

**REPORT OF THE
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING**

A Saltwater Sportfishing License

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



Senate Document No. 17

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1985**

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr., Chairman
Claude Bain, III
Keith Buttleman
J. Paul Councill, Jr.
Richard H. Cross, Jr.
V. Thomas Forehand
Raymond R. Guest, Jr.
James C. Harrison
L. Carl Herring, Jr.
Clarence A. Holland
J. T. Holland
W. Tayloe Murphy, Jr.
William A. Pruitt

STAFF

Legal and Research

Michael D. Ward, Staff Attorney
Martin G. Farber, Research Associate
Mary Elizabeth Cosler, Secretary

Administrative and Clerical

Office of Clerk, Senate of Virginia

**Report of the
Joint Subcommittee Studying a
Saltwater Sportfishing License
To
The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia
January, 1985**

To: Honorable Charles S. Robb, Governor of Virginia,
and
The General Assembly of Virginia

I. INTRODUCTION

The Joint Subcommittee Studying a Saltwater Sportfishing License was established pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution No. 68, by the 1984 Session of the General Assembly. The subcommittee was charged with studying the feasibility of establishing a saltwater sportfishing license in Virginia and considering the utilization of revenues that would be derived from such a license. The resolution further charged the Secretary of Commerce and Resources with the responsibility of establishing an advisory committee representing users of marine resources to assist the subcommittee in its work.

This document is submitted as the subcommittee's report on its 1984 activities.

II. 1984 ACTIVITIES

In response to SJR 68, the Marine Users Advisory Committee was established to address the key issues surrounding a saltwater sportfishing license. The Advisory Committee first met in Richmond in February, 1984, and then in Newport News in March, May and July, 1984.

The Marine Users Advisory Committee focused on the uses to which revenues from license sales could be applied, geographic areas to be covered by such a license, administration and enforcement, blanket licenses, exemptions, and reciprocity with other states. The group members were not asked to reach a consensus on whether or not a license should be required, but rather were asked to discuss how such a license, if enacted, could be fairly administered. The findings of the Marine Users Advisory Committee were submitted in a report to the subcommittee in August of 1984. A condensed version of this report is attached as Appendix A.

The joint subcommittee first met on September 14, 1984. Dr. Betty Diener, Secretary of Commerce and Resources, presented the report of the Marine Users Advisory Committee and outlined the recommendations of that group. The joint subcommittee was informed at this meeting that approximately \$4 million a year in revenue could be generated from the sale of such licenses. Secretary Diener also highlighted issues on which the Marine Users Advisory Committee had reached a consensus, which included:

1. A short-term license arrangement
2. A license fee of between \$5.00 and \$7.50
3. Blanket licenses for certain boats and piers
4. Certain exempted individuals and groups
5. Joint enforcement by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries
6. A reciprocity plan with other states.

At the initial meeting of the subcommittee, the members agreed that the best approach for

further considering the issues would be to condense the Marine Users Advisory Committee Report for public distribution and to hold public hearings in appropriate localities in the Commonwealth.

The subcommittee agreed that four public hearings should be held, one for each of the following areas: Richmond, Eastern Shore, Virginia Beach and Warsaw (Northern Neck area).

The first public hearing was held in Richmond on November 14, 1984. Speakers at this hearing urged that revenues from license sales be used for fishery management and that a citizen advisory board be established to provide input as to the expenditures from such revenues.

The second public hearing was held on November 27, 1984, on the Eastern Shore. Speakers at this hearing were generally opposed to a license program. Their statements included concerns that this license was an improper tax, that revenues raised would not be applied to the appropriate programs, that the license requirement would hinder tourism and business, and that the license could not be adequately enforced.

The third public hearing was held in Virginia Beach on November 28, 1984. A large turnout of concerned citizens and businessmen, as well as several area legislative representatives, addressed the joint subcommittee. The tone of the public statements was generally in opposition to a licensing program. Many speakers remarked on the potential negative impacts to tourism by such a license requirement. Concerns from other speakers included inadequate enforcement, using the funds for cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay, raising revenues before finding a specific plan for spending the funds, and the possibility of few benefits resulting from such a program.

The fourth public hearing was held on December 3, 1984, in Warsaw, Virginia. Overall, speakers at this hearing were somewhat supportive of the proposed licensing program. Several charter boat owners suggested that a licensing program in Virginia would help with alleviating confusion as to areas where Maryland licenses are required. Other speakers encouraged funds to be dedicated to resource enhancement, the use of a citizen advisory board to provide input to funding distributions, and the establishment of an effective saltwater sportfishing management program.

III. 1985 MEETING

A final meeting of the 1984 joint subcommittee was held in Richmond on January 14, 1985. Senator Gartlan suggested that the members review a copy of draft legislation that addressed the thirteen points on which the Marine Users Advisory Board had reached consensus. He explained that the draft (see Appendix B) was merely a working document, which represented an attempt to address the issues focused on by the Marine Users Advisory Committee, the joint subcommittee, and the general public during the meetings and hearings held in 1984.

Several members at the meeting expressed a desire to see the work of the joint subcommittee continued for another year. It was proposed that the study be continued and that the joint subcommittee's work during 1985 be directed towards refining the suggestions of the Marine Users Advisory Committee and the general public, making the public more aware of the issues, specifying where revenue from such a license would be spent, and fine tuning enforcement provisions. Subcommittee members also suggested using documents spelling out the license provisions and distributing draft legislation for future public hearings.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its studies during the past year, the Joint Subcommittee Studying a Saltwater Sportfishing License makes the following recommendations:

1. That the study on the feasibility of establishing a saltwater sportfishing license be continued and that the ten-member joint subcommittee make its recommendations to the Governor and the 1986 Session of the General Assembly. (See SJR 115 - Appendix C)
2. That the legislative and citizen members of the joint subcommittee continue to serve

during the 1985 study.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr. Chairman

Claude Bain, III

Keith Buttleman

J. Paul Council, Jr.

Richard H. Cross, Jr.

V. Thomas Forehand, Jr.

Raymond R. Guest, Jr.

James C. Harrison

L. Carl Herring, Jr.

Clarence A. Holland

J. T. Holland

W. Tayloe Murphy, Jr.

William A. Pruitt

APPENDIX A

CONDENSED REPORT
of the
MARINE USERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

to the

JOINT LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE
on a
SALTWATER SPORTFISHING LICENSE

October, 1984

MARINE USERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER
SALTWATER SPORTFISHING LICENSE

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>CONSTITUENCY REPRESENTED</u>	<u>RESIDENCE</u>
Claude Bain	Publisher and Editor, <u>VA/NC Fishing Report</u>	Norfolk
Wally Beauchamp	Virginia Anglers Club	Richmond
Fred Biddlecomb	Past President, Virginia Watermen's Association	Reedville
Bobby Cherrix	Acting President, Wachapreague Guides Association	Wachapreague
Glenn Croshaw	Member, Game Commission	Va. Beach
Pete Freeman	President, Working Watermen's Association	Hampton
J. C. Harrison	Harrison's Fishing Pier	Norfolk
Carl Herring	Conservation Council of Angling Clubs	Va. Beach
S. J. Hilton	Lure Manufacturer	Tappahannock
A. N. Hofmeyer	Chairman, Charles City Wetlands Board; Farmer	Hayes
Peck Humphries	Seafood Processor - Standard Products	Kilmarnock
Danny Cook	Seafood Processor - Standard Products	Kilmarnock
Jimmy Kelley	Small Menhaden Processor	Kilmarnock
Don Kuykendall	Charter Boat Captain, Former Waterman	Heathsville
Wil Laaksonen	Charter Boat Captain	Onancock
Randy Lewis	Wachapreague Inn and Marina	Wachapreague
Wallace Lewis	Charter Boat Captain	Reedville
Andy Lynn	Tackle Shop Owner	Occoquan
Ivan Mapp	Member, Marine Resources Commission	Va. Beach
Jim McHugh	Member-at-Large, Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council	Hampton
Wayne McLeskey	Owner of a Number of Virginia Beach Marinas	Va. Beach
Elizabeth C. Rogers	Sportswoman, Husband on Bd. of Dir. of CBF-Yorktown	Williamsburg
Joe Sparrow	Recreational Fisherman	Onancock
Donald Stiles	Commercial Fisherman and Charter Boat Captain	Chincoteague
Barry Truitt	Eastern Shore Marlin Club	Nassawadox
John Turner	Secretary, Bluewater Game Fish Association	Va. Beach
Ben Walls	Kings Creek Marina	Cape Charles
Charlie Ward	President, Tidewater Charter Boat Association	Va. Beach
Don West	President, Virginia Wildlife Federation	Richmond
Tom Winstead	Member, Virginia Watermen's Association	Kilmarnock

Table of Contents

I.	Fee Structure	1
II.	Areas Where a Saltwater License Would be Required .	6
III.	Potential Uses of Saltwater Sportfishing License Revenues	7
IV.	Administration and Enforcement	10
V.	Estimated Revenues	11

INTRODUCTION

The Marine Users Advisory Committee was established by the Secretary of Commerce and Resources, as provided by Senate Joint Resolution 68, to advise the Joint Legislative Subcommittee on a Saltwater Sportfishing License. The Advisory Committee first met in Richmond in February and then in Newport News in March, May and July, 1984.

The purpose of the Advisory Committee was to address the key issues surrounding a saltwater sportfishing license. A major issue was the uses to which revenues from license sales could be put and included resources management, habitat improvement, fish propagation and translocation, public fishing access, administration of licensing, law enforcement, and information and education. Other issues addressed were whether blanket licenses or exemptions should be provided and to which groups, reciprocity with other states, and the geographic area to be covered by license requirements. The group members were not asked to reach a consensus on whether or not a license should be required, but rather were asked to discuss how such a license, if enacted, could be fairly administered.

The Marine Users Advisory Committee was able to reach consensus on a number of these key issues. The following sections discuss these issues and the Advisory Committee's findings in more detail. Perhaps most significant was their finding that a license could raise around \$3.5 million per year. In cases where no consensus was reached, the issue is stated and the various positions outlined.

Consensus of the Marine Users Advisory Committee
Concerning Questions Raised During Its Study

I. FEE STRUCTURE

The Marine Users Advisory Committee tried to consider all relevant possibilities for structuring saltwater sportfishing license fees. Issues such as individual versus group licenses, short term licenses, and exemptions from a license program were discussed.

A. Persons to whom a saltwater sportfishing license should apply

Consensus was reached by the Marine Users Advisory Committee that a saltwater sportfishing license should apply to the recreational taking of fish with hook and line, and by any method of spearing or gigging. The Committee recommends that care should be taken in defining what recreational fishing means.

B. Cost of an individual saltwater sportfishing license

Though opinions of committee members were fairly evenly divided as to whether a saltwater sportfishing license should cost \$7.50 or \$5.00, there were no strong feelings on the actual difference. However, two important considerations were noted. Virginia should not set up a price structure that would put Virginia at a disadvantage to Maryland. Also, the license fee should be commensurate with the value of the programs considered.

C. "Weekend" or short term license

The consensus of the Committee was that there should be a short term license. The group did not have strong feelings about the cost or number of days covered, so they decided to let these points be determined at a later date.

D. "Blanket" licenses for charter boats, head boats, diving boats, private boats and commercial fishing piers

There was basic consensus among the Advisory Committee members, with some objections, to allowing blanket license fees for charter boats, head boats, diving boats and commercial fishing piers (Option III in Tables 3 and 4 of Part V). The primary reason for a blanket license would be to make licensing more convenient for the operators of these vessels and piers. There was considerable concern among the head boat and pier operators that since much of their clientele decides on a whim to go fishing, many customers are not likely to have fishing licenses when they arrive at the facility to fish. Since the volume of traffic handled by the head boats and piers is often quite large over a short time interval, the issuance of licenses by the operators would cause

extreme delays. Charter boat operators would prefer to buy a blanket license due to the service they could provide their customers, especially since many arrive the night before fishing from out-of-state, and would likely not have licenses.

A major objection against these blanket licenses is that less revenue would be generated. Since many more licenses for individual fishermen could be sold if blanket licenses were not issued, total revenues from the direct sale of licenses could be higher (see Option I, Tables 3 and 4 of Part V). Also, since federal Dingell-Johnson funds available to the state are partially based on the number of licenses sold, more of these funds can be obtained if only the individual fishermen are licensed.

Another objection to issuing blanket licenses is that data on fishing effort will be lost. A key tool needed for the development of fisheries management plans is the amount of fishing effort. The basic element needed for estimating fishing effort is the number of people that fish. Methods exist to estimate how often they fish and how many fish they catch, but at base is needed of the number of anglers.

In the event blanket licenses were offered to charterboats, headboats, diving boats and piers, one method to obtain the fishing effort data would be to require the operators to keep records of the number of people per day that used their facilities to fish. These records would be confidential (i.e. not accessible by the IRS) and should not impose an undue effort on the operators.

The Committee believes strongly that if a blanket license were offered to charterboats, headboats and diving boats, that the boats should be Coast Guard approved prior to the issuance of such a license. Committee members believe that there are numerous charterboats operating without Coast Guard certification, and that unless the Coast Guard certification number were required as a prerequisite to obtaining a blanket sportfishing license, confusion on the status of these illegal charterboats would be furthered. For example, clients would see the blanket license displayed on the side of the boat, and would believe the boat to be properly certified, when it might not be. The suggestion was also made that perhaps the captain of the boat should also be required to be certified prior to the issuance of the blanket license, but since more than one captain might pilot such a boat, this might prove unworkable.

While there is a basic consensus of the Marine Users Advisory Committee that blanket licenses for charterboats, headboats, diving boats and piers should be allowed, there are mixed opinions concerning the blanket licensing of private boats. Committee respondents to a mailed-out questionnaire were evenly divided as to whether private boat licenses should be allowed. However, at the 5/3/84 committee meeting, most members were against the issuing of private boat licenses. A few committee members were strongly in favor of issuing private boat licenses, but they believed all

resident saltwater boats should be licensed, whether they fish or not. One member in favor of licensing all private boats indicated that all users of the Bay should be taxed to help the Bay, while another member indicated that enforcement and general administrative costs could be reduced through the simplification of a boat tax and decal.

While many persons in opposition to a private boat license were concerned about revenue losses, other problems were also indicated. Again, fishing effort data would be lost, and since a large number of people fish from private boats, and since private individuals most likely would not keep records on the number of people fishing from their boats, very serious gaps in the data would be incurred. It was noted that some people have more than one boat for saltwater fishing for use depending on the weather and type of fish desired, and a mandatory annual license for all boats a person might own could be prohibitively expensive.

The question was raised that if a mandatory blanket boat license were required, should it apply to all boats, or just those actively engaged in recreational fishing.

The committee indicated that daily boat rental operators should not be allowed to purchase blanket licenses, and therefore lessees would need an individual saltwater sportfishing license.

E. Fee structures for "blanket" licenses

Consensus among members of the Advisory Committee was developed on the possible fee structure for blanket licenses for charter boats, head boats, diving boats and piers. Committee members were asked, through the mailed-out questionnaire, to indicate what these blanket licenses should cost. The mid-point of the range of values indicated by the respondents are shown in Table 1, as are the corresponding fees in Maryland's Chesapeake Bay sportfishing license program.

Both the questionnaire mailed out to the Advisory Committee and the Maryland law considered vessel sizes carrying six fishermen or fewer, and those carrying seven fishermen or more. However, at the advisory committee meeting on 5/3/84, the head boat operators indicated they think vessels carrying 7 to 49 passengers should pay less for a license than those carrying 50 or more. The Virginia Federation of Anglers also indicated that, to some extent, the price of a blanket license should be equitable to the number of people covered.

Thus, the following fee structures, as summarized in Table 1, were agreed to by consensus at the May 3 meeting of the Advisory Committee. Since many charter boats can only carry four people, the committee indicated a license fee of \$100 per year would be most equitable for boats carrying six or fewer persons. Boats carrying seven to forty-nine persons would pay \$250 per year, and boats carrying 50 or more persons would pay \$400 per year. A spokesman for the commercial fishing pier owners indicated that piers would be able to absorb a \$500 license fee into their operating costs without raising admission prices, and so this figure was agreed to by committee consensus.

Table 1.

Optional Saltwater Sportfishing "Blanket" License Fees
For Charterboats, Headboats, Diving Boats and Commercial Piers

Number in State	Number of Fishermen In Boat	Average # of people per year per vessel or pier	Mid-Point of Values Indicated in 4/25/84 Questionnaire	Maryland Chesapeake Bay License Law	Consensus of 5/3/84 Advisory Committee
* 250 boats	6 or fewer	400	\$ 240	\$ 200	\$100
+ 24 boats	7 to 49	2,500	450	240	250
+ 6 boats	50 or more	3,500	450	240	400
10 piers	-	10,000	608	500	500

- * Persons knowledgeable in the subject estimate there are approximately 200 full time charterboats in Virginia, with another 150 part-time charterboats used as a tax write-off. Therefore it is estimated that 250 might buy a blanket license.
- + Based on estimates by persons knowledgeable in the subject.

The Committee recommends that persons who buy season passes to piers to be required to purchase individual sportfishing licenses.

F. Exemptions from a saltwater license program

The Advisory Committee basically agreed that they would prefer the same exemptions from the requirement to purchase a recreational saltwater sportfishing license as currently exist in the freshwater license program.

The following exemptions to a saltwater sportfishing license program were agreed to by consensus of the Advisory Committee.

1. Persons under 16 years of age and persons 65 or more years of age (special permit not required).
2. Organized groups of veterans residing in hospitals (special permit required).
3. Organized groups of physically or mentally handicapped persons (special permit required).
4. School classes fishing as a group with an instructor (special permit required).
5. Youths at nonprofit youth camps fishing in waters adjacent to their camp (special permit required).
6. Veterans with a permanent and total service-connected disability (special permit required).
7. Property owners and their immediate family fishing from their land adjoining water (special permit not required).
8. Residents of state juvenile correction institutions (special permit required).
9. Patients in a hospital that buys a license (license required).

A suggestion for obtaining data on the number of people fishing under these nine exemptions listed above was raised by the Committee. It was suggested that perhaps free fishing licenses should be distributed to the members of the various exempted groups. While it was recognized by the Committee that this would involve a considerable bureaucratic effort without any financial return, it would be one method of improving the data on the number of persons annually fishing in Virginia's saltwater. The Game Commission estimates that approximately 30% of the freshwater fishing public is excluded by their license exemptions, with almost all the exclusions being due to the age exemption. Less than 200 people per year are excluded due to exemptions #2-9 above.

Committee members feel strongly that the posting of Free Fishing Areas should not be allowed. Though this exemption is allowed in Maryland's license program, the Advisory Committee strongly objected, primarily due to the loss of revenue.

G. Nonresident license fees

The Advisory Committee concurs that nonresidents of Virginia should be charged the same fee as residents for a saltwater sportfishing license.

H. Reciprocity with other states

The Advisory Committee concurs that Virginia should honor those saltwater sportfishing licenses issued by states that honor Virginia's saltwater sportfishing licenses.

II. AREAS WHERE A SALTWATER LICENSE WOULD BE REQUIRED

In its consideration of the area potentially encompassed by a saltwater sportfishing license, the Marine Users Advisory Committee explored various options for both the seaward boundary line and the freshwater/saltwater boundary line.

A. Seaward boundary line

The Advisory Committee is divided in its assessment of the area that should be encompassed by the requirements of a saltwater sportfishing license program. Some members think it should only apply to the Chesapeake Bay, while most members think it should also include seaside Eastern Shore and the Atlantic Ocean, so as to maximize license revenues. Some members believe enforcement could be a problem at the Bay mouth if the Atlantic Ocean were not included, though other members disagree.

Some members are concerned that since Maryland and North Carolina do not have a recreational license for fishing in the ocean, such a license in Virginia might pose a problem with tourism. However, other members do not agree that it would hurt tourism, and suggest that it might convince the neighboring states to implement an Atlantic Ocean recreational fishing license.

Most of the Committee members believe that one of the strongest cases for the inclusion of the seaside Eastern Shore and Atlantic Ocean under the provisions of the license fees has to do with the management of the fish stocks. All of the major recreational fish species migrate into the Atlantic Ocean for much of the year. Effective management of the species will require management of the fish stocks while they are in the ocean too. A license program that includes the ocean would provide monies for the management of the species, while they are in the ocean, from

those people who fish in the ocean. Also, data on the number of people fishing for the stocks while they are in the ocean would be obtained.

B. Freshwater/saltwater boundary line

Distinct lines will be established on the tidal rivers, above which freshwater licenses will be required and below which saltwater licenses will be required. In many cases a distinct structure such as bridge spanning the river was chosen so that the demarkation could be easily identified. It is suggested that a grace area of approximately 100 yards on both sides of the structure be established such that either fishing license would suffice. This grace area is needed so that persons fishing from the bridge would not need two licenses to account for tidal drift of their bait. These lines, arrived at per agreement between the Virginia Marine Resources Commission and the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries are as follows:

Nottoway River - Entirely freshwater.

Blackwater River - Entirely freshwater.

Back Bay - Entirely freshwater.

*James River - The line from Dancing Point to New Sunken Meadows Creek.

Chickahominy River - Barrett's Ferry (Route 5) Bridge.

*Pamunkey River - Route 33 Bridge.

*Mattaponi River - Route 33 Bridge.

*~~Rappahannock River - Route 360 Bridge at Tappahannock.~~

Piankatank River - Route 17/33 Bridge.

~~Nomini Creek - Route 202 Bridge.~~

Mattox Creek - Route 205 Bridge.

All creeks entering Potomac River above Colonial Beach -
Freshwater license required.

Freshwater license required on all creeks entering the James and York Rivers above the Route 17 Bridge and on all creeks entering the Rappahannock upstream of the Middlesex-Essex County lines and in Lancaster Creek above the Route 606 Bridge.

Saltwater license required on all tidal creeks on the Eastern Shore.

*This is the same line that designates the closed spawning reach for striped bass.

III. POTENTIAL USES OF SALTWATER SPORTFISHING LICENSE REVENUES

The Committee strongly recommends that revenues raised by a saltwater license program be put in a special dedicated fund to be used only for the enhancement of recreational saltwater fishing, as described above in the allocation priority. These revenues would therefore not be put either in the state's General Fund, nor would they be used for general Chesapeake Bay cleanup.

In addition, the Committee strongly recommends that the allocation of the use of those revenues would receive continuing input from some sort of governing board of "bona fide" recreational fishermen.

Programs for which to use license revenues were developed through a series of consensus building processes. After consideration the Marine Users Advisory Committee decided to accept the proposals of the Virginia Federation of Anglers. The Committee thus indicated that revenues raised by a saltwater license program should be allocated upon the following priority:

1. Resource Enhancement, Management, and Enforcement
2. Habitat Enhancement, Protection and Development and Artificial Reef Programs
3. Socio/Economic Studies
4. Research Programs
5. Access Improvement

In addition, other programs were suggested and adopted by Committee consensus.

These programs are:

1. A permanent catch/effort survey system that would incorporate catch size and composition.
2. Studies of the factors that affect the availability of fish to fishermen such as
 - a. Studies of recruitment mechanisms.
 - b. Studies of the distribution and abundance of fish as related to environmental factors, food availability, etc.
 - c. Studies of the effect of toxic substances and other man-induced factors on fish availability.
3. The coordination of state efforts with the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission on important issues.

Table 2.

Programs Proposed for Financing
with License Fees

Resource Enhancement - means increasing the numbers of fish. This can be addressed by stocking sexually mature shad and herring in their original spawning areas above dams. Also, hatching and rearing facilities could be developed for striped bass fingerlings.

Resource Management - means developing fisheries management plans to provide for a fair and equitable harvest of sportfish by both commercial and recreational fishermen such that a maximum sustainable yield can be maintained.

Enforcement - would mean hiring four additional game wardens and buying two new boats for CGIF, and hiring eight additional patrol officers, one dispatcher and one mechanic to put on an additional work shift on some of MRC's boats. These two agencies would enforce the rules and regulations of the fisheries management plans.

Habitat Enhancement, Protection and Development - means improving, buying and providing areas critical to the development of individual sportfish species. For example, some species may require marshes of either a specific type or in a specific location as nursery grounds. Other species require fishways through existing dams to return to their ancestral spawning grounds.

Artificial Reef Programs - means the placement of properly designed structures in tidal water to provide both cover for young fish and good fishing locations in otherwise poor fishing areas.

Socio/Economic Studies - means investigating the marine recreational fishery and determining who fishes, what they catch, how many anglers there are, etc. This will help provide the data needed to develop fisheries management plans, and will also provide political clout.

Research Programs - means paying for research specifically designed to benefit sportfish and to benefit their habitat and the food chain upon which they depend.

Access Improvement - means improving the opportunities for anglers to enjoy the sport of fishing by providing parking lots, ramps, bridge walkways, etc.

Catch/Effort Survey System - means interviewing anglers to determine how many fish are caught, their size and species, and how long it took to catch those fish.

Studies of Recruitment Mechanisms - means determining those process that bring more young fish into the species population each year.

IV. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The next sections pertain to the administration and enforcement of a saltwater sportfishing license. The responses to the questions were jointly prepared by, and agreed to, by the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries and the Marine Resources Commission. At the July 24 meeting of the Marine Users Advisory Committee, these joint agency recommendations were adopted by Committee consensus.

A. Where should fishing licenses be sold?

All 650 Game Commission License Agents will sell licenses. All 25 Marine Resources Commission Agents and all field offices and district inspectors will sell saltwater fishing licenses. The Marine Resources Commission will appoint any additional agents required to make the licenses more readily available in the coastal areas. Emphasis will be placed upon securing agents who purchase licenses for resale. The recommended agent fee is 25¢ per license.

B. What state agency shall administer the program?

The program shall be jointly administered by the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries and the Virginia Marine Resources Commission. The functions shall be shared as follows:

1. License Sales - As stated above.
2. Funds Administration - Funds from license sales and federal aid will go to a special account. The budget will be prepared jointly; MRC budgeting for functions it performs and CGIF doing the same. The total budget will be approved by both agencies and submitted to the Cabinet Secretary for inclusion in the Governor's Budget.
3. Dingell-Johnson Coordination - Initial federal guidance places responsibility for monitoring the funds with CGIF. Details of coordination must be developed along federal guidelines. MRC will prepare individual projects and forward to CGIF for submission to Fish and Wildlife Service.
4. Public Information and Education - CGIF vehicles will be used to publish information in support of the saltwater license and conservation program.
5. Program Delivery
 - (1) Construction of fishing and boating access - CGIF will perform.
 - (2) Resource management - Administered by MRC.
 - (3) Habitat management - Administered by MRC.
 - (4) Regulation promulgation - Administered by MRC.
 - (5) Law Enforcement - Administered jointly by MRC and CGIF.

C. How will law enforcement be handled?

The enforcement of laws relating to saltwater sportfishing will be handled jointly by the Marine Resources Commission and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries. Through close coordination, common communications systems, scheduling and joint training, the two agencies will share this responsibility. MRC will concentrate its efforts upon all commercial fishing activities, wherever they may occur, and sportfishing on the high seas out to three miles and in the open waters of Chesapeake Bay. The CGIF will work the shores of the bay, the surf, piers, boat landings, and the many tidal estuaries, rivers, and creeks.

D. Budget

Total costs for the joint administration, information processing and enforcement of the program are estimated to be 10 to 15% of the license revenues. Due to the two basically different areas of the Bay patrolled by the two agencies (MRC and CGIF) and the differences in public education capabilities, their staffing and equipment needs would vary accordingly. To cover administrative needs, the CGIF would employ one information officer and one clerk, while the MRC would employ one accountant and one information officer. To handle enforcement needs, the CGIF would hire four game wardens and buy two boats with trailers, while the MRC would hire eight patrol officers, one dispatcher, and one mechanic to add extra shifts to existing patrol boats.

V. ESTIMATED REVENUES

This economic analysis was developed to aid the Marine Users Advisory Committee in its study of the issues concerning a saltwater sportfishing license in Virginia. Estimates of the revenues that might accrue from various types of license fee structures were determined so that the Committee could weight, for example, the relative merits of such ideas as "blanket" licenses for various groups, versus the amount of revenue that might be lost from the fewer number of individual licenses sold.

Since federal Dingell-Johnson (D-J) funds are available to states based to a large extent on the number of licenses sold in a state, a decrease in the number of licenses sold also decreases a state's D-J allotment. (For a more complete explanation of D-J funding, see Part B "The Dingell-Johnson Funding Mechanism.")

A. Potential License Structure Options

This analysis is organized to show revenues that would accrue from five different licensing structures. In Tables 3 and 4, these five licensing structures are called Options I through V. Table 3 is a summary of the revenue subtotals that are fully developed in Table 4. Table 5 explains the assumptions made and estimates used in this analysis.

Option I. No Blanket Licenses

Revenues are estimated for the situation where licenses would only be sold to individual anglers (as is basically true for the freshwater program).

Option II. Blanket Licenses for All Boats and Piers

Revenues are estimated for the situation where blanket licenses are issued to all charter boats, headboats, diving boats, registered private boats that are used in saltwater, piers, and to individual anglers wishing to purchase a license.

Option III. Blanket Licenses Except Private Boats

In this case, blanket licenses would be available to charter boats, head boats, diving boats, piers and individual anglers, but not to private boats. (It is assumed throughout this analysis that all of the piers and fishing boats for hire would buy blanket licenses if available.)

Option IV. Blanket Licenses with Private Boat License Optional

In this case, blanket licenses would be available to charter boats, head boats, diving boats, piers, individual anglers, and to private boats on an optional basis. (In contrast to Option II where blanket licenses would be required.) It is estimated that 50% of the registered private boats would be licensed with a blanket license, and that four individual licenses for each of these licensed private boats would be lost from the licensing program each year.

Option V. Blanket Licenses with Private Boat License
Optional and Combination Freshwater/Half
Price Saltwater License Available

This case is identical to Option IV, except that it also allows the holder of a freshwater license to buy a saltwater license for half price. Thus, the difference in revenues generated by Options IV and V indicate the amount of revenue that could be lost by implementing the combination license. The structure of Option V is identical to the basic saltwater license program in Maryland (except for license fees).

Table 3.

SUMMARY TABLE
Annual Revenues Expected to Accrue from Various
Saltwater Sportfishing License Structures

Options	Subtotal of License Revenues	Subtotal of Saltwater D-J Based on current Law	Total (rounded to thousands)
I. NO BLANKET LICENSES			
A. \$7.50 License	\$4,500,000	\$ 336,672	\$4,837,000

B. \$5.00 License	3,093,750	336,672	3,430,000
II. BLANKET LICENSES FOR ALL BOATS AND PIERS			
A. \$7.50 License	3,904,280	222,782	4,127,000

B. \$5.00 License	3,066,260	222,782	3,289,000
III. BLANKET LICENSES EXCEPT PRIVATE BOATS			
A. \$7.50 License	3,581,289	265,803	3,847,000

B. \$5.00 License	2,474,114	265,803	2,740,000
IV. BLANKET LICENSES WITH PRIVATE BOAT LICENSE OPTIONAL			
A. \$7.50 License	3,455,687	222,782	3,678,000

B. \$5.00 License	2,572,807	222,782	2,796,000
V. BLANKET LICENSES WITH PRIVATE BOAT OPTIONAL AND COMBINATION FRESHWATER/HALF PRICE SALTWATER LICENSE			
A. \$7.50 License	2,996,588	193,820	3,190,000

B. \$5.00 License	2,343,258	193,820	2,537,000

Table 4.

**Annual Revenues Expected to Accrue from Various
Saltwater Sportfishing License Structures**

Options	Revenues from Individual Licenses		Revenues from Piers \$500/Pier	Revenues from Fishing Boats for Hire			Revenues from Private Boats \$25/Boat	Subtotal of License Revenues	D-J Funds		Total Revenue (License Subt plus D-J rounded to thousand)
	Full Term (75% of Buyers)	Short Term (25%) \$2.50/lic.		6 or Fewer Persons \$100/Boat	7 to 49 Persons \$250/Boat	50 or more Persons \$400/Boat			Total D-J to State	Subtotal D-J to Saltwater	
NO BLANKET LICENSES											
\$7.50 Lic.	\$4,078,125	\$ 421,875	0	0	0	0	0	\$4,500,000	\$1,001,200	\$336,672	\$ 4,837,000
\$5.00 Lic.	2,671,875	421,875	0	0	0	0	0	3,093,750	1,001,200	336,672	3,430,000
*BLANKET LICENSES FOR ALL BOATS AND PIERS											
\$7.50 Lic.	2,430,258	251,406	\$ 4,998	\$ 24,938	\$ 5,994	\$ 2,398	\$1,184,288	3,904,280	886,423	222,782	4,127,000
\$5.00 License	1,592,238	251,406	4,998	24,938	5,994	2,398	1,184,288	3,066,260	886,423	222,782	3,289,000
. BLANKET LICENSES EXCEPT PRIVATE BOATS											
\$7.50 License	3,210,808	332,153	4,998	24,938	5,994	2,398	0	3,581,289	929,488	265,803	3,847,000
\$5.00 License	2,103,633	332,153	4,998	24,938	5,994	2,398	0	2,474,114	929,488	265,803	2,740,000
+BLANKET LICENSES WITH PRIVATE BOAT LICENSE OPTIONAL											
\$7.50 License	2,560,352	264,863	4,998	24,938	5,994	2,398	592,144	3,455,687	886,423	222,782	3,678,000
\$5.00 License	1,677,472	264,863	4,998	24,938	5,994	2,398	592,144	2,572,807	886,423	222,782	2,796,000
+BLANKET LICENSES WITH PRIVATE BOAT OPTIONAL AND COMBINATION FRESHWATER/HALF PRICE SALTWATER LICENSE											
\$7.50 License	2,101,252	264,864	4,988	24,938	5,994	2,398	592,144	2,996,588	823,188	193,820	3,190,000
\$5.00 License	1,447,922	264,864	4,988	24,938	5,994	2,398	592,144	2,343,258	823,188	193,820	2,537,000

‡ licenses per boat estimated to be lost since all boats are automatically licensed.

‡ licenses per boat estimated to be lost since only those boat owners expecting several people would buy a boat license.

Table 5.

Estimates and Assumptions Used in the Development of
Annual Revenues Expected to Accrue from Various
Saltwater Sportfishing License Structures

Individual Licenses

500,000 licensable resident saltwater fishermen
500,000 licensable non-resident saltwater fishermen of which
50% purchase licenses
750,000 total individual saltwater licenses could be sold in
Virginia
25% of individual licenses would be short term
586,000 freshwater licenses sold per year

Pier Licenses

10 piers in Virginia
42,000 individual licenses would not be sold in Virginia if
blanket pier licenses were issued, determined as follows:
 $(100 \text{ people/day}) \times (100 \text{ fishing days}) \times$
 $(75\% \text{ weather factor}) \times (70\% \text{ non-repeat customers}) \times$
 $(80\% \text{ unlicensed}) \times (10 \text{ piers}).$

Boats for Hire

Capacity of 6 or fewer - 250 boats in Virginia - blanket
licenses would lose 72,000 individual licenses determined as
follows:

$(250 \text{ boats}) \times (400 \text{ people/year}) \times$
 $(90\% \text{ non-repeat customers}) \times (80\% \text{ unlicensed})$

Capacity of 7 to 49 - 24 boats in Virginia - blanket licenses
would lose 33,600 individual licenses determined as follows:

$(24 \text{ boats}) \times (2500 \text{ people per year}) \times$
 $(70\% \text{ non-repeat customers}) \times (80\% \text{ unlicensed})$

Capacity of 50 or more - 6 boats in Virginia - blanket licenses
would lose 11,760 individual licenses, determined as follows:

$(6 \text{ boats}) \times (3500 \text{ people/year}) \times$
 $(70\% \text{ non-repeat customers}) \times (80\% \text{ unlicensed})$

Table 5 (Continued)

Private Boat Licenses

145,000 boats are licensed in Virginia, and about 50% are less than 16' and thus basically are not capable of fishing in saltwater. If 2/3 of the remaining boats go to saltwater, then there are 47,850 registered boats in saltwater.

In Option II, where all registered boats are licensed, then 2 individual fishing licenses per boat were estimated to be lost (95,700).

In Options IV and V, where private boat licenses are optional, half the registered boats were estimated to buy blanket licenses (23,925) and 4 individual fishing licenses per boat were estimated to be lost (95,700).

Dingell-Johnson Fund

If saltwater licenses were issued:

It is estimated that Virginia would receive \$400,000 based on land area.

It is estimated that Virginia would receive approximately \$.45 per license sold.

In determining the portion of Virginia's D-J funds to be used for saltwater programs, the estimated number of saltwater licenses sold as combination fresh/saltwater licenses (26%) were not included in the ratio of freshwater to saltwater licenses. This is because these combination licenses can only be counted as one license when applying for D-J funds from F&WS.

B. The Dingell-Johnson Funding Mechanism

Dingell-Johnson (D-J) funds are monies that the federal government collects as a tax on certain products used while fishing. Congress recently passed legislation which greatly expanded this tax base by including such items as imported fishing accessories and by including a portion of the revenues collected through the Motorboat Fuel Tax.

D-J tax revenues are available for redistribution back to states from the Fish and Wildlife Service (F&WS). States first spend money on projects, then apply to F&WS for 75% of the project cost. Projects acceptable for this federal refund include fisheries habitat improvement, access, fisheries education, etc. By law, 10% of the gross rebate to a state must be spent on access improvement. In addition, another 10% may be spent on fisheries education.

The amount of D-J funds available to states is determined on the basis of the state's area and the number of licensed anglers. It is estimated that the state will receive approximately \$400,000 based on its area. In addition, it is estimated that the state will receive approximately \$.45 in D-J funds for each license, freshwater or saltwater, sold in Virginia. A combination freshwater and saltwater license can only count as one license, since license figures submitted for D-J funds are supposed to represent the number of individual anglers fishing in state.

The 1984 legislation that expanded the D-J tax base also placed restrictions on the allocation of revenues between freshwater and saltwater programs within a state. The agency responsible for the freshwater conservation program in a state must initially receive the same amount of money that it has been receiving in the past (about \$400,000/yr in Virginia). The remainder of the state's total D-J allocation can then be divided between the freshwater and saltwater programs as the state deems most appropriate. For the purposes of estimating the amount of D-J funds that would become available to saltwater projects in Virginia, the ratio of the number of freshwater to saltwater licenses was used to arbitrarily divide this remainder of the D-J funds (total D-J allocation minus \$400,000) between freshwater and saltwater projects.

It is not clear whether a \$.25 license sold to children under 16 and senior citizens over 65 would be accepted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as a valid license credited toward the D-J funding program. However, if it were accepted as a valid license, the net state gain is estimated to be approximately \$100,000. This is figured on the basis of 250,000 licenses sold, with a \$.45 D-J return on each license, minus license agent fees of \$.25 per license and \$12,500 for printing costs. Additional administrative costs for managing this additional data may or may not be significant.

The Selling of "Recreational Catch"

Most Advisory Committee members hold the strong opinion that there should be a separate license for all fishermen who sell their catch. This requirement would apply to all hook and line fishermen, giggers and spearfishermen.

Though the selling of "recreational catch" does not have anything to do with a saltwater sportfishing license and should not be considered as an issue related to the license, the Committee has very strong feelings about the management implications of such practices. Thus, the Committee is indicating its strongly held belief that legislative action should be taken to remedy this practice.

APPENDIX B

SENATE BILL NO. HOUSE BILL NO.

A BILL to amend and reenact § 29-11 of the Code of Virginia and to amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered 28.1-23.2, and by adding in Chapter 4 of Title 28.1, an article numbered 1.1, consisting of sections numbered 28.1-52.1 through 28.1-52.8, relating to the Saltwater Sportfishing License.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That § 29-11 of the Code of Virginia is amended and reenacted and that the Code of Virginia is amended by adding a section numbered 28.1-23.2, and by adding in Chapter 4 of Title 28.1, an article numbered 1.1, consisting of sections 28.1-57.2 through 28.1-57.9 as follows:

28.1-23.2. Authority for administration of saltwater sportfishing licenses.—The Commission shall have the authority to enter into interagency agreements and to make such regulations as it deems necessary to administer and enforce the provisions establishing a saltwater sportfishing license program (28.1-57.2 et seq.).

ARTICLE 1.1.

SALTWATER SPORTFISHING LICENSE.

§ 28.1-57.2. License requirements.—A. It shall be unlawful for any person to take or catch fish, other than shellfish, in the tidal waters of the Commonwealth without first obtaining a Saltwater Sportfishing License unless the person;

1. Possesses a valid fishing license pursuant to § 28.1-47 and has paid one or more taxes required by § 28.1-48;

2. Holds a valid Maryland Tidewater Recreational License or any other state, sportfishing license, provided the Commissioner has determined that the requirements for such a license are saltwater substantially the same as those required for such a Virginia license.

3. Is exempt under the provision of § 28.1-57.8.

For the purposes of this article, “sportfishing” or “taking and catching” means the recreational taking of fish with hook and line, and by any method of spearing or gigging.

B. Each license shall bear the name, place of residence and signature of the licensees and shall state the term of the license. Except as provided in § 28.1-57.4(2), each license shall expire on December 31 of the year of issue. No license shall be transferable.

§ 28.1-57.3. Administration and Enforcement.—The Virginia Marine Resources Commission and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries shall be jointly responsible for the administration and the enforcement of the provisions of this article and shall, by interagency agreement, determine which areas are “tidal areas of the Commonwealth” as well as delineate between freshwater and saltwater areas. These agencies shall also develop regulations providing for the sale of saltwater sportfishing licenses and the administration of funds from license sales, coordinating funds from the Federal Dingell-Johnson Act and developing a program for public information and education in support of the Saltwater Sportfishing License. Such regulations shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of this article.

§ 28.1-57.4. Types of licenses; fees.—The following shall be the schedule of fees required of certain categories of persons sportfishing:

1. Individual licenses for Virginia residents and non-residents shall cost five dollars annually.

2. *Weekend licenses shall be available to individual residents or nonresidents which would be effective for three days at the cost of two dollars.*

3. *Persons operating a charter boat shall pay an annual license fee as follows:*

a. *Boats carrying six or fewer persons, \$100 annually.*

b. *Boats carrying seven to forty-nine persons, \$250 annually.*

c. *Boats carrying fifty or more persons, \$400 annually.*

4. *Persons owning or operating commercial piers shall pay an annual license fee of \$500.*

5. *Special group licenses shall be available for such groups as designated in § 28.1-57.9(B) at a rate set by regulation.*

For the sale of each saltwater sportfishing license, a twenty-five cent agent fee shall be retained by each agent designated by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission or the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries to sell such licenses. These agencies shall also provide by their regulations for the times, places and manner of sale of the saltwater sportfishing licenses.

§ 28.1-57.5. Virginia Marine Resources Fund.—There is hereby established as a special fund in the state treasury, a Virginia Marine Resources Fund, consisting of revenues raised by the sale of saltwater sportfishing licenses and moneys derived from other sources. The fund shall be used only for the enhancement of recreational saltwater fishing as follows:

1. *For resource enhancement and management of saltwater fish species including, but not limited to, the stocking of fish, translocating species, establishing size and creek limitations, and restricting commercial catches.*

2. *For the enforcement of regulations established for resource enhancement and for administering the saltwater sportfishing license program.*

3. *For habitat enhancement and protection, the development of artificial reefs, and for research programs designed to benefit sportfish, game fish, and the food chain on which they depend.*

4. *For social economic studies of the marine recreational fishery to determine who fishes, what they catch, and how many anglers fish in Virginia tidal areas.*

5. *For access improvement to increase the opportunities for anglers to enjoy sportfishing. The Virginia Marine Resources Commission and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries shall jointly administer the Virginia Marine Resources Fund with the aid of the Marine Resources Citizens Advisory Board.*

6. *For improvements recommended by the Marine Resources Citizen Advisory Board and for expenses incurred by the Board.*

§ 28.1-57.6. Marine Resources Citizen Advisory Board.—In order to provide input into the allocation of revenues raised through the saltwater sportfishing licenses and to provide guidance as to the disbursement of expenditures from the Marine Resources Fund, there shall be created the Marine Resources Citizen Advisory Board; hereinafter referred to as the "Board". This Board shall consist of nine citizen members who are representative of the saltwater sportfishing community in the Commonwealth. Three shall be appointed by the Governor, three shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House and three shall be appointed by Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The terms of office of each member shall be for four years, however, of the members first appointed, three shall be appointed for terms of two years, three shall be appointed for terms of three years and three shall be appointed for terms of four years. No member of the Board who serves a full four year term shall be eligible for appointment during the four year period

following the expiration of his term. The Board shall designate one of its members as chairman. The Board shall meet on the call of the chairman or five members at such times as the chairman or the members may deem necessary and at such places they may designate. Members of the Board shall be reimbursed for all reasonable and necessary expenses incurred as a result of membership on the Board from the Marine Resources Fund.

§ 28.1-57.7. Annual report.—The Virginia Marine Resources Commission and the Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries shall jointly prepare an annual report which will be made available to the public showing (i) fees generated from license sales and (ii) expenditures made from the Virginia Marine Resources Fund.

§ 28.1-57.8. Exemptions.—A. The following persons shall be exempt from the requirements of this article:

- 1. Persons under sixteen years of age and persons sixty-five or more years of age.*
- 2. Property owners and their immediate families fishing from their land adjoining saltwater.*
- 3. Persons fishing from a charter or a commercial pier if the charter boat or pier owner or operator has a license as provided in § 28.1-57.4.*

B. The following groups and persons are not required to have an individual saltwater sportfishing license, but must be under a special group licenses as provided for in § 28.1-57.4(5):

- 1. Organized groups of veterans residing in hospitals.*
- 2. Organized groups of physically or mentally handicapped persons.*
- 3. School classes fishing as a group with an instructor.*
- 4. Youths at nonprofit youth camps fishing in waters adjacent to their camp.*
- 5. Veterans with permanent and total service-connected disability.*
- 6. Residents of state juvenile correction institutions.*
- 7. Patients in a hospital which buys a special group license.*

§ 29-11. General powers of the Commission.—In addition to the specific authority elsewhere herein conferred, the Commission shall have general power and authority to acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, gift or otherwise, such lands and waters anywhere in this State Commonwealth as it may deem expedient and proper; to establish and erect thereon and therein such buildings, structures, dams, lakes and ponds as it may deem necessary and proper, and to conduct and carry on such operations for the preservation and propagation of game birds, game animals, fish and other wildlife as it may deem proper to increase, replenish and restock the lands and inland waters of the State Commonwealth; to establish rules and regulations for the administration of the saltwater sportfishing license program (§ 28.1-57.2 et seq.) and to enter interagency agreements to coordinate its duties as designated thereunder ; to purchase, lease or otherwise acquire lands and waters for game and fish refuges, preserves or public shooting and fishing, and to establish such lands and waters under appropriate regulations; to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise lands and structures for use as public landings, wharves, or docks; to establish and erect thereon such structures or other improvements as it deems necessary; and to control the use of all such public landings, wharves or docks by appropriate regulation; to acquire and introduce any new species of game birds, game animals or fish on the lands and within the waters in the State; to adopt such other means as it may deem necessary to restock, replenish and increase any depleted native species of game birds, game animals, or fish; to have educational matter pertaining to wildlife published and distributed; to hold exhibits throughout the State Commonwealth for the purpose of interesting school children, agriculturists and other persons in the preservation and propagation of the wildlife of this State Commonwealth ; and to employ speakers and lecturers to disseminate information concerning the wildlife of the State Commonwealth and the protection, replenishment and propagation thereof; and to have and to exercise such other powers and to do such other things as it may deem advisable for the

conservation, protection, replenishment, propagation of and increasing the supply of game birds, game animals and fish and other wildlife of the *State Commonwealth* . In addition to those powers already enumerated, the Commission may permit the educational television entities in Virginia to use land under the jurisdiction of the Commission for the site location of towers and other transmission equipment as required for the most efficient operation of their facilities.

2. That the provisions of this act shall take effect on January 1, 1986.

APPENDIX C

LD9095118

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 116

Offered January 22, 1985

Requesting the General Assembly to create a joint subcommittee to study the problems associated with excessive phosphorus in the waters of the Commonwealth.

Patrons—Gartlan and Andrews, H. B.

Referred to Committee on Rules

WHEREAS, one of the major findings of the Environmental Protection Agency's Chesapeake Bay Program was that nutrient enrichment is a major reason for water quality degradation in the Bay and its tributaries; and

WHEREAS, nutrient phosphorus is present in excess in the Bay's tributaries and originates from industrial and sewage treatment plants as well as from run-off from agricultural, forestal and urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, the 1984 Task Force Report on the Costs and Benefits of a Phosphate Detergent Ban written pursuant to SJR No. 54 presents a number of findings and conclusions which need further study in relation to the problem of excessive phosphorus in waters of the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, there are a number of strategies which could be used to deal with the problem of excessive phosphorus, including a phosphate detergent ban and upgrading sewage treatment plants with phosphorus removal equipment; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That a joint subcommittee be established to study the problems associated with excessive phosphorus in state waters. The subcommittee shall examine:

1. The reductions in phosphorus loads which should be achieved in each river;
2. The nutrient effluent standard or standards which should be established to accomplish such reductions;
3. Short-term and long-term costs and benefits of various technologies available for meeting the applicable standards; and
4. Responsibility of state and local governments to pay for capital, operation and maintenance costs of phosphorus removal or other treatment requirements in excess of federal standards; and, be it

RESOLVED FURTHER, That the joint subcommittee shall consist of nine members. Two members shall be from the Senate Committee on Finance, one member from the Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Natural Resources, and one member from the Senate Committee on Local Government, all to be appointed by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. Two members shall be from the House Committee on Appropriations, two from the House Committee on Conservation and Natural Resources, and one member from the House Committee on Chesapeake and its Tributaries, all to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; and, be it

RESOLVED FINALLY, That the State Water Control Board, the Soil and Water Conservation Commission and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science shall provide such assistance as is necessary for the work of the joint subcommittee.

The joint subcommittee shall complete its work in time to submit its recommendation to the 1986 Session of the General Assembly.

The costs of this study, including direct and indirect costs, are estimated to be \$21,315.