## PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES GAME AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2010, 10:04 A.M.

## MAIN CAPITOL EAST WING ROOM 60 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

## BEFORE:

HONORABLE EDWARD STABACK, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE RONALD MILLER, MINORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE DOM COSTA HONORABLE NEAL GOODMAN HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA HONORABLE DAVID LEVDANSKY HONORABLE MICHAEL MCGEEHAN HONORABLE KEVIN MURPHY HONORABLE BRYAN CUTLER HONORABLE KEITH GILLESPIE HONORABLE MARK KELLER HONORABLE DAN MOUL HONORABLE CURTIS SONNEY

HILLARY M. HAZLETT, REPORTER NOTARY PUBLIC

1	TNDEV	
1 2	INDEX	DACE
	WITNESS	PAGE
3	Brian Barner	4
4	Thomas Kamerzel	26
5	Tim Schaeffer	32
6	Dave Miko	45
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
 19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
CHAIRMAN STABACK: The hour of 10:00 a.m.
1
    having arrived, I will call this hearing of the House
2
3
    Game and Fisheries Committee to order.
             The purpose of today's hearing is to take
 4
    testimony on the annual report from the Fish and Boat
 5
    Commission. Here today representing the Commission is
6
7
    Mr. Brian Barner, the Acting Director of the Commission.
8
             Before we get started, I would like the members
9
    of the Committee present to identify themselves and the
    area that they represent, starting on my right.
10
11
             REPRESENTATIVE CUTLER: Good morning. Bryan
    Cutler, Southern Lancaster County, 100th District.
12
             REPRESENTATIVE KELLER: Good morning.
13
    Keller, 86th District, Perry and Franklin Counties.
14
15
             REPRESENTATIVE COSTA:
                                     Dom Costa, 21st
    District, Allegheny County.
16
17
             REPRESENTATIVE SONNEY: Good morning.
                                                     Curt
18
    Sonney, 4th District, Eastern Erie County.
19
             SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER:
                                   Ron Miller, 93rd District,
20
    York County, Republican Chairman.
21
             CHAIRMAN STABACK: Ed Staback, Democratic
    Chairman, Norther Lackawanna and Southern Wayne
22
    Counties.
23
24
             REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: Mike McGeehan,
25
    Philadelphia.
```

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Good morning. 1 Keith Gillespie, 47th District, Eastern York County, right 2 3 along the Susquehanna River. REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Good morning. Dan Moul 4 from Adams and Franklin County. 5 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Good morning. Deberah 6 7 Kula, Fayette and Westmoreland County, 52nd District. CHAIRMAN STABACK: 8 Thank you. 9 With that, I will turn the floor over to Deputy Director Mr. Barner. Brian, welcome. You can start 10 11 your testimony whenever you're ready. MR. BARNER: Good morning, Chairman Staback, 12 Chairman Miller, and members of the House Game and 13 Fisheries Committee. 14 15 My name is Brian Barner, and I am the Acting Executive Director for Pennsylvania Fish and Boat 16 Commission. 17 On behalf of our Board of Commissioners and 18 19 Pennsylvania's anglers and boaters, thank you for the 20 opportunity to share this report with you today. The Commissioners asked me to serve in this 21

The Commissioners asked me to serve in this capacity upon the retirement of Executive Director Austen, and I will do so until they name a permanent replacement.

22

23

24

25

I already know some of you through my position

as the agency's Deputy for Administration, Boating, and Engineering.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Would you move the microphone closer to you?

MR. BARNER: As most of you are aware, the mission of the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission is to protect, conserve, and enhance the Commonwealth's aquatic resources and provide fishing and boating opportunities.

The Commission is an independent administrative agency with statutory authority and responsibility for these matters.

From stocking waterways and managing native populations of fish, reptiles, and amphibians to patrolling lakes and restoring habitats, our employees strive to protect the resource, for the resource is the foundation for everything we do.

We accomplish this mission with a relatively small, full-time complement of 432 employees, consisting of dedicated waterways conservation officers, biologists, fish culturists, engineers, and other professional and support staff.

We have approximately 150 temporary and seasonal employees who are hired during periods of peak operation, and we also rely on a network of volunteers

and other partners to carry out our work.

These volunteers include 170 deputy waterways conservation officers and scores of water rescue trainers.

We explain our activities more fully in our 2009 Annual Report, which is included in your packets and can also be found on our website at fishandboat.com.

Before I share some of the highlights from last year, I would like to thank you and your colleagues in the Senate for continuing to support our work in the Lake Erie Watershed.

This past year, you passed Act 40, which provides that proceeds from the sale of Lake Erie permits will continue to be deposited into a restricted revenue account until December 31st, 2014.

In addition to continuing to provide for public access, these funds may now be used for projects that protect or improve fish habitat.

Since this program was established in 2005, and with the help of many partners, we have acquired permanent fishing easements or outright ownership of over 12.5 miles of tributary streams near the watershed.

Pennsylvania's steelhead fishery is nationally renowned, and our Erie Access Improvement Program shows how dedicated funding for access can be leveraged to

connect people with the resource.

Thanks also to Chairman Staback for introducing House Bill 2233, which will update and improve the Fish and Boat Code.

While many of the changes are technical in nature, two in particular will benefit many

Pennsylvanians.

One change simplifies the process for the issuance of free institutional fishing licenses and allows for more facilities to provide fishing as a therapeutic opportunity.

The other provides for an exemption for fishing licenses to participants in structured educational programs, including those offered by parks, nature centers, and conservations districts.

Let's now turn to some of the highlights from this past year. During our report for 2008, we told you that we expected to see Pennsylvanians continue to fish throughout the economic downturn.

Historically, fishing license sales tend to increase during lean economic times and periods of high unemployment, and 2009 was no exception.

License sales increased by more than 4 percent in 2009. We sold nearly 871,000 fishing licenses, a little over 500,000 trout/salmon permits, and a total of

more than 112,000 Lake Erie and Combination Lake Erie and trout/salmon permits.

These increases reinforce the notion that people return to fishing as an affordable, family-oriented activity in hard economic times.

Fishing continues to be an important part of local, regional, and statewide economies. The most recent figures from the US Fish and Wildlife Service estimate that fishing generates an overall annual economic benefit of over 1.65 billion dollars in Pennsylvania.

Fishing also supports nearly 18,000 jobs and generates about 120 million dollars per year in state and local tax revenues.

Pennsylvania's lakes, ponds, reservoirs, and thousands of miles of rivers and streams also hosted a lot of activity for the Commonwealth's 2.5 million resident and nonresident boaters in 2009.

These individuals registered 338,000 boats, enjoyed boating privileges with tens of thousands of unpowered and unregistered boats, and collectively produced an estimated impact of 1.7 billion dollars for the Commonwealth's economy.

Combined, anglers and boaters contribute nearly 3.4 billion dollars to Pennsylvania's economy each year.

This was most evident last summer when Pittsburgh hosted the prestigious Forest Wood Cup fishing tournament, the world's richest bass fishing tournament with a one million dollar first prize.

Professional anglers spent four days pursuing bass on the Three Rivers while fans flocked to tournament venues and local businesses.

We were honored to partner with tournament organizers to, once again, show the world one of the Commonwealth's first-class fisheries.

Please note that Pittsburgh will draw international attention again this fall as we cohost the 2010 annual meeting of the American Fisheries Society from September 12th through September 16th.

The Commission remains committed to playing an active role in the study and management of the Three Rivers system, and this work will be highlighted when fisheries professionals from around the world come to the Steel City this fall.

Speaking of large rivers, our biologists also spent a lot of time last year working to protect the long-term health of the Upper Delaware River.

In particular, we crafted a joint recommendation with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation for better management of

water released from New York City water supply reservoirs to Delaware River tributaries.

The recommendation calls for improved flow management to better support cold water fisheries and species such as the federally and state endangered dwarf wedgemussel.

Moving from the Delaware to the Susquehanna Watershed, the Commission worked in partnership with the US Geological survey and the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection to diagnose ongoing problems with smallmouth bass.

Problems were first detected in the middle reaches of the river in 2005, when Commission biologists found unusually high numbers of dead and distressed smallmouth bass.

We later determined that the affected fish were suffering from infections related to a common soil and water bacterium called Columnaris.

The disease is considered a secondary infection brought on by environmental factors that stress fish, weakening their ability to cope with the bacteria. The same bacterium was discovered again in 2007 and 2008.

In October 2009, the US Geological Survey released a two-year water quality study, which found stress factors such as elevated water temperature and

low dissolved oxygen concentrations during the critical May through July development period for smallmouth bass.

While the causes of this degradation have yet to be pinpointed, we remain committed to working with the US Geological Survey, DEP and the US EPA to figure out what is happening and we will continue to encourage that the necessary steps be taken to improve the health of the river.

While the Commission is responsible for all fish, amphibians, reptiles, and other aquatic organisms, we know that trout are of special interest to you and your constituents.

Since they are both indicators of healthy ecosystems and prized gamefish, we take a very deliberate approach to managing our wild and stocked trout fisheries.

In the past ten years, we have conducted a number of evaluations to help us refine trout management.

These evaluations include statewide angler use and harvest assessments of both wild trout and stocked trout waters. A Trout Summit with the angling public; economic and cost-benefit assessments and stocked trout residency studies.

Armed with all of this information, we convened

a 37-member Trout Work Group to help us develop a five-year Strategic Plan for the Management of Trout Fisheries in Pennsylvania.

Our Board of Commissioners adopted the plan in October of 2009, and it sets the immediate direction of trout management within the agency, identifies priority needs and actions and provides a means of measuring progress. The full plan is available on our website.

Trout management illustrates how we rely on partnerships to accomplish just about everything we do. Partnerships are particularly critical to leveraging habitat projects.

One of the most exciting current initiatives for fish habitat is the National Fish Habitat Action Plan, which is receiving Congressional attention through the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act.

Pennsylvania has been a leader in developing this plan and is committed to working towards congressional passage.

If enacted, the Bill is expected to authorize up to 75 million dollars per year nationally for the implementation of the plan, providing critical support for projects across Pennsylvania.

Six members of our congressional delegation are cosponsors in the House and Senator Casey is a cosponsor

in the Senate.

A few examples of some of our other effective partnerships are worth mentioning as well:

We rely on an incredible network of cooperative nurseries. In 2009, we supplied approximately 1.2 million trout fingerlings to cooperative nurseries to help us meet angler expectations; and we provided grant funding to 35 of these nurseries totaling nearly \$80,000 for nursery improvement projects.

This past year, we awarded 1.3 million dollars to 14 grantees under the Sinnemahoning Creek Watershed Restoration Grant Program to develop and benefit recreational fishing and boating and the aquatic resources of Elk, Cameron, McKean, and Potter Counties.

We provided over \$52,000 for 12 Sportfishing and Aquatic Resource Education Grants to develop or expand programs that teach fishing and boating skills or to educate participants about waterways and the organisms that live within them.

We provided more than one million dollars in Boating Facility Grants to 14 entities to acquire or improve public boating access.

We awarded two grants totaling more than 2.5 million dollars in federal pass-through funding to venues in the Pittsburgh area for the development of

boating mooring facilities for large, transient recreational boats.

We awarded nine State Wildlife Grants totaling almost \$800,000 in federal pass-through funding to help conserve priority species and habitats identified in Pennsylvania's State Wildlife Action Plan.

These grant programs allow us to achieve more than we ever could with just our own staff and resources.

This is especially noteworthy given that these grants account for less than 5 percent of our entire annual budget.

To round out this section of the report, I would like to give you a quick update on our major Growing Greener II funded hatchery improvement projects and work on two of our large dam projects.

We have successfully completed effluent and production upgrades at our Tylersville, Pleasant Gap, and Bellefonte State Fish Hatcheries.

We are actively working to make much-needed improvements at our Benner Spring and Huntsdale facilities, both of which are scheduled for completion in 2010.

Work at our Reynoldsdale hatchery is also scheduled to begin sometime this coming summer or early

fall and will be the final project funded with our allocation of Growing Greener II bond funds.

I am pleased to report that the upgrades at the three completed facilities are working as designed and will leave a legacy of cleaner, safer water for both the fish and the anglers who pursue them.

We are proud of this work and would welcome the opportunity to host a tour of the projects for the Committee.

By working with local partners, Legislators, and the Governor's Office, we also matched Growing Greener II dollars at ratios as high as 3-to-1 to upgrade the dams at Leaser Lake in Lehigh County and Opossum Lake in Cumberland County.

In 2009, we were also awarded 10.2 million dollars through the H20 PA Act to support our efforts with making needed repairs and upgrades to five Commonwealth-owned high hazard dams.

Like we did with the Leaser and Opossum Lakes, we hope to work with partners to leverage these funds to help ensure the long-term, safe operation of the five facilities.

While this is a great start, please note that the Commissions manages nine other high hazard dams that will require an estimated 50 million dollars in

improvements to bring them into compliance with current dam safety standards.

I'd prefer to continue sharing our success stories, but it is important that I mention some of our challenges.

Like other agencies, the Commission is struggling to keep up with the rapid pace of natural gas exploration and development in the Marcellus shale zone.

One way to help ensure that aquatic resources are protected is through the wise use of revenues generated by the proposed severance tax on these natural gas development activities.

We agree with the need for this development, there are critical concerns that must be addressed. These include the potential for the spread of invasive species, impacts of drilling and drilling infrastructure on the quality of our streams, and the handling of wastewater.

Prompted by concerns over the possible spread of invasive species associated with the widespread movement of drilling equipment and water, we began working with DEP, the Delaware River Basin Commission, and the Susquehanna River Basin Commission to encourage the disinfection of the Marcellus-related equipment that comes into contact with water. We are optimistic that

the protocols will minimize this risk.

Many people do not realize that there are still tens of thousands of stream sections in Pennsylvania that have yet to be surveyed to determine whether they contain wild trout.

In 2009, we began assessing a prioritized list of waters with the potential to support wild trout, with an emphasis on streams within the Marcellus shale regions of Pennsylvania.

In cooperation with other partners, our biologists will continue this work as time and resources allow, with the goal of documenting and ensuring enhanced protection of our most sensitive cold-water fisheries.

Finally, on the Marcellus front, we want to make sure that the wastewater from drilling sites does not compromise water quality.

To that end, we support DEP's current proposal to regulate total dissolved solids at the point of discharge.

The recent condition of high total dissolved solids concentrations in the Mononaghela River is the extreme case we want to avoid.

Many or our streams and rivers, like the
Mononaghela, have made amazing recoveries over the past

several decades and it would be very unfortunate to see them decline again.

A major challenge for us in addressing Marcellus shale natural gas development activity is that, unlike DEP, we cannot raise permit fees to fund and bring on additional staff to deal with the many issues surrounding its development.

With the rapid increase in well drilling activity and without additional funding, the Commission is severely limited in its ability to work with DEP and the natural gas developers.

As a result, we will miss opportunities to proactively work with DEP and the drilling community to minimize and avoid impacts to aquatic resources.

We want to be proactive, and we think the resource deserves it. To that end, the Commission supports the enactment of a severance tax that allocates funding for natural resource conservation.

We think dedicating a portion of a severance tax to enhance conservation will be a wise investment for the Commonwealth as we meet energy demands while conserving aquatic resources.

Anglers and boaters across the Commonwealth agree, and they are expressing the need to make sure that conservation is part of the equation, if and when

such a fee is established in Pennsylvania.

Of course, one of our persistent challenges is to secure and maintain basic funding for the programs and services demanded by anglers and boaters and for the services we provide to the Commonwealth at large.

I will conclude my remarks by building on a conversation that began with this Committee two years ago.

At that time, you encouraged us to come up with innovative ways to fund the agency with the goal of minimizing the effects of a boom-and-bust cycle associated with large, periodic fee increases.

During these cycles, large fee increases are followed by corresponding drops of 7 to 10 percent in license sales, from which we never fully recover.

As we have discussed with this Committee and with many of you, this model results in two major drawbacks.

First, the boom-and-bust cycle seriously damages our ability to plan and operate strategically, especially toward the end of a cycle.

The intermittent nature in which we adjust these fees, in combination with normal inflationary increases in operating costs, largely contributes to this cycle.

Second, we experience a substantial decline in license sales or loss of customers in response to each large increase in fees.

Most recently, the 2005 license fee increase of \$4.75 for a resident annual fishing license was followed by an 8.5 percent decrease in resident license sales. A similar pattern played out in each of the four fee increases enacted since 1982.

As you may already know, the Commission receives no general fund revenues. We rely almost entirely on revenues generated from license sales, boat registrations, and federal grants.

In the most recent fiscal year that ended last June, license sales accounted for 72 percent of all Fish Fund revenues, and boat registrations accounted for 53 percent of all Boat Fund revenues.

This current fiscal year is a pivotal year for the fiscal benefits derived from the 2005 fee changes. Last year, our revenues were just slightly more than our expenditures; but our projections for the current fiscal year and beyond show that our expenditures will increasingly be greater than our revenues. This means that our end-of-year Fund balances will be less than our beginning-of-year Fund balances.

During the next several fiscal periods, we will

begin to spend down, or use up, our cash reserves to maintain levels of services currently being provided to the anglers, boaters, and other citizens of the Commonwealth.

This was actually expected. Based on historical patterns, we had estimated that the increased revenues from the 2005 license fee changes would help sustain agency operations for five to seven years.

If we maintain current levels of service, we will most likely hit, or even dip below, our minimum required Fund balance thresholds sometime within the next three to possibly four years.

In response to interest expressed by this

Committee and others, last year we developed and

proposed an innovative license fee package based on the

following three concepts:

Modest annual fee increases, in the neighborhood of \$1.00, to be added to the cost of fishing licenses and \$.25 annually to be added to the cost of trout/salmon permits.

A one-time, permanent addition of \$1.00 to the cost of a fishing license for a statewide access and habitat acquisition and restoration initiative.

Flexibility in adjusting fees to lower than authorized amounts for limited-time marketing and

promotion purposes.

Again, we offer these funding concepts with an eye toward creating a system that allows us to fulfill our mission while keeping the cost of fishing licenses and boat registrations as low as possible for the anglers and boaters who support all we do for the Commonwealth.

Thank you again for this opportunity. I will be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: I would like to acknowledge the presence of another one of our Committee members in the likes of Mr. Neal Goodman.

Brian, I want to thank you for that comprehensive report. You covered a lot of ground and the Committee certainly appreciates your thoroughness.

I'm going to start the questioning and the Members who have questions will be recognized in the order that we normally work.

Brian, my first question and comment has to do with a part of your presentation that was related to license fee increases. That subject is not new and has been discussed in the past by me with both the Commission staff and the Board Members as well.

I want to say publicly, again, what I have said in the past, that there is a protocol that is followed

concerning fee increases for the two agencies. That is, that both agencies never receive a license increase in the same year and that the agencies alternate and that no agency receives two increases before the second agency receives one.

The reason for this is that we don't want to overburden the sportsman and one wildlife agency is not viewed as receiving some kind of preferential treatment. I have made that very clear when I have explained that in the past. As far as I know, that pattern is still in effect.

Given these facts, there was one idea in your presentation about new licensing options that I would like you to comment on a little bit further and that is the possibility of putting together a new combination license.

For example, a combination of a husband and wife kind of permit at a reduced fee. Do you think -- has the Commission studied the impact that that kind of a license fee might have on your financial status in the long run? Could it be a losing proposition for you?

MR. BARNER: Thank you, Chairman Staback. It is a very interesting observation about the third component of our flexibility, which is what we call the flexibility of our license increase package.

Before I address that, I would like to thank you for your comments about the protocols on the agency funding. We support those protocols.

We just continually would like to keep the need for funding on the radar so, in this case, the Committee doesn't forget about us. So with that, thank you.

Yes, we have studied the impacts of what some of these combination licenses may do; and in a lot of cases, we view those as a loss. That is exactly why we would like to have flexibility in introducing those.

If we would introduce something for a promotional campaign and we find it is going to cost us revenue for the agency, we immediately stop it.

Currently, the way the legislative authorization works for us to issue a fishing license, we have categories of fishing licenses. We are required to sell those regardless of whether they return net revenue for us or not.

If you would grant us the flexibility to at least try those things, we could experiment and test the waters, so to speak, and see just how effective they are.

We have done some research and some indicators say they would be great for promotional activities, but they are not going to be the answer to sustain the

agency funding-wise nor would they really attract a large number of folks to fishing.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. So that notion works probably in conjunction with a proposed licensing increase, is what you would be looking for in conjunction with doing that; am I right?

MR. BARNER: Typically, yes, that would be the most ideal setting. However, if we got the ability to at least test some of the promotional stuff now, I would not see the harm in that. We would be better to use that in the future.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you. The protocol that I alluded to earlier, I would like to expand just a little bit.

The fact of the matter is the Pennsylvania Game Commission has not had a license increase in probably going into the 12th year.

The Fish and Boat Commission last had one, I believe, back in 2004; and it became affective in 2005. So obviously, the focus of this Committee where a license increase is going to be viewed would have to be on the Pennsylvania Gaming Commission first.

When that is completed, then we certainly would take a hard look at your financial needs and deal with them accordingly. Okay?

MR. BARNER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: The second question I have would deal with your current labor negotiations. Can you tell the Committee if progress has been made and if the Commission is prepared to give their WCOs the same compensation package that eventually will be received by the game Commission officers?

MR. BARNER: Chairman Staback, it is fortunate today we have with us our Director of Bureau of Law Enforcement. His name is Tom Kamerzel.

He has been intimately involved in the negotiation process and he is our agency contact for those negotiations.

I'm going to ask if Tom could come up and present some of the information that he is at liberty to share with the group, if that is fine?

CHAIRMAN STABACK: That would be fine.

MR. KAMERZEL: Thank you, Chairman Staback.

Let me give you a little bit of history where we are.

Our officers as well as the wildlife officers in the

Gaming Commission early in 2007 chose to leave AFSCME as
a bargaining unit. They did that. July 1st of 2007,

they are no longer represented by AFSCME to do that.

For the first year, when they were under representation, it look them a while to get a lot

established and also putting together a business proposal.

We received that in early 2008 and started serious bargaining with the officers in September of 2008, and we continue to do that.

We have had 12 bargaining sessions. Up until now, we have five additional bargaining sessions scheduled.

I would like to report that we have had some success relating to operational things having been resolved with the officers.

Currently, the outstanding articles deal pretty much with benefits. And right now, both sides are in sort of a holding pattern because we are awaiting an award for the game officers that will hopefully be out shortly that they will receive a wage and benefit package through the arbitration process.

Once we know what that is, our Commission is committed to ensuring that our officers are provided with the same wage and benefit package that the conservation officers have, and that is truly our goal.

We believe that once that award is provided, our negotiations can move a lot quicker; and we can hopefully have something resolved and wrapped up here maybe as early as March or April.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Tom, has the Commission prepared for the fiscal impact of the eventual new labor agreement?

MR. KAMERZEL: Yes, Chairman Staback, what we did is we looked at what the AFSCME employees received in the last contract and there was some graduated pay increases and steps within that contract. We did a fiscal note based on those numbers. If our officers were awarded more or less, this number would change.

Based on those awards that were provided to the AFSCME employees of the Commonwealth, currently the fiscal note, and this is assuming that the officers would receive retroactive pay, which the Commission is supporting to make them whole, the number is about 1.2 million dollars. We are capable to paying them back at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Tom, there is rumor or talk among the WCOs that if a labor agreement is not forthcoming and they don't have, you know, a contract that they are talking strike.

Now, what would happen if a labor agreement would not be forthcoming and they decided to go on strike or on stocking time of fish or in and around the opening day of the trout season, how would you folks deal with that?

MR. KAMERZEL: Chairman Staback, we have heard some of the similar rumors that you have heard amongst the workforce.

We right now have not a lot of reason to believe that the officers are going to move toward a strike. Certainly, that is an option they had under Act 195.

However, we have a lot of young officers that it would be very difficult for them to go without a paycheck and pay their family bills.

We believe that a strike by officers is at this point not something that is going to happen. However, we have taken a position. We do have a contingency plan in place and that plan has started since the beginning of the year that if a group of our officers choose to strike and that group of officers was in the neighborhood of about 25 percent of the workforce, we have a plan that would successfully ensure that all of the fish would be stocked and ready for anglers in the open stock season.

We would have an area fish anglers supervisory and management personnel within our Bureau. We would elect our aquatic reserve conservationist to help stock fish and so that our streams and lakes would have trout on opening day for the anglers to enjoy.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you. I have one more question, and then I'm going to open it up for Members, and that deals with Dr. Austen.

We all understand that he is no longer the Executive Director of the Commission, but he was or is under contract with the Commission. Is he still under contract; and if he is, what does he do? What are his duties?

MR. BARNER: Dr. Austen did retire from the Fish and Boat Commission on January 22nd. Upon his retirement, the Commission, Board of Commissioners asked him to stay on and have him finalize some of the initiatives he had been working on.

I had talked about some of the congressional items that he has had action in. Dr. Austen is instrumental in trying to get that plan and legislation passed.

If that happens, it is going to result in millions of dollars for the Commonwealth for fish and habitat-related projects.

So he is currently working on that and a couple of other federal initiatives, like the reauthorization of the restoration funds as well. That is our staple federal grant source, which we hit between eight and ten million dollars.

Every five years, it needs to be reauthorized through Congress and he is making sure that happens for us. He is playing a very instrumental role. He is working as a retired annuitant through the Commonwealth's Annuitant Program.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you very much.

Chairman Miller?

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Brian, thanks for your testimony. Yesterday, we heard from the Game Commission. They talked about two separate incidents with water impacts, stream impacts, stream quality due to Marcellus shale drilling activity.

You touched quite a bit on it in your testimony as far as concerns there. What is the role that the Fish Commission plays in that as far as is it mostly a monitoring of the quality of the water or inspecting for impact on the fish? I'm trying to get a feel for how you play in with the leaseholders, the Game Commission, DEP, and everyone else.

MR. BARNER: Chairman Miller, Dr. Schaeffer is here with us today as well. He came along and helped prepare some of this testimony. He has been the agency's lead person in working with DEP and other partners on Marcellus shale activities.

If you don't mind, I'll ask him to come up to address this question.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you, Brian. We have a couple of different roles when it comes to Marcellus.

One of the things that we do is we review permits for their development activities to see what the impacts on our trust species are.

As you know, we have jurisdiction for all fish, reptiles, amphibians, and other aquatic species. So permit review is one of the things I do.

Tom, correct me if I am wrong, our WCOs share the ability to enforce environmental laws in Pennsylvania.

So if our WCOs see things that are going on and would have an impact on water quality, we can address those in cooperation with DEP, and in fact, we have been working on that.

Our staff also does monitoring activity. Brian mentioned the work we have been doing on unassessed waters to document the degree to which streams have naturally producing trout populations. That is a monitoring function.

Also mentioned, how the aquatic species work.

We were really the first to note to DEP, the River

Basins Commission the need for the drillers to make sure

that their equipment is being disinfected before it comes into contact with water so we don't inadvertently spread bacteria to aquatic species.

There is a monitoring role. There is a technical assistance role. We also work really close with the River Basins Commission to ensure that there is adequate pass-by flows when they are deciding whether or not they should allow for water withdrawal, and we help them decide what those requirements are to be.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: With that in mind then, the major concern as we increase the drilling operations, it appears to be personnel related to address all of these issues?

MR. SCHAEFFER: And we would like to be able to be proactive rather than reactive. In fact, we do that in cooperation with the Department of Transportation with highway product projects.

We have had a really nice relationship with them. We had a relationship with DEP on coal mining and work when the Applicants come in for products.

While this is happening, everything else is still active. We don't have permit fees that we can raise to bring on additional staff.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: I prescribe that explanation.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. 1 CHAIRMAN STABACK: 2 Representative Kula? 3 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brian, I was looking through the book and kind 4 of fascinated. I was wondering if you could explain to 5 me, I see such an increase in the trout in the 6 7 classroom. Can you explain that program to me? 8 MR. BARNER: Yes, I probably could, I guess if I could ask maybe a little more specifics what you would 9 10 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: I mean, how does one go 11 about it? I have been in many preschool, early 12 childhood classes where they are raising butterflies. 13 How would some of these young people or 14 15 classrooms back in my area be able to -- I mean, is it 16 the eggs go to the classroom and they hatch them and have a trout? 17 18 MR. BARNER: Yes. You understand a lot more 19 than you think you do. REPRESENTATIVE KULA: 20 But --21 MR. BARNER: Yes. We have a series of aquatic 22 resource program specialists who work on and monitor

this program. That is exactly one of the things that

they do. They ensure that the eggs are delivered in

appropriate time, instructions, and demonstration

23

24

25

materials and how they are raised, what to do with them, and you can actually view those at different stages of life. It is available to most schools. In fact, some of the grants that we talked about are, I guess, related to that as well.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: So it would be through a grant process that they would be able to have this opportunity. Just explain the application process.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Just go on our website. We have information about trout in the classroom. We do work with Trout Unlimited. They are our primary partner with this.

We have awarded them the grant, a pass-through grant that helps to keep this program going. We provide the eggs to the schools.

So the teacher and -- if you qualify for the program and are successful in your application, we actually give them the eggs.

The schools, what they need to do is to come up with the funding for the tanks and everything else that goes along with it.

We do training for the teachers and explain what they need to be doing with the tanks. I actually went through the training. It is a pretty rigorous training so they understand how to maintain the tanks

and what to do with the eggs and give them tips for what happens with the trout.

I have to tell you, they all really don't make it. This is really a biology lesson. It shows the kids what it takes to successfully raise a trout.

At the end of the year then, we do ask them to release the trout into streams. I should point out that this is not a stocking program.

We're not pretending that the trout in the classroom is going to restore the population. It is really an educational program.

Through funding support and technical support and providing the eggs to the school and providing them when they get them in place, it really has been off the charts. The growth of the program has been exponential the last couple of years. I would be happy to talk with you afterwards.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Moul?

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Thank you, Brian. I appreciate your testimony today. Just a couple of quick question and then a little story.

Abandoned dams, do you get involved with them at all? Is there funding available for them? Is that under your realm of authority?

MR. BARNER: Tom, would you mind coming up with that? Tom Kamerzel, that is in his area of responsibility as well. We do have a limited role in those programs.

MR. KAMERZEL: The dams you are referring to are dams that have been identified by the Department of Environmental Protection as river dams. The ownership of the dam is questionable. We don't know who owns it and nor does DEP.

Primarily, our responsibility on these dams is to ensure that the required signs, buoys, and markers are in place and attempt to identify ownership.

Where we don't identify ownership and the work of the dams falls back on DEP's shoulder, either possible removal of it or to try to find ownership, which at times becomes very difficult to do especially a lot of the old mill dams and tracking ownership. It is very difficult.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: So the funding of removal would not come through Fish and Boat?

MR. KAMERZEL: Not necessarily. We do have a program with dam removal. Typically, it is a partnership program where we have a gentleman, Mr. Scott Carney who facilitates funding from outside sources for dam removals, then we oversee the project.

We accomplish plenty of those throughout the states. They are not necessarily for dams. The owner just wants the dam removed.

The number of dams is relatively small compared to the 5 or 600 dams that we do inspect, each in conjunction with DEP.

So, again, the orphan dams basically fall back to ownership of the Commonwealth, and Department of Environmental Protection oversees them.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Okay. Thank you. While you are here, how many vacant positions do you have with WCOs these days?

MR. KAMERZEL: Currently, within our Bureau, we have 12 vacant positions. There are six district field officer positions. Those are the ones you would encounter within your local district.

We have three assistant supervisor positions.
We have three regional managers that are vacant.
Currently, we have a class in.

We have six officers being trained that will graduate in August of this year, so that will assist us in filling some of those positions.

We are currently recruiting another class in hopes of finding ten additional residents to the Commonwealth that want to take up the conservation water

officer. They will start training July of this year.
Within a two year period, I'm hopeful we can have all of our vacancies filled.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: And the funding will be there for them?

MR. KAMERZEL: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Which brings me to another question. I know you are going through the bargaining agreement. What is the salary range of a WCO?

MR. KAMERZEL: It is a Pay Grade 6. I'm going to give you an estimate. The first year they are in training, they are a lower pay grade. There is a 52-week training period. They really don't do any work for us.

They are in field training; but upon graduation, they move up one pay bucket -- and don't hold me to the number.

They start out at about \$36,000 a year and after 20 years going through the steps within the pay group, they end up in the mid-50s to high-50s.

Some of that is obscured because all of our officers have the ability for overtime. You can't do it in 40 hours work. They earn about 150 to \$175 in overtime, which equates to another 5 to \$6,000 in wages.

REPRESENTATIVE MOUL: Okay. Thank you.

One last thing I want to mention, and I beat Gary up with this last year when Doug was still on board. I'm going to run it again so that I float the idea into everyone's head.

We had a situation in my district this past year where a gentleman when he reached a proper age bought a lifetime license, fishing license.

He has two sons, one still lives in my district the other moved to New Jersey. He opted to -- after he lived here most all of his life, moved with his son over to New Jersey and that is where he became a resident.

He came back and visited in my district with his other son, and they decided to go fishing. Well, upon the inspection of the WCO, it was decided that since he was no longer a state resident that his lifetime license was null and void. Therefore, he received a citation for fishing without a license.

We need to correct that. Even though that is something that happens once in a blue, blue moon, it still happens. We should not treat our elderly citizens as such.

I'm just throwing that out there. I am hoping within your regulations, you can make a change. Thank you, I appreciate your time.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. The Committee has been joined by two more additional Members in the likes of Representative Murphy and Levdansky to the left.

Brian, can you talk just a little bit more about point of sale and its potential with the Commission?

How is the system working and when do you think we might see outreach and surveys as a result of the data that the system is currently gathering?

MR. BARNER: Yes, Chairman Staback, I would be more than happy to. It is one of the projects that I have been really involved with.

We are in the third year of the implementation. What that really means is we are coming up with what would be the third year of having customer data that is accurate. It would be all inclusive of fish and boat licenses.

As you know, up to this point, we would sell, historically, licenses and we had no way of identifying in the paper system, at least a feasible way of identifying who our customers were.

We've now started to get that database of our customers and our customers' buying activities. We are starting this study and thinking about how the study interactions of customers purchasing the fishing license

either occurs annually, every couple of years, every five years.

Once we have some of that information, we will know how to target or at least encourage people to buy a fishing license.

We are in the infancy stages of that stuff. We haven't done a lot of the work in that area, and we have a lot of great ideas we would like to try out.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Have you made any attempts at all to try to contact people who you identified as former fisherman for the last year or so who have not purchased a Pennsylvania fishing license to find out why not?

MR. BARNER: Mr. Chairman, what we have done is we have sent out, we got a grant through the recreational fishing and boating foundation for the last two years. They helped us do this.

We sent out notifications to people who purchased in the previous year or two years previous and sort of prompted them to buy a license.

Now, it wasn't sophisticated enough for us to really determine if they did buy a license, was it because of the mail that we sent or is it for some other reason.

We do have the ability to do that because it

would be easy to look later on at the 50,000 people who did not buy and the other 50 percent we sent a reminder to, we could do a follow-up of some sort but that takes time and money to develop.

We are not at that point yet. We are thinking along the lines of how to use that.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you, Brian.

Representative McGeehan?

REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: Director, I want to turn your eyes east to the Delaware River and the Schuylkill River and Watershed and talk about the population of striped bass and shad in both of those waterways. One, the health of the striped bass population in those waterways.

Secondly, the determination that the Delaware River has a self-sustaining population of shad. I have heard from a number of groups in the area who have told me and I think science is bearing this out that there has been a precipitous drop of the number of shad returning up the Delaware and up the Schuylkill.

I know the Commission has successfully propagated shad in other waterways in the state, and I know the Potomac in Virginia and Washington, DC and Maryland and in the waterways there, that the successful hatchery system has proven successful for returning

shad.

One, what is the health of the striped bass population? And secondly, I think we need to change the determination of the Delaware River as far as the shad population is concerned. I would like your comment.

MR. BARNER: Thank you, Representative. That is actually a very interesting topic. We have had a number of discussion with some of our people about those issues.

It is very complicated and we have very talented people within the agency studying shad for decades in the Susquehanna River and the Delaware River.

I just learned these are extremely different on the Delaware side, not necessarily on the Susquehanna side, and a lot of them have to do with the impoundments. The Delaware does not have impoundments.

The shad who live in the ocean, I guess it is up to five or six years before they come back and spawn. The striped bass have similar habits. They are -- the problem is we think some of the effects of that are occurring, either fishing or predatory type activities.

It is not necessarily an indicator of either the Delaware or the Susquehanna that is causing some of the reductions in the shad runs. It might be what is happening to them offshore. Fortunately, Dave Miko is with us. He is our Chief, Divisions of Fisheries Management. He would be more inclined to answer some of the questions you have about that.

He is here with us fortunately. I was at least smart enough to bring some of our resident experts along for the topics.

Dave is here. I would ask him to fill in the blanks or correct anything that I said that is not right.

MR. MIKO: The question on the striped bass on the Delaware -- good morning or afternoon. The striped bass population in the Delaware on the East Coast was declared fully restored in about 1997 in Delaware and the Schuylkill up to the Fairmont Dam where the Fairmont does not pass very many striped bass beyond that.

We open it up to a harvest, typically, closed season, in the spring spawning period. A lot of folks take advantage of those returning fish up there and to the Delaware to spawn.

As far as the shad population goes, as Brian pointed out, we do feel a large part of the problem is in the ocean fishery and adult fish in the ocean.

We are working with NOAH and trying to increase
-- observe coverage on some of the offshore fishing

industry, primarily butter fish, mackerel, a lot of American shad is by catch.

We still feel that the numbers of adult in Delaware is adequate and sufficient to provide enough young fish, and that is based on surveys that showed there has really been no change in the number of juvenile, American shad.

There is still a number of American juvenile shad as there has been in the past. It fluctuates, but there has been no change over time in the number of fingerling of shad in the system.

Once those fish leave the system, they are being taken offshore. It is more than just Delaware and Schuylkill. It continues as an Atlantic Coast-wide problem on the American shad that are available out there.

REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: If I may,

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. The report of Gary Moore has been helpful to make me understand some of the science behind it.

My understanding is they are hatching and releasing on the Potomac and the success rate on the Potomac far out exceeds what is on the Susquehanna and

Delaware River.

My question is why aren't we doing that in the eastern region? I know you do it in other tributaries around the Commonwealth. My question is why isn't the same attention being paid to the Delaware and Schuylkill regions?

MR. MIKO: Very good question. In the Potomac where the stock is being successful, there were very few, very small number of wild fish in that system to keep the population in the Delaware system, we are seeing no benefit, very small benefit from stocking of hatchery fish.

All of our hatchery fish are marked with a chemical mark on the ear bone. We are getting a 3 percent return of our stocked fish.

What it ends up being is a competition issue in the Delaware where we have a good wild population and good number of fingerlings population.

They are out competing our hatchery fish; whereas in the Potomac, there are very few numbers of wild fish out there and the majority of fish making up that population were hatchery fish.

REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: Well, I would like to continue to explore that with you, Mr. Chairman, and Director Gary Moore.

Lastly, a politically loaded question. 1 dredging of the Delaware River, what impact is that 2 3 going to have on the affect of sturgeon and other native populations? 4 MR. MIKO: I can't answer that question 5 directly at this point. I have had staff involved with 6 7 the dredging and the impacts that may occur there; and 8 if I could get with that gentleman, I can get back with 9 you. REPRESENTATIVE McGEEHAN: Well, you avoided 10 11 that political bombshell. 12 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Very good. Representative Gillespie? 13 REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Thank you, 14 Mr. Chairman. 15 Brian, you had talked about the upgrades to 16 some of the hatcheries on sale and some of the other 17 18 ones, is that for PCBs at all? 19 MR. BARNER: No. The upgrades that we are working are for the fish and waste. The water in a lot 20 21 of cases is cleaner coming out of the hatcheries than going into the hatcheries. It doesn't have anything to 22 23 do with the PCB problems. REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Where do we stand 24

with PCBs? Where do we stand with that now?

25

MR. BARNER: Actually, I would ask
Mr. Schaeffer to come up again and speak briefly on
that. I'm not sure that we have a lot of new
information.

From what I understand, it is not an issue at many of our hatcheries, I do now know that. Dave might be able to help with that. He won't dodge this question.

MR. MIKO: The PCB issue is that the levels in the hatcheries and fish that were leaving with the hatcheries are all levels below consumption. They are comfortable with the fish now and consumption. I'm not sure --

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Well, I guess what I'm trying to gauge four or five years ago, when this thing first came out, there were consumption advisories.

Has that improved in the last four or five years or are we still maintaining the same amount of PCBs when this first arose?

MR. MIKO: When this first arose, we had levels in our fish that exceeded levels that required consumption advisories. Those have dropped, and the consumption advisories are no longer required for fish to go out in our system.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Okay. Great. You

talked about the spread of the basis invasive species regarding the Marcellus shale that Chairman Miller had touched on. Can you give us an up-to-date on what are some of these invasive species from one body of water?

MR. SCHAEFFER: There are literally hundreds of species that are in Pennsylvania that are endemic to the Commonwealth that have potentially spread. Golden algae, we are concerned about that, is in southwestern Pennsylvania.

We are not suggesting that it came from drilling equipment, but the point is it has been discovered there. We know there is drilling activity there now, and we don't want it to be moved anywhere.

The other is zebra muscles through the Lake Erie Watershed have been detected in the Susquehanna drainage and the list goes on and on.

Golden algae and zebra muscles are two examples. Again, I want to give kudos to the Susquehanna River Basin Commission.

They have been requiring as part of their dockets -- issue permits to take water bodies out of the Susquehanna Watershed. They have been requiring disinfection plans for drillers to make sure the risk of the spread is minimized.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: I would imagine some

of the stuff is probably microscopic that can't be seen?

MR. SCHAEFFER: That is another good point.

You can't just assume that you can't see something that nothing is there.

Oftentimes, the conditions aren't right, maybe it needs certain water flowing conditions to let this stuff bloom.

I would like to point out this is one of the factors that we are concerned about. We realize that Marcellus drilling isn't the only effect. Our anglers and boaters in a lot of places may be just as much in certain streams.

We are taking a really deliberate approach to educate anglers, boaters, and others about the steps that they can be doing to clean their gear.

I should respond about the automatic license indicator. We actually used that to conduct a survey this winter of anglers to find out what sort of message would resonate with them.

We would like to do the right practices to clean their gear. So we surveyed them based upon the data we got and find out what they are doing now, find out what they would be inclined to do. Then we're going to be able to target our message a lot better than we would have had we not done the survey.

REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: One more quick one. 1 Maybe this will be for you as well. I mentioned about 2 3 the streams and sections that you are monitoring and surveying for wild trout. How is that done? Is that 4 5 done by shocking? Is it done by dipping or how do they 6 7 MR. SCHAEFFER: We'll continue to tag team. 8 MR. MIKO: We've got 45,531 waters that are 9 monitored by the fish and boat. Those take place by 10 electronic fishing. We have a three-men group that sets 11 up a system to detect the presence or absence of large trout and other species. 12 REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: So it is done by 13 electronic shock? 14 15 MR. MIKO: Correct. REPRESENTATIVE GILLESPIE: Thank you, 16 Mr. Chairman. 17 18 CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Levdansky did 19 have a question. He left the room for a minute. 20 sure he will be back shortly. 21 In the interim, I would like to ask one more, 22 and that references the study of the Susquehanna River 23 in the past three years regarding the demise of the 24 smallmouth bass and gray numbers.

As I understand the situation, you know what is

25

happening to the fish but you don't know why. Now, does it seem unusual that after the three-year study that is still the case?

I mean, you have been working with the US

Geological Survey and DEP. Is there any ideas at all as
to what is causing the problem and what a potential fix
may be?

MR. BARNER: Chairman Staback, I will have Dave Miko address that.

MR. MIKO: We worked very closely with DEP on the issue of smallmouth bass. I would say it is not unusual to have an answer of what is causing the problem at this point, and it is so complex in nature.

We know that the small fish are being stressed to a point and are coming to a number of different diseases, bacterial disease that is probably simply the final stage that we could actually visually see before those fish die.

We work with the USGS and are identifying that these fish have a high parasite load in them that may be causing additional stress.

We are also looking at some of the adult fish prior to spawning to see if they are starting the spawning already stressed. There are a number of avenues.

We don't have a direct answer or smoking gun.

To be honest, we could never find a smoking gun. It

could be from a number of additional stressors on these

fish that make them unable to fight off some of these

diseases and parasites.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Now, is it both the smaller fish as well as the adult population that is impacted and is it the entire river that is being impacted or just certain parts of it?

MR. MIKO: The fish kills that are occurring on the smallmouth bass and the two- to three-inch fish, we are finding this problem throughout the system from the north branch down to the southern border.

There seem to be some hotter pockets.

Harrisburg south seems to be where the bulk of the problem is occurring.

Above Sunbury, there are some issues there as well. There may be currents in the tributaries, and we will look at that most closely in 2010.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Is the mortality rate higher in warmer weather than cooler weather?

MR. MIKO: We are finding we have low water years and high water temperatures. That is where we identify the disease occurs. In 2006, we had a high water year and cool temperatures but the disease did not

manifest itself.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Thank you.

Representative Goodman?

REPRESENTATIVE GOODMAN: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Very quickly, I appreciate your testimony. It was very thorough, but you do mention some of the successes that you have had with partnership with many different communities and agencies.

I have been trying -- I know the time does not allow you to go into detail with an answer of this. I have been trying for the last two years to find funding for a dam in my area. It is called the Public Station. It is owned by the Borough of Shenandoah, but it is one of the largest fishing opportunities for anyone in Northern Schuylkill County.

They were targeted as one of the high hazard dams, and we all know how expensive they are. We don't have the funding sources to make the needed repairs.

I remembered in your testimony that we did change the law a couple of years ago to allow the fish and Game Commission -- Fish and Boat Commission and the Game Commission for Growing Greener II grant applications and the H2O PA funding source.

I have been going through DCNR, maybe the

people I should be taking is through Fish and Boat. I
would appreciate if one of your staff Members can get in
contact with my office so I can talk in greater length
to see if this qualifies.

MR. BARNER: We will make sure to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE GOODMAN: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Representative Levdansky?

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I apologize for arriving a little bit
late. I had a Joint Finance Committee with the Senate
this morning.

Just a couple of quick questions, Mr. Barner. I see here that your Fiscal Year '08-'09, your actual revenue was about 49.7 million. Your expenses were 48.1 million. So you're about a million -- 1.5, 1.6 on the positive side of the ledger but my question is what is your overall fund balance?

MR. BARNER: Representative, that is a good observation, especially somebody working with the finance stuff.

One thing I would like to note about the numbers you are talking about, the revenue and expenditures, I think that typifies that cycle that we talked about earlier.

We are currently in that period where the first three or four years after you receive a license fee increase, we are able to produce more revenue than we expend.

We need to put that in the bank, which is what I'm going to talk about, to carry us through the next three or four or five years when that side of the ledger changes.

Probably next year, you're going to see that our expenditures are going to exceed those issues. The fund balance is always a complicated thing. We have two of them, a fish and a boat fund. They are exclusively two different things.

The fish fund has -- there is technically 40 million dollars in an account. There is 8 or 9 million dollars in what we call restricted revenue that brings the balance down to 32 million.

Of that 32 million, there is another seven or eight that is committed for long-term projects, for bond repayments for our headquarters, and things like that.

Right now, if you said write me a check with the money you have, I could technically write a check out of the fish fund for 25 million dollars. The boat fund is a similar situation. I could technically write you a check for up to 16 million. That would be our

usable fund balance. It is not the amount of money we have, but it is available for expenditure.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: So the usable unencumbered revenue in both funds combined would be about 25 million plus 16?

MR. BARNER: That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: You mentioned in your testimony about your utilization of the Growing Greener bonds, Growing Greener II financing that was provided by the General Assembly and made available to -- some to the Fish and Boat and some to the Game Commission.

What is the total amount you ended up using? I believe you used pretty much all of us it for upgrades to the hatchery system. How much of that was in total? Do you know?

MR. BARNER: We were allocated 27 and a half million dollars. We have not used it all yet but we will use every single penny of that. That will hopefully occur by the time of the Reynoldsdale area is completed. So probably two to three years.

We are working on five major projects; three are complete, two are almost finished -- we have done numerous smaller facility upgrades to some of our other locations.

We spread the money around. We have also used the money to repair the burden process of Leaser Lake Dam in Lehigh County and Opossum Lake Dam in Cumberland County.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: If my memory is correct, years back, I think the total fish hatchery cost to upgrade everything at the time was like somewhere around 75 -- north of 75 million I think?

MR. BARNER: And I can tell you why the 27 and a half million dollars was used the way it was. We took that 75 or 80 million dollar estimate, and we had our engineering staff break it down.

What do we have to have right now to be complying with our permits? What do we need to do over the next ten years? What is the list of things we can do without and the stuff that everybody wants to have and set aside?

We have exclusively worked on the Phase I, the essential things we need to do to have the hatcheries open and operating. That is where the funding is going at this point.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: So even after that 27 and a half million expenditure, you're still going to have other upgrades that you would probably like to do but you can't because you don't have the funding to do

it?

MR. BARNER: The funding for what we have now is for upgrades for treatment systems. It is not doing anything for the long-term maintenance and care of the facilities.

They are large, expensive facilities, concrete, piping, infrastructure, and stuff all breaks those numbers out.

So there is issues with the affluent, which is what we are dealing with now plus there is the reduction to keep the facilities healthy.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Just one final thing I just want to point out. Often government is accused of being, you know, reactive and behind the times, but one thing that the Fish and Boat Commission has done in a very proactive sense is to anticipate and look at the problems, the environmental impacts of Marcellus drilling in the state before it happens.

I just want to commend the agency for being aggressive, being proactive, you know, putting, you know, working to put protocols in place to make sure golden algae doesn't expand beyond and all of the other environmental impacts especially since so much of the fair play of Marcellus shale in this state also is in an area where there is really exceptional value watersheds

and native brook trout species and some of the best, cleanest water in the state is in the Marcellus shale area.

It is good to have the Fish and Boat Commission personnel out there, you know, looking at the impacts and making sure of that in the planning process for establishing the drill sites and being able to do the water withdrawals and with the water and with the disposal of frac water as well.

I just want to commend the agency for being proactive in anticipating those concerns. It is not just because of that. It is because of a lot of other things.

I'm glad you mentioned it in your testimony, the importance of Marcellus shale as a potential source of revenue for the agency, especially in light of the fact that every time we raise license fees, we lose, you know, people drop, they don't buy a fishing license. That is just the reality.

So we've got to look for ways to get some other alternative financing for the agency, especially given the fact that almost 70 percent of your budget comes from license fees unlike the Game Commission where it is about 50 percent. They have plenty of coal, oil, gas, timber, minerals resources that they could lease and

receive revenue from. The Fish and Boat Commission by and large doesn't have that option.

I think you are in a much tougher financial bind all of the time compared to even the Game Commission. I'm not saying that to diminish their problems. I'm just saying it because I think it is vitally -- it is both relevant and significant that when we do the gas severance tax that we earmark just a little piece of it, just a small amount to help fund the operations of the Game Commission and the Fish and Boat Commission. That will go a long way towards lessening the dependency on fishing licenses and the loss of fishing licenses that will be experienced from that.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity and I apologize for being a little late.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Miller?

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When I look at the annual report, there is a chart here that says the number of warm water and cool water species cultured and stocked in 14 state hatcheries, one of the fish that is not on here is smallmouth bass.

In light of what Chairman Staback discussed with the Susquehanna River, can you explain to me why we

are not raising smallmouth bass?

Is that something that we have not had a need to do over the past years? We might have to consider that with the issues that we are now seeing.

MR. MIKO: I could respond to that. The typical reason we stock fish is direct, immediate recreation. The other fish we stock, the walleye, muskie, fingerlings, they are stocked in waters where those fish can reproduce on their own.

Smallmouth bass are capable of spawning on their own, but we did look at it. We tried to raise fingerling and smallmouth bass to see if we have an impact on the smallmouth bass on the rivers in the system.

The numbers that we need to make an impact would be so great that they are really not available.

Again, we raise enough in our system. They are not available nationwide, the numbers that would be required in Susquehanna.

Some good news, if there is good news there, the number of adult fish that are in the Susquehanna River based on our assessments are very similar to the number of adult fish that were there in the mid '80s and early '90s.

Those adult fish are the great fish that we

have all experienced through the mid '90s, so there is plenty of fish to respond to getting the fish back through this illness.

If we stock smallmouth bass, fingerlings, it wouldn't get close to the number we would need to raise -- it would be a very small size, and they would be susceptible to the stressors that the wild fish are susceptible to and will have little gain in that approach.

SUBCHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Thanks for that explanation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STABACK: Are there any others that have questions of Mr. Barner?

Seeing none, Brian, I want to thank you again for your presentation and for the manner in which you responded to the questions that were put to you.

I know the process is new to you; but given that fact, you certainly did a commendable job with your presentation and handling the questions that were posed to you. On that note, this hearing is now adjourned.

(The hearing concluded at 11:24 a.m.)