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P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR:

I'd like to call this meeting of the Pennsylvania Game Commission Board of Commissioners to order. At this time, if you would stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE RECITED

CHAIR:

I'd like to welcome everybody to the meeting. And if you would, a reminder about your cell phones. If you would turn your cell phones off or to vibrate, I'd appreciate it. I have to do that myself. Mr. Secretary, would you do a roll call of the Commissioners?

MR. PUTNAM:

Commissioner Martone?

CHAIR:

Yes.

MR. PUTNAM:

Commissioner Schlemmer?

MR. SCHLEMMER:

Present.

MR. PUTNAM:

Commissioner Putnam? Present.
Commissioner Schrefler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Present.

MR. PUTNAM:
Commissioner Delaney?

MR. DELANEY:
Present.

MR. PUTNAM:
Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:
Present.

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, all the Commissioners are present.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary. At this time, I would like to approve the minutes of the Commission meeting that was held January 24th, 2012. Do I have a motion to approve those minutes from that meeting?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
So moved.

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer. Seconded it,
Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussion on these
minutes? Hearing none, all those in favor, please say
aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
All those opposed? Mr. Secretary.

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the minutes are approved.

CHAIR:
Thank you. At this time, I would like to
turn the meeting over to Executive Director Roe.

MR. ROE:
Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to
take a few minutes to get it on the record, as we do
in our Bureau records or meeting records, that this
will be the last meeting for Bob Strailey, who is a
Bureau director for our Information Technology. He's
been with the State since 1979, I guess it was, Bob,
around there?

MR. STRAILEY:
I'd say.

MR. ROE:
Just wanted to thank you for your many
years of service to the State and to the Game
Commission, and best of luck on your retirement.
Thank you.

CHAIR:

Bob, I'm getting to the point where the word retire is sounding better and better all the time. And I'm hanging around with way too many retired people. They don’t have to check their calendars, check their watch, or anything. So good luck on that. I think you'll adapt well. At this time, we will move into the adopted rulemaking.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:

Yes. The first item to come before the Commission today comes from the Bureau of Wildlife Management. It is adopted rulemaking, the adoption to proposed amendment to Section 139.4. To effectively manage the wildlife resources of this Commonwealth, the Game Commission proposed at its January 24th, 2012 meeting, to amend Section 139.4, relating to the season and bag limits for the license year, to provide updated seasons and bag limits for the 2012-2013 hunting license year. These are shown on Exhibit A on pages three through ten of your agenda.

CHAIR:

Okay. At this time, do I have a motion to adopt the proposed amendment to Subsection 139.4?

MR. WEANER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner. Second?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer. Is there any discussion? During the discussion, for the seasons and bag limits, we are going to go through this item page by page. Any proposed amendments will be handled one at a time. And at this time, I think we can dig in on page three of Exhibit A in your agenda. Do I hear any discussion or any amendment to page three? Okay. We'll move on to page four.

MR. DELANEY:
Yes, Mr. President. I do have an amendment on page four.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Delaney.

MR. DELANEY:
If we could go down towards the bottom of the page where it reads hare, snowshoe rabbit, or varying hare, my amendment is to move to close the snowshoe hare season statewide except for the following WMUs. WMU2G, WMU3A, and WMU4F.
MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Do you mean 4F or 2F?

MR. DELANEY:
My apologies. I'll repeat that again.
WMU2G, WMU3A, and in northwestern Pennsylvania, WMU2F.
Does that clarify things, Mr. President?

CHAIR:
Yeah. Those are all contiguous and that makes it a little bit clearer and it makes it a unit in the north central.

MR. DELANEY:
Writing error on my behalf.

CHAIR:
So let me repeat. Snowshoe hare or varying hare, the season of December 26th to January 1st would be closed statewide except in Units 2G, 3A, and 2F; is that correct, Commissioner Delaney?

MR. DELANEY:
That's correct.

CHAIR:
Do I have a second?

MR. PUTNAM:
Second.
MR. WEANER:
I still second it.

CHAIR:
Putnam, second. Is there any discussion on this motion?

MR. DELANEY:
Yes, Mr. President, I do have some discussion, opinions that I'd like to offer.

Certainly, I believe this is a large and complex issue. I think we've had some reasonable discussions with the Bureau of Wildlife Management at our working group meeting. And from what I have seen to date, we have very little science to support season.

Number two, the snowshoe hare is a species of special concern in Pennsylvania. It's noted that there's been some fairly severe habitat loss. The 2010-2012 --- I'm sorry. The 2011-2012 season was one of our warmest on record and very little snow for an animal that turns white in Pennsylvania's woods. What has driven this for me to bring to the table actually has been hunter interest. Hunters are the ones that brought it to me with their concerns, particularly in northeastern Pennsylvania. It's been said that we really don't know what's happening to the species. It's also been said we
don’t have a lot of metrics to judge the change in hare populations.

Doctor Diefenbach, back in 2005, has said he's convinced the state is in danger of losing them all together. And I actually support and advocate the agency to just do some research. And when they come back, that we have a viable population certainly, you know, consider reopening the season. That would be my opinion.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Is there any other discussion? Mr. Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. The snowshoe hare is a species that's near and dear to me. I grew up hunting snowshoe hares in McKean County, and it was always the highlight of our Christmas season, getting out after hares. The hares have experienced a pretty significant decline based on my observations. However, in about the last five or six or so years, we've seen increased cuttings in the areas that I hunt and a reduced deer population that has allowed some pretty significant rebounding of hare habitat.

Talking to the hare hunters, and I've had much more communication with hare hunters in the last
several years, they seem to be seeing an increase in
the north central. I've asked them, and I reported
this, I think, at the last meeting, that when I asked
the hare hunters how they were doing and whether they
would like to see a longer season. None of them asked
for a longer season. But they are seeing a fairly
good number on the north central. So I am very
excited that they have finally gotten on the radar
screen and we’re going to take a good look at them.
And I support continuing the hunting in the north
central and closing the rest of the state. Thank you.

CHAIR:
Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes

unanimously.

CHAIR:

Anymore discussion on page four? Moving
on to page five, do I hear any discussion from page
five? Page six? Page seven?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Mr. President.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Schreffler.

MR. SCHREFFLER:

I have two amendments to make on page seven. The first amendment is to add Wildlife Management Unit 4D to the regular firearms season, antlered and antlerless from November 26th to December 8th, and remove it from Wildlife Management Unit 4D from deer, regular firearms, November 26th to November 30th.

The second amendment, which I'd like to have voted separately, is to add Wildlife Management Unit 4B to the deer, regular firearm season, antlered and antlerless, November 26th to December 8th, and remove Wildlife Management 4B from the deer, regular firearms, antlerless --- antlered only, November 26th to December 8th.

CHAIR:

Okay. Commissioner Schreffler, would you please restate your first amendment?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

First one was to add 4D to the deer, regular firearms, antlered and antlerless, November 26th to December 8th.
CHAIR:

Okay. Gentlemen, we have a motion. Do I have a second for this motion? Hearing none, the amendment fails. Commissioner Schreffler, would you state your second amendment please?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

The second amendment was to add Wildlife Management Unit 4B to the deer, regular firearm season, antlered and antlerless, November 26th to December 8th, and remove it from the deer, antlered only, November 26th to December 8th.

CHAIR:

Okay. Gentlemen, you've heard Commissioner Schreffler's second amendment on 4B. Do I hear a second?

MR. PUTNAM:

Second.

CHAIR:

Okay. I have a second from Commissioner Putnam. Any discussion on moving 4B as stated by Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

Yes.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Schreffler?
MR. SCHREFFLER:

I got several comments about that from hunters in that area. One said we hunt private lands in several locations in 4B, which seem to be overpopulated with doe, and my kids could not fill their tags because they couldn't shoot doe the first two days when available. Another one said they was hoping that a full two-weeks in current season would be approved for this unit.

I found that a lot of hunters have been moving --- actually voting with their boots by going to those areas that have concurrent seasons, and they would prefer to have concurrent seasons where they are. Our research here by the Game Commission, we spent a lot of valuable funds for research on the split season, and found that it did not accomplish those objectives. And the hunters were not actually more satisfied, which I'm finding in a lot of comments I'm getting. And that the deer management goals were not met in those cases.

The limiting doe allocations, and allocation was the way to go, is much more effective in meeting management objectives or limiting the opportunity or season length for our hunters and especially for our youth. So I really think this is
important here for the scientific matters as well as providing opportunities for our hunters, which seemed to be more and more in favor of having this concurrent season in this wildlife management unit. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Thank you, Commissioner Schreffler. Is there any other discussion? Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:

Unit 4B is largely within the territory that I represent and while I concur with some of the arguments put forth for returning this, I would --- I think we made a number of changes the last couple of years. We changed --- which are concurrent whether or not for several years in a row. And we have a study ongoing which will present us information on possibly changing the boundaries, possibly changing boundaries of WMUs here in June.

And what I'd like to do is I'd like to get that report and take a look at what the WMUs look like for the following season. And, you know, at some point, I might be able to concur and say we ought to go statewide with all of the --- or concur with all of the state. But at this point, to make one more change, and we've been making several changes in the past, I think it adds to the confusion, and I'd like
to wait until next year and do the whole thing. So therefore, I choose to vote no to this amendment.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM:
While I seconded the motion, I don’t necessarily favor the change. I wanted to stimulate the discussion on this particular topic. I'm torn on some of these other units as well between the shortened season, the changing of the allocations based on what the biologists' recommendations are. I think in general, our biologists are right on with the numbers that they're suggesting for these units. We've shortened the seasons in some cases, as Commissioner Schreffler said, to address the concerns of people who aren't seeing enough deer. We still didn't --- we didn't get much of a positive response from doing that.

I would favor the 12-day concurrent season in all the units once we complete the WMU study next year. Hopefully, we'll have something we can all live with there. So while I concur with most of the arguments that Commissioner Schreffler made, I'll agree with Commissioner Weaner, that we've made enough changes. We should try to go forward with a minimum
amount now.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yes. I'd just like to say a few things. We talked about confusion among hunters. I think the real confusion isn't that we're making the change if we adapt it, but when you go from one side of a highway to the other, and one side has the split season and the other side has the concurrent season, and the doe run across the road, I think sometimes that's hard to understand amongst hunters. And also to understand that they may be hunting in a particular county or geographic area, wherever, and part of it is not concurrent and the other part is separate seasons. So I think it's a lot simpler and less complex to the hunters if we have at least those WMUs that are next to each other similar or the same, same seasons.

The other thing is that we found that --- and it was reported yesterday by a biologist, that allocations, not season length, are the way --- are actually the way we really manage the deer herd. And the concurrent season is actually more effective in managing the deer. And what we can find is that it stabilizes the deer herd even more effectively than
the split season. So I really think that this is not going to be a big dramatic change for anybody. I think that the hunters are going to like it. I hear from the hunters, and they asked for it. I don’t think it’s --- you know, I think it’s a move in the right direction in this area which we see from --- we see actually a rise in population in the deer herd.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Commissioner Schreffler. Any other discussion? Commissioner Delaney?

MR. DELANEY:
Commissioner Schreffler, I just ask you to repeat your opinion on what the sportsmen want in 2B which is the limited season to the concurrent. You made some analogies of the split season versus the concurrent and what sportsmen want about regarding 2B.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Well, about 4B.

MR. DELANEY:
4B?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yeah, 4B.

MR. DELANEY:
Yeah, I'm sorry. 4B. Give me 4B.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yeah, I'm sorry. Well, what I've been getting is a lot of —— I've been getting a lot of communication from hunters that they would like the two-week concurrent season. And that some of them are disappointed that —— especially when they have young hunters with them that are out there. They're seeing a lot of does in the first two days when the kids are off school. They can't shoot the deer. And then they have conflicts with scheduling other activities, school and maybe job opportunities or job conflicts, that they don't get out to hunt more after that. So they were unable to fill their tags. And so they have been asking for this.

The other thing that's very interesting is that I'm getting all kinds of reports, and I've actually observed this because I live right next to a game lands that has concurrent seasons. And the increase in hunters to that area from other areas who come there because the first days are not concurrent in the surrounding wildlife management units. So they come to the wildlife management unit that they can hunt either doe or antlers —— or bucks. And so in essence, what they're doing is they're voting with their boots. They are going to an area where they find the opportunity to hunt. It's sort of a silent
vote, you might say, for in essence, they're voting
with their boots, that they want a concurrent season.

It was interesting in the very beginning
of this whole thing, when we tried to encourage
enthusiasm amongst the hunters by splitting the season
so they would see a lot of deer going by and getting
enthusiastic and wanting to hunt and to move into the
areas like 2G and so on where they weren't seeing as
many deer. It didn't work out that way. And after we
had the concurrent seasons, we found that the hunters
became more and more in favor of them and actually
began to like the concurrent season. And as they
understood that the allocation's the thing that really
determines the population of deer and not the season
length or the opportunity, they began to understand
that concurrent season was the better way to go.

A lot of rifle hunters have this feeling
that, you know, you span the seasons and done things
for other hunting groups, and they're the last one on
the list a lot of times. And they're saying that this
opens opportunity for them. And I also hear a lot of
from hunters who own properties in these areas, who
work out of state or come back here to hunt or they
were family properties. And they say that this
actually opens up and provides opportunity for them.
This is one area that --- 4B is one area in the Wildlife Management Unit that could stand the concurrent season.

But I'd rather go with the lower allocation and the 12 days rather than having a higher allocation and just have the five and seven split season. I think it makes more sense. And I think a lot of hunters are coming to that conclusion also.

**MR. DELANEY:**

Commissioner, I just wanted to mention to you, we just had a 2011 Pennsylvania deer hunter survey done. And really, it had a lot to say there. Fifty-two (52) percent, or the majority of sportsmen, favor the five day antlered followed by the seven day antlerless. I mean, that's the only point I'm trying to make. You said a lot of hunters want it, but I think this 2011 Pennsylvania deer survey by the agency staff has said something a little bit different than what you said. But I'm done with my opinion. And thanks for allowing me to have some commentary.

**CHAIR:**

Commissioner Putnam?

**MR. PUTNAM:**

To follow up, I do agree with most of what Commissioner Schreffler said. I think we should
be working to a 12-day concurrent season. I think
this is an excellent discussion to start the process
for next year, which I would strongly favor. I’m not
in favor of making anymore changes at the moment. I
specifically would like to change 3A if I could to the
point to satisfy the people in the part of 3A that
have very low numbers of deer. But the majority if 3A
has very good deer population. And I'm not sure that
are we drawing the management unit boundary, will it
be able to help something like that? 3A's a
relatively small unit. We're going to have to ---
we're always going to draw the line, and there's
always going to be inequities on either side of the
line. And I think that's probably a discussion we'll
have as we talk about redrawing the --- redrawing the
management units. But at this time, I favor just
making minimal amount of changes.

CHAIR:

I’m afraid to ask for a discussion
further. At this point, seeing now that we have a
motion by Commissioner Schreffler to move 4B from the
12-day --- five day/seven day split to a 12-day
concurrent, we'll have a vote. All those in favor
signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND
CHAIR:
Opposed?

ALL NOS RESPOND

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion fails by a vote of five to one.

CHAIR:
Okay. Also on page seven, I would like you to look at the very top.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Excuse me. I had two amendments.

CHAIR:
Yeah, that was a while ago.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Short memory.

CHAIR:
Sorry. At the top where it says deer, archery, first day, September 29th, the last day, November 10th, I would like to propose a motion to move that last day to Monday, November 12th. That's adding a single day to the archery season. However, that's my motion.

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Second.

MR. WEANER:
Mr. President, point of order. As president, you can't make a motion.

CHAIR:
Oh.

MR. WEANER:
But I would make that motion for you.

CHAIR:
Thank you. Commissioner Weaner actually teaches this stuff, so he has one over on me.

Commissioner Weaner, would you state your motion?

MR. WEANER:
I move that we change the date of November 10th to November 12th.

CHAIR:
Do I have a second?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
You have a second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer, second. Any discussion?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Yes, Mr. President. Would you put forth why you would like to do this?

CHAIR:
Okay. As I was stating before, that
Monday happens to be Veteran's Day where we have a lot of people and schools have a day off. We thought it would --- I thought it would add some recreational value by adding a single day to the archery season. That was my consideration. Any other discussion on this?

MR. WEANER:

I would add one thing. Even though I made the motion, our school doesn't have off and it doesn't benefit me at all.

CHAIR:

Neither does mine. Any other discussion? Seeing none, we'll proceed to vote. All those in favor of this motion signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Any other changes to page seven? On to page eight. I'm going to take about a two-minute break here.

SHORT BREAK TAKEN
CHAIR:

An important thing, our discussion was whether the President can or can't make a motion. And the discussion came out to be maybe. But to solve our problem in a better way, at this time I'm going to ask does anybody have any amendments to page eight? Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:

Mr. President, with regard to the black bear, right in the middle of the page, I move to withdraw from bear archery where it says WMU1A, remove that. Down where it says bear muzzleloader, WMU1A, remove that. Next to the bottom where it says bear, extended firearms, WMU1A, remove that.

CHAIR:

Okay. You heard Commissioner Weaner's motion. Do I have a second?

MR. DELANEY:

Second.

CHAIR:

Second, Commissioner Delaney. Do I have any discussion? Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:

The primary reason for removing this is, as you had alluded to yesterday, we've all gotten
quite a bit of correspondence from hunters that hunt in this Wildlife Management Unit 1A. And through, you know, I think it would be prudent to remove that from all the other extended seasons that we're proposing for this couple WMUs.

CHAIR:
And I'll add that, you know, I mentioned it yesterday as well. I'd like to repeat that. This is the way the process works the best. We've heard from a lot of people living in 1A that there is some excellent bear habitat, particularly on the northeast corner where Venango County touches it. And I think again we're responding to those constituents that addressed it. I would like to ask Cal, can you comment on this, removing 1A from this proposal?

MR. DUBROCK:
It was one of the issues that got the most public attention over the last few months. We had in excess of 100 letters asking that 1A be removed. And it was the only Wildlife Management Unit mentioned actually for the seven units --- the five units that were being proposed in this extended. And the staff certainly supports the removal of 1A.

CHAIR:
Thank you. Any further discussion?
Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. The motion is to remove 1A from bear archery, bear muzzleloader, and bear extended firearms. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Any further amendments or motions to page eight? Page nine? Page ten? Okay. At this time, we have an amended motion which encompasses all of Exhibit A in your agenda. If passed, pages three through ten, including the amendments that were made, will be approved. Do I have any motion to accept these amendments to this amended exhibit?

MR. WEANER:
We already had the motion.

CHAIR:
Oh, okay. I'm sorry. Is there any further discussion on this? Hearing none, would you please vote by raising one hand to signify if you're voting in favor by raising one hand?
ALL HANDS RESPOND

CHAIR:
Those opposed, raise one hand. Mr. Secretary?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item to come before the Board today would be the adoption of proposed amendments to Section 141.28, to effectively manage the wildlife resources of this Common, the Game Commission proposed at its January 24th, 2012 meeting to amend Section 141.28, relating to wild pheasant recovery areas, to eliminate the Pike Run wild pheasant recovery area, and to include crows to the list of species that can be hunted within wild pheasant recovery areas starting the first Sunday in February. The text of this amendment is shown on pages 12 through 14 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
Do I have a motion to adopt the proposed amendments to subsection 141.28 as stated?
MR. PUTNAM:
Motion.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam.

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Second, Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussions? Seeing none, we'll proceed to vote. All those in favor vote by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed? No?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item is concerning the adoption of proposed amendment 141.62, to amend that section relating to beaver trapping, to extend the 15-foot trap placement restriction near beaver dams and lodges statewide and extend the body-gripping trap limit of ten to wildlife management units where beaver bag
limits are 40 or more per season. The text of these amendments are shown on pages 16 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
Do I have a motion to adopt the proposed amendment to subsection 141.62 as stated?

MR. DELANEY:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Delaney. Second?

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner. Any discussion?

Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item concerns the adoption of proposed amendments to Section 147.808 (sic), to amend
this section relating to general to allow a mentor to
transfer a valid fall turkey license to an eligible
mentored youth upon the harvest of a fall turkey. The
text of this amendment is shown at page 18 of your
agenda.

CHAIR:
Do I have a motion to adopt the proposed
amendment to Subsection 147.804 as stated?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Motion.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer. Second?

Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Any discussion?

MR. DELANEY:
Just a point of clarification, Mr. President. I believe our Counsel said 147.808. My
document says 147.804.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
It's 804.

CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Delaney.
147.804. Any further discussion? I'd like to add, this is another step in our mentored youth program, and I think it's a very positive step. And I would like to thank the legislators for allowing us to add the antlerless Doe tag transfer and now we have extended it to fall turkey, and I think it's a very good move. So I appreciate that. And I would encourage the Board to vote in favor. All those in favor of this motion, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES Respond

CHAIR:

Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:

The next item before the Board comes from the Bureau of Wildlife Protection. It concerns the adoption of proposed amendments to Section 135.50 relating to definitions to delete references to 75 Pa.C.S. Section 7702(3) relating to definitions, which no longer exists, and replace them with a generic exclusory reference. The text of this adoption is shown on page 20 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
Do I have a motion to adopt the proposed amendment to Subsection 135.50 as stated?

MR. WEANER:

So moved.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Weaner. Second?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

Second.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Schreffler. Is there any discussion? Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:

One thing we need to point out, this is basically a bookkeeping mechanism, and I want to be very, very clear that we are not extending any use of ATVs on game lands. I mean, nothing's changing. It says ATVs here. Nothing's changing. You can't ride an ATV on a game land if that passes. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Good point, Mr. Weaner. Any other discussion? At this time, we'll vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

Opposed say no.
MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item concerns the adoption of proposed amendments to Section 141.1 relating to special regulations areas to permit hunters to legally harvest deer during any deer season through the use of bait on properties authorized under a valid deer control permit, known as red tag farms, in wildlife management units 5C and 5D in the southeastern Pennsylvania special regulations areas. The text is shown on page 22 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
Do I have a motion to adopt the proposed amendments to Subsection 141.1 as stated?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
So moved.

MR. WEANER:
Second.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
What I'm moving is a replacement page that was supplied to us as my --- okay. Not yet.
CHAIR:

Do I have a second? Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussion on this? Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:

Mr. President, I move to amend this motion by deleting the page 22 that's been presented before us and inserting the blue page 22 replacement. It says the same exact thing. It adds one sentence. The sentence is this limited authorization is valid only to the extent that persons comply with the standard and conditions as set forth in 147.556, relating to unlawful devices and methods.

CHAIR:

Thank you, Commissioner Weaner. We have a motion to amend as proposed by Commissioner Weaner. And it is on the additional blue page. It replaces page 22. Do I have a second?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

I second that.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Schreffler. Is there any discussion on the amended amendment?

MR. WEANER:

Mr. President?

CHAIR:
Yes.

MR. WEANER:

I would suggest that we get someone to explain exactly what this is.

CHAIR:

Could you go ahead and explain the additional sentence please?

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:

Yeah. The additional language, as on the replacement page, basically it ensures that the persons that are going to be hunting through the use of bait, and it's very limited red tag areas, in a regular deer season will be required to comply with the same baiting restrictions as a red tag sub-permittee would be required to follow.

CHAIR:

Okay. Any discussion, further discussion?

MR. DELANEY:

Yes, Mr. President.

CHAIR:

Go ahead, Commissioner Delaney.

MR. DELANEY:

I really struggle with these baiting issues. You know, we told sportsmen or we talked with
the sportsmen, and we received some information from
the deer team with regard to the baiting and its
effects or not its effects. And while I recognize
this is a narrow kind of acreage or issue, I really
still have concerns with baiting and EHD or chronic
wasting disease or tuberculosis, diseases of turkeys,
mange, distemper, rabies, or raccoon, skunks. So I
just think it's still not an easy issue. While I may
support it because of the amount of deer some of these
places have and the damage that they're doing, I just
think that it's still contentious with some of the
disease risks by doing that.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yeah. I think this is a valid aid to
some of the remaining farms in the special red areas
around Philadelphia, in southeastern Pennsylvania.
And I think it's needed, and I think they've had some
problems with being able ---. You know, every time
they've tried to control the deer, the deer disperse
to neighboring properties. And hopefully the baiting
will help bring them in so they can actually control
the deer on the farms and to help them become
economically viable, because there are a lot of other
pressures on them as well.

CHAIR:
I'd like to remark that I concur with Commissioner Delaney, and I would be opposed to this if it wasn't so narrowly focused and so limited. And that's what's convincing me that this is worth doing. But any wider spread of baiting, I would probably be opposed to. Any further discussion? Seeing none, we're voting on the amendment from Commissioner Weaner. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the amendment passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Now, we need to complete the original motion for Subsection 141.1. We have that Commissioner Schreffler made and then seconded by Commissioner Weaner. Any further discussion on this original motion? All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the original motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item to come before the Commission is adoption of proposed amendments to Section 141.4, Appendix G, relating to hunting hours, by updating the current hunting hours table and migratory bird hunting hours table to accurately reflect the dates and hours of legal hunting for the 2012-2013 hunting license year. The text of these changes is shown on pages 24 through 26 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
Okay. Gentlemen, the hunting hours tables as stated are on page 25 and on to page 26. Do I have a motion to adopt the proposed amendment to Subsection 141.4 as stated?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer.
MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Second, Commissioner Weaner. Any discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed, say no.

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item is the adoption of proposed amendments to Sections 141.43 and 141.44, relating to deer and bear, to delete the sunset language to effectively make permanent the authorized general use of crossbows during the archery deer and bear seasons. The text of this change is shown on page 28 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
This is final adoption for the inclusion of crossbows. Do I have a motion to adopt the
proposed amendment to Subsection 141.43 and 141.44 as stated?

MR. PUTNAM:
Motion.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam. A second?

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:

MR. WEANER:
Mr. President, I move to amend this motion by striking everything that's written in the book here on page 28 and insert instead the blue addition page 28 that we were presented.

CHAIR:
Do all the Commissioners have the replacement for page 28 covering two pages? Okay. Do I have a second on Commissioner Weaner's motion to amend?

MR. PUTNAM:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam. Any discussion?
Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:

Once again, I would suggest that we get expert help in explaining the differences between these two tables.

MR. DUBROCK:

Commissioner Weaner, the difference on your fore-amendment page as opposed to what was printed in the book primarily is with the final adoption in 139.4 of the muzzle-loading bear season. On the second page of your replacement, you'll see that we needed to establish permitted devices for that particular season, there not having been a muzzleloader bear season in the past. There was no specific section for that. And that is the added information.

CHAIR:

Any further discussion? Mr. Schlemmer?

MR. SCHLEMMER:

Yes, I'd like to question. It's saying the crossbow and bolts. Are we still using the various bolts or is there common terminology referring to an arrow in this instance?

MR. DUBROCK:

It's been my experience the Agency has
always used the term bolt in describing the projectile that is used with the crossbow. And that has not changed to this point.

MR. SCHLÉMMER:
Thank you.

CHAIR:
Any further discussion? Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:
Yeah. I was one of the opposed to the whole crossbow issue initially. And as I said at the last meeting, it still bugs me to be voting on this, but we can't take them away at this point. We knew that when the vote was last a couple years ago, so I reluctantly urge you all to support this motion.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Commissioner Weaner. Any further discussion? We're now voting on the amended motion by Commissioner Weaner. No further discussion? All those in favor of the amendment motion, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed? Mr. Secretary?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the amendment passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Okay. And now we would be back to the original motion which was stated --- it was made by Commissioner Putnam and seconded by Commissioner Weaner. Any further discussion on the original motion? Hearing none ---?

MR. DELANEY:
Yes, Mr. President.

CHAIR:
Yes.

MR. DELANEY:
I just think I need to add just to the discussion too and not to reiterate what we talked about, but I was one that also voted against the crossbow when we first started this. And I'm going to vote in the affirmative for it today because they are a legal weapon. I think it's done a lot of good for the sport. But I would still challenge our Bureau of Wildlife Management to monitor the harvest figures of the antlered deer with regard to the increase harvest as we move forward.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Commissioner Delaney. Any
further discussion?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

Yes.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

I would just like to say that I echo what Mr. Delaney --- Commissioner Delaney just said. I also was originally opposed. I think the hunters have quite an investment. Also hunting oftentimes just boils down to how good a hunter you are and not the weapon you have. But I also would like to see the Bureau of Wildlife Management closely monitor the harvest of bucks in the future.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Further discussion? Hearing none, all of those in favor signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the motion passed unanimously.

CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.
ATTORNEY BECHTEL:

The next item concerns proposed rulemaking. The Commission is proposing to amend the Pa. Code Section 131.2 by creating, amending, and deleting certain definitions. The first amendment involves the removal of two sentences from the definition of a bow. The first sentence concerns the prohibition of devices commonly known as draw-locks on bows. The Commission determined that the prohibition of this drawing aid was no longer necessary given the recent expansion to permit crossbows during archery season. The contents of the second sentence were deemed redundant to similar language recently created in Section 141.43, relating to deer, and are therefore no longer necessary.

The second amendment involves the addition of the definition of decoy. And the third amendment involves the addition of the definition of meat or animal products. The text of these definitions are shown on pages 29 and 30 of your agenda.

CHAIR:

Okay. Gentlemen, the first amendment is a change in language to permit the use of draw-locks in archery. The second amendment is definition for
decoys. Third, definition for meat and animal products for use in taking furbearers. That said, do I have a motion to amend 58 Pa. Code Subsection 131.2 as stated?

MR. WEANER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner. Do I have a second?

MR. PUTNAM:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam. Any discussion?

Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
On April 24, 2012, the Commission finally adopted amendments to 58 Pa. Code Section 139.4,
relating to seasons and bag limits for the license year, to among other things, expand fall turkey hunting opportunities in WMUs 1A, 1B, and 2A, by removing the shotgun, bow, and arrow only limitation. This amendment will effectively allow hunters within WMUs 1A, 1B, and 2A to hunt fall turkey with rifles. As a result of this change, the Commission is proposing to amend Section 141.20 to apply the more restrictive fluorescent orange requirements to WMUs 1A, 1B, and 2A that apply to all other WMUs where use of rifles to hunt turkey is authorized. The text of this change is shown on page 31 of your agenda.

CHAIR:
Okay. Gentlemen, the amendment you just heard is designed to accommodate the addition of rifles to fall turkey by adjusting the fluorescent orange requirements for 1A, 1B, and 2A. Do I have a motion to amend 58 Pa. Code 141.20 as stated?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler.

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussion on this? Hearing none --- oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM:

The issue of hunting turkeys with rifles always brings up the point of safety. I reviewed the --- all of our reports of hunter-related shooting incidents. I don’t believe there's ever been a case of a hunter shot with a rifle who had orange that was visible to the shooter. We did have quite a few incidents, many of them fatal. And that's the problem with rifles. Rifles are more often fatal than shotguns. But I don’t believe we've ever had a hunter shot in mistake who had orange that was visible to the shooter with a rifle.

And the same would go --- most of our hunting-related shooting incidents involve people violating the law and not complying with our orange law. There are times when they, like me, who hide down in a hole and can be fully dressed in orange and I'm still pretty well hidden. That can always occur. But if hunters are wearing orange that's visible to the shooter, very, very few people were shot in Pennsylvania.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Commissioner Putnam. Any other discussion on this? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:

The next item is also an amendment. The Commission has recently reviewed its policy concerning what it requires from licensed hunters and trappers who change their residency from resident to nonresident and vice versa. Currently, if a Pennsylvania resident becomes a nonresident after having previously purchased a hunting or furtaking license, that license is deemed invalid and the person is required to repurchase a nonresident hunting or furtaking license at full cost in order to continue engaging in hunting or trapping activities within this Commonwealth during that license year. The result is quite the opposite for nonresidents who become residents after having previously a hunting or furtaking license, whom are not required to repurchase
a new license or even report the change in residency. In both cases, the Commission has identified a value in obtaining updates from its license holders when a change in residency occurs. The Commission is proposing to create Section 143.13, relating to change of residency registration, to harmonize the approach that it takes concerning both types of residency change. Pursuant to this amendment, changes in residency will require the license holder to acquire a change in residency registration within 30 days of the change in residency, otherwise their license will automatically become invalid. Once a change of residency registration has been submitted, no further repurchase of license will be required for residents or nonresidents that have changed their residency status. The text of this change is shown on page 32 below the commentary.

CHAIR:
Okay. Gentlemen, this amendment seldom used, a situation that might be encountered involves licensing of residents becoming nonresidents and nonresidents becoming residents during a license year. Do I have a motion to amend 58 Pa. Code Chapter 143 adding Subsection 143.13 as stated?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler. Second?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer. Any further discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item is also an amendment. On March 31st, 2010, the Commission's three-year evaluation of the effectiveness of a broad scale and widely accessible authorization permitting the baiting of white-tailed deer across the southeast special regulations area expired. The Commission's final review of the baiting authorization generally concluded that broad scale and widely accessible baiting did not establish viable increases in harvest rates to justify an extension of the experimental
program. On February 1st, 2011, the Commission amended Sections 147.552 and 147.556, relating to application and lawful devices, to create a focused, limited authorization permitting the baiting of white-tailed deer in WMUs 5C and 5D on approved properties enrolled in the red tag program. The Commission's reference to WMUs 5C and 5D was in error as this geographical reference is not compatible with the term special regulations areas as referenced in Section 2308(b)(2), subsection three of the Act, relating to unlawful devices and methods, and described in Section 141.1 Subsection B relating to the special regulations areas. The Commission is proposing to amend Section 147.552, relating to application, to replace the reference to WMUs 5C and 5D with the more appropriate reference to the southeast special regulations areas. The text of this change is shown on page 33 below the commentary.

CHAIR:
This amends the code to accommodate the recent changes to permit very limited use of bait on red tag properties in 5C and 5D. Do I have a motion to amend 58 Pa. Code 147.552 as stated?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
So moved.
CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler. Second?

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item to come before the Commission is the Bureau of Wildlife Habitat Management. It concerns the donation of real estate, contract number 3601, State Game Land No. 264 in Dauphin County from the executors of the estate of David V. Randall. They have offered a donation to the Game Commission of 5.05 plus/minus acres in Wiconisco Township, Dauphin County located on the south-facing slope of Big Lick Mountain as shown on Exhibit Red 1 on page 35 of your agenda. The property is forested with oak, maple, and birch, and will act as a buffer.
between backyards of existing residences and State Game Land No. 264.

CHAIR:
Do I have a motion to accept the donation of land as described by contract 3601, State Game Lands 264, Dauphin County?

MR. DELANEY:
So moved.

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Delaney. Second, Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussion? All those in favor say aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:
Mr. President, the motion passed unanimously.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:
The next item concerns two acquisitions. The first is contract number 3602, State Game Land Nos. 24 and 45 in Clarion and Venango Counties. Timbervest Partners II, Pennsylvania, LLC, is offering
for sale two tracts of land, one located in Clarion
and one in Venango County. The first tract being
offered is 82.10 more or less acres located in
Farmington Township, Clarion County adjoining State
Game Land No. 24 as shown on Exhibit Red 2 on page 38
of your agenda. It's referred to as the Hall tract.
The cost of the Hall tract is $82,100 lump sum.

The second tract is 545 more or less
acres located in Cranberry Township, Venango County
adjoining State Game Land No. 45, as shown in Exhibit
Red 3 on page 39 of your agenda. And it's referred to
as the D. Vann tract. The cost of the D. Vann tract
is $473,000 lump sum. Acquiring this property will
provide vital legal access into a portion of State
Game Land No. 45, which is currently inaccessible.
The D. Vann Tract contains an unnamed tributary to
Sandy Creek, which borders the property to the east.
And both properties have regenerating mixed northern
hardwoods and shall be paid for with funds from third
party commitments for compensation of habitat and
recreational losses which occurred on State Game Lands
from previously approved projects.

The second acquisition is Contract No.
3603, State Game Lands Nos. 166, 147, and 41, in Blair
and Bedford Counties. The Conservation Fund is
offering for sale 2,157.43 more or less acres of land in multiple tracts located in Frankstown, Blair, Taylor, and Catherine Townships, Blair County, and Bloomfield and Greenfield Townships, Bedford County adjoining or near State Game Land Nos. 166, 147, and 41 as shown on page 40 of your agenda in Exhibit Red 4.

The Conservation Fund is willing to sell the properties as a two-phase acquisition project. Phase one of the project shall include the acquisition of three separate tracts. The first being 403 more or less acres in Frankstown, Blair, and Taylor Townships, Blair County, adjoining State Game Land No. 147, referred to as the Reservoir tract. The second being 95.88 more or less acres northwest of Roaring Spring in Taylor Township, Blair County, and referred to as Dunnings Ridge tract. And the third being 368.55 more or less acres located southeast of Claysburg in Bloomfield and Greenfield Townships, Bedford County, near State Game Land No. 41, and is referred to as the Dunnings I-99 tracts. These tracts are forested with mixed northern hardwoods in various age classes with mountain laurel understory at higher elevations and greenbrier, witch hazel, and grapevine thickets present at lower elevations. Rock outcroppings are
also present, especially at higher elevations on the Reservoir tract.

Settlement on this phase shall be no later than June 21st, 2012. The cost for the three tracts will be $625,000 to be paid with funds from third party commitments for compensation of habitat and recreational losses which occurred on State Game Lands from previously approved projects.

Phase two of the project shall be the acquisition of 1,290 more or less acres in Frankstown and Catherine Townships, Blair County, adjoining State Game Land No. 166, and is referred to as the Beaver Dam tracts. The Beaver Dam tracts are forested with mixed northern hardwoods and lie within both an important mammal area and an important bird area, which support the existence of both state and federally listed species. The cost of the property shall be $2,458,000, minus any funds raised by the Conservation Fund. The property shall be purchased with funds from third party commitments for compensation of habitat and recreational losses which occurred on State Game Lands from previously approved projects, and may also be partially funded by habitat mitigation commitments for impacts to state and federally listed species. Settlement on this phase
shall be held no later than June 2013.

CHAIR:

Thank you, Brad. Do I have a motion to accept the acquisitions of land described by Contract 3602, State Game Lands 24, 45, Clarion and Venango County and Contract 3603, State Game Lands 166, 147, and 41, Blair and Bradford (sic) County?

MR. PUTNAM:

So moved.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Putnam. Second?

MR. WEANER:

Second.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Weaner.

COMMISSIONER SCHREFFLER:

A comment there. That's Blair and Bedford County, not Bradford.

CHAIR:

Oh, okay. You're right. Thank you, Commissioner Schreffler. Any further discussion? Commissioner Putnam?

MR. PUTNAM:

Yeah, I'd like to ask Director Capouillez to tell us the third party commitments, can you tell
us where the money is coming from to pay for these tracts?

MR. CAPOUILLEZ:
Yeah, these tracts are going to be largely funded by oil, gas, and mineral operations that the Commission's approved in the past, where there will be some surface use on the game lands. And we go for recreational and habitat replacement. This is an example of where we've absolutely maximized that opportunity, you know, for the sportsmen and for the wildlife where we approved in the past limited impacts. And here we're acquiring land that actually houses threatened endangered species, land that we would never have the opportunity to acquire if those third party commitments hadn't been, you know, approved by the Commission in the past.

CHAIR:
Thank you. Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yes. I'd just like to mention that not only that, but I visited some sportsmen's clubs in the area there, especially in Bedford and Blair Counties, and they're probably right in this area that utilize that state game lands. And I think they'll be valuable additions. They'll be well used by the
sportsmen.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Any further discussion?

Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

ATTORNEY BECHTEL:

The next thing before the Commission is land exchange. The first is contract number 3604, State Game Land 72 in Clarion County. The executors of the estate of Charles R. Alexander are offering 4.5 more or less acres of land in Highland Township, Clarion County, in exchange for a right-of-way through State Game Land Number 72, Highland Township, Clarion County. That's shown on Exhibit Red 5. The 70-foot wide right-of-way shall run from Miola Road through State Game Land Number 72 to the northern boundary of the Alexander property along an existing private road referred to as Penny Lane. In addition to conveying the 4.5 more or less acres, the Alexanders have also
agreed to place certain restrictions, including no-build buffers on the Alexander property. A no-build setback of 75 yards shall extend along the boundary between State Game Land Number 72 and the Alexander property from Miola Road east approximately 1,800 feet. From this point to the eastern terminus of the Alexander property, the no-build setback buffer shall increase to 150 yards. The 4.5 more or less acres is forested and is accessed from Miola Road.

The second exchange is contract number 3605, State Game Land Numbers 111 and 88 in Somerset and Juniata Counties. David and Laurie Crosby desire a 350-feet by 16 and a half feet permanent right-of-way into their existing residence as shown on Exhibit Red 6 on page 43 of your agenda. The non-exclusive right-of-way shall be across State Game Land Number 111 in Lower Turkeyfoot Township, Somerset County, and is for one single-family dwelling with associated outbuildings. No new buildings shall be constructed within 75 yards of the State Game Land boundary. Maintenance of the right-of-way shall be at each party's sole discretion to meet their particular needs. In exchange, the Crosbys will provide $1,062.50 toward costs associated with the acquisition of the Wilson L. and Mabel Eberly property.
These are two tracts of land totaling 4.4 acres in Spring Hill Township, Juniata County, adjacent to State Game Land Number 88, as shown on Exhibit Red 7 on page 44 of your agenda. Currently the Game Commission and the Eberlys share a common right-of-way. Acquiring these tracts will provide improved access into State Game Land Number 88. The first tract is 4.31 acres and will provide access from State Road 3006, Mountain Road. The second tract is 0.09 acres, and will allow for the use of an existing timber road located on State Game Land Number 88. The total cost of the two tracts is $18,953.84 lump sum, and will be paid with funds from the Crosby right-of-way with the remainder being paid from third party commitments for compensation of habitat and recreational losses which occurred on State Game Lands from previously approved projects.

The final exchange is contract number 3606 taking place on State Game Lands Numbered 295 and 87 in Centre and Clearfield Counties. Aquillas J. and Sallie A. Peachey are offering 4,011 more or less acres of land in Greenwood and Penn Townships, Clearfield County, adjacent to State Game Land Number 7 --- I'm sorry. State Game Lands Number 87, as shown on Exhibit Red 8 on page 46 of your agenda, in
exchange for 524 acres of State Game Land No. 295 located in Miles Township, Centre County, as shown on Exhibit Red 9, page 42 --- 47 of your agenda. The 524 acres consists largely of mixed hardwoods and steep terrain with rock outcroppings and limited access. The Game Commission shall retain 50 percent of the oil and gas on the 524 acres being conveyed to the Peacheys. In addition to the land exchange, the Peacheys agree to allow immediate public access into a portion of State Game Land Number 87 by allowing the use of an existing road located on the 4,011 acres being conveyed to the Game Commission, as shown on Exhibit Red 10, on page 48 of your agenda. Current public access is being impeded by terrain and private land holdings. The tract being conveyed to the Game Commission will connect a detached 596-acre parcel of State Game Land Number 87 to the main portion of the State Game Land. The 4,011 acres consists mainly of mixed hardwoods, interspersed with herbaceous openings and supports a large beaver dam complex. Curry Run, a cold water fishery designated as a wild trout stream runs through the property.

The Peacheys are excepting and reserving all timber 13 inches or greater at DBH until November 11, 2026, not to include any hickory and conifer
trees, except for larch. All reclamation, seeding, and infrastructure development supporting timber operations will be in coordination with the Game Commission. In order to effectuate the land exchange, the Game Commission shall pay the Peacheys $410,000 with funds from third party commitments for compensation of habitat and recreational losses which occurred on State Game Lands from previously approved projects. Settlement on this contract or on this exchange shall be held no later than September 1st, 2012.

CHAIR:
Gentlemen, do I have a motion to accept land exchanges described by Contract 3604, 3605, and 3606?

MR. DELANEY:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Delaney. Second?

MR. WEANER:
Second.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner. Is there any discussion?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yes.

CHAIR:

Commissioner Schreffler.

MR. SCHREFFLER:

I'd just like to comment to Director Capouillez that I appreciate the foresight that was put into the exchanges, especially in the setbacks. That's always been a concern of mine, State Game Land where people build right up against the boundaries and then they put the safety zone and in essence lose that hunting for, you know, 300 yards into the game land. And I thought that was well done. And it's good foresight.

And the other comment I had was that it's always one of the things that we're always looking for is more access to our game lands. Several of these here have provided that access to game lands, which is really critical to hunters, even to manage those game lands. And that's also a good move. Thank you.

CHAIR:

Any further discussion? Commissioner Putnam?

MR. PUTNAM:

Yeah. I'd like to ask the Director Capouillez if he can expand on what Commissioner
Schreffler just said. Explain the setback provision, what we got for that particular right-of-way. And then after that, just comment a little bit more on the land exchange. That was a pretty significant land exchange, one of the bigger tracts of game lands we've ever given up.

**MR. CAPOUILLEZ:**

Sure. With regard to the setbacks, as Commissioner Schreffler said, what we try to do is in working with these deals, the staff in the region are very, very diligent in looking towards the future. A lot of times once, you know, an exchange occurs, what might have been with the intent of the property for one single dwelling or a camp can sometimes change and there might be three or four. So that's the time to actually start to negotiate with the landowner, prior to the exchange, and allowing for there to be limited use of what we're exchanging so there's less of an impact on the game lands. And that's why you're seeing some of those setbacks which, again, like we're saying, cuts into the safety, the safety zone of the game lands. And although we can manage it for habitat, the recreational value starts to --- starts to be lost because people can't hunt it to the fullest degree that they could before.
With regard to the large acquisition, you know, as per the Executive Director, the Agency has taken a lot more effort in establishing early successful habitat for the various species that rely on that throughout the Commonwealth. This particular tract, coupled with the 9,200 and some odd acres we just recently purchased from the Deward (phonetic) estate, really sets a large block of game lands and early successful habitat, something that, you know, we're desperately in need of. And I can tell you too, that, you know, some of the issues, as soon as you buy a large tract, all the properties around it will go up in value. And we saw that very quickly out here to the point where, for lack of a better term, you know, it was getting to the point of almost extortion for us to try to get into some of these tracts by some of the private landowners. This deal allows for us to access everything we need to for the sportsmen, for habitat, and to further increase and link up some of those other outlying tracts. So it was an exceptional deal for us to do.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
And access to the Peachey tract was quite limited?

MR. CAPOUILLEZ:
Correct. So the recreational values and the habitat values far outweigh what we're doing from the exchange perspective.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Any further discussion?

Okay. At this time, we'll proceed to vote. All those in favor of approving this motion, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

Opposed?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:

That concludes that portion. Before we move on to the new business, do we have any old business to conduct? Okay. Moving forward to new business, I believe at this time we would look at the proposed elk license. Mr. DuBrock.

MR. DUBROCK:

Commissioners, yesterday Dr. Rosenberry provided a summary of the status of the elk population, and we reviewed with you proposed elk licenses. And I believe that has been distributed to
the Commissioners. Hopefully you have it before you now. The recommendation is for 19 antlered tags and 46 antlerless tags, a total of 65 elk licenses for the 2012 season. That does not include the one conservation license that was auctioned off earlier this year. And the distribution is as outlined on the table before you.

CHAIR:
Am I correct in saying this is the exact one that we saw yesterday at the presentation?

MR. DUBROCK:
That is correct. Yes.

CHAIR:
Okay. Commissioners, do you all have the paper with the proposed license? Okay. Do I have a motion to accept the license as proposed?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler. Second?

MR. PUTNAM:
Second.

CHAIR:
Second, Commissioner Putnam. Is there any discussion on the allocation of elk license?
Commissioner Putnam?

MR. PUTNAM:

Yesterday I questioned Doctor Rosenberry what the elk number would be. The population has grown pretty significantly in recent years. And he responded that we manage elk the same as we do deer. We're looking at thresholds of habitat impact, herd health impacts, and citizen complaint. We have received some complaints in the recent --- in the last year, particularly in the Bennett Valley area. The allocations reflect an increase in harvest in the Bennett Valley area. It's the way the system is supposed to work, and that's the way it's going to continue to work. I'm very happy to see that we are addressing the citizen complaints we received.

Some point along the way, I think we're going to see significant increases in these numbers because the herd seems to be increasing pretty fast. That's all I have.

CHAIR:

Okay. Thank you. And I think it should also be noted that there's a total of 65 elk license being issued, 19 antlered, 46 antlerless. However, that does not include the one that's considered a conservation license that will be given to a
conservation group; is that correct?

MR. DUBROCK:
That is correct.

CHAIR:
Thank you. Any further discussion?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Question.

CHAIR:
Mr. Schlemmer.

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Cal, can you tell me, are there any restricted areas for the special license, where they can hunt?

MR. DUBROCK:
There are not. The special conservation license that was auctioned off, that person can hunt in any management unit, and, in fact, has an extended opportunity from the first of September through the last legal hunting day.

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Thank you.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
I just wanted to mention that I think
this is really an appropriate allocation as the deer --- the elk herd continues to expand. And I believe that it will, especially as we see more and more right-of-ways for the gas pipelines and so on increasing, favorable habitat for elk in the area. And I'd just like to say that I think that the management program --- I've visited up there and been up there several times, is operating --- I'll echo what Dave Putnam said, that it's operating perfectly well. And I think it's doing a good job.

CHAIR:
Thank you. Any further discussion? Okay. At this time, we have a motion and a second to accept the elk license. Is there no further discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:
Opposed? Mr. Secretary?

MR. PUTNAM:
Fell asleep there. Mr. President, the motion passes unanimously.

CHAIR:
Thank you. At this time, we will be handling the antlerless allocations. Just for
information, yesterday the Board, each of the
Commissioners, was given a packet with the
recommendations for each Wildlife Management Unit 1A
all the way through 5D. Each page had a considerable
amount of information that you saw in Doctor
Rosenberry's presentation. At the bottom of each
page, the antlerless allocation options are listed.
There is a 12-day concurrent listing that shows what
number they would recommend for a decrease, another
number for a stable, and a final number for an
increase.

There's also a recommendation for a five-
day antlered, seven-day concurrent. And again,
there's a number under decrease, a number under
stable, and a sixth number under increase. At this
time, if it pleases the Board, I'd like to go down
through the Wildlife Management Units and have the
Commissioners offer their suggestions for the
allocation, and we'll take a discussion on each of
those. Once we have a completed list, we will have a
motion to accept that list. And at that time, we'll
be able to vote on an entire list of allocations. Is
that suitable to the Commissioners? Signify by
nodding.

ALL AYES RESPOND
CHAIR:

Good enough. Hopefully this will be less complicated than my explanation just was. We'll start with Wildlife Management Unit 1A, which at this time, having been approved in the seasons of bag limits is a 12-day concurrent season. Is there anybody with a number they'd like to offer for 1A? Being that that's my area, I would like to offer in 1A a number of 42,000 antlerless licenses to be allocated. Any discussion as to that number? I'm going to put 42,000 down under 1A.

On 1B, also considered a 12-day concurrent season for 1B, I'm offering a number of 33,000 since it's my district. I would ask for any discussion on 1B? Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

Can you tell us why you chose 33,000 rather than a higher number?

CHAIR:

As soon as I get to that page. Last year we issued 30,000. This year the recommendation was to decrease, and their recommendation was a decrease in population was 36,000. I just felt that a 20-percent increase was just a lot of licenses. I thought we would --- I would split the difference and offer an
increase of 3,000, which is a ten-percent increase. It's something I think both myself and the sportsmen in 1B could bear. That would be my explanation.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
The reason I question is because the deer population ---.

CHAIR:
It doesn't fall on any of their six. Yeah, they gave me six numbers, and it wasn't quite enough for me.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
I noticed the population was increasing while ---.

CHAIR:
Right. And I am recommending an increase in allocation. Any further discussion? Seeing none, under 1B, I would recommend a 33,000. 2A, which is a split season, five-day buck, seven-day concurrent, do I have a recommendation for a number on 2A?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
59,000.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schlemmer, 59,000. Do I hear any discussion on that proposed number? Okay. Moving on, 2B, which is the special regulation area,
which is a 12-day concurrent, do I hear any recommended number for that?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
I recommend, Mr. President, 67,000 in allocation concurrent.

CHAIR:
67,000 for 2B. Do I hear any discussion or concern on that number? Moving on to 2C, which is a split season, five-day buck only, seven-day concurrent, do I hear any numbers for 2C?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
For 2C, I'm looking at a split season, please?

CHAIR:
Yes, it is.

MR. SCHLEMMER:
With an allocation of 50,000.

CHAIR:
50,000. Do I have any discussion on Wildlife Management Unit 2C? 2D, again a split season, five-day/seven-day. Do I hear any discussion on 2D?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Mr. President, on 2D, I'd like to offer 62,000 allocation.
CHAIR:
Okay. Since I share that area, I'd like to take a look at 2D briefly. Last year we issued in 2D, 60,000. The recommended for stable would be 64,000. So I guess you followed the same --- I can't argue with you because I did that. I guess you're doing the same, splitting the difference. So I would concur since we split that. Any other discussion on 2D at this time as 62,000? Yes, Mr. Schreffler.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Mr. Schlemmer, you just sort of split the difference? Is that what it was?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
That's correct.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Because I noticed the population was really increasing in that WMU. And as far as health, was stable.

MR. SCHLEMMER:
That was a tough decision, Commissioner. I had to put the customer leg on that. I got quite a few phone calls and so forth. And so I came up and hopefully evened that out. And with the change in WMUs next year, we can take and review this and take another look at it.
CHAIR:

I have to add being that I shared 2D, I did question a lot of our field personnel on this. And I think they would concur with the recommendation that there is an increased population. And also if you're familiar with 2D, it extends down to the northern Pittsburgh/Cranberry area where there is a lot of deer and nowhere to hunt them. And then the northern part of 2D is definitely more rural, more forested. So it has almost a north and south component that makes it very difficult to balance out the entire management unit. But hopefully, this will put us on our way to at least stabilizing this herd. It may be a little slower than Doctor Rosenberry would have liked, but at least it puts us on that track.

Any other discussion on 2D? Commissioner Delaney?

MR. DELANEY:

President Martone, yourself and Commissioner Schlemmer live there. Your sportsmen are there. I respect the fact --- I don’t know anything about 2D. I respect your opinions by living there. Sportsmen are from there. And I'll be supporting your recommendations.

CHAIR:

And I can say the same is true for the
northeast, that I'm not comfortable with and I take
your recommendations when we get there. No further
discussion on 2D, I'd move on to 2E, which is a split
season as well. Do I have a number for 2E?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
Mr. President, on 2E is also a shared WMU
with Commissioner Putnam. I'd like to have his input
on this, but I'm recommending an allocation of 21,000.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam?

MR. PUTNAM:
I don't have any objection to that.

CHAIR:
Okay. 21,000. Any further discussion on
2E? 2F, again, that falls in my district. That is a
split season, and I'm recommending 27,000 for 2F. And
if I can get to that page, that is the recommendation
for stabilizing the herd for 2F at 27,000. Any
discussion on 2F? Thank you. 2G, Commissioner
Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM:
I think we're talking about the elephant
in the closet here with 2G.

CHAIR:
I really didn't want to go there, but 2G
has to be discussed.

MR. PUTNAM:

2G is a serious concern to me. Not that we can't handle it, but I'm very torn by the disappearing habitats of 2G. I was born and raised in 2G. I hunt in 2G. And I drive through 2G a lot. I just planted about 30,000 seedlings in 2G, and I see higher numbers, lower numbers. The habitat is not that even. However, I do want to point to the fact that the population of 2G has almost doubled since 2006. The population is now over 100,000 animals there.

Some of the complaints that we're hearing, the complaints that the Board is voicing back are there's some lag time involved in that. Some of the people I talked to in this, even the ones that hunt the Sproul State Forest, as bad as that habitat is, when I ask them how the deer are, they won't say oh, it's really great, it's back to the old days, but they will almost all begrudgingly tell me, oh, yeah, there's more deer there. And they're doing that because they don't want anybody else to see it and say oh, wow, it's finally working. So I do believe our program is working, and I believe it's working in 2G. I'm concerned that the numbers in the northern part of
it are getting to the point where we really do need to do some control, to put the brakes on the herd.

The southern part, I'm not so confident that we're at that point yet. So my recommendation will be, as some of you, I'll split the difference, set it at 33,000, which is a 10,000 increase over last year. I really lean towards even the 20,000 increase. I think we could stand it except for the fact that the --- we can't apply the permits to exactly where they're needed. That being said, we will never be able to apply the permits down to the individual property. It's going to take some restraint on the individual hunters when they start talking about their own individual areas.

I got a letter last year from a guy that said I only saw one deer last year, and it's the one I shot. What can you say to that? If there's only one deer in the area you're hunting, maybe you shouldn't shoot the last one. So I mean, it's very easy to blame the Game Commission for every last thing. I didn't want to kill the deer but you made me do it. Anyhow, our antlerless allocations, I think, are achieving our objectives pretty well, and I'll leave it at that.

CHAIR:
Will you repeat your number?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

33,000.

CHAIR:

Okay. For 2G, 33,000. Any discussion on this? I'd also like to point out that these decision sheets will be made public. They'll be handed out and made available to the public. I would encourage you to look at 2G and put yourself in Commissioner Putnam's place making these decisions. You'll see, it's not the fun part of the job. Moving on, 3A, which is a 12-day concurrent season. Do I have a recommendation for 3A?

MR. PUTNAM:

3A, I would recommend 26,000.

CHAIR:

Okay. Commissioner Putnam, 26,000. Any discussion on 3A? 3B is a split season. Do I have a recommendation for Management Unit 3B?

MR. DELANEY:

Yes, President Martone. I'm going to recommend the same allocation as last year. But let me elaborate a little bit. It was 39,952. I'm going to make it a little bit cleaner at 40,000 to make it easier. I really think WMU 3B is an example of a WMU
that really wasn't doing so good and the forest health model has increased. I think if you look at this spreadsheet, it really shows some really good things going on when you give it a chance to work. So I'm agreeable to keep the allocations the same as we had last year, you know. Our trends seem to be looking good at 3B, so that's my recommendation, 40,000.

CHAIR:
Thank you. Any discussion on 3B? Moving on to 3C, which is a split season, five and seven, do I have a recommendation for 3C?

MR. DELANEY:
Yes, I'm going to recommend 35,000. 3C was one of the original study WMUs, and we have had a substantial increase in the deer population in WMU 3C, so I'm actually going to follow the recommendation of keep the herd stable, and that would be 35,000.

CHAIR:
Thank you, Commissioner Delaney. Any discussion on 3C?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yes.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Give me a second here, but I think 3C, when I go back and look at the recommendations by --- it doesn't say stable. It said reduce the deer population by allocation --- where the decision chart is. And the population has really been increasing in that WMU. Would that make a difference in your recommendation?

MR. DELANEY:

Oh, it certainly did. Last year we had 29,118, so it's increasing it substantially with 35,000.

MR. SCHREFFLER:

Okay.

CHAIR:

Do I have an agreement on 3C at 35,000?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

I guess. It doesn't really reduce it is what they recommended, but it does increase it from last year. But it's really a considerable increase in deer population. What that does is sort of stabilize it. And I'm hopeful that will bring it back in line. The habitat seems to be --- the forest health seems to be holding steady. You would concur with that, Mr. Delaney?

MR. DELANEY:
Yeah. Actually, I think the forest health has gotten better.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Okay.

MR. DELANEY:
That's at least what the numbers show me.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Okay.

CHAIR:
Okay. For 3C, a split season of 35,000. 3D, 12-day concurrent season. Do I have a recommendation for a number?

MR. DELANEY:
This WMU for me, it's in northeastern Pennsylvania, and it's fairly large. But I have the same issues here that I believe Commissioner Putnam has in 2G. It's a tough one. The eastern half of the WMU seems to have very good habitat. It's doing pretty well. And the western half doesn't seem to be doing so well. It's a WMU that's under review. You know, I don't think the forest health managers are doing really good, and I kind of wrestled with this WMU last year to see, you know, what kind of numbers we should put out there. Last year's numbers were 38,955. And I'm actually looking to keep the deer
herd stable there. To keep it stable is recommending 36,000, but I still think we should do the right thing, and I'd be willing to keep that at the same level as last year also, which is 38,955. So we make it cleaner at 39,000.

CHAIR:
Thank you for the cleaner number. Any discussion on 39,000 for 3D? 4A, which is a 12-day concurrent season, do I have a recommendation?

MR. PUTNAM:
Where are we at?

CHAIR:
4A.

MR. SCHREFFLER:
4A is getting ahead here. Recommendation is to maintain. It's a 12-day concurrent season. To maintain a stable population at 29,000.

CHAIR:
Okay. So 4A, I have a recommendation from Commissioner Schreffler at 29,000. Do I have any discussion on 4A? 4B, which is a split season, five/seven, do I have a recommendation for the allocation of 4B?

MR. WEANER:
Mr. President.
CHAIR:
Commissioner Weaner?

MR. WEANER:
4B is largely within the territory of the area that I represent. And I'm going to recommend, excuse me, 26,000. The recommendation to stabilize the herd is 31,000 here. I've heard a lot of people saying that in the Tuscarora Forest, they're just not seeing very many deer. I'm not willing to go the whole way to the 31,000. So that's why I'm recommending 26,000 for 4B.

CHAIR:
Okay. We have a recommendation from Commissioner Weaner of 26,000 in 4B. Do I have any discussion on that number? Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
If I --- this, I see the population increasing right here. The population is increasing overall in that unit. But what Commissioner Weaner said in his Tuscarora Forest, he hears some grumbling there and so on. And I wonder if we couldn't just keep it at what it was last year rather than --- last year was --- I thought that said 28,000. It said 23,000. Okay.

CHAIR:
Okay. So do I understand that you are agreeing with the 26,000 recommendation ---

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yes.

CHAIR:
--- by Commissioner Weaner?

MR. SCHREFFLER:
Yes, I do.

CHAIR:
Okay. So 4B is the recommendation of 26,000. I have 4C at a 12-day concurrent. Do I have a recommendation for 4C?

MR. WEANER:
Yeah, we're getting into the part of the state here where we don't have Mr. Isabella or anyone else representing that area, so I'm basically going to suggest that we follow the recommendations listed here. They're recommending 35,000. I would recommend 35,000.

CHAIR:
Okay. Based on the fact that I'm on the wrong page, I better take a second here. 35,000 under 4C matches the recommendation on the decision chart. Is there any discussion on that 35,000? Commissioner Schreffler?
MR. SCHREFFLER:

Yes. I get a lot of contact from hunters, especially involved in Dauphin, Lebanon, and Berks Counties. I've been in that area. And I concur that going with the 35,000 --- it's a good number.

CHAIR:

Okay. So we have agreement. Any further discussion on 4C, 35,000? 4D is a split season. Do I have any recommendation for 4D?

MR. PUTNAM:

Yes, Mr. President. I'm from 4D, and like our other units, we have some very high productive farm land in 4D. We've got some very unproductive dry forests in 4D. So it's always going to be a quandary. I don't think we've drawn the units --- unit boundaries is going to significantly address that problem, but I would go with the recommendation of the staff at 36,000.

CHAIR:

I have a recommendation for 4D of 36,000. Any further discussion?

MR. WEANER:

Yeah, part of that area is in my area also, and I agree.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

I also am part of that area, too, and I concur.

CHAIR:

Okay. We've got complete agreement on something. That doesn't happen very often. We got to celebrate. Moving on, 4E, we have a split season. Do I have a recommendation for 4E?

MR. DELANEY:

Yes, President Martone. That's kind of --- a lot of it is in my area, but I'm going to follow through with the 28,000, which is fairly close to last year.

CHAIR:

28,000 for 4E. Matches the recommendation on the decision sheet for a split season. Is that correct?

MR. DELANEY:

That's correct.

CHAIR:

Okay. Any discussion on that? 5A is a 12-day concurrent. Do I have a recommendation for 5A?

MR. WEANER:

Yeah, we've been at 19,000 for a couple
years. People seem satisfied with that. We do have a anomaly of the state forest being right in the middle of our district. There are fewer deer like there are everywhere else, but in general, I'm satisfied with the number 19,000.

CHAIR:

Any further discussion on that 19,000?

Thank you. 5B, again, a 12-day concurrent. Do I have a proposal for 5B?

MR. WEANER:

Yeah, I'll continue along with the biologists' recommendation in this area as well. It's 51,000.

CHAIR:

5B is 51,000. Any further discussion on 5B? Commissioner Schreffler?

MR. SCHREFFLER:

Again, as I previously lived in the area of Lancaster, Lebanon, Dauphin County, Berks County, I get a lot of contact from that area. And I go back to that area and still occasionally hunt there. I feel that 51,000 is a good number.

CHAIR:

Thank you. Any further discussion?

51,000 for 5B. 5C, 12-day concurrent, special
regulation area. Do I have a recommendation?

MR. WEANER:
Yeah, I'm going to recommend --- I'll do
two of them at once. 5C and 5D, I would just go with
the recommendations presented. So for 5C, stabilize
at 111,000. And 5D, stabilize at 19,000.

CHAIR:
111,000 for 5C. And I got to turn the
page. 19,000 for 5D. Let me repeat that. 5C,
111,000. 5D, 19,000. Is that correct?

MR. WEANER:
Yes.

CHAIR:
Any further discussion on those?

MR. DELANEY:
Yes, President Martone. I have a
question for you, Director DuBrock. Do you think that
we'll sell 111,000 tags for 5C?

MR. DUBROCK:
The simple answer is we'll see.

MR. DELANEY:
That's not what I asked.

MR. DUBROCK:
We, in the past, I think we have exceeded
that number, so yeah, I'm optimistic that we will with
the concurrent season provide that additional
opportunity, yes.

MR. DELANEY:
Fair enough. Thank you.

CHAIR:
Okay. At this time, we have proposals
for all 22 Wildlife Management Units. I’m going to
read them quickly, and then I'll ask for a motion to
accept these numbers and second, further discussion,
and we'll vote. Is that acceptable? 1A, 42,000. 1B,
33,000. 2A, 59,000. 2B, 67,000. 2C, 50,000. 2D,
62,000. 2E, 21,000. 2F, 27,000. 2G, 33,000. 3A,
26,000. 3B, 40,000. 3C, 35,000. 3D, 39,000. 4A,
29,000. 4B, 26,000. 4C, 35,000. 4D, 36,000. 4E,
28,000. 5A, 19,000. 5B, 51,000. 5C, 111,000. 5D,
19,000. I feel like I just discussed one of my wife's
shopping trips.

MR. WEANER:
So moved.

CHAIR:
I wanted to also point out for the first
time nobody added all those up. Okay. Commissioner
Weaner, you have moved to accept this motion?

MR. WEANER:
Yes.
CHAIR:
Do I have a second?

MR. DELANEY:
So moved.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Delaney. Any further discussion on these numbers?

MR. WEANER:
Mr. President, I would like to say that this packet that we were presented with is outstanding. We got more information in here than I've ever seen before, and it's getting better each year. So I would commend the deer team and all those associated with this for the data that was presented and the way it was presented, the options that were presented. It's a very good system, and I appreciate it.

CHAIR:
I would concur with that completely. Any further discussions?

MR. SCHLEMMER:
I'd like to echo Commissioner Weaner.

MR. PUTNAM:
I would like to echo that, and I would also like to make a couple suggestions. One is anyone
who really cares about the deer program should look at these numbers, look at them very closely. We're seeing some pretty significant increases in the population on some of these units to the point where there's certainly at least one segment is a concern that we're going to lose many of the gains that we made over the years. And I would share that, that I don't want to see us lose the gains that we've made. But there is a tremendous amount of very good information and if people look at them you can see some of these units have almost doubled in population since 2004, 2006.

CHAIR:
Mr. DuBrock.

MR. DUBROCK:
If I just may note for those in the audience in particular that the document that you're referring to will be posted on our website probably early this afternoon.

MR. PUTNAM:
I have one more thing.

CHAIR:
Commissioner Putnam.

MR. PUTNAM:
Based on the way this discussion went
today, I think it would be much more productive if we could hold this discussion at our working group meeting, the exact same discussion we just held in our formal meeting, and allow the public to have a week or two weeks to see these numbers that we're suggesting and as much time as possible. And then comment to us. We've got public testimony yesterday in general about what they think we should do. But they don't have a chance to react to what we're actually doing. So I think we can move this discussion to a working group meeting. But then have maybe a follow-up discussion in the formal meeting would be a better way to do it.

CHAIR:

I agree, but I feel bad for our mailman. It's going to inundate us, but it's good. It's a good suggestion. Any further discussion? Hearing none, we proceed to vote. I'd like a show of hands. Those in favor of these allocations and the motion, signify by raising one hand.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR:

All those opposed, raise one hand? Mr. Secretary?

MR. PUTNAM:

Mr. President, the vote passes
unanimously.

CHAIR:

Thank you. At this time, I'm completely lost. I guess our final thing is we have the following Commission meeting dates approved for 2012. The date of June 25th to the 26th, 2012 in Harrisburg. September 24th, 2012, tentatively in Franklin, Pennsylvania, Venango County. And the proposed meeting date for January of 2013 of January 27th to the 29th again in Harrisburg. Are the Commissioners okay with these dates? Should we proceed with those dates?

MR. DELANEY:

Affirmative.

CHAIR:

Okay. Do I have any further discussion on those? I would like to point out that we have already determined the date for the working group meeting for June. It will be on Tuesday. I believe that's May 29th, the day after Memorial Day. And we'll also put that on the website, but we've determined that. So those of you who are interested in those working group meetings, either attending or watching them on the webcast, that will be May 29th. Okay. Before adjourn, is there any discussion from
the Board? Anything for the good of the order at this point? I think we've worn them out. At that time, do I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. SCHLEMMER: Motion.

CHAIR: Commissioner Schlemmer. Second?

MR. SCHREFFLER: Second.

CHAIR: Commissioner Schreffler. All those in favor of adjournment, signify by saying aye.

ALL AYES RESPOND

CHAIR: Opposed? Mr. Secretary.

MR. PUTNAM: Mr. President, the meeting is adjourned.

CHAIR: Thank you.

* * * * * * * *
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