

**Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks  
Commission Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, August 17, 2023  
Pittsburg State University  
Bicknell Center VIP Room  
1711 S Homer St, Pittsburg, KS  
including a  
Virtual ZOOM Meeting Option**

**Approved** Subject to  
**9/7/23** Commission  
Approval

The August 17, 2023, meeting of the Kansas Wildlife and Parks Commission was called to order by Chairman Gerald Lauber at 12:00 p.m.

Chairman Lauber and Commissioners Lauren Queal Sill, Troy Sporer, Delia Lister, Emerick Cross were present in person; Warren Gfeller was present via Zoom. Phil Escareno came in after break on Zoom.

**II. INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSIONERS AND GUESTS**

The Commissioners and Department staff introduced themselves (Attendance Roster – Exhibit A).

**III. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO AGENDA ITEMS**

Mission Statement – Exhibit B and Agenda - Exhibit C.

**IV. APPROVAL OF THE ~~March 9, 2023~~, April 27, 2023 MEETING MINUTES**

Commissioner Troy Sporer moved to approve the minutes, Commissioner Lauren Sill second. *Approved* (Minutes – Exhibit D).

**V. DEPARTMENT REPORT**

Chairman Lauber – Doing something a little different today. To start with we will have Secretary Loveless say a few words to preface this meeting. Then we will go to public hearing.

Secretary Loveless – There has been much discussion as a result of the two-hour session we had on supplemental feeding in June. To spite our efforts there is miscommunication going on around the topic. We will continue to update our information on our website and seek public input. Our website will be the best current source for information on any topics having to do with the agency. We do not have a recommendation from the agency to the Commission on supplemental feeding or baiting. We have no plans to vote on this. Typically, the process is, we have a recommendation from staff, it goes to the commission, and we start a series of public meetings during commission meetings on the topic. It goes at least three times in front of the commission before a vote ever occurs. The idea of something happening fast is not the way we

work, never have and never will. There will always be ample time. Topics will be published ahead of meetings, and it will come up multiple times with opportunities for public discussion as well as staff and commissioners. However, there is no recommendation from staff, no plan by the commission to have a vote on this. What we do have is a series of public meetings, with the first one scheduled for September 21 in Manhattan. Specific details on that meeting will come out on our website. This will be the first of a series of public meetings that will give us a chance to share information. Share best information based on science and listen to public about their thoughts. When the public calls and asks our staff for a recommendation on feeding we do caution them about risks, based on science we have on deer and other wildlife and putting out piles of bait. It is our obligation to pass that on. We encourage public landowners to put in food plots and continue other habitat improvements to benefit wildlife in general.

Chairman Lauber – We have seven meetings a year scheduled. If something gets recommended by staff, the first time it comes up formally is in general discussion; if no thumbs down it moves to workshop session, usually two. So, three meetings at least before we take a vote. Not elected, we are appointed officials. We don't make regulations easily; we have lots of public input and discussion. I got several emails that left the impression that something was going to be voted on today. We tried, through the website, to indicate what we were doing. Yes, we had two-hour discussion in June, and it was of some value, but we are a long way from doing anything on this. Before we get to public comments, I want to go through public hearing items first.

**A. Public Hearing** (Notice of Public Hearing – Exhibit E)

1. KAR 115-25-7 Antelope; open season, bag limit and permits – Matt Peek, furbearer research biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit F). Three changes to this regulation. First, it establishes durable season dates, so we don't have to come back every year with specific dates that need updated. Season dates remain standard, a technicality in way the regulation reads. Second, proposing eliminating late part of archery pronghorn season that typically occurs the second half of October. We have had poor production from pronghorn out west for several years, most likely related to drought. Over last five years we have reduced firearm and muzzleloader permits by approximately 30% but unlimited archery permits have remained unchanged. This is a way for archery hunters to share opportunity loss. In previous years approximately eight percent of the total archery harvest has come from that October season. Also, 90% of archery hunt during early season we are maintaining and only 20% of archery pronghorn hunters hunt in this late season we are getting rid of. Still maintaining time period that is most important to archery hunters and where most of harvest occurs. Third, is proposed adjustment, minor decreases, in permit allocations, Unit 2 muzzleloader permits from 24 to 22, Unit 17 firearm permits, from 32 to 30, a decline of four total permits. All the others remain the same. Chairman Lauber – One of you referred to preference point creep at one point also.

**Commissioner Lauren Sill moved to approve KAR 115-25-7 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Delia Lister second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit G):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-25-7 passed 6-0.**

2. KAR 115-25-8 Elk; open season, bag limit and permit – Matt Peek, furbearer research biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit H). The only change is durable language for season dates, so we don't have to come back every year. All the seasons recommended are standard relative to previous years, effectively no change to season dates. This regulation also established permit allocations on Fort Riley limited draw permits. We are proposing 12 any-elk and 18 antlerless-only, same number from recent years.

**Commissioner Warren Gfeller moved to approve KAR 115-25-8 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Delia Lister second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit I):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-25-8 passed 6-0.**

3. KAR 115-25-9 Deer; open season, bag limit and permits – Levi Jaster, big game coordinator, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit J). We are putting in durable language as well, so we don't have to continually revisit this. We will be back if we need changes made. Everything follows what we have historically done. However, we did add six days of antlerless whitetail hunting in October in Unit 12 because of increasing deer populations and strong sentiment from ag producers there, crop damage is getting severe. Otherwise follow traditional dates.

**Commissioner Lauren Sill moved to approve KAR 115-25-9 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Troy Sporer second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit K):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-25-9 passed 6-0.**

4. KAR 115-25-9a Deer; open season, bag limit, and permits; additional considerations; Ft. Riley (military deer seasons) – Levi Jaster, big game program coordinator, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit L). We are exploring ways to make this durable but dates on military subunits seasons usually change every year. These are their recommendations, working with the agency to set this up. Often, Fort Riley creates additional opportunities for non-military hunters because of days outside of regular seasons. Need to have these approved to set these dates for this year. Chairman Lauber – In the event the military deer seasons can't get a public hearing in time, will seasons be the same as year before or have to wait to legally open a season? Jaster – I understand they could be open under statewide season for that year but need approval if different than statewide. Chairman Lauber – There would be a season, but not what they would want and what we would prefer to give them? Jaster – There is good potential in some years where they would actually have to close because of their activities necessary for their missions. Having these exceptions from statewide season lets everything be tuned to their activities and avoids closure.

**Commissioner Delia Lister moved to approve KAR 115-25-9a as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Troy Sporer second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit M):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-25-9a passed 6-0.**

Levi Jaster – I would like to thank Department of Administration Attorney General Office for focusing on these regulations. They put in some extra effort to get these done on time this year.

5. KAR 115-7-10. Fishing; special provisions (and Kansas Aquatic Nuisance Species reference document) – Bryan Sowards, fisheries division director, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit N). We want to remove the term "Asian carp" throughout the reference document to "silver and bighead carp" to be more specific to species we are talking about. We want to add Lebo City Lake to the designated waters list because of zebra mussel infestation noted in 2021. Add McPherson State Fishing Lake due to rusty crayfish, that is the only water body we have collected them from, there abundance is still low but keeping an eye on it. Chairman Lauber – Currently there are restrictions on movement of crawdads, is that so they can't be moved to a different watershed? Sowards – Correct, that was passed a few years ago, live crayfish and mussels. Chairman Lauber – Can they be seined and used for bait in certain circumstances? Sowards -Within water body they were collected from.

**Commissioner Emerick Cross moved to approve KAR 115-7-10 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Warren Gfeller second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit O):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-7-10 passed 6-0.**

6. KAR 115-8-10. Importation and possession of certain wildlife; prohibition, permit requirement, and restrictions – Bryan Sowards, fisheries division director, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit P). This relates back to rusty crayfish, we want to add this list to the prohibited species that are illegal to import, possess or release without a permit issued by the Secretary.

**Commissioner Delia Lister moved to approve KAR 115-8-10 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Emerick Cross second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit Q):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-8-10 passed 6-0.**

7. KAR 115-25-14. Fishing: creel limit, size limit, possession limit, and open season (and KS Special Size Limits, Creel Limits, and Bait Restriction Tables, known as reference document) – Bryan Sowards, fisheries division director, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit R). I will just list some of note. We are proposing to remove 10-inch minimum length limit on crappie at Cedar Bluff Reservoir. Instituted in 2018, based on response to poor recruitment and rapid growth, since then the lake filled up in 2019 and growth has slowed, so moot point now. We are proposing a 6-inch to 9-inch protected slot on bluegill and other sunfish at Antelope Lake in Graham County, part of an expanding program. We have five lakes we are doing this in. Proposing an 18-inch minimum length limit on saugeye at Pomona and Melvern Reservoirs We have been stocking saugeye on top of an existing walleye population as part of a research project to see if they do better than walleye population. We already have 18-inch minimum length limit on walleye and due to the species identification concerns we want to add saugeye at same minimum length limit. Last item is changes to trout water. Added Kink Lake-Emporia, a new trout water partnering with the state, add as type 1 water. Add OJ Watson

Park-Wichita as a Type 1 trout water. Remove Wichita KDOT-East Lake. Colby Villa High Lake, from type 1 to Type 2. Sherman County Smoky Gardens Lake from Type 1 to Type 2. trout water list. Under (4)(b), changed dates from November 1 through April 15 to “during the Type 1 waters are waterbodies where most people would be going in the wintertime to catch trout and not a lot of opportunity for other things, so would need a trout stamp there during trout season, November through April. Type II waters are if you are fishing for and possessing trout you need the trout permit during those times. Those are lakes where people want to winter fish for crappie or other opportunities, and we don’t want to restrict those activities by making them have a trout permit.

**Commissioner Emerick Cross moved to approve KAR 115-25-14 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Lauren Sill second.**

**The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit S):**

<b>Commissioner Cross</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Escareno</b>	<b>Not present</b>
<b>Commissioner Gfeller</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lister</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sill</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Sporer</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lauber</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**The motion to approve KAR 115-25-14 passed 6-0.**

Chairman Lauber – We passed seven regulations in a short amount of time; however, we workshopped those multiple times, at least two, maybe four or more. By the time they get to public hearing most of the controversial issues have been dealt with. Sometimes there is a lot of public comment on a vote and sometimes not.

## **VI. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Chairman Lauber – Limit presentation from 3-5 minutes. One person asked for time on agenda.

Steve Ford, retired WL biology professor at Pittsburg State - I want to welcome you back to the area, it is appreciated. Bringing up an issue that is not new, user fees on public lands. Everyone knows hunters and anglers have carried freight for wildlife conservation for over 100 years. In last several decades a lot of non-game use has been put on public lands, like bird watching, camping, sightseeing, hiking, etc. Use from non-consumptive users as consumptive users. Like to see non-consumptive users have a piece of that pie in term of paying for use. Not talking about a big fee, but maybe a \$15 sticker that would go on a car on an annual basis. Propose they would get credit back when they buy a hunting or fishing license. A way for non-consumptive users to pay their fair share. I know there are new license plates and things like Chickadee Checkoff, those are volunteer. This would be potential, if not lucrative addition, to wildlife and park offers. Considered before, a good idea, logical and encourage you to consider it one more time. I have been a member of Pittsburg for 38 years, as a landowner, a professor, had a lot of students. Been a member hunter ed group for 35 years, and a member of Audubon for that long and still am. Every step of the way, in all those adventures, KDWP has helped me all the time in various ways. Appreciate it in all those endeavors, an integral part. Thank you, proud to be associated with you. Chairman Lauber – On the drawing board, the non-consumptive user fee, we don’t

want to make it too high. But if you use it, you should pay a modest fee and might feel better about it. Secretary Loveless – Steve is pillar in this corner of the state, in education and environmental issues for decades. We have had discussions on this and continue to. Would it be possible for non-hunters and non-anglers to buy a license. Most of you know we use those licenses to leverage federal fees and that would bring more money to Kansas. Those users typically don't want to buy a license but are glad to pay a fee. We are having discussions because we do want to reach out to them and give them the opportunity to contribute. The other thing is that would allow us to connect with them and start communicating to get better feedback on what their priorities are. We will continue to work on that, but not a found solution yet.

Greg Bieker, Hays – Thank you for letting me come up here. We are appreciative of KDWP employees and the work you do every day and appreciative of the input. Lifelong Kansas resident and a deer hunter. I have a presentation that outlines current deer situation from the view of hundreds of in-state and out-of-state hunters, landowners, business owners and citizens (handout - Exhibit T), entitled 2023 Kansas deer assessment. I would like this to be conversational and serve as a guide to foster comments and questions. The current landscape and proposed ban on supplemental feeding, means of take and seeing harvest rates versus, some of the advances in technology, harvest rates versus CWD deaths and some of the recommended solutions. We believe Kansas is in the top three deer hunting destination states, which includes, Iowa and Illinois, then Kansas. We want to see resources continue to thrive. Here to work together for a solution that works for deer herds, and everybody involved. I am here because KDWP is considering a hundred percent ban of supplemental feeding on all private land in Kansas. The driving factor behind proposed ban, from what I understand, is disease transmission and concern of chronic wasting disease (CWD) impacting the deer population as a long-term resource. Offer all-encompassing view. From my perspective, and others, there is declining population in western Kansas, not in eastern Kansas. Do we know what it is from? I don't think so but began in 2018 and 2019. I sent messages on Facebook that deer numbers were in trouble, especially mature bucks, both whitetail and mule deer. I got no reply. So began five years ago and now in 2023 you decide to take action by banning supplemental feeding based on unknown outcome. It is important to look at what banning feeding would do and its goal. What are we trying to solve? CWD right. Continue to hear that somebody should not shoot over corn pile. Okay, that is a fair case, conversations in other states. We are trying to ban supplemental feeding 100%, year-round. Is it fair chase or is it CWD motive you are trying to solve? How is Kansas performing versus other states that have banned supplemental feeding? How many deer do we test and from which counties? Are we seeing deaths from CWD? How do we keep deer off deer scrapes, licking branches and spitting prions? The answers are, we don't know. I have reached out for information, some from KDWP, but a lot they couldn't provide. For relative importance, Wisconsin will test roughly 202,000 deer next year, Missouri over 200,000 and Kansas will test about 2,022, probably less than half a percent of harvest rate. We don't know which counties tests were in. If you walk into oncology floor and test people that are sick with cancer, you will get high rate; if 80% of Americans have cancer, that is not a fair conversation because testing people on oncology floor. We must look at state as entire state. Who wins if we ban supplemental feeding? We don't know because no definitive data. Losers are youth and disabled hunters, new hunters, Kansas residents with tax burden, business owners, local co-ops and KDWP. Financial impact, have \$24.1 billion budget set by Governor. Take \$100 and spend on supplemental feeding, that will change hands five times. In Ellis County, pay 9.25% sales tax on

\$100, that's \$45 that the state will lose, massive financial impact. Looking at trail cameras this year, saw four deer over six years old, less than 120 inches and less than eight points. Why isn't CWD impacting them? Also, saw four-year-old deer that are 140-175 inches and higher and they are all dead, it's not CWD, it is harvest. Nobody wants to go home with a seven point, 7-year-old, they want to kill 160-inch four-year-old. So, if CWD is the problem, why is it not killing all the older mature deer. Laser focus on CWD. The deer season in Kansas is 121 days. We have seen weapon advancements, tag sales have risen significantly, and drought causing EHD in western Kansas. In 2023, youth and disabled season starts on September 3, muzzleloader and archery on September 11, rifle on November 30 and ends December 30. Let's talk evolution of that deer season. Kansas removes resident draw and allows an any season tag for residents. I have shot deer with muzzleloader, bow and rifle. That is hard on our population. We have allowed over the counter muzzleloader mule deer tags and increased nonresident permits from 30,000 to 55,000. We allowed any caliber rim fire and legalized crossbows. Muzzleloaders used to be able to shoot only 50-200 yards, now a 50 caliber at 2-4-inch group can shoot 100 yards and new ones can shoot 30- to 400-yard range in 40 calibers with 1-inch group at 100 yards. That is a single shot rifle. My bow used to shoot 40-50 yards at 300 feet per second, now 60-80 yards at 350-360 feet per second; and crossbows have gone from 360 feet per second to 500 feet per second. We must protect our deer. There are many other advancements in technology as well like trail cameras, cell cameras, Garmin IQ sites, Bog Pods, etc. CWD isn't the only problem, let's look at all the problems and make people go back to picking one season. Protect our resource, nobody knows how many deer are being harvested each year. You send out surveys, but we don't send them back, I am nine out of nine and never sent one back because don't want people to know where you are hunting and what you are doing. I propose we develop a baseline for where we are at now. Have people check in deer, charge \$5 more for this process and get a baseline. If change is needed, consider changes that are proven. Educate us on what we can do, if you want us to reduce size of piles, tell us there. We are all here for the same solution, we want our deer sustainable for the next generation. Give us solutions and not make monumental decisions that financially impacts our organization as much as this does without data. Chairman Lauber – Do you sell deer feed? Bieker – Yes, I have a second business beyond my 8 to 5 job in Hays. For every \$100 spent, I collect 9.2% sales tax and they use that to fund whatever, and that dollar will change hands five times. I sell feed to help youth, disabled and other hunters have best chance of success. If you take supplemental feeding away that would be a crying shame. Unknown Audience – Why not leave off doe season. Kills potential breeding. Bieker – We sell deer feed to give hunters the best opportunity, if you shut us down, we will sell feed to Oklahoma, Missouri or Nebraska and we will send our tax dollars there.

Michael Dutschmann, Texas – Hunting here since 2017, bought ground in 2020, and I am for banning baiting. If you had asked me three years ago, I would have said no, I wanted it easy, but last year or two thinking about it and came up with different conclusion. Not to say I know about CWD, they tell me it spreads on saliva and contact. If I have a glass of water, and you know I have a disease, would you drink from that cup of water? I don't think so. It is simple, gravity feeders have holes and deer stick their noses in one hole, so have all that saliva. They drop corn on the ground and other deer come eat that. Don't know how much banning will help but it won't hurt getting rid of it. I look at other animals, seen coyotes sneak up to feeders, hawks get quail at feeders, here we are looking at coyote and everyone is looking at the corn. If we quit all of it, we are doing our job, banning bait would not hurt one thing. Might hurt pocketbooks and might not shoot a deer every year but it would preserve what we got here. Second thing, money will hurt. What is tag quota for nonresidents, 55,000? If banned next year still have them up here hunting. I hunted Missouri for 20 years and they didn't allow baiting and they were still packed



with nonresident hunters. Outfitters don't spend money, they stay at lodge and eat there; they may get gas on the way up or back, but they eat and stay there or stay at motels. If you ban bait, they will hunt harder and eat at local restaurants. People think it will hurt, not selling feed but nobody looking at the guy in the restaurant, it is about ethics. I don't consider myself a big sportsman, I am old school, brought up in church and it says the animals are here to be protected and we eat them. I come up for big horns but eat the meat. Lot of good hunters not here today who will not hunt over a feeder. Lot of farmers for it too. Talked to farmer, aggravated at nonresident hunters, have feed and camera, and don't come up and hunt until they see a deer on the camera. That used to be me too. I feel banning is the best way to go.

Commissioner Sporer – At Milford, why thinking about our two-hour discussion; 30 minutes was on CWD and 1½ hours on other logical reasons why we should be doing it. Listening is important. We are talking about having sessions and having you listen to what we heard on what makes it important. All I have heard today is CWD, more than that to this.

Keith Mark (did not sign register), lifelong Kansas resident – I am a landowner, a deer hunter and founder and president of Hunter Nation. You might've seen our organization; we're trying to protect hunting rights across the country. I recently sued the state of Wisconsin because they didn't have the wolf hunting season that they're statute said they were. Supposed to have because of unelected bureaucrats. I think they know more than the elected people that we hire. No offense. And we won that case in court (Handout – Hunter Nation – Exhibit U). Glad getting points from both sides. Asked you to provide one peer review study, it does not exist, that will confirm CWD does what they say it does. We can bring in Dr. Deer, who is probably the leading biologist in the country on deer; study doesn't exist. If CWD is the problem, then why not just let it die? You are not seeing entire picture of what happens if we ban feeding. The commission admits it will shrink the Kansas deer population. Aldo Leopold, one of the leading conservationists, talked about deer population in America over 80 years ago and he said that in 48 states, 47 had deer, one state that didn't was Kansas. Now over 640,000, a great success story. We have had supplemental deer feeding the entire time. Always allowed. We went from no deer to top three hunting destinations because what we've done with our deer herd. Talked about the ethics of it. I don't think we should tell other people what ethics is, I hunt with a bow but if you want to shoot it with a gun or crossbow you should be able to. You can use an outfitter or not and feed deer or don't use deer feed. We are an aging out demographic, we have to recruit, but are fighting against exciting things kids have thrown at them. If you take young people to hunt and they see no deer, may not come back, but proven fact, they see more deer close up if you use supplemental feed. We want to recruit more hunters. I used to host a television show on the Outdoor Channel; I'm not high fence guy but took out a Congressional medal of Honor hunter to hunt in high fence and some people against that, but he can't do what you do, can't walk, how can they tell him it was unethical. We should not dictate as long as legal. Kansas will lose revenue; \$700 million comes in because of hunting every year. A lot of things bring those dollars in. Deer hunting is largest hunting revenue generator in Kansas. If CWD is such a problem, then how come states that ban supplements have the highest rates. How come some states that have never allowed have high rates. If two and two does not equal four, somebody is lying. They say deer feeding is bad for deer. You have mad scientists in the world that are putting together concoctions of feed. Why supplemental feed for cows, sheep, rabbits, or dogs? We want them to have healthy diets. Supplement with healthy nutrition and you have a healthy herd, proven fact.

People with high fence deer regulate their diet. You had a grand expert telling you that if deer eats corn it was like sending kid to McDonalds every day. So, are we supposed to ban those farmers or regulate what they plant. That is silly. I think we are the stakeholders, the deer hunters. The outfitters are in the field more than anyone else, but you have not called to ask how many deer we have or ask about health of the deer. Kansas rural property values have increased annually, if they implement this ban, it will be bad for recruitment of hunting, will hurt Kansas economy and hurt property values. Think long and hard and do that to, we the people. Go to HunterNation.org. Commissioner Gfeller – Do you agree with first speaker that deer in western Kansas is declining? Mark – I do. Do you agree there is a drought? And how has the game bird population done?

Ray Huff, farmer, in education for 12 years. - I own and operate farm that has been in my family for eight generations. I am heavily invested in southeast Kansas. In early 2000s, first experienced baiting on farm we don't own, land leased to outfitter, I thought it was a waste of good corn. That small pile of corn eventually affected my hopes and dreams as a hunter and steward of the land. I was never given any land only land I was farming by sharecropping with other landowners. I purchased some of my own land, mix of farmland, pasture, CRP and hardwoods. I am an avid outdoorsman and am drawn to the woods and prairie. As a hunter education instructor for two years in my classroom and we discussed stages of hunting. The shooting state is when you just want to shoot things, trophy stage is when you select the animals you kill, and sportsman phase is more about the experience rather than the kill. I have eaten tags in pursuit of animals. It is about the land I own, at first all about me, I wanted to create sanctuary for big deer, but I have passion to share my love of outdoors with others. My intentions with my land changed again to providing hunting opportunities to kids with life threatening illnesses. In 2017, I started One Arrow Initiative, funded 100% by me, no profit or income at all. I want to share the outdoors with kids who may not have another opportunity. On my land I set up hunts for two kids, both with life-threatening issues. My goal is simple, get these kids a mature buck. I spent days with the kids in blinds and one by one the bucks started to disappear, by predators, EHD, injuries or other hunters. An outfitter leased 160 acres across the road and within a year set up tree stands and two large piles of corn. Twelve years of working two jobs, preparing and habitat work and in one season, entire generation of 4-, 5- and 6-year-old deer wiped out. I don't give up easily, but I know when I have been beat. I can't financially compete with the amount of corn being put out and I grow it. Puts a bad taste in my mouth and I have leased out my land. I keep a few acres for my family and myself to hunt. I understand guys are running a business and that income depends on ability to get their clients on whitetail or turkey, but should it come at the cost of another man's passion? Or at the cost of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. That is the world's most successful system of policies and laws to restore and safeguard fish and wildlife and their habitats through sound science and active management. This is not a decree from the federal government to deny rights as some TV personalities or probating communities might think. Countless reports and studies have shown the detriment to wildlife caused by baiting. From increased nest predators to turkey poult dye off to aflatoxins and vomitoxins being fed to wild animals. The science is there in deer simply do not need supplemental feeding to survive. Whitetail deer have been around for thousands of years and have done just fine. Supplemental feeding or baiting, through Pavlovian conditioning is only beneficial for the hunter. A world-famous author and poet wrote a short story titled The Elk. To summarize, he speaks of the natural beauty of our lands across this great nation, but he speaks specifically of the Wissahickon Valley west of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. On one particular occasion, he spent a day floating in a skiff in a brook in this valley and while floating elk appeared not 40 or 50 yards away. He was in awe and elegantly describes not only the beauty of

the animal, but also the incredible moment he was now witnessing. And then just a few moments later, a man emerged from the thicket. His hand outstretched and full of salt. He soon realized that this elk was a pet. And in one of the final sentences of this story, he simply states, thus ended my romance of the elk. Ladies and gentlemen, the woods are where the wild things are. I believe that we have the opportunity to define what wild things are for future generations. And more importantly, preserve the romance that we have with them. I believe that today you can vote on this if you choose to and put a ban in place immediately, but I realize that's probably not going to happen. But you can make this commitment, with the intention of protecting our wildlife from the uncertainties of baiting. We will be having more meetings in the future to discuss this ban and whether it should be lifted or kept in place indefinitely. It's time for Kansas to move towards the sportsman stage. Where it's more about the experience and sharing with others than it is about the kill. I believe this is a sword worth falling on.

Steve Hall, resident Potwin, graduate Wichita State, degree in education. - Third generation farmer, Butler County where we run cattle. In 2018, invested \$300,000 to \$400,000, in a hunting lodge, I am an outfitter and my passion to take people hunting. We can accommodate eight hunters at a time. Hunting is about the sport. I am no different than the gentleman before. Not here to slaughter animals or overtake what God put on this earth, that is not intent of my business. The intent is to take people hunting and I do it profitably and give them return on their investment. I lease a lot of ground, farm a couple thousand. I have 24 different hunting properties in south-central Kansas. I utilize commercial, supplemental, nutritional deer feeding program developed by deer feeding experts. Deer do not come to my feed 24/7 365 days a year. I have 16 cameras. An average mature buck visits once every week, they rotate through and run a 3-4-mile radius around my property. They browse the feeder as part of their territory. In 13 years of business, I have never had CWD, all the deer are caped and go to taxidermist who participates in state program. Here as expert in field of hard knocks, fireman and herd manager to voice my opinion. Don't change the rules on feeding or baiting deer. Why change something that works. Don't take a step backwards. Article by Dr. James Crow (Dr. Deer), in retrospect, he was head of Wisconsin CWD management program. He said, CWD is least deadly to deer herd about that, which by the way, the protein part or CWD is the least addictive or the least deadly to the deer herd. Of all the diseases that there are, and it falls within the protein state. You have the viruses, you have the bacteria, and you have proteins. It's not even in the top five of what decimates the deer herd. Banning deer feeding and baiting and you got the cart in front of the horse because that's the wrong way. That is caused by lack of water, so if we do anything we should improve our water situations and the way that we can get water into the fields. He stated that he included efforts to eradicate CWD in southern Wisconsin and it failed, after spending millions of dollars and killing at least 200,000 deer. CWD has been around a long time and is going to be around for a long time after we're all gone. It is not what we should be focusing on. Has it killed here, yes. But it takes up to four years in order for CWD to kill a deer in that four-year period of time, a doe will have six fawns. Wildlife takes care of its own through natural means.

Andy Queen, Missouri resident and state chair of Missouri Ducks Unlimited. - I have 2,000 acres in Cherokee County, mixture of crops, timber, deep water, creeks, and marshes. I'm passionate about outdoors, hunting and heritage of it. I am paying fair share of taxes and license fees in many states including Kansas. I have listened to what you have proposed for nonresident waterfowlers and I hate it. I hate that you're taking the resources I've helped pay for away from me.

I hate that you're creating a divide in the hunting community, and I don't like the hatred toward nonresidents in the state. It goes back all the way to my grandad from Parsons, Kansas. He hated nonresidents coming over here. It's moved on over the last 20 years towards deer hunting with nonresident deer hunters and outfitters. And now we're focusing on nonresident waterfowl hunters and turkey hunters. There is a huge problem on managed waterfowl areas, but the problem is much bigger than the license plates in the parking lot. Studies have shown with GPS backpacks, ducks using managed areas will go nocturnal as soon as a little human pressure is applied, yet you're not addressing limiting hours that people can use a marsh, people running motors wide open, the number of shells hunters take to the marsh or the number of hunters within the draw system. You point finger nonresidents. Meanwhile, residents will call their buddies sliding in their spots and take eight limits of ducks out in one spot to make a good social media post. They get off work at 3 PM, blowing in the parking lot to race their black death mud motor on Excel boats across the marsh with one hour shooting left just to shoot every duck that comes up in slight range. This is not a managed waterfowl area, it's a free for all and it's a problem in many states, not just Kansas. You also want to include the areas with no pressure and federal ground that I've helped pay for. Ground that we have hunted for years on weekends with no pressure at all. What you're doing will cause a bigger problem with those hunters going to these areas. Honestly, how dare you guys take federal ground from hunters? You should be ashamed of that. Please remember the successful hunt is not pictures of piles of ducks. It's containing a heritage for all hunters, and we need to stand together and manage. Got the good Lord to ride for us. We're all hunters and we're all in this together. We have plenty of organizations trying to take privileges away from hunters. Please don't add your names to that growing list. You wanted to pass it that night. You say one thing. But that night you wanted to pass this right then. It's on video out there. I've seen you ask if we could get this done for the upcoming hunting season without taking in consideration from other hunters. So., I ask that you all please reconsider this.

Will Cokeley, Liberal, own 10,000 acres northwest of Hays. - I operate hunting on 30,000 acres up there. Reduction of out-of-state tags for deer, I believe using smoke and mirrors to take our attention away from that. We can't operate deer outfitting business if we can't figure out who will come until April, six months before the season starts. I can manage my herd better than you can, I know what deer I have there, I run 40 cameras and I supplemental feed, but I can't operate a business when only 30% of my clients can draw a tag. Jaster told me there is an initiative to reduce the number of out-of-state tags because in-state hunters don't like them. I run a business and you can hunt deer on my land as long as you pay the same as the out-of-state hunters. I run a business and I won't let you hunt for free; I will get depredation tags and smoke all the deer because I don't want to feed them if I can't make money. I get \$20-\$30 an acre for pasture rent, way more than that on hunting. Greg missed out on the farmers income; they are reliant on deer income to supplement them through drought conditions. This is the first year in 150 years that we didn't harvest wheat because too dry. Don't let does be shot after December 30, that is stupid.

Felston Kirkendahl (did not sign roster), I am six generation farmer. - The whole supplemental feeding and CWD is made up. I want you to all think about this avenue too. You have no right to tell anyone what they can do on their private ground period. It's asinine for paid bureaucrats. Mr. Loveless, how much money do you make a year sitting here at this table? It's public knowledge so I know it's a \$120,000 of our taxpayer dollars. My point is it's unconstitutional trying to sway landowners to do anything with their land. CWD is made up. Any former can tell you about field loss, that's when a combine goes through the field, cuts the corn, some falls out on the side.

That's when CWD would have started, if ever, a hundred years ago. Second point I'd like to make about the outfitters. I have been blessed that one outfitter has leased all our ground for 30 years. He's one of the first outfitters in the state and he has done more for the ground and heralding it and taking care of it than the government could ever dream to do. If anybody wants to stand up and talk about wildlife and parks and how corrupt the organization is in many different points of what you've done over the last years in Osage County, we can talk about that on the side. But it's unconstitutional. Straight up to the point. Nothing else matters. It is against the civil rights of American citizens for you to come and tell me what I can do on my privately owned ground. It is mine. Unless I stop paying taxes on it, like my family's done for six generations. Deer is not a resource that anyone owns, they are where they are and free moving. No one owns them. They're not a resource. Mr. Lauber, you are a liar, you did try to vote on this. And I love how the convenient time you all have chosen to have this meeting at 12:00 on a Thursday. You want people to start showing up when you vote on this, I promise you there will be thousands of us here. I'm going to spread the word on this because it is unconstitutional. It's as simple as that. Knowing that it'll never pass the House, the Senate, or the Attorney General. This is waste of time.

Harlan Anderson (did not sign roster), Osage County, Melvern Lake area. - In 1962, my brother was feeding cattle and he saw a crazy looking animal in feed bunk, a deer, getting its supplemental feed. Is it really harming them? Some of them get nutritional supplements from it to help them out. How many CWD cases are there? In Osage County, one in fenced area in elk. I have a picture of deer on my land eating wheat, hundreds of deer do that. Eating corn and soybeans too. We don't have a deer problem, but not taking enough bucks or does. In western Kansas you have a problem, but not in eastern Kansas. Look at this real hard.

Sam Voss (did not sign roster), I work for Trophy Properties and Auction in Kansas and Missouri. - I own land around Melvern also. I sell farmland for a living. I am not an outfitter, but I am pro-supplement feeding. Contention is with the word, bait, I supplemental feed. There are always going to be people that do, and deer will hop a fence to go to where feed is, deer you have been hunting and that is the way it is. Good conversation a few weeks ago, I've been reaching out to the commissioners asking for their time. I offered personally to take anybody to my farm. I'm somewhere between trophy and sporting. I've got a 5-year-old daughter, we went out, just to watch coyotes because she loves coyotes. We watch deer, coyotes, turkeys, and everything, right, so that's the sporting side. I do trophy hunt. I own 400 acres, and hunt at least another 2,000 acres. I am about ethical hunt. Anytime you guys would like to go, I'm offering you an enclosed air-conditioned side by side; there's no excuse why you couldn't be comfortable. I would like to email you guys my personal information, my cell phone, email, whatever it is. We spoke about it the science behind it. I just don't see it no matter what. We're not testing the deer. Someone mentioned about a cancer facility. If you test people in a cancer facility, they're going to have cancer, so the 122 deer tested last year are of course going to have it because something was already wrong with those deer. I doubt whether someone killed it and said test it. I just don't see the science, if there was something that said it was proven, I don't think we would have many of these meetings. I don't think people would want our deer herd to suffer or die. I put too much time, effort, money, time away from my family; drive about 60,000 miles a year each year for work alone and I see a lot of ground and I am passionate about hunting too, so

much so that I made a career out of it. To me, this is not a science issue at all. If you're going to talk about the science side of it, it's feeding that I use as high protein and different things as well. And I've read consulted and watched many hours of YouTube to talk to or listen to people about, how they supplement feed, what's good, what's not good, how not to switch deer diet. Don't see the science, I apologize saying that if it is, but it's not there yet. If you show me then maybe I would agree with you then. If you come, I'll show you from top to bottom how I supplement with the different types of protein, the different types of feed minerals. I use water. I don't care if it's next to a river. I'm always getting water to try and keep them away from certain critters in the water, the midge, things like that cause other issues. I think the biggest thing you could show us is a number, something that's solid as opposed to just the 10% tested. Then I think more people would be less emotional about it. And I think that would be the best start. You said there at the discussion stage. I hope that's the case because if this were to happen overnight, that's not fair.

Andrew Clark, western Kansas, representing myself and several blue-collar workers. - Not talking about deer supplements. I'm here to discuss, the lack of furbearers the last 5 to 6 years and why that's an issue and what we can do to increase recruitment. To get more sportsmen to go out and harvest some raccoons and possums. I'm also here to commend the board here for looking at extending that season to year-round, similar to what coyotes are for trapping season. I would like to encourage you to become a little bit more encompassing, allowing hounds man during the running season to take raccoons, especially on public property. It would help to target some of these nest predators that we're having issues with. I also have data that I've put together regarding this issue. I would like the night vision season to encompass raccoons and possums in both on and off seasons. If we expand the season to year-round and allow some of those thermal night vision optics to be used, particularly outside of deer season, that would be awesome. I'm also here to voice support and KAR 115-6-28, which limits nonresident pressure on public ground. It doesn't. Take that privilege away from folks and it's limiting a resource, no different than issuing a big game tag. Good waterfowling is a limited resource. We are seeing a spike in users, nonresident, use so we would like to see that regulated as well. Information regarding some of the furharvester numbers we're seeing would be great.

Chairman Lauber – We're going to take a little break. Anybody who has anything other than deer/baiting/feeding question?

Susan Atchison, Osage County, own land in 21 counties and lease 14,000 acres. - My concern is the number of nonresident deer tags. We've been bringing hunters in for sport for about 10 years. We have 8,000 acres that we have them hunt on. We bring in 12 bow and 3 rifle hunts. It's just to supplement. I have buildings and historical buildings and it was a way for us to pay to keep those up. Our problem is that we have had less than half of what have applied for with those draw tags. So, in the last two years we've lost between \$22,000 and \$27,000, which doesn't help us keep our business. We're not trying to make a lot of money; we're just trying to pay for what we have. I just think there could be a solution to this that's an easy solution. If we had private and public land, because how do you know how the land is being managed if you don't know what those centers are or coming in to go to public or private land. We just don't want anyone coming in and hunting on our land because it's a liability. So, what would be wrong with having the hunters that are nonresidents apply for their license through the state and the state taking care of that, so they know who's coming in. And then let the land, I'm good with paying for a tag for those hunters. But then I know in April when they apply for the tag how many hunters that I'm going to be planning for and are going to be coming in. Then I can go ahead and sell the tag to them or add it

to what they're paying and then everyone comes out a winner. Have four hunts and it is part of our income and supplements farming and cattle.

Chairman Lauber – Unsuccessful draw ratio of greater than 50%? Last year 75% of nonresident drew and it varies. What happens if someone draws with buddy, one person doesn't draw and then none of them get one. Susan – We had 21 apply, got five tags. A huge difference in public and private hunting. Chairman Lauber – Everybody has a point. As far as baiting and feeding, it has been around for a long time. Somebody said I wanted to vote on it last time. Agreed with nonresident waterfowl. Because I anticipated this sort of reaction, some logical, some I agree with, some I don't, I was not anxious to start on vote because haven't explained to public.

*Unknown audience* – Keep on topic. Chairman Lauber – We're getting statewide information on how many people applied and didn't get tag. We will review this. Send us an email and we will look at this. *Unknown audience* - There was 10,160 nonresidents, there was 21,980 applications. Lot of it was done with preference points. Each year it's gone by that statistic we're looking at about 60% 70% for success. So, by that statistic, we're looking at about 60%, 70% for success. But a lot of those have preference points. You're trying to cloud the data. You're not using real data.

Chairman Lauber – If you comment, please come to the mic so everyone can hear it. Let's take a break.

*Break (Phil Escareno came into meeting)*

Chairman Lauber – Whole other part of meeting. Have CWD session coming up and another opportunity for public comment. I would like the lady who just spoke to send me an email.

Joel Morrison, Emporia (did not sign roster). - I just was pointing out that on your website that you state that you handle the public portion of your meetings prior to any other portion of this. So, I would encourage us due to the amount of time that most of us have spent. Coming here not just myself but other individuals that we go ahead and deal with. Including, with business is completed. "The commission holds the public hearing discussion and vote at the beginning of each public meeting. To ensure that ample time for public input prior to other commission activities." Chairman Lauber - CWD is other commission and there are seven items under the public hearing. Morrison - We are the public, sir. We're here. But I have deviated from the agenda. Where are we doing public before public discussion where we left those were public discussion on non-agenda items those are items that aren't on the agenda. So, are they the beginning of the meeting? Chairman Lauber - I have chosen and recommended that we put those at the beginning of the meeting, not for purposes of finishing those before we do the other business. Morrison - Right, but you don't state that on your website. I'm just trying to keep you consistent with what you put on your own website, what you're trying to do. But that would be best use of everyone's time here, because I think everyone, I mean, everyone will watch and be happy to look at this, but some of us do need to travel and get home. Some of us have young I understand and of course I don't.

Chairman Lauber - How many more people are going to want to come up here and talk? (Seven hands went up) And one online. Yeah, then I'm going to really request that we keep the time

short. There is no established protocol for general public comment on agenda items. And we don't want that portion of the meeting to preclude that other business that we have to get done.

Morrison - Sir, I would again point to your own policy. I know when you read the policy and we would again point to your own policy.

Austin Ledbetter, Sumner County. - I don't know that guy, but he exactly describes me, I've got three little kids I have to get home too. I'm going to face you guys. I'm a bit of an odd duck here and I did drive a way. To echo what someone said earlier holding these at noon on a Thursday isn't really conducive for a lot of people's normal work schedules. So, I feel like you get a skewed view in the room of who's able to attend. Me example, I had to take 8eight hours sick leave today to come out here to voice my concerns. I work 40 hours a week. I don't farm, I work at Spirit Arrow Systems. I actually might be one of the few people in here that has no financial vested interest in these policies, but what I was here to talk about is, how it impacts me in a personal way. I thank you guys, first of all, for taking some of the arrows and rocks that you've gotten. It is a passionate subject for those of us that spend most of the year working and saving money to be able to hunt in my home state. I've lived here 36 years and my story, and I grew up with a dad that got friends to try to teach me how to hunt. And, because at the time we looked at baiting as what lazy hunters do. We don't do it. So, guess what happened? I never saw a deer and I quit hunting. So, as I became a father, I had a friend that got me back into hunting and said, dude, have you tried doing supplemental feeding to be able to see deer? I started it. Since then, I've gone to five or six different states hunting. Sometimes it's easier to hunt in other states than here to be honest. I've got a thirteen-year-old son and I'm fighting against video games and a lot of things that are killing the spirit of outdoorsmanship, just adventuring in a child's heart these days. Just sitting on a couch and having a console in their hands is what I have to contend with. I feel like I may not be the voice for everybody in this room, but I feel like I'm the voice for an awful lot of people that don't get to come here. There are a lot of people who are at their 40-hour week job or on overtime 50- and 60-hour week jobs that can't be here for this kind of stuff. They can't take off work to come and voice their opinions. I can't tell you how many hundreds of friends voice their opinions, that either currently hunt and are about to stop or no longer hunt because either they can't deal with the competition on public grounds, 98% of this is a private state. So, we're not a western state managing us like a western state, a big problem for us. We have 2% public grounds to try to fit all the nonresidents and us residents that can't afford other places. All those people I'm trying to speak for those that can't take off work to come here and tell you guys to remember us. Remember the residents or even the nonresidents who sleep in their truck bed to come up here and try to get the best crack at a Kansas deer.

I'm not faulting anybody for wanting to pursue what they want to do here. I do it in other states also. Things are not correctly being handled in our best interest by removing the ability to supplemental feed and those opportunities. There is a lot working against an average working class, middle-class American guy that lives in Kansas to try to get a deer or to get an opportunity to do it unless you got a friend that will let you shoot a deer behind his swimming pool. It's an uphill battle that I'm not really winning. I appreciate you giving me a second to talk I didn't hear anybody else that had no financial interest so I thought me being a random normal person that works building airplanes, maybe that would mean something.

Kenny Graham, Osage City. - I'm really getting kind of tired of the fights. I've been coming to meetings now for the last six, never said a word at the first four. What you all want and what we want as outfitters as landowners as private landowners is all the same. It's all online. It really is. Talked to Brad several times. We've got to come together and start working together. But one of



the biggest issues we're run into, and I'm not going to apologize for, making money off of hunting on land that I pay people to use. And as it was said in the last meeting, I never met an outfitter that did anything for anybody but himself. And that's when I cut you off at the last meeting. I took very large offense to that as anybody out here should have. I am sixth generation, my family came here in the 1870s. I moved away for a while, came back. I've ran a successful business for 30 years that I have given money to help farmers and people consistently. We buy supplemental food, we buy food from restaurants, we buy food from grocery stores and fuel. We bring a lot in. Do I feel for the guy that can't hunt? Can't afford to do that, yeah, I do. Because all you have 2% of the properties. WIHA numbers are going down, not up and that's a shame and the quality a lot of those places are poor and should be there. I think what you'll find when the outfitters come to you guys because we're business and we are legit business and want to be looked at as a business because we bring over \$200 million a year into this state. We are a partner with the Department Economic Development and Tourism. Just like you are, our name is right below you. I will not apologize about that no more, I'm done. Do I worry about the deer herd? Absolutely. But what I worry more about than anything is a loss of my landowner and my resident rights given to me. On 98% of the land, the little piece I own. What I want to do. There is not a guy here that owns a piece of land that wants the government, or anybody else, to come in and tell him what they can do with it. If you can show the science on how CWD affects it and not bring in three paid folks to come in and do your agenda the way you wanted. I listened to all two hours and not once did one member on this committee say, what are the advantages to supplemental feeding? Not one of you asked that. When you look at rules, at regs, there's got to be signs, if you put a stop sign there, there's a reason there's stop sign there. I appreciate you guys volunteering what you do. But don't give in to public opinion, being ours or anybody's. We do have professionals, Jaster and Fricke can help us, but we aren't going to help each other by fighting on this. Yeah, we got a turkey problem, but we always go back to the nonresidents. Nonresidents bring in the majority of the money that comes into your department revenue-wise. There were 21,960 not 50,000, unless you count the additional that is given tax, there were 10,160 people didn't get to come and enjoy this great state. And that dollar turns around four or five times. I pay my landowner, my landowner turns around and pays what he pays for grain, the grain manufacturer pays for seed, and it goes on and on and on. We got a Hunter Nation involved, which I'm glad. They're coming in because they see infringement on our rights, our own attorney general has said he's worried about infringement on our rights. Don't let us do that. Let's figure out somehow to work together. How many days do you spend in the woods each year? Do you spend a hundred? How many of you spend 200 to 300 days, because we do. And when we volunteer our services to the department, to allow CWD testing on our deer, you're not going to find any because our taxidermist does. We are more welcome to open our books to you, not our financial books, but open to you gear used, buck/doe ratio. You can't tell us what state buck/doe ratio is, but I can tell you exactly what ours is. I can show you for 30 years of doing this. The numbers as they fell and how our deer improved their weight and everything. I'm not hitting on supplemental feeding, but that's because we work with the landowners. I want to throw the gauntlet down for once and take the commission, the department, the outfitters, the private landowners and have people just quit saying, Missouri is the way because it isn't a war of the states. I'll guarantee, with some of the rules you passed, they're going to reciprocate. And the one hunting on public ground, I've already heard rumblings in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, and Nebraska, they're going to limit Kansas residents. I don't even duck hunt, but you got to be careful what you do. There's not a bigger baiting state in the nation then Texas and they have one

of the lowest CWD rates anywhere around. Let's leave the gauntlet down, start working together and helping each other. Go to western Kansas and look at the habitat, it's nothing but sand and stuff, because of the drought and fires they had out there.

Yeah, that kills animals. We do things ourselves even in eastern Kansas. It kills a lot of our game nesting birds. My hunters killed 36 long beards last year. Nobody hunted over half a day. I've got 3,400 acres touching Melvern and we never killed one bird on anything that touched that area. Because they can't tell you how heavily it's hunted or how it's hunted. I also want to encourage you, please go to e-tag system where we can balance or check books with real numbers instead of surveys.

Walker Trimble (via Zoom), Coffey County. - Thanks for doing a thankless job. Not say more than what has been pounded into the ground. I talked to a commissioner over the phone prior to this meeting and they told me there wasn't a private land issue. So, I think that we probably need a little more education. With the commissioners even before we go forward with this. I do want one thing I haven't heard, but not a whole lot. If this does go forward the state will need to be more liberal on the depredation permits on the deer. I fed seven tons of straight corn last year, on 10 different spots, but if I didn't those deer were going to go somewhere else. Everyone right back to the farmer's pocket. If this moves forward, you will need to think about the repercussions that could fall. The state doesn't come in and tell any of us what we can eat for dinner, so I don't think that they should come in and tell us how we're going to feed animals in our own backyard. I've never once heard the state come and say I can't have poultry, pork, or beef for dinner. It's been touched on briefly, the economics of this, not only do we take into account our local feed stores and outdoor supply that make their own deer blend for what works best for eastern Kansas, but as our real estate values as well. We're looking at a crunch on a lot of counties in our area. Eastern Kansas is selling land at inflated values for recreational properties, which comes with more taxes. People are traveling to hunt those properties. If we get rid of our baiting, I see those recreational values dropping off tremendously. I've always had a little trouble with this, I don't have an issue paying for a tag, it's what we've always had, I find it difficult to pay for a tag, when we're the one trying to keep our deer herd healthy. We're the one making sure that if there's an injured buck, I'm putting my tag on that buck. I don't want to see any animal go through any undue stress, not be successful in living, or limp away. So, and I believe every outdoors person would be the same way, if there's an animal that comes in that it's best to put down, they would. So, when we pay for a deer tag, we pay to feed these deer and we do what we can to improve the herd health. But all of a sudden, if that deer happens to be hit on the highway, as the state is claiming ownership for these deer where we're paying for tags and all that, on the highway it's not the state's ownership. So somewhere in a split second there is a transfer of ownership of that deer. We're paying for a tag. We're trying to improve the health of that deer. Which is hard for me to understand. Lastly, and not on that subject, it goes to the thermal.

We talked about it a little bit earlier. I had also talked to the commissioners on the phone about something that's hard for me to understand as well, that we cannot thermal hunt from an elevated position. I had called and talked to Colonel Kyser as well. I can be in a tree stand so why can I not have a rack in the back of my truck? If it's not moving. Why can I not from that elevated position, but I can go sit in a box blind? To me it makes no sense. A couple of the commissioners that I talked to had not even participated in the thermal, but they had at that point strong feelings against it. We had great conversation. They understood where I was. I understood where they were. It was very pleasant to speak to them. But what I want to say is, it's not a video game, it's not as easy as what it looks and if you don't go out and just whack and stack everything. If you watch the videos online, it looks easy, it's not, it's work, it's cold, it's windy. So, a lot of times it's not enjoyable, but we still continue to do it.

Kurt Ratzlaff, Back Country Hunters and Anglers. - We are the sportsman's voice for our public lands, waters, and wildlife. Deer baiting is not allowed on public lands in Kansas and hasn't been allowed for quite a while and we just clarified that. So why am I here? Well, it comes down to the basic principles established by the founding fathers of our country. Over two centuries ago, it was decided that our wildlife is owned by the public. The public own the wildlife, all Kansans. When our country was created, the founding fathers wanted a different way of life than they knew in Europe. They didn't want all the land owned by the royalty, so they changed things. In America, individuals can own land, not just the royalty. In regard to the wildlife, they adopted a principal known as the Public Trust Doctrine. And that doctrine has clearly become the law of the land. Under the public trust doctrine, the wildlife in America is owned by the citizens. It's a clear historical fact. In America, we don't have the system where there is the Kings deer, that's not what we have. The public trust doctrine, the state government manages all of the wildlife for the benefit of We the People. And it's been that way since our great country began. Later on, we've developed what has become known as the North American model of wildlife conservation. And that has become by far the most successful wildlife management system the world has ever seen. Pursuant to the North American model, the wildlife in the state is managed by the state wildlife agency, and that's you folks. You're charged with the difficult task of managing the wildlife of the entire state for the benefit of We the People, the state. The citizens of the state of Kansas. And under the North American model you follow good solid, sound scientific principles, and manage the entire Kansas deer herd. And by the way, all the other critters that are out there too, which is just a piece of cake for you guys. I don't envy your job in the slightest. McCandless BHA will be watching to make sure that you do follow the North American model and that you do what is right for the deer in Kansas because that's the criteria. Under the North American model, we do what's right for the deer. They belong to all Kansas. And not the people that own the land where they happen to be standing at that point in time. That's the permission side of things. The animals belong to the citizens. And again, that's a historical fact. So, we'll be watching the evidence that comes in at your hearings and we're going to be listening to the arguments. And then we're going to be determining our position on this issue. Once all that information is in front of you. Then your job is not just to address that but to address everything else that's a problem for the deer in Kansas. Anything, carcass movement if we need additional testing that needs to be done, whatever it is. If there's a problem, it's your job to manage and preserve the deer. For us and our future citizens. And you're the trustees for us. That's the way it is. You are the trustees for us. So please don't listen to social media influencers. Don't listen to rock stars. Don't listen to people making a quick buck. Don't listen to people who want to be a king. Follow the North American model, please. It's a proven method of preserving our wildlife and our hunting.

Adam Gariglietti, John Sports Center, Pittsburg. - In business since 1955, none of that matters except we have been selling licenses forever. So, like every fee income, whatever you want to say, it's come from us sparsely, especially during COVID when everybody closed. We continue to supply income for you guys. What I see is I never see a nonresident coming to complain about how much it costs. Never. So, 1976 I've been doing this. Never had a nonresident component complain they're not going to spend any money. So, they're willing to pay to play. People that are coming into our outfit and stay with the nice lady that spoke they need to come in they need to spend money. About 50% of our sales comes from nonresidents, especially expensive stuff.

They're in the mood. They're on vacation. They're getting to hunt. Point being there's money to be had. In the state of Kansas within the system where we have it just needs to tweak majorly. I call on the game wardens on Saturday and Sunday to make sure we're doing stuff right for licensing. They usually know the answer, but I thoroughly believe there's a lot of money left on the table from printing with Travis Valley and printing for fishing game books to advertising. If you get time, call me. I can get a couple of million bucks in your pockets, no problem. There's a lot of money there.

Todd Amershak, Pittsburg. - I've talked to a couple of you guys in the past. Mine's not the deer hunting so much. I don't dare hunt anymore. I understand and I'm not bashing anybody, but I am buying all of my merchandise from Adam. I'm just, just a good old boy who works 40 hours a week. And can go on vacation and take my kids. We got a model here, pass it on. It's hard to pass it on when we have no hunting ground. When it's all leased, how do we pass it on? We got 2% of the hunting ground and people make a living at it. My opinion, that's not the way it's supposed to be. That's not, that's not the way it's supposed to be. I hunt ducks. We do a lot of duck, used to do a lot of quail hunting in this area and it was wonderful at one time. My problem with that situation is have we tried to find out what's going on with quail population in our state, in our area, and we're more worried about big game because it brings more money. We worry about the turkeys. We worry about the deer because those tags are \$350 or \$500 or whatever they are. But the quail, we've let our quail population go to nothing. We don't try to help the farmers to plant grasses that would help the quail. I'm not a biologist, but I'm smart enough to know that I can't get through grass when it clumps up or get around. They don't nest in it. We've let our quail population go down to nothing. And we were known in this country at one time for our quail hunting and pheasant hunting was great, those populations are down in western Kansas just the same. We're more worried about making the dollar than we are about our wildlife than in our future with our children and duck hunting. There was a man that came up earlier about the out of stater not being liked by the residents. I have nothing against them coming in here hunting, but when they treat us like they've treated us over at St. Paul refuge that is bad. I had my 84-year-old dad, my brother, my son, and myself two years ago at St. Paul refuge. We set up 250 yards away and we got a small refuge. I've been hunting there since 1975, my dad since 1962, probably when they opened it, they started building 1961. So, I cut my teeth in that refuge, and I walked in with jersey gloves and rubber waders and no equipment like we have now, that is how we hunt, my dad went down to their store and mooched stuff because we couldn't afford nothing. We have become so commercialized with everything and money, money, money that we're ruining the sports. I'm pulling my boat out after we set up 250 yards from this man, an out of stater from Louisiana. They start cussing us for 20 minutes. Finally, I said enough. They were shooting ducks. We both get our ducks, but they didn't like it because we set up 250 yards from them. There was a mound that you're legally able to set on, but we didn't. We skipped the mound to go down the hedgerow a little farther. I come out that night, it was 34 degrees, spitting snow, it was dark, and I went to pull the trailer out and it had a flat tire on. We changed the tire out there. Somebody thought it was funny. This is what we deal with. People say, they want to pick on the out of stater. No, you don't know what's going on over there. You guys have no idea what's going on over there. When we got home, I checked the tire and someone had taken off the cap, put a pebble on the valve stem and put the cap back on to form a slow leak. Excuse me, these are the assholes we're dealing with. We could have taken off on Highway 47 and had a car wreck that killed us or killed somebody else, because of a duck. Because of a duck. And they wonder why we have a problem with them. Some guys from another state thought he was sitting too close. He was sitting in a legal mound away from these guys, doing everything legal, I think he is 18, game manager's son, they rip off three shots across his decoys. Boom, boom, boom. He calls

his dad and mom, who runs the refuge, he says he was leaving because he just got shot at. He comes down, walks out there, asks those guys what was going on. Tells them he just had another complaint, their third complaint since they have been in town and asked them to pack up their stuff and leave. They shot at his kid, over a duck. I'm preaching to you guys because this is going on and I'm not picking on guys because these out of staters coming in hunting. These are not guided hunts. Two or three days later, a guy from Columbus, gets threatened from a guy with a handgun out there. Same marsh. Same area. It was reported. About 3 or 4 days later manager goes back in there because his son left the dog collar on the mound. This guy jumped in a boat with three guys from Texas, from the boat ramp. They let him in but didn't know him. He threatens management because they are ruining his hunt and threaten his family. They got the highway patrol and sheriff in there and got this guy. Come to find out he had no license; no stamp and he's been in our refuge. This is this is what we're dealing with, these people who don't respect us or our state. I hunted Four Rivers over in Missouri for years, one of the nicest places to hunt. Those people treated you right. They didn't crowd you and it was a good place to hunt. This is what I'm dealing with, it's not that guys hate out-of-staters. People are weird. That's what I'm telling you. Just look. Do what you got to do. Let's get this taken care of. South Dakota has limited draws for their licenses, we have to do something. It's bad. I mean, when you start threatening people with guns and start letting air out of tires and slicing tires. Not a good situation. And please work on our quail population.

Kyle Lorson, Abilene, graduated from Bethany with sports management degree. - I work for Department of Corrections at Ellsworth. Apologize for some of the things some of you have experienced from other people, but in the world we're in, there's a lot of people making bad choices and we can't always control everything. My whole goal, I grew up hunting and I'm the only son that could come back. I have no cousins; I have nothing like this. My dad, my uncle, are farming by themselves. I saw this as an opportunity to build a business where I could afford to start my outfitting business on my family ground. Communicating with local neighbors who are trusted family people. To help them farm and help us farm and we appreciate the wildlife. I can't speak for every outfit or in the state. But the operation I'm very strict on our age management protocol. We kill no 3-and-a-half-year-olds, lots of five. I select certain 4-and-a-half-year-old deer that are studied by game cameras and watched year to year to year. I have multiple external hard drives where I save every single trail camera picture that I have where I am studying. I want to know the deer that I've got. I would gladly share any of the information I have for any study that anybody would ever want to do. Right now, I have around 12,000 acres of private family on ground and local neighbors, it's quite big. Pretty good cluster in one area. But I know if anything was to change on the supplemental feeding of things, I would lose the ability to give information to my hunters or be able to say, this is a 3-year-old, don't shoot him or you're going to have a \$2,500 fine if you do. If you shoot this 4-year-old that we're trying to get to maturity, here's another \$2,000 fine on top of the \$1,500 fine. It takes me four years for a deer to reach maturity, to have a deer for these people to actually have the product to give them. It's very important to my operation, quality over quantity. We aren't trying to overhunt. We've had about a 50% success rate. The lady that was talking about losing out on opportunity to have hunters in, I was out camping last May with my family and in a matter of 15 minutes I learned that six of my 13 hunters didn't draw a tag so there went \$25,000 in 15 minutes, but my lease fees are the same. My expenses are the same. I was trying to run a club to where I had the same individuals coming back year to year, so they take ownership of the properties to make it their own too. Recognize

that they can let this 3-year-old or 4-year-old walk because I'm coming back next year. I've had to abandon that philosophy and a hand in the club scenario and had to go back to six-day guiding just for the fact that I can't guarantee that I'm going to have the hunters that I have because I'm not selling the spot behind them. It was their spot. I'm not trying to double book it because then if you double book it and they both draw then I've got way too many and I'm not going to take that many deer off my property. I don't want that, not my purpose. My purpose was to go to my neighbors, help them afford their co-op bill. It's the same as mine. We've had some great conversations in here today and some information has been learned. I've noticed our turkey populations going down. We do have a good number of quail. Our pheasant numbers are far and few between, but there are some on all the properties that we hunt. We hunt one day the last week into the year for any upland birds. I have a group of friends that come in and we spend one day hunting it and you know it's unfortunate because that's what I grew up with, but you know hunting opening day of pheasant seasons, holidays, for most people. I've been working for the state for five years and I know your job is synchronous and there's a lot of stuff goes into it that is not fun to do and that's why I'm back at the farm where I can hide my head in the sand a little bit. You know, I don't want everyone to think that because you have an outfitter or after the name of your business that you're an evil person or you're trying to do something negative. I've always offered, if anybody's ever approached me with opportunity to lease ground, I'll ask if they have anybody else hunting it, a neighbor/son/nephew or anybody, and if they say yes, I ask if they offered it to them first. I don't want to be the guy that stole it from him. I've also had guys approach me that say, my granddaughter just had a premature baby that's been in the NICU for three months and we're struggling to make payments on this, would you be interested in lease on our ground? Absolutely. How much do you want? It's about helping my neighbors and helping my family. I've got three kids of my own and I want to teach them how to hunt and have this. So, there's always an evil aspect to it, but its people making a living and its people trying to survive and do what they can because everyone's experiencing the harsh reality of inflation right now and how expensive it is to be here and just live and eat. It will make my job harder to sell if you guys do a ban on this because of the product that I'm selling. For what I'm charging I'd be ashamed of myself for still charging that if I couldn't provide the information to my clients. I'm at the management side of it is the most important part of my job rather than making money. I just wanted to speak from that side of it. If you took it away or made it a ban completely. It would be hard, but as long as I would have a proportional part of it to be able to inventory and manage my deer and see what survived and what's out there. I'd be okay, but a complete ban I don't think that benefits anybody, honestly.

Kurt Turlip, Pittsburg (did not sign roster). - Thanks for being here today. In law enforcement here in Southeast Kansas. My reason for being here today is about the wildlife and the resource of the state of Kansas. It's not about the opportunities outside the resource. I got some comments, statements and maybe some questions for the staff. Fourth generation here. So, I wrote the commissioners a letter about two or three years ago. Had a little bit of reply, but not a lot. I'd just like to update the commission on the state of the resource in southeast Kansas, that's why I'm here. I don't care about baiting. But I will give you the facts about baiting. I'm here today to express the state of the wildlife in southeast Kansas as a lifelong resident in outdoor enthusiast. I spend approximately 150 days a year hunting, fishing, or building wildlife habitat in Kansas. My family owns over 30 farms in southeast Kansas. At least thousands of acres for hunting and recreation only. That's why I think I have an opportunity to speak to this commission in an open and honest manner. It is my understanding that you are the stewards of wildlife in the state of Kansas and should make decisions that benefit the wildlife in the state. If that is the case, then this board should not protect the interest of the businesses that make a profit off the resource.

Deer hunting in southeast Kansas, your population is out of control in southeast Kansas because everyone know Kansas was recognized years ago as a trophy state. Now it is just a state that you could fill a tag. Over harvesting of bucks, you have the buck population and under-harvesting of population can cause pressure and generous limits have made everybody a buck hunter, mostly harvesting immature deer. Big piles have increased every one's success by 90%. Solutions to help manage the program. The point restriction, decrease the out of state buck tags, shorten the regular season and add an additional week to the doe season to reduce the numbers of those. Every tag holder should shoot a doe before they shoot a buck. The state of turkey in southeast Kansas has suffered like it has suffered throughout the state due to marginal hatching, lack of a habitat and over hunting. Out of state pressure and resident pressure along with bait piles are the issue. Outfitters that are hunting over corn piles will kill all the turkeys. Outfitter in Bourbon County for three years, first year killed 34 turkeys and didn't stop until ran out of turkeys. You reduced the tags, eliminate the fall season, and don't allow hunters to hunt over bait. The duck hunting is a big topic, a total disaster. Out of state and in state hunters are at each other's throats over here on public property is a daily occurrence. Disagreements on how the state refuges are being managed with crops being planted and water being available to hunt on a date, is a daily topic of discussions and descent. Applying a four-day restriction on our state hunters is not going to solve the problem at the refuge. You still have the problem three days a week. You're just redirecting the problem to four days a week to the local landowners. If the commission thinks that out of state restrictions on duck hunting, if only allowed Sunday Monday and Tuesday, none of your in-state hunters are going to hunt on Sunday Monday and Tuesday because there's too much pressure. You actually cut the season for the out of state hunters unless they want to hunt with outfitters, or they if they can get permission on public or private property. So, then the residents get four days to hunt, and you overfill the capacity of the refuge with in-state hunters on those four days. So, it's not going to solve the problem. I think the best way to solve the problem is, of course, as you guys have discussed is doing out of state draws or some other viable option. The quail, rabbit, or other ground dwellers, I've been an avid hunter of in southeast Kansas since I was 16, I'm 65. I don't want to quail hunt anymore because there's not a humble population. Why does the state even have a quail season or rabbit season in southeast Kansas? Solutions to help, maybe close the season, reduce the bag limit, and help the habitat. You guys are talking about coons and opossums, the production predators. These guys aren't going to shoot the coons, they're going to shoot the possums, unless you put a bounty on them, 10 bucks maybe or give 120 tags, 10 bucks apiece and they're going to pay attention. It's a proven fact that we have an open season on coyotes, a predator and they'll be shooting them in June, July, August, September, October, whatever. Well, maybe the outfitters are right. I hope you take my experience in southeast Kansas as a fact. The mission, not an agenda.

Alex Wilcox, Charleston, SC (on Zoom). - Won't begin to act like I have as much merit as the people of Kansas in speaking, but I would like to provide a different perspective. I've heard the past couple gentleman talk about St. Paul refuge and I'm not very familiar with that as I tend to hunt further west. We come to this state, a lot of us from South Carolina, and we drive 24 hours through the night to get here. It's a big task. And when we come, we're not out there to kill anyone's chance. Out of state hunters, probably puts a bad taste in a lot in-state hunters' mouth. I understand that because I'd be in your same shoes, we face the same problems in South Carolina. I don't believe it's a problem with the out of state hunters as much as it is with culture around duck hunting. With banning the out of state hunters to a certain number of days. This is going to

greatly reduce the number of hunters that Kansas sees and the amount of money that we put into the economy. I mean when we go and hunt, we're staying there days at a time. Because ducks are migratory bird, they start up in Canada, come down to the Dakotas, to Nebraska and Kansas and Oklahoma. They are no more anyone else's ducks in the state of Kansas than they are Oklahoma's, other states, or Canada. When we go, we put miles on the truck, burn plenty of tanks of gas, we eat out. We're putting money in the economy that might not be there otherwise, and we've made some great relationships with farmers and other people of Kansas we met along the way. I believe that not all out of staters are a burden, as some are or maybe in certain refuges. I know Cheyenne Bottoms has problems as well. From my experiences, the places I've hunted, we've had no more than three groups of hunters on the entire lake with yards and yards between us. Everyone has a good time. No one gets on top of each other and that's why we drive 24 hours across the country. The hunt in South Carolina we're facing is that people set up a hundred yards away from you as well. One of the rivers I normally hunt, it's lined boats and boats and people. The reason we come to Kansas is because it's not crowded. And I understand why that would make a lot of residents of Kansas upset. They want to have that to themselves as well. A lot of people here at this meeting I've been watching for 3 hours, to hear about the deer. I'd be interested to hear more about people of Kansas and how most of them view us because, like I said, I know a lot of people. Just from the years that I've traveled to Kansas that I've met. All nice people and we all get along well. We still have this relationship today. Still text them and you talk about the bird count and whatnot. These are things that we enjoy about Kansas, and we don't get the opportunity to experience in our state. You've done such a great job with planting millet and stuff like that in all these places around Kansas that hold ducks and provide the numbers that they do. We don't get to experience that and that's why we come. If we will not be able to spend enough time there to actually get on the ducks and find them, we're just most likely going to end up moving our yearly trip somewhere else just to make it worth the drive. I'd hate to see that for towns that depend on hunters coming in the wintertime and people that have businesses that depend upon it too. So that's just my 2-cents.

Brie Gariglietti, Johns Sport Center (did not sign roster). - Married to Adam. We are third generation store who's been part of the fabric of Pittsburg for a long time. Hearing people talk about their experiences coming to Kansas and hunting. We enjoy and this is from an economic business point of view, seeing those people come in and spending time at our store. Out of towners will come in and say, they don't have anything like it at home. That's our goal, to make it a nice warm welcoming place for local people that come and sit on the bar stools and chit chat with all of our employees, that they've done for years, as well as making contacts and friends with out of state people that come hunt. A lot of the things that have been going on here recently seems like it's an ethical hunting situation and maybe more education needs to be introduced and I would love to have that introduced back into the schools. I think that's excellent opportunity to teach kids ethical hunting practices, how to handle weapons and all of that. It seems like some metropolitan ideas are being put on rural communities. That's how we survive, how we make our income, and we need to preserve that. Teaching to this next generation because it's going to be lost.

Chairman Lauber - You've already talked once but come on up.



Joel Morrison. Come over there, use that (the podium)? Other individuals begin in the opportunity to speak from this area, sir. I only wish to have the same opportunity so I can hold my notes here, sir. I would just like the same opportunity that other individuals have been given so that I can read my notes. As Secretary Loveless has pointed out, funding for the agency comes from us as the individuals. It also comes from individuals buying firearms bows and other ammunition. Their funding is from us. So, I come here to talk as a general force. That's why I asked to speak from here. I really came to speak to you and the commission, everyone in this room. It's very important for us all to work together. This is not an issue that should divide us, it should bring us together. We should be here to talk about this and have a discussion. Those are the important things to understand as we move forward through this. So, to talk about a few things that were brought up. The North American model, again that was not biologists, that was us, the hunters. We're the ones that saved these species, the ones that put in the time and that went out and did that. You see that across the world, no matter what system you use, it is the hunters that save it. A camera cannot save these animals. It is us that does that. Unfortunately, that is being threatened. It is the youth that we are failing right now. That is our number one issue. So, we look at this. CWD was brought up talked about a lot. One thing I wanted to throw out there in reference to that is you can look at a CWD section set up in southeast Texas where they did over 1,600 forced tests, you had to turn it in in this area because there was CWD there. If you can go to Texas, it's the number one baiting, supplemental feeding or whatever you call it, state in the nation. That study found, I should say, the enforced area found that they had 1,600 samples turned in, every deer killed in the that area, and they did one with no testing on that area. What they found was no cases. That is the only thing I'll say about that. I feel that most people have gone through and covered that as well. So, we talked about crop impact. That was discussed in the last meeting as well. Crop impact is an aspect of this, there is some impact to the farmer and then we talk about feeders. Honestly, most of your, at least in my area, stuff is found to be grown is soybeans, corn, milo, those things. These things grow during the summer. Most people are not running feeders during the summer. The impact I would question that. Don't know. The deer impact is a real thing. We do know that numbers are large in this area. That handles that. Sorry. Game bird impact. So again, the study talks about that the last time. The study is in reference to nesting, which occurs from April to August. Again, most of us are not running feeders during that time period. If you look at the majority of hunters that are hunting, we don't know when they're harvesting. So that's a good question. Again, these things bring up the important questions. And what I'd like to bring up is, most hunters are not running your feeders throughout the summer months. This is the most impact. We heard about impact in those areas. We talked about predators. You can manage for predators, there are programs and ways to manage for these things. In closing, to make this very sweet and simple. Outfitters are not the problem. Out of staters are not the problem. That goes across this board. We have true problems. Our turkey population is in decline, we can all agree on that, what is causing that. We do know one way that we can, and I thank the commission for doing this, looking at extending nest predators because that is a way that we really can impact those numbers. It's a tried-and-true way. We can honestly say we have limited funds in this state. We just gave a raise to our game wardens, and we need more and need more funding for that. I would agree with those things. I think that it is competitive that we look at how this impacts us and what we can do that will actually do good. We do have a problem with turkeys, and we also have a problem with recruiting. We're dying. That's why I started this off by saying that we need to work together.

This should be across the board. The easiest way for us as hunters to get out and bring somebody into this is supplemental feeding. I'm sorry if that hurts somebody out there, but it really is. Anybody out there, you can put it out, put corn out. Highest likelihood. The gentleman spoke earlier that he quit hunting because he could not be successful. Success is the key to hunting. You have to be successful, or those people are not going to continue with this. We can all argue about this. We can talk and the reason. I say out of state and other areas are not the problem. Because it won't be a problem in 10 years. There won't be anybody left. It will be us. We will be taken over. We will not be allowed to hunt; our rights will be taken away, by PETA and groups like them. They don't like us. We need to stand together. And this issue just brings us all together. And I'm happy because yes, we can disagree on this, but we do need to stand together on this. First, the commission, the majority of them do not hunt deer, that's the truth. You can look at it, I did a Kansas Open Records Act request on all of their license purchases, including Secretary Loveless. I'm glad to see that you do, deer hunt. It's kind of a nice thing to see. So basically, they have no vested interest in this. Some of them don't even hunt or fish. That's the truth. So, we need to simply look at it this way, we as the individuals that do pay for this because we are the ones that buy the tags. We are the ones that go out and purchase firearms ammunition and bows. We need to take this to the legislature. Don't let them do this. They said it best themselves. They're scared of us. They're afraid we're going to take this to the Department of Agriculture. We need to contact our legislators, they're the ones we elect. They're the ones that represent us. I would encourage anyone in here to contact them, for or against. I don't mean that just for baiting. I have no vested interest in this outside hunting myself, but I do see that I want my children and other people to enjoy the sport as much as I have throughout this.

## **V. DEPARTMENT REPORT (continued)**

### **B. Secretary's Remarks**

1. Agency and State Fiscal Status Report – Brad Loveless, Secretary, presented this update to the Commission. Thank you for coming. FY 2024 began July 1. Park Fee Fund (PFF), derived from entrance fees, camping fees and annual vehicle passes to state parks. Total revenue for July \$1.25 million, 10% higher than same month, previous year. Revenue for calendar year FY 2023 has been good and cash balance at end of July was \$6.56 million. Cabin net revenue for parks and public land cabins from rental of cabins, July was \$144,000, also an increase from previous year. Wildlife Fee Fund (WFF) is derived from sale of hunting and fishing licenses, big game permits and tags, to hunters and anglers. WFF revenue for July was \$814,000, similar to recent years. Cash balance in WFF was \$25.5 million. This is the fund that virtually everybody, but parks draw from. The Boating Fee Fund (BFF) is derived from boat registrations and with this money we provide boating safety, education, and access infrastructure to protect and support the boating public. Receipts for July were approximately \$173,000, increase from previous year but less than long term average; balance at end of July of \$2.6 million. Hectic budget time for us, we are turning in numbers to the state Department of Revenue and Department of Administration, working on FY 2025 budget requests. This is expected to similar to FY 2024, but for WFF we had a spike during Covid, sliding back down to normal levels. We expect budget request to be slightly less than previous years to not exceed money in the bank.

### **C. General Discussion**

Chairman Lauber – Ask everyone to be as brief as possible to cover subject matter.

1. Big Game permanent regulations – Levi Jaster, big game coordinator, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit V). Included is 115-4-2, general provisions; involves procedures for transferring meat to another person, salvage carcasses, proof of sex, registration to transport certain animals, information that has to be included on tags. We haven't changed this regulation since 2020 with modifying proof of sex that allowed hunters to voluntarily take actions that would limit the spread of chronic wasting disease (CWD) by leaving the head and spine in the field, which are the worst parts of carcass. Next is 115-4-4, legal equipment and taking methods, not usually changed every year but as we have items to change. The last change we had for that was the tumble upon impact ammunition. This year we do anticipate a review of muzzleloader ammunition, language in regulation is fairly old. Have had it brought up multiple time over last few years. In asking law enforcement folks some of the ones they want would not be legal, so will review that. KAR 115-4-6 is management units, adjusted recently due to road rerouting and road name changes. KAR 115-4-11, permit applications. We have lapped ourselves on this and will talk about that regulation and hope ready to move forward on that. KAR 115-4-13 permits and descriptions, no real changes, looking at what kinds of permits we have and will continue to evaluate. Starting process and will come forward in next few meetings. *Unknown audience* – Do we have any plans to look at modernization and technology of weapons, seasons and tags and adjust? Jaster – Common topic of conversation within the agency and usually brought forward on piece-meal basis. Once something is brought to our attention or have significant number of people asking for it then we evaluate it. *Unknown audience* – Technology continues to advance, so do our seasons match those advances. Jaster – We discuss technology all the time and a common topic in meetings.

#### **D. Workshop Session**

1. KAR 115-4-11 Big Game permit applications (FY 2023 big game regulation review cycle) – Levi Jaster, big game coordinator, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit W). Need to clean up some language, some language from previous change was inadvertently left in, no change just cleanup. I will talk to Dan about submitting this to have a vote soon. Chief Counsel Dan Riley – Need acknowledgement by commission that we should start promulgation process. Chairman Lauber – I recommend moving forward.

2. CWD Update and Carcass Movement Regulation – Levi Jaster, big game program, coordinator, presented this update to the Commission (Exhibit X, PowerPoint – Exhibit Y). Only covering last season's CWD information, so a limited picture of what is going on. Map of where found, not highlighting prevalence rates because length of time it has been in a place affects that. In eastern counties only one to two samples positive. Green star counties are only detected in captive elk, not positive wild elk in Kansas yet. Research shows they are more resistant, maybe behavior foraging change. Test few elk, only test sentinel animals from one of the herds. Get handful of hunter-harvested elk that come in, most around Fort Riley, and no detections in that location yet. Samples collected between normal rotation efforts in south-central Kansas last year, in southwest this next year. Goal of 450 samples, it is voluntary, and we get a lot from taxidermists and concerned hunters. For state, we had 2,105 useable samples, none of sick animals were part of this number, if you looked at them you wouldn't know they had CWD. Generally, 10% across the state, not telling us much. In northwest Kansas, where we have had it the longest, prevalence there is 32-48%. By species, mule deer, 34% prevalence. That is tough

because 108 samples make that estimate questionable because we would like to have 400 samples at least, more reliable the more we get. Whitetails are 7.7% prevalence across the state, not full story. In far southeast Kansas it is unlikely you will harvest a deer with CWD but will in northwest Kansas. We use sampling zones because that is the way sampling is designed, not by units. If in southwest Kansas would have to go to mandatory sampling scheme there and would have to sample 80% of deer harvested in DMU 18 to have enough, so we opened to area and averaging across that. Work with 2 ½ year old bucks because that is majority of samples we get. Deer who have CWD that is where you will first pick it up, in older bucks. Prevalence rates tell the most story, all deer combined, basically the same because so many of the samples are made up of this group. Low prevalence in east, in north-central and northwest where it has been around the longest it jumps quite a bit. Less farther south. I included unknowns because we had some that came in, low numbers of samples, not read into densities; it would be similar to picking two people out of this room and asking whether in favor or against banning baiting. Not a good idea, but if we asked 30-40% of you, we would have a better idea of what is going on in this room. That is how polling and surveys work. You have to have enough samples to do it. Secretary Loveless – Talk about lower and upper, is that a confidence interval? Jaster – Confidence intervals, 95% because history and statistics in using that. It means if we went out in same area and collected samples again and looked at what that estimate is going to be, that prevalence estimate, is what statistical analysis comes back to. If we went out and collected another 393 samples from eastern Kansas in bucks that are 2 ½ years old or older, the likelihood that we would get a prevalence estimate between lower and upper number is 95%. It gives confidence that whatever you come up will fall between those numbers. You can narrow the range down with more samples. With the University of Missouri project wrapping up so we should have final report from that in December. After review before we wrap up that and publish that. Since I was talking about the research projects, bring up the couple that we've had recently. We had a project in western Kansas where we captured and collared deer. That's wrapped up, but part of that that came out with some blood work and some hybridization stuff and that has then continued into a larger statewide project when we were able to get some money out of USDA. That is covering: looking at the genetic resistance of our deer herd in Kansas and looking at what we see in that, versus some historical data we could look at. Potentially that's an easier way to look at whether or not CWD is present at all without having to pull hundreds, or thousands, of samples to cover an area. If we can do it that way you can get what samples you can get and it's not going to tell us what the prevalence rate is, but it should tell us, if we get more than greater resistance, good chance we should probably be focusing effort there. The other part of that is from a project where we're doing some more epidemiology looking at how it spreads. We used it as a way to get a much better picture of CWD in Kansas rather than just limiting to our rotational sampling, which we rotate around the five-unit zones, once every five years. This opened up sampling to a lot more hunters that would like to do that. Now that we are done with that project that opportunities have gone away. Commissioner Sill - We used to send teeth in for the purpose of aging and U.S. Postal Service shut that down because we were messing up their machines. Is that correct? Jaster - That's what I was told, they got really unhappy with bloody envelopes. Commissioner Sill - So that used to be one way that you were able to track age structures. At a workshop this summer, in discussing CWD, general synopsis, it affects older bucks first. So, you're going to see a change in age structure before you see a decline in numbers. Is that generally accurate? Jaster - Yes and no, in some cases, certainly it is. Other cases, it's more population decline before you see that change. If it's more related to some other outside event, like a really hard winter, it is likely deer that have CWD are going to die faster. So, you may see a population change before you really detect that age. Or in some cases it may be like Colorado saw, in hunting population, they lost their older adult bucks, versus in a hunting population they

still had them but, was still a lot lower. It is smaller there is some harvest. The hunted population versus the un-hunted population. Didn't have harvest but was in a location that there was no hunting. So likely if it was not. In the middle of Boulder that would have been hunted more. Commissioner Sill - What are we doing to track age structure to see how CWD is impacting it? Whether it is impacting that age structure, are those early changes may be happening or not. How are we tracking age structure now that we no longer have that tool? Jaster - Within that, even if we went to something that like aircraft, cover the same area or more, you're not going to see them. Even from a bed of a truck to say that's a four-and-a-half-year-old versus a five-and-a-half-year-old year would be difficult. We could certainly be pulling teeth again and looking at them. That would likely be the most cost-effective method. We would have to make it mandatory to make sure we get that. At least to a point, it'd be probably more localized if we're looking that way, but we do look at just the number of adult bucks out there which we classify any buck that's 2 and a half or older as an adult in the surveys. We look at that ratio to the number of those that we see. We've got that against, what percentage of the number of bucks that we see are yearlings in that. So, at this point, tracking the age, or the age structure on the doe, is not a significant contributor. Without pulling teeth, there's really not a good way to track age structure. When I first started, part of the spotlight survey was trying to include those yearling does, but that's really subjective as to whether or not it's a yearling or an adult. A doe that's standing out in a field, 150 yards away in a spotlight is hard to tell how old she is. Then trying to do that across the number of staff and volunteers that help with those surveys, it made a lot more sense just to call it a doe. We looked at some of the ages during that research project out west, and the biggest thing with that was we found does are surviving really well out west. So, it's not necessarily doe survival, it's our fawn production there. We've been looking at this proposed language for dealing with carcass movements. This is hunters taking responsibility for not moving carcasses since we've had some whole carcasses that have been hauled to other states that have been positive for CWD. Also, to deal with different strains we have of CWD in an area, you see resistance to that strain start to grow. All the research so far has shown if deer have CWD, they are still dead. Eventually maybe we can get to the point of resistance and maybe deer can live longer or maybe even develop some sort of resistance where they don't die. I don't know. We are looking at the importation of wild cervid carcasses in Kansas and trying to do the best management option that's outlined through quite a bit of research. That is, don't bring in anything, but that doesn't fly, as far as people trying to go to other states and hunt or wanting to bring in their deer. The same reason people come to Kansas. They're not really coming to haul packaged meat they want antlers too, if they can get it, in many cases. You can bring the whole carcass after you've had a not-detected test; quarters with all the spine and head materials removed; deboned meat cut and wrapped; hides with the excess flesh removed; clean skulls; clean teeth; skull plate with antlers if they're cleaned of soft tissues, or antlers without a skull plate attached, which would also include shed antlers that are found; finished taxidermy products; and tanned hides, are incredibly low risk. Most people are going to keep them at home. Heads and capes with not more than six inches of the neck, just limit the worst parts in this case. Provided you're taking it to a taxidermy service. And then tissues used in a diagnostic testing or research lab or for research. If there's prior approval, so that it is tracked that way and hunters would still have to maintain the proof of sex as required by regulations. This basically just puts Kansas in line with what other states around us have done. That was the bringing stuff into Kansas. This is talking about moving around within Kansas. Part of the problem we have with that was, as we looked at different places, that any kind of buffer around, rather than sticking to

the hard boundaries of the units, split some cities in half. There were, in many cases, folks from Wichita that may be hunting spread out quite a bit around Wichita at all not necessarily close to home. So, we looked at 30 miles from the boundary of the unit. In trying to split it apart and find a distance, we always split a city somewhere and so the solution we came up with is that if it's within a contiguous municipal area, and I'll have to work with Dan and other folks to make sure that we've got this spelled out in legal language correctly, that it means what we're intending it to mean. If you're from Wichita or Kansas City or somewhere that may have multiple small municipal areas within that. Even though we call it Kansas City, Kansas City is made up of Olathe, Shawnee and those places. So as long as those are all connecting. If that line crosses that somewhere, then you can still stay within that city because in most cases, the waste from that is going to go to the dumpster. So, it would be 30 miles or within that contiguous municipal area that intersects that limit. Chairman Lauber – So, Highway 75 is the boundary for one unit, you can go 30 miles beyond that to a processor? Jaster - Yes. Riley – We are going to have quite a few terms that we're going to have to define because they don't show up elsewhere in the regulation. So, there will be a lot of expansion in terms of definitions required for that. Jaster - Since we had been holding on trying to figure out that boundary line and that's where we left off. This is what we've been discussing moving towards rather than try to come up with just a boundary. Those municipal areas, so that somebody that is over on the outskirts of the town doesn't necessarily get left out. Otherwise most everything else, as far as what could be moved, is the same as the import restriction. It allows the meat and people to move their trophies and whatnot, but still try to leave the worst parts of the carcass there. It's not the ideal situation, that is you don't bring in anything, but that's unworkable. This still fits within all the best management practices. Of course, everybody still has to maintain that proof of sex as required. And we opened that a few years back to allow people to do this voluntarily. I wanted to leave off with the plan for our sampling this coming season. We will be down in the southwest corner; we're still targeting 450 samples out there. We go with what we've seen historically. We'll probably get somewhere in the realm of 200 or maybe up to 300 out of that zone. We hope more people participate in it. What's new for this coming year is that with that wrap up of that University of Missouri project the statewide option for folks, that covered that cost of the test, is going away because that project was a limited fund for a limited term. So, we put together a plan to open testing up a little more, making it a little more cost efficient for folks for anybody that harvests a deer in Kansas.

It's first come first served. There's a lot of options that have varying cost and speed, but the test cost will be covered in most cases. If a hunter wanted the fastest possible option and didn't mind the cost, they could pay to have the kit shipped to them from the Vet lab and then pay to ship that back and pay the cost of the test and do it all private. That information is theirs and they don't have to share it with anybody. But you pay the full cost of the test plus all the shipping, which is going to be around \$40 or so total. But you'll get your results the fastest because usually they work those through as they get things up at the diagnostic lab. If you still want speed, but don't mind a little bit of cost, but don't necessarily want to pay the cost of the actual test, then you can cover the cost of the shipping yourself. And then get it up to the lab yourself. It'll go as fast as you ship it out and when it gets there, they process it. That has to have a completed data card from us to actually cover the cost of that test though. We've got those and there will be a card in our hunting regulations of what's got to be included and I'm sure we'll get that up online as well and maybe is up already or will be soon. We cover the cost of the test, and the hunters are not paying for it upfront. If you want the least cost to you but potentially the slowest results, you can get a kit from some of our staff or offices where you can and then get a sample to one of our offices or one of our biologists and they will then bulk ship all of the ones they collect every two weeks as they get more in. I think the plan at this point is, at the height of season, like rifle

season in November, they will probably ship out every week. There's a chance that your sample would sit there for a couple of days, but it'll then be bulk shipped, so you don't have to pay that shipping return to the lab and then the test is still covered by us. Again, it's got to have a completed data card for us to take it and pay for it. When you do that, you're agreeing that the results will be shared with KDWP too, as far as whether that sample is positive or negative. And at this point, like I said, it's first come first served. We've got a plan in place for 1,500 samples combined overall. So, that includes that 450 potentially from our own monitoring. The last three years with that University of Missouri project, part of that involved paying technicians to be out collecting samples and picking up road kills to pull samples. Going to places when hunters call for to assist or just pull the sample. In the past when people have done voluntary sampling, which they had to pay for themselves with the lab, the total number of samples from that was only, 200 to 300 in a year. I think our best year, so we're hopeful that 1,500 is enough to get us where we need to go and certainly more than we've targeted before that research project. A chance to provide some customer service and get a little more information over time. If it improves, I'm sure we'll reevaluate and see where we go from there but for this inaugural season of the program, that's where we're at and what we plan for. It was asked how we were going to encourage people to do that. We'll have information in our regulation summary that goes out. We will work with our public affairs folks to get some Facebook and other social media posts out to let people know that it's an option out there and people that sell licenses or something like that. I will not discourage anyone from testing for CWD. *Unknown audience* – Can people who sell licenses have something to give out or post for people. Jaster – That is outside my realm so I would ask the Secretary or Nadia from public affairs about that. Secretary Loveless - We'd love to. We can get with license sellers and have tests available as well as information. We'll take that on. Jaster - That's what I had for us today.

Chairman Lauber - Great information. Hopefully you all consume that. I had some notes here.

Bieker - A couple of things. I live in the northwest part of Kansas. I'm in the heat of this thing. I am a mule deer hunter I noticed that your mule deer numbers were in the mid-thirties and if you are like me and supplemental feed, they are the hardest of any animal to get on a supplemental feed pile. So, anybody out there that hunts over in the western Kansas you can't get mule deer there. I can't get pictures on them. If supplemental feeding is the big laser focus. Why are mule deer populations in the mid-30s? But yet they're not the ones hitting the supplemental feed sites. Jaster - CWD is only a small part of this, as far as the discussion about baiting and feeding. It was brought up that we had talked for 30 minutes on during that last meeting that was a small part discussed on disease transmission. There's a lot of other diseases out there. A lot of the cases in northwest Kansas, where our first detection was 2001. It's been 20 years since we've had it there and I don't think anybody ever said that baiting and feeding is going to stop it. Nobody knows what will stop CWD. But when you got a broken leg, you don't then break your arm. You know we're just shooting ourselves in the foot and contributing to that. It's also what we saw from our research in that there's some interaction between whitetail and mule deer. So, how do we know if spreading, amongst whitetails even more, then does. That means any interaction with whitetails is going to affect them, there's options for that to happen naturally too without baiting and feeding, you know it's there. But again, are we hurting ourselves otherwise, it's a small part of it, CWD. I know that's been talked about a lot about today, but. I don't know

that I would say it's laser focused. It's certainly a concern and major point to make with it, but there's a lot of other reasons to just besides CWD to talk about this and educate ourselves more.

Bieker – In regard to Commissioner Sills comment, she mentioned the age structure in the deer seems to be declining. Completely agree with you. Commissioner Sill - That's not what I said. Bieker - You asked the question if it was declining? Commissioner Sill - No, I asked the question how we tracked it. Bieker - I would like to invite anybody out here who wants to hunt a 7-year-old, 8 point or less, to come out. I'd love to have you. I've got plenty of 7-year-old whitetail bucks. Love to have you come out with me. I can't shoot our 4-and-a-half-year-olds, they're already getting killed, but I'd invite you to come out to 7-year-old. At the last thing you mentioned, does aren't as susceptible to CWD or they're not having the same raise. I think it's important to note that many times does aren't hitting scrapes, not hitting rubbing trees and they're not fighting throughout the season. That is all-natural stuff that whitetail bucks will do, and I think something we need to consider. And part of that with those is that the number of samples we get because we get hunter harvest, a lot of our stuff is taxidermy, and they collect it because that's the group of deer that you're going to see it first. Jaster - And that most people are interested in, that's the highest interest by far. What we do see with those would be a reason to consider increasing sampling effort in places. Once CWD is established in an area that's when you start seeing the creep in does. CWD rates start once it's there, and then for a little bit idle then it starts to pick up. At that point, I would say you're in a lot of trouble. Because you know looking at fawn survival out in western Kansas, we were down in the 25% to 30% range. So, which is the big driver right now. We also are seeing some issues with the number of does that were pregnant. So, we caught deer in February, generally, if a doe is more than a yearling, fawn have to wait to be sexually mature enough to actually have a fawn or carry a fawn and be bred. But adult does are there, and we generally expect the high 90% pregnancy rates, and we were seeing some numbers down in the 80% rate out there. So, you start taking deer that aren't even pregnant, going into spring that late, and then turn that around with low fawn survival of what's out there. It's a much greater thing than just CWD for sure. You know, we've talked about drought and habitat. I went out there last year on surveys and there's a lot of places that I saw deer during surveys, and that we didn't see any in others. I could also see a cow pie at 300 yards across the plains this past year that was the tallest thing around. We saw deer fawns that need grass waist high to survive best and that is what we saw in research, the ones that survived had that. Find a lot of places like that in western Kansas, but when you add CWD on top of it. Does CWD directly kill deer? No, it doesn't, but it opens them up to infections and they may be more likely to succumb to predators, other illnesses, hunters too, which is why we encourage folks to harvest them. Harvest and test when you harvest. That's why hunters are really the solution we've got in Kansas to deal with this. Bieker - I invite you to western Kansas any time. If you want to come ride around with me, you're more than welcome.

3. Turkey Regulations – Kent Fricke, small game coordinator, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit Z, PowerPoint – Exhibit AA, Handout – Exhibit BB). First thing I just wanted to mention, and highlight was that earlier this year the National Wild Turkey Federation awarded one of our private lands biologist Steve Adams who works out of Hutchinson and the Reno South Central Kansas area with the Joe Kurzweil Life Manager of the Year Award. We are really proud of Steve's efforts and getting him some national recognition, so this is a one biologist out of the country wins kind of deal and we're really, happy with his efforts. He's been on our turkey committee representing south-central Kansas for a long time, longer than me. And has brought a lot of really good perspective and works with private landowners across his district and really does good work and has spent a lot of time on wild



turkey restoration efforts across the state. Happy to recognize Steve for his effort. The second piece I wanted to highlight is our statewide turkey research project. We've now got contracts and funding in place with Kansas State University through the Kansas Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit and the College of Horticulture and Natural Resources to do a statewide turkey research project that we've been discussing internally for several years. The primary objectives are to get us a much better baseline on overall demographic rates, habitat use and resource selection, across the state not just within a local, more targeted area. We intend to have three study sites on both private and public, accessible lands in the west, central and eastern parts of the state. Think of paired turkey hunting units north and south and then as part of this effort we'll be putting 300 GPS transmitters on adults but then we've also been able to add some additional components. Thanks to some funding from National Turkey Federation for a multi-state turkey health assessment, which is a study that'll be conducted with samples from Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. And then also some Kansas specific poult forging ecology work. We've utilized funds obviously from some supplemental friend's funds from National and Turkey Federation, but otherwise everything's coming from the wildlife and sport fish restoration dollars that were allocated that comes from hunters and anglers. We're really excited about this research and getting started working with Dr. Dave Hocus and Dr. Dan Sullins out of Kansas State. We've already got two PhD students and a master student on board for this. A quick summary on the process that we finalized at the last two meetings, April and June. We confirmed the 2024 season dates and I'll mention them a little bit later. We removed the adjacent unit allowance for Unit 4 permits. We reduced the number of Unit 4 permits from 500 to 375. We reduced bag limits and Units 1 and 2, so that we're at one bird statewide. We set nonresident quotas by unit and then in June created the nonresident permit draw process. And just a reminder that as we're working through these, there is one other related discussion piece that will be coming forward to the commission, which is KAR 15-2-1, amount of fees and in that is proposed to create and set the price for nonresident preference point and also increase the cost of both the nonresident hunting license, which is required to hunt turkeys and the nonresident turkey permit. Costs associated with that. So just a quick overview of where we've been. In August last year we first proposed all of these changes. Again, I'll be somewhat brief here in terms of population trends, your briefing book has the information I had through, 2022 for the production indices. What I've handed out to the commission prior to the meeting today (Exhibit BB) is the updated numbers with the 2023 numbers. I just ran the analysis yesterday, which shows the production trends. From our rural mail carrier survey that's done in the spring, which is a rough index of population abundance and the production indices, which is represented as young per 100 adults, I'll point out that gray line is at the 100 marks, so that would basically represent and be a rough estimate of a population that's stable, not growing, not decreasing. Any estimates that are below that number indicated a declining population. In the spring numbers of adult birds and the numbers that are feeding into that from the production side, statewide, we got a way to go. I think this reflects the overall status of turkeys in the state and the state of decline that we've seen. That said, we did see a slight statewide increase this year in 2023, with some favorable nesting conditions. We'll start in the west and again the northern unit, which is how we quantify our numbers, is the solid line and then the dotted line is the southern unit. You see some decent increases, especially in the northwest part of the state, Unit one, in terms of production. Then in central Kansas, we've seen not as well as we would have liked this year, thought conditions may have been a little bit better with the amount of precipitation they got, especially in June. We did not see that reflected or any big jumps in the production numbers. In the eastern portion of the state, we did see some fairly

decent increases in the amount of production over the last several years and a slight increasing trend there over the last 5 or 6 years. Overall, we'll move on to turkey, season framework. As we made changes in the public hearing today, to change the verbiage in the season frameworks for elk and pronghorn to make them more sustainable so we don't have to revisit it each year. Those are already in place for turkey seasons, where the youth season starts April 1 and then they get a full weekend, archery begins the Monday after the full first weekend and then the regular season begins the Wednesday after the second full weekend. So, youth, disabled, get a full weekend, archery gets a full weekend and then the regular season begins and goes through the end of May. And again, the fall season is now closed. The commission approved the 2024 season dates last year and are as represented here with the regular season starting on April 17 and the fall season closed. Then for consideration today, or during this process, is that if there's no change to the season framework for the regulation, what spring of 2025 will look like with a regular season start date of April 16 and a closed fall season. When I last talked to you in June, we did not have the results of this spring harvest survey, we do now. As you can see in the Units 1 and 2, we were still at the spring, the two-bird bag limit in the northwest and north central, Units 1 and 2. There were no hunting incident reports made this year, or for several years in a row now, which is obviously a good thing. Overall, we had a slight increase in the number of overall permit buyers. Everything looked fairly stable. Nonresidents had a slight increase this year, but still within the trends that we've seen in the last several years. Of course, we had the COVID year in 2020 when nonresidents permits were suspended for the majority of the season, but we see overall steady trends in terms of permit sales by residency. Estimated spring harvest was just shy of around the 15,000 marks, which has been stable. Relatively stable, since we reduced the number of game tags, the second bird in the majority of the units in the state, the eastern and south-central units. So not a lot of big surprises here, obviously glad from perspective that we're staying stable to a degree. Overall harvest by residency, was presented last year. We do see about the same, if not more harvest, by nonresidents than we do by residents. So again, these are just overall stats, nothing out of the ordinary in terms of the data that we see. You can see the trends, breakdown of the harvest and overall hunter success still remained relatively high. Overall, hunter success remains relatively steady on all fronts. Additionally, I feel like hunter satisfaction has somewhat stabilized in the last couple of years. For 4 or 5 years now I've been demonstrating the decline that we've seen in the number of satisfied and very satisfied numbers and the increase in the number of dissatisfied and neutral hunters. Again, this is an index of overall feelings of hunters, but I do feel like we've seen more of a stabilization here in that satisfied and very satisfied portion and kind of a peak on the dissatisfied portion. A lot of factors go into hunter satisfaction at an individual level but like to present this just to give you a feel for what overall satisfaction looks like. In terms of our harvest strategy, we did see another year for all units below the threshold for resident hunter success however we do require at least two to three years of consecutive hunter success below those thresholds. So, given that we haven't been able to implement any of the actual changes during an active hunting season yet, the harvest strategy itself. We have no recommended changes to either the season structure, permit numbers or bag limits and, and are looking forward to next year and seeing how we work through the process. We talked about things in our general discussion in June, today I presented the harvest summaries, population trends and staff are not recommending any changes. If the commission does not have any additional items that you'd like us to look into regarding regulations, this will be the last time I see you, I won't come back for additional workshop sessions this fall. We'll keep working on getting research field work beginning in, January.

Travis See, Augusta. - Looking at your research that you're getting ready to do, is there any consideration to expanding that scope to nesting success? Looking at polls but I'm worried that

we're not even getting that far. To expand on that to go along with what Andrew said earlier, if you do look at the data that was provided with the drastic drop in predator harvesting with the crash of the fur market. We were one of you guys to look at. Essentially just extending, that season for including basically, raccoons and possums in with coyotes because we've seen success as presenting that data with doing so. I'm really concerned that the nesting success is going to drop quite a bit with the drastic rising predators with them. There's just a lot less of them being taken. Fricke – So, your first question, certainly the nesting success is a key component of this. As I mentioned, 300 transmitters that we're going to be putting on adults is the goal across three different sites and the focus of all our trapping efforts is going to be on putting those on. We recognize that low production is one of the key drivers of our population currently in the state as it is in many states in the Midwest and southeastern states. The success is a key component of that. See - Once you find those, do you guys go back and check like every few days and candle eggs and do stuff like that? Fricke - No, is the short answer. But there's a good reason for that. Turkeys are highly susceptible to abandoning nests and so the benefit of a GPS transmitter, for example, is that every day, especially during the nesting season, we can get uploaded from satellites the exact location of those birds of those hens. Let's say for the example, we follow them day by day, especially during April and May and June, and find out when they start displaying nesting activity, right? Staying in one spot entire day, and that kind of stuff. Typically, then we will either try to get to that nest maybe once during that time period when she's on the nest and ideally, it's when she's off the nest and to go to the feed and get water, so we get in see number of eggs, handle eggs, but then we also get out so that we have the lowest likelihood of causing abandonment. There is a very distinct correlation between the increase in predator harvest the increase in turkey population between 2000 to 2010 and the same correlation in the decline and harvest of fur harvesters and the decline in the turkey population is what the data provided.

Kenny Graham - I see the past, which I knew was, passed for the draw on the turkey tags. For nonresident, will that nonresident buy a \$30 tag? Will they have to buy a hunting license prior to the draw like we do with deer. Fricke – No, that will not be required for turkey.

Trevor Wilson. - I'm curious when you guys are going to release the draw results for the turkeys. The proposed date. Fricke - Yeah, they will definitely be out by March 1. Wilson - Is there any way to make it sooner than that? Fricke - We had to put something realistic into the application process, and so to clarify too, the application period is from early January until the second Friday in February, so it's about a month-long period. We have to time to go through the full process for the draw and then notify as soon as possible. So typically, we can make it happen much faster than March first, but that's not always possible. Wilson - My concern is just for the hunters that are coming out of state to plan their trip and short amount of time to make that happen and also short amount of time to figure out where they're setting with the numbers. So earlier the better if that all possible. Fricke-Absolutely. Wilson - Also is that again to be a party draw, or can you do a party draw similar to the deer? Fricke - The goal was really to have things as similar to deer as possible, because we expected that obviously this is specific to nonresidents that they're likely be a relatively high correlation of that similarity with the process.

Josh Stubbs – I may have missed it, but what was the number set for nonresident tags for turkey? Fricke - They're in the briefing book item. They are by unit. I believe, 9,700, but again, by unit.

Kenny Graham – 25% reduction across the board? Fricke - The process that we used to utilize that was, we took the five-year average, not a five-year average of the estimated active number of nonresidents in each unit, which they indicate on the Hunter Harvest survey. So, from that number, we took last five averages, five years of data and took the five-year average of that minus 2020 due to COVID. Then took that number, reduced it by 25%, rounded to the nearest 100. Graham – Hunt multiple units? Fricke – What made it difficult was a lot of those did not put in anything before, it was just statewide.

Sheila – Is request to go to promulgation process necessary? Riley - Only discussion, no changes for next round. Nothing to ratify.

Billy – Unit specific on tags, unit and conjoining unit? Fricke – Just the unit you draw for.

4. Boating Regulations – Eric Deneault, boating law enforcement officer was unable to attend (Exhibit CC). Assistant Secretary, Stuart Schrag – Eric not able to be here today. Nothing different than what was presented at June meeting presentation.

5. Fishing Regulations – Bryan Sowards, fisheries division director, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit DD). Third workshop. Biggest changes to blue catfish at Clinton, Glen Elder, John Redmond, Melvern, El Dorado, Elk City and Milford reservoirs. Catfish committee met this winter and discussed a lot of creel and sampling data that we've done over the last decade. A lot of these populations were stocked in the late 1990s and others in the mid-2000s. We are getting a lot of good information now and starting to see smaller individuals that are growing relatively slowly, like our counterpart in Oklahoma. We are trying to be proactive and get ahead of it and encourage people to harvest those fish, so these length limits are going to change to 10/day, including one fish over 30-inches. Those fish are rare and targeted very often and caught fairly easily in respect to the population. We're trying to give some protection for those larger individuals over 30 inches, but also liberal harvest of smaller fish to encourage growth in the future. A lot of the other regulations on here are fairly minimal in scope. If you want me to go over those, I will but they are listed in the in the briefing book. I have one more to mention. To remove a number of locations off the paddle fish snagging location list. As I mentioned the previous two workshops, this was because somehow it got in a regulation book, and you didn't actually vote on it. We caught it and now we're removing those because they were not voted on. Removing those from reference document tied to 115-25-14 (Neosho Falls Dam, Erie Dam, and Oswego Dam on the Neosho River, Coffeyville Dam on the Verdigris River, and Ottawa Dam on the Marais des Cygnes River). Request to no longer workshop and move forward with promulgation process. Chairman Lauber – Move forward.

6. Aquatic Invasive Species Regulations – Chris Steffen, aquatic invasive species coordinator, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit EE). Changing from aquatic “nuisance” species (ANS) verbiage to aquatic “invasive” species. ANS term has fallen out of favor in that aquatic invasive species (AIS) is easier for the general public to understand. Most states have made that change. Specifically, to move from nuisance to invasive would require changes within KAR 115-7-3, 115-7-2, 115-7-9 and 115-7-10; a total of 18 instances where we want to replace word nuisance with invasive. We are asking to move forward with an AIS affirmation statement for folks operating a boat registered in Kansas, within Kansas waters. It is a short summary and statement explaining what aquatic invasive species are, the damage they can cause and how boaters can help us prevent the spread of those invasive species to other

waters. Modeled after other states such as Minnesota and South Dakota who have existing affirmations. We have 200 certified commercial fish bait dealers in Kansas. They get a permit through us and as part of their application packet we would like to request that they complete an aquatic invasive species (AIS) certification course that exists on our website that we use for a few city lakes that require it to boat on those locations. Ask them to send in the certificate that they get in at the end of the course upon successful completion, with their fish bait permit applications. The last item is to add a couple of water bodies to our AIS designated waters list. Willow Lake and the Riley County portion of the Kansas River, both for zebra mussels. There are not new finds, Willow Lake is connecting more frequently to the river pond below Tuttle Creek where we have zebra mussels. Then the Riley County portion of the Kansas River was inadvertently left off in the past, so that entire river section has zebra mussels. Riley – Will these be workshopped again. Steffen – Request to move into promulgation process. Chairman Lauber – We will move forward.

7. KAR 115-20-2, possession limits amphibians and reptiles – Daren Riedle, wildlife diversity coordinator, in the Ecological Services section presented this to the Commission (Exhibit FF). I give a pretty significant presentation at the June commission meeting. We're just looking at changing the possession limits for amphibians and reptiles. Reducing them from individuals per species to five of any combination of amphibian possessed per person and/or domicile. And then on reptiles, no more than five reptiles and two individuals per any reptile species per person and/or domicile, whichever is reached first. There are several reasons we're looking at this including some bills that have been introduced through the legislature looking at reducing possession limits for some species down to zero. We're trying to find a happy medium here and working with our law enforcement folks, helping them with field stops and so forth. Chairman Lauber - I think you've got a good job the first go around. Riedle – Are we ready for hearing at the next meeting? Riley - Yes up for vote at next commission meeting.

8. Furbearer Regulations – Matt Peek, furbearer research biologist, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit GG, handout Exhibit HH). Talked about these two topics extensively, night vision coyote hunting and raccoon harvest seasons. At the last meeting, we brought forth a proposal to leave the coyote season as it currently is with the exception of doing away with the permit itself. Commissioner Gfeller recommended that maybe we should not do away with that permit and continue to track the permit sales and participation in that season for a bit longer. So, we went back and visited about that, and we will go ahead and take his advice so that will allow us to monitor these \$2.50 night vision permit sales for a couple more years until we think that the permit sales reach stability. At the current time, we're proposing no change to the night vision season. Onto the raccoon harvest season, we are proposing to move the season for raccoons and possums to year-round as a result of long-term increasing population estimates as well as recently reduced harvest and felt prices associated with that. Although the harvest season would be open year-round, the trapping methods that would be allowed outside of the current fur harvesting season would be limited to cage traps and the dog-proof foot encapsulating foothold traps. We would not be allowing body grips, snares or foothold traps during that off-season time. Commissioner Sill – Do you expect more hunting-type harvest versus trapping? Peek – I think that in places that they might make a difference, if their motive is for increased nesting, that is primarily going to have to be based on the legal hunting techniques. It's going to have to do with trapping. Trapping is the most effective and efficient way to manage populations

of them out there. It's more effective than daytime calling or nighttime calling without light, or raccoon hunting with hounds for that matter. But it remains to be seen how much of that is going to go on beyond just opportunistic harvest. It isn't going to make a difference for nesting. We had originally proposed that, but we're backing away from that now; for the night vision coyote permit, so we're going to maintain that \$2.50, it's meant to be a free permit, but as you know, there's the \$2.50 license fee. That's what allows us to track participation in that activity as opposed to it just being absorbed into hunting license sales.

*Unknown audience* – Do what you want but guys are spending \$5,000 to \$6,000 or more for pulsar or for IRA. You could make it \$22.50; they are going to buy it. Because they are tech savvy. Peek – We are not trying to pick on a specific hunting methodology or anything like that. We did this so we could track numbers only. So that was not intended to be a moneymaker for us at all. It was just simply so we knew how many people were doing it and in the past three years we've conducted post-season harvest surveys to estimate their harvest success and how many coyotes were taken, how many days they hunted, you know, their general activities as well. I prefer this to move to promulgation process. Chairman Lauber – We will move forward.

9. Public Lands Regulations – Ryan Stucky, public lands assistant director, presented these regulations to the Commission (Exhibit II). I'm here to talk about a couple of the changes we have to our reference document. This, workshop session on the reference document. We visited this 11 times now. So, I'm probably going to be asking to move this on to a promulgation process. Under section one, access restriction, towards the bottom there, there was no access into the wetland before 5 a.m., they must exit the wetland within one hour after sunset. We were doing that at, and we have some managers that would like to add their properties into those regulations as well. Slate Creek Wetlands, Byron Walker WA, and Perry Wildlife Area Wetland. Then under section six, boating restrictions, under region one, Cheyenne Bottoms, we do not have any motorized watercraft permitted only during the waterfowl seasons and we wanted to add Jamestown. Moving to region two, Perry Wildlife Area, “motorized watercraft permitted in wetland only during waterfowl season”. Under subsection (d), no vessels allowed, to be added for Cheyenne Bottoms, which is no vessels allowed during the waterfowl season. Moving to subsection 12, refuges, one we've talked about from the very beginning on, add Cherokee Lowlands area and two areas there that we'd like to move into the refuge system, Perkins East, and Bogner Center. Perkins East is a landlocked piece that we acquired in in a package deal so there's no public access to that property, we have maintenance access only and we felt that would be a good one to move into the refuge system. The next one is under Section 15, daily hunt permits, and the department is recommending adding all public land properties, state fishing lakes and wildlife area into the electronic check-in/check-out system. This requirement would be for hunting activities only, for all department managed lands and waters and i-WIHA properties, but would it be excluding Maxwell Wildlife Refuge, Big Basin Prairie Preserve? And all state parks. Under section 16, daily use permits, change a little bit of verbiage in there to electronic daily use permits are required through the department's licensing system for all activities fir Buck Creek and Noe Wildlife Area. Ask to move to promulgation process since we have discussed it 11 times. Chairman Lauber – Move forward.

Stucky – Next is a new regulation we're proposing for nonresident access into some of our department properties. Information and data collected from staff since 2021 Kansas waterfowl season is showing that nonresidents are spending more consecutive days on public waterfowl properties. Hunting in larger groups, spending more time per day on specific properties pursuing waterfowl. This has changed waterfowl behavior to the point there is growing concern that ducks specifically are not able to utilize their public wetlands sufficiently to meet their dietary energy

and resting needs. Because the human pressure has increased and intensity. Resident waterfowl hunters are also reporting, in increasing volume, that this change is nonresident waterfowl hunting culture has decreased their opportunities on our department lands and waters. Staff from public lands and wildlife division have been meeting regularly and discussing these growing issues of the past few hunting seasons. Several potential recommendations have been vetted and to continue to be discussed but the department believes the following recommendation has the greatest potential to address the nonresident. Pressure issue, the department is proposing a new KAR under the 115-8-series, to potentially help alleviate the above-mentioned concerns. It would state, in some fashion, that nonresident hunting or waterfowl hunting on Kansas Department Wildlife and Parks department lands and waters shall be restricted to Sundays, Mondays and Tuesdays throughout the duration of the established Kansas waterfowl season, including September teal season. Nonresidents would not be allowed to hunt waterfowl on department lands and waters Wednesday to Saturday. The three-day restriction is for the regular duck and goose seasons, but not to include the spring snow goose conservation order which starts in February and goes through April. And we did look at some stats on that to see which hunters were utilizing that, conservation order and 38% were nonresidents and 62% were residents. We've also been talking with our federal partners, the U.S. Army Corps Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation and National Wildlife Service. We'll be going back to them, in about month, with a written regulation. So, it'll be after the next commission meeting, November, that we will be coming to the commission with a written regulation. We'd like to give a little bit more time for public input and for further discussions with our federal partners. There are also a couple of categories of nonresidents that would be allowed to hunt as residents, active military, nonresident lifetime license owners, or nonresident college students. And they would have to have a valid ID to get that resident status. The department believes this proposed recommendation will have the least negative impact. We looked at several different options, one from Arkansas where they had three slot times within their seasons, and they could buy a five-day permit for \$40. They had to be done in the first or second session or section and they would only be able to hunt till noon. It'd be only one or two sessions all day. We looked at those and some of the other models that states have. One thing we wanted to allow was nonresidents to hunt throughout the season. Because you know they want to follow those heavy migration times. So, to not put specific dates on that. We thought if we gave it three days, every week during the season. At least they'd be able to come during their heavy migration. There was one other thing that Stuart wanted me to mention, and that was that we are also planning to request the Kansas legislature make changes to 32-939, waterfowl stamp and fees and 32-988 to establish habitat stamp at higher fee than residents.

Garrett Trenum, Delta Waterfowl Regional director for Kansas and Missouri (did not sign roster) – I'm on behalf of Delta Waterfowl and our members both in Kansas and across North America. We want to thank you all for the opportunity to weigh in and provide comment on the ongoing discussion and proposal centered on restricting nonresident waterfowl hunters from public lands in Kansas from Wednesday through Saturday during the waterfowl seasons. First and foremost, Delta Waterfall recognizes the authority and appreciates the intention of the Wildlife and Parks commission and the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks to enact regulations in an effort to create a better hunting experience for their residents. We understand the desires of Kansas residents to have a high-quality waterfowling both on public and private lands and we believe their needs should be strongly supported. While we believe this proposal was crafted with the best intentions, we feel it doesn't adequately address which is ensuring high quality waterfowl

hunting opportunity for residents. Kansas is a new highly desired destination for waterfowl owners across North America. Routinely Kansas rates at the bottom of states for publicly accessible hunting acres and Kansas Department of Wildlife and Park lacks the authority and flexibility to acquire more public land for hunters to meet that growing demand. In preparation for this meeting, Delta Waterfowl surveyed our members and waterfowlers in Kansas and the five surrounding states about their hunting tendency in Kansas and their overall attitudes and opinions on the proposed regulation change. A total of 379 survey respondents provided meaningful insight into not only the proposal itself, but other concerns stemming from accessing both public and private lands in Kansas. First, it's important to note that there was not unanimous consensus among the Kansas residents we surveyed about the proposed regulation change. In fact, one in three Kansas residents that were surveyed indicated that they either opposed or were unsure about how they felt about this proposal. While the majority of Kansas residents surveyed generally supported the proposal, many of those supporters had real concerns about the cascading impacts and unintended consequences on the ability to access private lands that this change may present. Restricting an entire user group to less than 50% of the season on public lands will likely lead to an increased demand for private land access, causing more land to be leased at higher rates and a more competitive marketplace. In addition to concerns about impacts of private land access, a large number of hunters surveyed expressed major concerns about the impact this will have on a growing guiding and outfitting community in Kansas. While guiding an outfitting on public lands is currently prohibited, this proposal will likely lead to more demand for guides and outfitters on private land that could lease up more of the available private access. In our survey more than 87% of survey respondents indicated that they primarily freelance, i.e., not utilizing services of guides and outfitters to meet their waterfowling needs. This proposal as written may in fact catalyze a series of events that will reduce opportunity on private lands for resident waterfowl hunters, which we believe is contrary to the fundamental objective of this proposal. Lastly, there were concerns communicated among those surveyed that this proposal could set off a chain reaction of additional states and acting similar regulations on their public lands. 83% of survey respondents indicated that they primarily access some combination of public lands to waterfowl on either state, federal or otherwise. So, as you move forward and crafting this proposal, we respectfully ask that you take into consideration all these potential problems in a broader suite of solutions to address the concerns of Kansas resident water valleys. Delta Waterfowl is committed to working closely with Kansas Department Wildlife and Park staff, the Wildlife and Parks commissioners, and the waterfowl hunting community at large to find a resolution that will provide a real benefit to resident waterfowl hunters while providing nonresident waterfowl hunters access to our shared resources. In the coming weeks, we're happy to follow up directly with agency leadership and the commission with more information and data from our survey as well as alternative potential solutions to consider as you debate and consider this proposal. We look forward to working with you and your staff and your commission in the coming weeks and months.

Secretary Loveless – Appreciate your presentation. Very interested in survey and in the conversation. If you would talk to Jake George, he will help you connect with our waterfowl biologist and keep the conversation going. Trenum – We hope to present that survey to all in a place where it is publicly accessible and going to get some information out to the public so they can look at the survey data as well. I don't know if we are going to totally release all of the raw data but will at least hit on some of the high points of what we saw. Commissioner Sporer – Do you understand the regulations in Arkansas, North and South Dakota limiting nonresident waterfowl hunting? Trenum – I do. I think to the degree of your average waterfowl hunter. I hunt in Arkansas annually, on public ground I've never been to South Dakota, but I have to North



Dakota, which also has some nonresident restrictions. Commissioner Sporer – Which are you and Delta Waterfowl not in favor of, any of that? Trenum – Nope. I think we worked with all those states as these issues have come up to try to get it into best place where it benefits primarily resident hunters but also waterfowlers as a whole. I think what shined through with that survey data was concerns about private land access, that could be impacted. Commissioner Sporer – We have been talking about this for three years, only 2% of land. Very tough in Kansas, when you don't have all the acres, or acres are limited and that's one of the reasons why we're doing what we're doing. Our areas are so small. Trenum - Absolutely, and I think that's something Delta Waterfowl will be interested in helping out however we can. Potentially change those regulations to allow the department to acquire more land to meet that demand. Assistant Secretary Stucky – In contact with some of your staff, and maybe even did a podcast with them. Get with me before you leave, I would like your contact information.

Stucky – On the private and versus public property. Private is 98.1%, which leaves 1.9% that's not private. That doesn't mean we manage the 1.9%, that means 1.9% is all the federal, state, county, township or whatever owns. So, we are just a part of the 1.9%.

10. Pending Regulations (Exhibit JJ) – Chairman Lauber - We have the same pending regulations that have been presented multiple times as part of perpetual workshop. Do we need to start promulgation on those? Riley – KAR 15-2-1 is more than halfway through the process. We've had a couple of issues with language but went to Attorney General's office. Also, 115-2-3, camping. These is one of Linda's regs and it is just about ready to be launched into the promulgation process because you gave your thumbs up on that one last commission meeting. So, that's everything we've got in the pending category now.

- KAR 115-2-1 Amount of Fees.
- KAR 115-2-3 Camping, utility, and other fees

## **VII. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Assistant Secretary Schrag - I was under the understanding there were some folks here that wanted to talk about some fishing issues. And if they're still here and didn't feel like they had a chance to speak. You're in the other public comment on non-agenda items.

*None*

## **VIII. OLD BUSINESS**

*None*

## **IX. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Future Meeting Locations and Dates**

*September 7, Finnup Center (Lee Richardson Zoo) Garden City*  
*November 9, Lyon County Fairgrounds (Bowyer Building) Emporia*

*January 11 - Sabetha or Seneca area*  
*March - Topeka*

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

Adjourned at 4:58 p.m.