

Public Commentary

This plan was posted to the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission website on August 9, 2011 for public review and comment. A news release was issued announcing the posting and it set a deadline for comments of September 9, 2011. A total of 33 comments were received from Pennsylvania anglers.

One comment dealt with the structure of the plan. It requested tables describing the section limits on the Major Rivers and Small Rivers as they are currently managed. These tables have been added as an appendix in the final version of this plan.

The remaining 32 comments can be summarized in several ways.

Water Specific Comments

Many comments did not reference this Plan at all, but dealt strictly with how they wanted specific walleye fisheries managed. Twenty-nine of the 32 comments dealt with the management of one or more specific waters. The waters that received commentary are listed below along with the number of comments received. Some responses mentioned multiple waters, therefore, the total number of water specific comments exceeds the total number of responses. Most comments regarding the Susquehanna and Allegheny Rivers dealt with the stocking moratorium instituted in 2008.

Water	No. of Comments
Allegheny Reservoir	2
Allegheny River/Kinzua Dam Tailrace	6
Blue Marsh Lake	1
Brandywine Creek	1
Colver Reservoir	1
Glendale Lake	1
Hills Creek Lake	1
Juniata River	1
Justus Lake	1
Kahle Lake	1
Lake Carey	1
Lake Marburg	1
Lehigh River	2
Meshoppen Creek	1
Pymatuning Reservoir	1
Rose Valley Lake	1
Schuylkill River	1
Shohola Lake	1
Struble Lake	2
Susquehanna River	8
Tunkhannock Creek	1
West Branch Susquehanna River	1
Wyalusing Creek	1

Yellow Creek Lake	1
Youghiogheny Reservoir	4
Total	43

The three remaining responses did not mention specific waters. Those comments were directed towards statewide or regional issues.

Comment Subjects

All commenters provided opinions on the Fisheries Management strategies they would like to see instituted on their waters or generally statewide. The subjects of all 32 comments fell into two broad categories; stock more walleye or reduce harvest (lower the creel limit and/or raise the size limit). Some of the longer comments covered both subjects, therefore, the total number exceeds the total number of responses (32). None of the commentors wanted to increase their opportunity to harvest walleye by reducing the size limit or increasing the creel limit. The number of comments on each subject is presented below.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>No. of Comments</u>
Stock More Walleye	25
Reduce Harvest	10

Two other themes that appeared multiple times were anglers would like to see more WCOs patrolling their waters (3 comments) and the PFBC spends too much money on trout (4 comments).

This Plan discussed the PFBC's strategies for determining where and how we would stock walleye and how we would manage our waters capable of natural reproduction. Comments regarding the management of specific waters were forwarded to the respective Area Fisheries Manager.

This Plan did not evaluate current statewide regulations for walleye. That analysis is a future project of the Fisheries Management Division.