't know for sure the total number of acres that we have that we have the mineral rights to?

MR. ROE: That is correct. Our approach has been when there is activity around game lands, we do the research on that specific game land to find out what we own in that immediate area. It is driven by resources and people that are available to get the job done.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Of the number of acres that we do now know we have the mineral rights to, how many of those acres are under contract?

MR. ROE: I would have to go back. That would be by game lands by game lands. We can get that for you. We'll get that for you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: While you're dealing with that, will you determine how many more acres you are anticipating putting under contract in the near future?

MR. ROE: We'll put together what we have in play for this year, most certainly.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. Can you tell the Committee just how much revenue are you generating from Marcellus shale leases right now overall?

MR. ROE: As I have gotten older, I have more notes in my smart book. Let me look real quickly here. Last year -- basically, I can give you the total for oil and gas.

Oil and gas came to, on royalties was, I believe -- oil and gas, rental and royalties was a little over five million dollars for oil and gas this year.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Five million?

MR. ROE: Yes. That is -- for the rental rate was 2.8 million and royalties were 2.2 million. That is total. That is previous shallow wells and new deeper wells, which we have two of them.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. When you report back to the Committee regarding the number of acres yet that you plan on putting under contract with various drillers, can you also give us the estimated revenue which you hope to generate?

MR. ROE: That would be very, very difficult. As you know, the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee just did a study on oil/gas/mineral. It is almost impossible to project revenue in the out years.

As an example, 18 months ago, 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas was selling for \$16. This year, it is \$4. If we would have projected \$16 in the out years, that would be 300 percent more than what we were getting today. In reality, it is a fluctuating market.

They came to the conclusion, you can not project that. That report will be released this afternoon also.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: I think I would be more concerned at that point in time with the amount of dollars you're going to generate from the actual leasing on the property.

MR. ROE: Okay. Again, that is -- I mean, we benefit from that; but it is really given as problematic.

I know one of our game lands in the northeast we just looked at, we have 34 percent of the minimal rights on it.

The question becomes that, leasing efforts, the more acres you can lease in a particular area, the better leasing rate you are going to get.

In that case, we may have to go to a unitization process as opposed to a straight leasing process of drilling wells on game lands.

In other words, the other 66 percent is leased

to somebody else and they drill under our game lands and they don't -- it is a difficult process, but we'll put together a package for you and explain exactly where we are.

That five million dollars did not even make up the short fall in our timber revenue from last year. As you know, the timber market is way down across the board.

We only brought in 5.7 million dollars of the 12 million dollars anticipated in timber. That oil/gas/minerals are barely making up the difference in our timber revenue shortfalls.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Tell me, how is your court case going on Game Lands 57 up in the Wyoming County area regarding ownership of the mineral rights? How many acres are we talking about?

MR. ROE: It is either 11,000 or 17,000. Where is Steve? It is around 12,000 acres. I believe there is a hearing this month on that.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. Okay. I have one more and then we're going to open it up.

In your opening remarks, Carl, you mentioned four proposed wildlife management areas that now have a split doe hunting season.

You and I spoke recently during which I told

you my strong support for that proposal. That proposal, I think, is a giant step in the right direction in the eyes of a good many sports groups.

It shows the type of flexibility that I think has been missing in the last several years from the Board of Commissioners.

I'm wondering, what feedback have you received since the January meeting regarding that division?

MR. ROE: In fact, very little. I'm a gluten for punishment, so I spent four days at the Eastern Sports Show.

If you want to hear the comments across the board, you get a wide range of them there. There were three or four people that hunt in those wildlife managements that were positive.

Generally, there wasn't much said at the sports show. I know the Commissioners received some positive calls in general for those four WMUs, that we will have buck only first five days and antlers only for Saturday to Saturday. I know they have got some positive phone calls.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Was there any consideration given or are you thinking of giving any consideration down the road to the possibility of opening up that second week of doe hunting on the second Monday rather

than the first Saturday of that two-week season?

So many sportsman that I have talked to have suggested that, simply because of the fact that in their view, that would be like the beginning of a second hunting season for them.

As the three-day season, years ago, when we went through the first three weeks of the buck season and then the bow season opened up, the supporting community always viewed that as a new hunting season, if you will.

I think if we gave consideration to opening up that split season on Monday rather than the first Saturday, you will go a long way in the lines of supporting the community of referencing that as a new season, if you will.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: I would say that that would be problematic in a couple of areas. One is we take most of our deer on the first Monday and the two Saturdays.

You also, from our youth hunting point of view, some areas still give Monday off for hunting season.

They get one day of buck in. They may not get out for the antler season until the second Saturday.

If you take that Saturday out , it really eliminates the possibility of the youth participating,

for all intents and purposes. That would be an area of concern that I would have.

The other challenge is we are doing a study to see what the antlers harvest is in that five-day buck only season followed by a six-day season.

Again, we do not know what the impact would be on the antlers taken by shifting that season. That was the purpose of the study designed as it is now and then keeping those changes and those other four wildlife consistent with the study that we are doing. So we will have a good idea on what it may be.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you, Carl.

Representative Miller?

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Carl, in your testimony, you referenced two incidents, separate environmental degradation incidents in the Marcellus shale drilling.

And in your statement, you say that that caused the need for increased Commission coordination oversight management scrutiny.

First of all, also, before that, you said there were only two wells drilled in 2008. Are these the same two situations?

And then as a follow-up to that is, how does the Commission become more involved? Does DEP not have

that role? How does that require the Commission to be involved more?

MR. ROE: We would rather be very proactive in the supervision of game lands, to be very frank with you.

Although we have great cooperation and have good partnerships with a lot of gas companies, if you are not out there looking, things seem to happen.

In this case, the two incidents were, they were drilling and they cracked an underwater water supply that affected a hatchery downstream. They had to stop drilling. They had to reseal that frapping area before they continued on.

They second issues was they put a pipeline under a stream and the sedimentation to set that pipe leached out and rolled downstream also.

If you are there watching, you can probably preclude some of those things from happening as opposed to fixing them after the fact, which, in general has been the case. I would offer, in DEP as being reactionary to a problem as opposed to precluding one. We would like to be there to preclude it from happening.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. One last question from me, if I might, for this round. As far as the pheasant reintroduction, I remember fondly hunting

pheasants in York County in my younger days. It is very hard to find any pheasants these days.

I might have mentioned to you, I had the opportunity this past fall to see the first bobcat on my property in York County.

What is the impact of pheasant population that you are seeing from coyotes to other predators? It seems to me that we are sort of fighting a losing battle in some ways. It is just nature. Could you comment on it and where we are headed?

MR. ROE: Well, it is nature with man's intervention, unfortunately. That usually always complicates some problems for nature.

We are very careful about where we are reintroducing pheasant. We want to make sure we have a sufficient habitat. You have sufficient cover and enough food there that those pheasants will survive okay even in an area where there is predation, including avian predation, which is probably a bigger threat.

In the end, if you have good food and cover, those pheasants will survive. In a wildlife preservation area, we are looking for 15 to 20,000 acres of good pheasant habitat before we will reintroduce.

The Central Susquehanna has almost 100,000 acres up there. We are really excited about that. I

know our initial flushing counts this year were very good.

Hopefully, this snow doesn't knock down things in the spring. We look for a good habitat first, and then if we have good habitat, we will reintroduce pheasants see if we can make it and take off.

Again, we have no hunting for almost six years and that would give a chance for good natural populations to get started.

If the habitat is there and they have good cover, the birds will survive, just like they did many, many years ago. Although, they did have a different attitude toward their avian predators.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Cutler?

REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to briefly echo the Chairman's comments earlier in regard to the assistance of the Game Commission and working on House Bill 1881. I appreciated the work of Steve Smith and others. They have been great to work with.

I wanted to say that publicly. It was not an easy process shepherding that through Committee and over in the Senate. You certainly were helpful along the way, as needed, and willing to look at all of the

information we brought forward to reach a good compromise, and I appreciate that.

MR. ROE: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: In regards to the fishers, I shared with Representative Gillespie a littler earlier, I for the first time saw two while I was out hunting, in two different areas, which kind of surprised me.

Is there, other than probably the nature reason that you alluded to and the intervention of manhood, what is the reason? It had been several years since I've seen fishers in the wild.

MR. ROE: As you know, we had a reintroduction program in the northcentral/northeastern part of the state two years ago and southwestern part of the state, where we have the largest population that basically didn't migrate up.

We have done a study over the last three years on populations of the fisher. As I mentioned, we will start off with a very conservative season of fishers. I think it is four wildlife management units. As that population expands, we'll expand that opportunity for our trappers.

They are a great animal to watch in the woods, but they are also a tremendous predator. We do have

some concerns about that. It creates another opportunity for us.

REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: Thank you. And then the other question is, as I shared previously, I've been up in Potter County. I know up there we had horrible weather the last two cycles for the first day of hunting. Generally rain, snow. While I like to hunt in snow, not necessarily when it is actively snowing, which has impacted the season up there.

What impact have you noticed across the northern tier or other areas where the weather has impacted the hunting season, and unfortunately, the success rate for hunters?

MR. ROE: Yeah. We haven't got the harvest data for this year yet. I know last year, it knocked the harvest down quite a bit on that first day.

We didn't fully recover. We usually recover on the next two Saturdays, for the most part. We didn't really recover to the total amount we anticipated getting on that day.

REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: I will note that we did get three deer for nine guys, which was an improvement over prior years. Unfortunately, I wasn't one of those three, but so be it.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Pyle?

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question is going to echo that of Chairman Miller

here.

The Pheasants Forever Program, I know in my area, Armstrong, I know there are quite a few commercial bird farms that are supplying the Game Commission.

I just spoke about this with one of my PFSC guys the other day what would it take for us to establish a Pheasants Forever Chapter in Armstrong or even the Westmoreland Butler area as we do have all of these farms, which is something we can talk about later.

Sort of to echo what Representative Cutler mentioned earlier, I wanted to pay -- Chairman, a little latitude here. I specifically want to tip your hat to Bill Capouillez.

We had an issue with some resource management people and US Fish and Boat Commission, which Mr. Capouillez was key to solving problems. I want to compliment you for hiring him and compliments to him as well.

MR. ROE: Thank you. It is always good to lead a good team, if you have a good team. I think we put together a pretty good team.

In addition to the Pheasants Forever, we are

sensitive that there are a lot of propagators and promulgators out there. We hope to have good success in the restoration areas, but it will still be a great pick and take operation out there, particularly in the northern part of the state because pheasants won't have a large range opportunity to survive there.

We address natural areas and put and take areas. As for as raising birds and populating birds, that is not going to impact the industry at all.

REPRESENTATIVE PYLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Haluska?

REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Carl, I just want to thank the Commissioners that are here, obviously, the ones that aren't, for adding those two management units to the limited bow season.

I think that really puts a step forward in our area. I really think with the bow season the way it is now, the extended bow season, there are a lot of deer taken in bow season that the rifle hunters don't get to see. They are not seeing the numbers that used to be there, and that is probably one of the problems.

Just to touch on something we talked about last year, since we have the PAL system now, has the

Commission talked at all about updating the way we get our antler permits?

It is such an antiquated area to send in all of those envelopes. We talked last year about getting a lottery system similar to what you do with elk permits and bobcat, that you go to the automated system and you give them one, two, or three management systems that you would like to participate in. Has the Commission talked about that?

MR. ROE: We talk about it all of the time. As you know, it is in the statute that requires the county to be sole sellers of the antlers license.

We can build a system. In fact, in the first analysis, we talked about a lottery, but there would only be three or four that are even required to be a lottery system. Those would be the ones that sell out in the first, two, or three weeks.

Basically, you almost get your first choice of your wildlife management, if it is not 2G, 2F, and 1A, I think it is, and one other one.

We will have a lottery and everybody would get their first choice during the first round. So yes, we are looking at it. We are putting together a system requiring us to do that; but again, the law would have to change that to allow all other vendors, not just the County Treasurer.

REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: And I talked to my
County Treasurer. She is a little upset. I said, Barb,
you can be in the system, you know, it is just to the
point where it is so antiquated now with this new
system. We definitely have to open it up. I would be
in favor of voting for a piece of legislation. Thank
you, Carl.

MR. ROE: A system will certainly -- you can get your antler license when you get your general hunting license. The system capability is there.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Moul?

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I can attest that you were working very hard fielding the tough questions out there the other day at the Sportsman Show. How many WCOs are we short right now?

MR. ROE: I believe that number is 25. It is 23 districts and 2 in our special investigations.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Is it because of funding or the hiring increase?

MR. ROE: We moved the class another year for funding purposes. We are going to start the class in March.

As we did the last time, we will figure out a

way to pay for that. We have 98 vacancies right now and that includes the WCOs. So we will hold some more vacancies open to pay for that program.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Okay. Switching gears, I know we are trying to introduce pheasants back into Pennsylvania. I fully don't expect them to be where they were when I was a kid.

Hawks are making a big comeback, especially in my area. We used to have a rabbit population that was actually getting out of control. I was grateful to see the hawks come in and control that for us.

What is that going to do to possibly reintroducing pheasants in our area?

MR. ROE: Obviously, predation is a concern.

Again, if you have a good habitat, you will have a good natural population in that area. Habitat is the key.

As we all know, 40, 50 years ago where you had fenced rows and you had corn left in the field, you go through what I call clean farming now where corn is nubbed off at 3 inches above the stalk. There is no food and no cover. It would be great habitat for pheasants out there in small areas if we could have a native population going in.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: You think the two could survive together?

MR. ROE: There is no doubt that the predation 1 will be a challenge for that. 2 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: One last 3 Understood. thing, Sunday hunting on private land. I know it is a 4 touchy subject. Any thoughts on it? 5 My thoughts are when you all change MR. ROE: 6 7 the law, we will certainly react to that. It is in your 8 hands right now. 9 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Just wanted to know where 10 you were with that. 11 MR. ROE: We took it as increasing opportunities for people to come in, but I can't speak 12 for the Board, but we would certainly like the 13 opportunity to address that issue. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you very much. Ι 16 appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 18 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Carl, I followed a 19 discussion on the Commission's headquarters regarding 20 the impact of predators on the fawn deer population. 21 During Mr. Rosenberg's presentation, he seemed 22 to say that the coyote population we have in the 23 Commonwealth is not really having much of an impact on the deer population. 24

Did I hear that right? Because back in the

25

northeast, in fact, the entire Commonwealth, there are any number of hunters who are saying that the coyote population is certainly on the rise. The deer population is on the downturn. They're making a one-to-one correlation.

Now, in my view, common sense would dictate that because the population is as great as it is across the state, coyotes that is, that they absolutely are having an impact, an adverse impact on at least the fawn population. Could you comment on that?

MR. ROE: It is a very complicated issue. In some areas, coyotes are increasing. In some areas, coyotes are decreasing.

If there was increased predation on fawns, we would see a difference in the population to fawn to doe ratio.

So far, there has not been a significant change in the ratio, which would indicate increased predation. As we build that population model, we build that as a prehunt population, which includes all predation, roadkill, and any other mortality that could be there.

To date, we would see the fawn numbers going down in relation to the doe. To date, we haven't seen significant change in that.

Two years ago we took -- I'm giving big numbers

here. There was 28,000 coyotes two years ago and last year, we took about 23,000 coyotes in hunting and trapping.

If the effort was the same, that would indicate

If the effort was the same, that would indicate that there were fewer out there than the previous year. We have not seen predation as an indicator in the population changes.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Where are you doing those studies? Are they done across the entire Commonwealth or are they specific to an area?

MR. ROLE: It is part of the population model that we do every year as a result of the hardest data and using the 6-H kill model that we use in Pennsylvania to determine a prehunt population.

We do that by wildlife management. Some wildlife management may have a greater impact than others.

In reality, across the state, we have not seen predation as a determining factor on any change on the fawn population.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: I didn't quite follow you on that.

MR. ROE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: What I am interested in knowing is, are you doing a specific study on fawn

mortality?

MR. ROE: No. We did a fawn mortality study in 2001 and 2002. So the question becomes -- one of the things -- I know the Commissioners had asked that same question and we have sufficient resources that we had done this current study that we are doing, maybe we will go back and look at the fawn study for a couple more years.

Right now, the resources are driving towards that study that we are doing on the one week antler, second week concurrent season and because of the resources that he have, that is what we can do for deer right now.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: If you had more resources, we could figure on you doing specific fawn mortality?

MR. ROE: We could reconfigurate the fawn mortality studies in 2001 -- 2000-2001 or 2001-2002. I'm sorry. I'm not sure. I wasn't there.

We have data. It is not showing up in our population numbers as compared to the studies done in Georgia. They had a declining fawn population in their population model.

Others had a shift in the change of doe to fawn population model that showed where mortality was increasing there. Across the board, we just don't see

that yet in Pennsylvania.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Tell me. Several years ago, we had an opportunity to quiz Vernon Russ, who was the director at that point in time regarding the same issue.

He told us -- he told us that the Commission at that time was in the process of looking to hire six biologists, one for each of the six regions.

His primary duty -- one of his primary duties was supposed to be studying the impact that coyotes were having in the region on the whitetail deer. Whatever happened to that idea? Because that never occurred.

MR. ROE: It didn't occur. We did hire a regional biologist for species of special concern in every region. That study was never part of their duties at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Godshall?

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Just a couple of observations and some comments. Good morning, Carl. I really appreciate you being here.

I do agree with the license proposal that I would be very happy to cosponsor a bill to get rid of the antiquated system that we have, because that was something that should have been done away with.

The limited bow season is a little more limited. It is definitely a step in the right

direction. It is known as far as I would like to have seen it, especially up in 3-A where I am, above Mansfield where your Game Land 47 is, I don't seem to have a lot of deer on my property or the game lands.

On the coyote issue, we were up above Marshalls Creek. They don't have the snow up there. My grandson and another one of the people that was in our party took -- they seen four coyotes going on Route 402 above Marshalls Creek.

They saw four -- they traveled four miles and they saw four coyotes. I think they are doing a lot more damage. They have to eat. There are not a lot out there to eat except deer. That is something that is in serious consideration.

Carl, I wanted to ask you on your Marcellus wells that you were talking about, do you share those royalties with somebody else?

I mean, are you -- is that the full royalty that -- you know, is there a pooling concept that the companies use with 640 acres? Are you sharing the full amount of that lease?

MR. ROE: Where we own the rights and we drill on our area, we own our rights and we get the royalty.

Then there is the unionization process that you are describing where you share the value of a part that has

already been leased.

If you want a lot more information, I can get Bill Capouillez up here and explain it to you. What you described is the unionization process where you share that royalty rate where someone who is next to or near the game lands because they own the mineral rights.

Where we drill our well on our land, that is going to be --

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: You are getting the full royalties, which is a lot less than what a lot of the companies are mentioning that you should be getting from those wells?

MR. ROE: No. In fact, royalty rates, we are well above most companies.

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: In the amount of dollars -- the input you say is 250 million cubic feet per day is lower than what a lot of the companies are professing that they are getting from their wells?

MR. ROE: Well, that is a production rate.

That is not a royalty rate.

REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Right. But the royalty relates to the production?

MR. ROE: Well, yeah. The more production you have, the higher the royalty. That is why we go for higher royalty rates. That is the difference between us

and DCNR. 1 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Where are those two 2 3 wells located, Carl? MR. ROE: Game Lands 100 and --4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We own the oil and gas on 5 both of those wells. 6 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: You don't share with 7 8 anybody else? 9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That is full compensation. 10 And with regard to what you are seeing for 250 MCF, you 11 hear projections of 200,000 and 300,000 MCF on some 12 wells. Those are high-producing wells. I'm going to tell you there were wells that 13 were abandoned after nine million dollars worth of 14 15 effort put into it because they didn't produce hardly anything. 16 That is part of the pitch back that we 17 18 constantly have to go through, that we are not expecting 19 nor are we seeing 2 and 3,000 MCF wells. Although they 20 are out there, we don't have them. 21 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Where are those two 22 wells? Game Lands 100 doesn't mean anything to me. 23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Center Clearfield County in the area north of Snowshoe. 24 25 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: Okav.

MR. ROE: That is what I was going to say. 1 2 Again, the difference in our approach and DCNR, I 3 believe they buy out trying to maximize rentals. We do a fixed rental rate to maximize royalties because one 4 good year in royalties will make up more of a difference 5 than the --6 7 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: I'm not arguing with 8 you on that. The only thing I looked at was the 250 9 million cubic feet per day, which is lower than what was 10 projected. That is what I was wondering, you know, 11 where these wells were and I thought maybe you were 12 sharing that royalty with somebody else. MR. ROE: Those wells I described, we own 13 No. the full royalty on those. It is a production issue. 14 We don't control that. 15 REPRESENTATIVE GODSHALL: I understand that. 16 Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 17 18 Don't forget next year, 3A, if you want to cut 19 back -- I could use a few more deer. 20 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Sonney? 21 REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Thank you. 22 Mr. Chairman. I wonder if you could touch on where we 23 are on sales, and also, second part of my question is going to deal with the condition of the state game 24

25

lands.

We all heard we needed to reduce the deer herd because the state game lands -- Pennsylvania, in general, is being decimated. Are we seeing a rejuvenation in those forests? The deer herd has been knocked down. I'm just curious to hear what the shape of the forests are.

MR. ROE: First of all, sales for our general hunting license are up 1 percent. This year they are up 4 percent. For at least the near term, we have reduced that downward trend as far as general hunting licenses are concerned.

Hopefully, we can continue that trend. As far as regeneration is concerned, we do see regeneration in a lot of the areas that I described earlier, the northern tier, snowshoe hare and grouse because we are able to provide that protection.

On game lands, if we think we need to fence, we fence. For the simple reason, our goal is to optimize game on state game lands. That is the purpose of game lands. If we have to fence to ensure regeneration, we do.

The challenge we have on game lands is keeping deer on game lands. As you know, it gets hunted much heavier than private land does.

On 1,000 acres, I get two good weekends of

archery season in. The small game comes in, the deer is done until the late season, late archery and muzzleloader hunters out there.

We do need to work with DCNR, how they are using D Map. We are working with them to come to a better understanding of the use of D Map and plan cuts for them. I know Chris Rosenberg met with them and how D Map is being used on state forest.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Do you think the reduction in sale of timber, because that plays such an important part of the regeneration also and the type of cover for especially small games, is that going to have an effect?

MR. ROE: Since I have been the Executive Director, I want acres of production. I can't control the revenues coming in. We have a production goal not a monetary goal.

We are trying to get between 6,500 and 7,000 acres of trees by forest operations every year on game lands. If we get 5 million dollars for that or 12 million dollars for that, that is up to the market.

Around 10 percent of our game lands is early succession. We need to get about 20 percent early succession for a variety of succession plus the current rate for more cover for other species. So my goal has

always been an acreage goal not a monetary goal.

REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Carl, I had an inquiry from a non-Member on our Committee that I promised to bring to your attention at this meeting for a response.

Over the years that there has been a restriction in effect, there has been a cry from our senior citizens about the inability to count points on moving deer, along with the difficulty in identifying.

Another argument that is sometimes used is the fact that they have been purchasing a Pennsylvania hunting license for decades and decades and they deserve a break from this three- or four-point restriction.

Now, what is the sense to older hunters that bring this up? Has the Commission ever given any thought to lifting the point restriction for people over a certain age; 70, 75, 80, 105, whatever?

MR. ROE: Well, we would certainly consider the 105 mark. In reality, we get that -- we get quite a few notes and letters from our senior hunters.

To date, we haven't looked at that very hard because our senior hunters have to approach 70, 80,000 plus senior hunters out there. That could have a major impact on how we do our population models and harvest.

So from a standpoint of view, we haven't looked at that as being an area where we want to go to.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Peifer?

REPRESENTATIVE PEIFER: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Carl. I got a lot of comments, positive comments about your youth mentor hunters. Having families being able to take children out in the woods at an early age really seems to work.

It jogs their interest and there are so many competing forces for children. I have heard a lot about that.

I know the rabbit hunt we talked about that, adding that a week early. I am a real strong supporter of that.

Rabbit season is a time of year where it is good weather and a lot of actions of being still and watching that. Rabbits coming around are very important for children of that age. I would like to applaud those efforts.

The outreach in the hunter education programs have been very good. We had a nuisance bear that was caught. The children got to see that bear and got to see it being tagged. It was really a great program and I thank your conservation office for that.

In addition, I had been walking along the street and a conservation officer came up to me and said they had a mistake kill in the back of their truck. It had already been brought to your headquarters. They were looking for a family where they could give that deer, and I thought that was a good program.

There is no sense in the way the economy is today to waste good meat. I was able to write down the name of a friend in my cell phone and gave them that number. I still get thank-yous from that family. We appreciate having that gentleman bring the mistake deer over. It helped feed the family.

Those are the things that I like to see, practice kindness goes along way. I think you need to be applauded and hear that.

The only negatives I have are, please, always goes back to my bear season. Just leave that bear season alone. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday is a beautiful thing.

Opening it up on Saturday and hunting Monday and Tuesday and closing before Thanksgiving, I really don't believe in it.

I got a lot of negative feedback with that. Wednesday is the day before Thanksgiving, most kids aren't in school that day.

The way we hunt bear in Pike County crawling through swamps isn't something you want to take a child through anyway. Thank you.

MR. ROE: Just a comment on our program in the mistake kills, we, in fact, have a partnership with hunters sharing the harvest.

Last year, we did have quite a few.

Interesting enough, we did notice a lot fewer and that is because our conservation officers do have a list of DEA families. We took it to those families directly instead of sharing the harvest.

When the numbers came back, it was quite a surprise. After being there the first week, mistake kills, between the WCOs and our Deputies, they deliver that evening, even if it is midnight, putting them on people's back porches.

We are very sensitive to that. We don't want to have our wildlife resources go to waste. We think that is a good program that the WCOs do.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: The Committee has been joined by another member in the likes of Representative Levdansky.

Carl, I have one more question to go over with you. I want to ask you about the game fund and specifically the reserve balance.

Can you tell the Committee where you stand financially today and compare those numbers with last year?

MR. ROE: Absolutely. It is hard to say today, but I can tell you what our projections are going to be. Last year, our game fund ended with \$39 million. This year is to end with a balance of 37 million.

Revenues are down on the timber side. They were down on timber and investments. We lost over two million in investments last year as part of our revenue.

We lost money in the first part of this year.
We don't control that. That is the Treasury that
controls that.

If revenue stays the same and our spending stays the same, at the end of the year, the fund balance will be around 37 million.

What could affect that, if you get increased Pittman-Robertson funds this year. Right now, the initial projection was around 12 million.

We heard in the fall that could be up 40 percent. That is federal dollars that we have to spend first and then draw down federal funds to replace it.

However, there is a match involved.

Pittman-Robertson funds say we get an extra five million dollars. Or make it simpler. If we get an extra four

million dollars in Pittman-Robertson, we have to spend one million dollars. We have a 25 percent match, if that math came out right.

So in order to spend that four, we need to spend another million. That could affect the fund balance in the end also as being a major area.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Carl, I have heard from some in the sporting community about what they label as slush funds, if will you, or special accounts where money is placed in escrow and used solely for the purchase of the -- purchase of land.

The money doesn't show up on the books and doesn't come up as the game fund. The total value, if that is true, is never really correct. I know you probably have heard that.

MR. ROE: I have commented on it before many times here.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Can you address this and tell the Committee if the funds are separated out of the game fund and used only for land purchases and if that is true, just how do you account for the funds?

MR. ROE: Well, it is quite simple. First of all, there are no slush funds. That is a derogatory term and that is not the case.

These escrow accounts are placed there for a

specific reason and held by a third party, for the most part, so they never come to the game fund. The purpose of those monies, if we have an oil/gas/mineral operation, let's say it is a coal operation. That will affect the game lands for the next 20 years.

We think our first obligation is back to our hunters. We will take some of that advanced royalty money and put it in an escrow account to purchase land to replace that land that may not be available for the next 20 years.

About five or six years ago, we had three million dollars in our land acquisition budget. I think that money this year was 150,000 to 200,000 in land acquisition.

Those escrow accounts, again, don't come to the game fund. They are a separate account. We use those to replace land taken to from the hunters for oil/gas/mineral operation. That is the purpose of those funds.

The biggest one you may be referring to is Penn State. Again, that is Pittman-Robertson money. That is Pittman-Robertson to replace the land that Penn State put some affluent water on that was contaminated, and they got the land, they paid for that land. It was mandated that those monies be used to buy replacement.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Are you saying that the Pittman-Robertson money that you received does not go into the game fund?

MR. ROE: No. This specific case. All Pittman-Robertson money that we draw down, we spend it first and then we draw it back out of the federal pool of money that is sitting there.

The specific on the land deal that I am referring to, based on your question, was money that Penn State had to pay for destroying that land -- I don't want to destroying -- misusing that land and that money went into an escrow account.

It is hampered by Pittman-Robertson in the sense that you have to use that money under federal rules to replace that land that Penn State now owns.

Another issue, all of these transactions are approved by the Board. They are done at public meetings. It is stated where the money is going. There is nothing secret about this.

I know we have one of our group of detractors that loves to throw this red herring up. This is all done in a public forum. We can show you where all of the money is going.

I know another case where we had 90 acres destroyed by a coal operation and never replaced those

lands. We did a good job at replacing those lands.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: It seems to me, any monies that the Game Commission has control over where it is in a separate fund or not is immaterial, any monies that you have control over, in my opinion, should be a part of the total game fund.

Now, how you break it out from there, right, remains to be seen. If you have 50 million dollars in an escrow account that is going to be used totally for the purchase of land, that is fine. That is fine that you have that account but that money should be shown, in my view, as part of the game fund dedicated to the certain use.

MR. ROE: And I would argue differently because in the sense it is earmarked for land, it doesn't affect my operational budget one iota.

I could be sitting here with 70 million dollars in a restricted account, I can't use that for the day-to-day operations. It doesn't impact the bottom line on what we do.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: But because it is money that is controlled by you --

MR. ROE: It is not controlled. It is available to us. It is in a third-party escrow account.

25 CHAIRMAN STABACK: All right. I guess you and

I can go back and forth. 1 MR. ROE: I would be happy to talk more offline 2 3 with you on this one. CHAIRMAN STABACK: For the rest of the day, and 4 we won't agree on it. I am the Chairman and I have the 5 6 final say. I would like to say I wish you would reconsider. 8 MR. ROE: I would be glad to tell you where it 9 is right now. A lady left in her will, I think it was, 10 \$160,000 to purchase game lands. 11 If we bring that into the General Fund of the game fund, it could go someplace on a day-to-day 12 operation, that is why it is held in a separate escrow 13 14 account. 15 We have a little over two million dollars in escrow accounts to replace the lands affected by 16 oil/gas/mineral. In Penn State, I think there is 5.2 17 18 million strictly to purchase land. So we can continue 19 to do the same operations, strictly for land purchases. 20 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. Okay, Carl. 21 Representative Gillespie? 22 REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Thank you, 23 Mr. Chairman.

Carl, just two points on areas that you had

testified on. One regarding the wild pheasant

24

25

restoration project in Somerset County, how is that going?

MR. ROE: Pretty well. We are in our second year of stocking pheasants. So we will see how that goes.

The best indicator we have had so far is the Central Susquehanna one where we finished stocking and will get an idea of what that will be for the next two or three years and then we will see what opportunity allows.

Again, while we are stocking birds, the population is usually pretty high and might drop off initially. We are in our second year of stocking in Somerset. We will know in a couple of years.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Are they tagged with any kind of radar collar?

MR. ROE: A certain portion are. In fact, as we see what the mortality is on transferring a captured wild bird, it provides some interesting data. It is an expensive process.

This may be the last area we use telemetry on.

After two or three, we got a pretty good idea on how far they are going to fly and those sorts of things. While we used telemetry.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Where are those

```
1
    birds coming from?
             MR. ROE: North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana.
2
3
    It just depends.
             REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Mr. Chairman, if I
 4
 5
    may, regarding the special snow goose season.
6
    Susquehanna season and the management area, which holds
7
    about 100,000 snow geese this time a year, you mentioned
8
    there is no need for the special season between February
    and the end of March.
9
10
             Has Pennsylvania adopted any of the other
11
    regulations that are taking place in other states
12
    regarding electronic calls or unplugged guns?
             MR. ROE: We have allowed the electronic calls
13
    to be used for snow geese. We haven't used unplugged
14
15
           If they do it for snow geese and then for
    rabbits, three shots for most people, it should be
16
    sufficient and bring down a few birds.
17
18
             REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Is there a limit on
19
    the number of snow geese?
20
             MR. ROE: I want to say 15, but let me check.
21
    Yes, 15.
22
             REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Thank you,
23
    Mr. Chairman.
             CHAIRMAN STABACK: Chairman Miller?
24
25
             SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER:
                                   Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
```

To follow up on the Pittman-Robertson, if we might. Do we have to match 25 percent of the funds, or 4 million you got to put 1 million in?

The question is, we have been experiencing dealing with the federal stimulus program where we have to do some maintenance of effort in spending, whether it is educational programs or other things.

Do you have to maintain a maintenance level of spending? I mean, basically, it sounds to me you could spend one million dollars that you were going to spend anyway and then leverage four million from this program without putting the fund in great jeopardy.

MR. ROE: Absolutely. I'm talking from a budgetary point of view earlier. We anticipate 12 million dollars a year and meeting our match.

We always exceed the requirement for habitat required by law, so that allows us to be the master of Pittman-Robertson.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: As far as what you can do with that money, is it strictly for operations or is it also for purchase?

MR. ROE: It is also for purchase of equipment that we need. We, in fact, purchased some Caterpillars, I call them lopper machines, to knock pole timber down. We are looking at using some Pittman-Robertson because

over the last few years, we burned about 1500 acres and want to decrease the use of fire of game lands and forest lands.

You can buy equipment mostly oriented to habitat development. That is the majority of the spending.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: And just as a final statement, I would support Chairman Staback, not so much that the money gets counted from escrow accounts as part of the General Fund for the Game Commission but certainly in the era of transparency where we are asked to show money.

It might go a long way to dispel some of the rumors if that is part of any report you put out. If the information is laid out there, we could dispel some of this negativity.

MR. ROE: We will make sure escrow is included in the annual report next year.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Rock?

REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just have two brief questions. The first is, I guess it relates to the deer management plan. Over the last six or seven years, we had relatively mild winters and didn't experience a large winter kill. This

year could be different.

I have three and a half feet of snow on a piece of land and it could be there for a long, long time. I was just wondering if that was figured into the deer management plan and how that would affect doe license allocations in the future?

MR. ROE: Again, as we build our population model, that prehunt, which will include winter mortality fawn, we will localize impact, absolutely.

When you are dealing with a wildlife management area, it is hard to take into consideration. Those deer going into this winter season now were pretty healthy.

I know in the fall a lot of deer have good body fat.

Will they have a better survival rate? We just don't know. That is all in the population model, because we build a model end of September, beginning of October instead of one in June where the mortality may come behind you.

REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: In an area where the deer numbers are very low can create some problems. I don't know how we would fix it.

MR. ROE: We would fix it over time. If you look at winter mortality, it has just the opposite effect. The allocation was pretty steady and had a milder winter and survivability was higher. You would

expect an increase. If we didn't see that bed, then it would be adjusted down based upon the population trend.

REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: My biggest concern, there are many areas was where the deer numbers are already low. This could take us to the point -- I'm not sure how we recover from that. It is something to keep in mind.

My second question is working with habitat restoration for pheasants. We have a local group in my area and one of the questions that I was asked was within their group, their statewide group, they were talking about the idea of a \$20 pheasant stamp. I think there is support within the membership to do that.

I heard numbers of up to -- if they would sell what they think they could sell, would raise two million dollars.

They would only pursue that if that money would be in addition to the money that was already in the budget currently for pheasant restoration.

I mean, they wouldn't want to get their membership to replace pheasants if that was going to be what was already budgeted. And I just wanted to hear what you thought about that.

MR. ROE: I mentioned Pheasants Forever. That is a two-edged sword. If you raise two million dollars

-- I heard the figure 100,000 pheasant hunters. We have over a million hunters in Pennsylvania.

So, the other 900,000 are now paying for a program that they can't utilize. We spend over three million dollars on propagation and pheasant restoration areas now.

To get a full production, we think that would be closer to four million dollars. Then it becomes the question that I'm buying a general hunting license and a portion of that is going for pheasants that I can't hunt anymore. If we spend, what is in that pheasant stamp. When you deal with earmarked money, it could become problematic.

REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: I think the general thinking there is if we don't -- obviously, we need more money and if we don't get more money, what we are doing currently really isn't going to work. That money isn't well spent, but I can see where you are saying it is a tough spot.

MR. ROE: Right now, every hunter has an opportunity to hunt pheasants.

REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: There are just not many of them.

MR. ROE: 100,000.

REPRESENTATIVE ROCK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Haluska?

MR. ROE: If I may address the issue on mortality, and as we go through this, we did a study on our antlerless deer in Wildlife magazine. It is 2G and 4B.

I want to throw some numbers out to you that were quite startling to me. On 2G, all of the deer of over 400 doe were tagged and radio collared, the survival rate was 90 percent in 2G.

It was 70 percent, a little over 70 percent on private land during that study period. In 4B, it was 60 percent survival rate on public land and just under 80 percent on private land.

From all of the data we are gathering on tagged deer and bucks and, in fact, antlerless deer, a lot of them were surviving during our hunting season.

I don't know what that indicates, but the reality is we have a lot of deer that we tagged that are still running around. They are still tagged and still collared.

You mentioned coyotes earlier. We had 1500 deer that were tagged or collared. We only had five predated by coyotes -- by predation. Three were by coyotes, one by bear, and one by bobcat. These are adult deer.

When you look at predation, particularly on the 1 adult side, I'm not just saying it doesn't happen. The 2 3 indications are, at least from the deer we have tagged and they are monitoring, adult predation is not there 4 very much. 5 REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: Thank you, 6 7 Mr. Chairman. 8 Since we are talking so much about land 9 purchases, in Title 34, is there still a ceiling you are 10 allowed to pay? 11 \$400 per acre from the game fund. MR. ROE: REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: From the game fund? 12 MR. ROE: Unless it is an indenture or a 13 special habitat for species of special concern. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: But you can waive that if you are taking that out of the other funds? 16 MR. ROE: The escrow account does not limit us 17 18 by that. 19 REPRESENTATIVE HALUSKA: Okay. Thanks. 20 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Keller? 21 REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 22 23 Thank you for your testimony this morning. I'm 24 going to ask you a question. I have been asked this 25 question by fur takers.

They have come to me and said, listen. I purchased a fur taker's license. Why do I have to spend more money if I want to trap fishers or bobcats? What was the reasoning for that?

MR. ROE: To control the take. In other words, we want to know who are hunting fishers and bobcats so we can have an estimate of what we anticipate the take to be.

It is to follow along with surveys and how you were successful or not successful. The challenge is to determine wide open as we have controlled it in the past through a lottery program. We hope that will control some of that.

We don't want to go hog wild on a population, particularly fishers and, in fact, bobcats, we could take a tremendous take and the permit gives us an opportunity to control that.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: I have never got a fur taker's license. I am not knowledgeable on this piece. Do we require fur takers now to provide any type of information on what they have taken?

MR. ROE: Absolutely.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Well, then why would we not use that as --

MR. ROE: Because we know exactly how many

bobcat permits we put out because there is a lottery system.

In reality, for those who are hunting bobcat and participate in the lottery previously, there is no additional cost to them.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Levdansky?

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Thank you, Chairman

Staback.

Carl, first, I just want to follow up to a point that Representative Haluska raised about the \$400 an acre. That is the maximum that an agency can purchase on land with the exception of some of those indenture and some of the special fund allocations. Do you feel a need at this time to have that statutory cap raised?

MR. ROE: That is a two-way sword for us also. In many ways, when we purchase land, we can bring \$200 to the table and bring the additional monies and I can get to that land.

I think it is time to raise that \$400 limit.

Again, it would be a two-way sword for us. For \$400 in Pennsylvania anymore, that doesn't get you a whole lot

1 of acreage.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: And it hasn't been changed for quite some time?

MR. ROE: Quite some time.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Right. That's one issue. I want to switch to oil, gas, and mineral rights on state game lands.

I do understand -- I was at a workshop a couple of weekends ago that the Game Commission would be in support of legislation to make it clear as to who owns the title to mineral rights on, principle interest being Marcellus gas, to make sure, if you can't find the owner, at least the surface owner could be notified when those rights are going to expire so the agency would have a chance to purchase those rights. And that would certainly make sense.

And we ought to do that in the context of a gas severance tax that I think will be moving through the Legislature.

I also want to call attention, again, to the severance tax and my interest in using a small portion of it for fund -- to get some alternative revenue to the Game and Fish and Boat Commissions to fund their ongoing operations, because I think they are at the point to keep asking sportsman to fund all of the things that

these two wildlife agencies do in the interest of all Pennsylvanians is not only perpetuating an inequity but doesn't get you the kind of resources to get the job for all of Pennsylvania.

One thing real quick I want to shift to is the issue of this is going to be -- there is going to be a report of the budget and finance report, Representative Staback knows and probably most of you, on the bear management audit.

We are going to be releasing that in the Budget and Finance Committee this afternoon. I don't have any questions relative to that.

One area I am a little interested in is timber inventories. It is my understanding that only about a third of all of the game lands have a timber inventory that has been conducted and only about one fifth of all of the acreage have up-to-date management plans.

Why has the Game Commission been so lax about coming up with a really good inventory and a good management plan for those inventories on state game lands?

MR. ROE: I can tell you that was one of my areas of concern early on and that is why we integrated a state planning model and we put forward the forest inventory plan at that time.

We are four years into the program. We are about a third of the way through on plans. They are quite cumbersome and gets people used to dealing with them but it is an innovative process.

In other words, we approach our game lands as a habitat as opposed to a forestry. That is why the game manager and the forester have an interest in this.

Our obligations were to buy habitat and to provide timber for the heart of the industry. We are in that process, a slow process.

Last spring, we couldn't hire three of our farmers because of the hiring freeze. We fell a little behind.

Within five years we anticipate having the full cycle done. As far as game lands plan, there was some forestry plans that were 20 and 30 years old. From my point of view, that wasn't satisfactory. We are going through that process. It will take a few more years to get that done on all of our game lands.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: And how many foresters do you have on staff?

MR. ROE: I think we have around 30 field foresters and 6 regional.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: So you have 30 based out of the Bureau of Land Management?

MR. ROE: No. They are in the regions at this point in time. They used to be in the Bureau of Wildlife Habitat Management. Now they are in the regions for that specific purpose of integrating forestry into a Habitat Management Plan on the game lands.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: I'm not pointing fingers involving anyone, but one of the other reports that will be released this morning by the Budget and Finance Committee also looks in response to Representative Haluska's ongoing interest in this area.

It examines this and it is rather shocking at least to me that only -- you know, you only have up-to-date management plans on about 20 percent of the acreage and about a third of it has a timber inventory.

When you face the demands that you get to cut timber, if you don't have an inventory or a management plan, it almost doesn't make any sense to cut anything unless you really know what our inventory is.

Yes, you are going to cut for habitat; but the reality is, you need to cut in a way that not only is good for the environment in the habitat but you also have to do it with some long-term, you know, perspective in mind on how you can maximize your revenue without negatively impacting resources.

MR. ROE: I would say we do have a general idea as to what we have on our game lands. We know that 10 percent is early successional, 10 percent is in large/small timber, that is 12 to 18 inches and that is 54 percent of our inventory. And full timber is about another 26 percent.

So at the macro level, we certainly know what we have out there. Specific to each game lands, that is the purpose of integrated planning.

I'll talk more about this this afternoon if we are given the opportunity, the approach was a forest management program as opposed to a habitat management program.

I mentioned that if, in fact, let's say, we have an oak stand that is the only hard mast producing oak stand in the 125-year-old oak tree and the next oak stand is producing four miles away, from a forest management point of view, we take those oak trees out because they are there for the market.

From a habitat point of view, we wouldn't take those down for another 30, 40, or 50 years until we have oak regeneration that replaces those mast reproducing trees.

Our approach to the habitat environment is quite different than it was on a pure forestry model.

Another example is, in fact, we are surrounded by state forest on the state game lands.

They are managing for our forest around game lands, why would you want to continue with that forest or integrate different habitats? Why wouldn't we put it in to benefit a variety of species. That won't be a good forestry, but it would a good habitat management.

That is the difference between the two approaches between us and DCNR in particular. That is my concern with the study we will hear this afternoon, if we use a habitat approach as opposed to a pure forestry approach.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. Carl, one last question regarding licensing sales. I have been told that sales are running ahead of last year's numbers. Is that holding true up until now?

MR. ROE: Right now, that is correct. Our general hunting license sales are up about 4 percent.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Would you contribute that to archery sales?

MR. ROE: No. That is a separate figure.

These are just general hunting licenses up to 4 percent.

Archery is up about 7 percent. That was about 17,000

additional licenses for archery sold this year. That could be crossbow or could be a portion of the general hunting license that went up also. We're not sure.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. One final statement.

That is that any dollars that the Gaming Commission has access to for spending purchases should be shown as part of the General Fund so that total value of that fund could never be challenged as not being correct.

On that note, that will conclude today's hearing. I want to thank you for being here and the manner in which you conducted yourself and the manner in which you responded to some tough questions. Thank you again. You demonstrated yourself to be very professional in that manner.

I want to remind the Members that tomorrow morning, we are back here again at 10:00 a.m. to take the testimony and annual report of the Fish and Boat Commission.

(The hearing concluded at 11:38 a.m.)