Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks & Tourism
Commission Meeting Minutes
Thursday April 23, 2020
Virtual Meeting

Approved ~~Subject to~~
6/25/20 ~~Commission~~
~~Approval~~

The April 23, 2020 meeting of the Kansas Wildlife, Parks and Tourism Commission was called to order by Chairman Gerald Lauber at 1:33 p.m. through virtual programing. Chairman Lauber and Commissioners Emerick Cross, Gary Hayzlett, Aaron Rider, Warren Gfeller, Lauren Sill and Troy Sporer were present.

II. INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSIONERS AND GUESTS

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

III. ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS TO AGENDA ITEMS

Sheila Kemmis – No changes to revised agenda printed in briefing book (Agenda – Exhibit B).

IV. APPROVAL OF THE January 9, 2020 MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Aaron Rider moved to approve the minutes, Commissioner Lauren Sill second. *Approved* (Minutes – Exhibit C).

V. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Instructions given on how to comment (Virtual Meeting Instructions – Exhibit D).
Chairman Lauber – Review again and have comments later? Tymeson – Yes, we can take comments later as necessary and in the evening as well.

VI. DEPARTMENT REPORT

A. Secretary's Remarks

1. Agency and State Status Report – Brad Loveless, Secretary, presented this update to the Commission – Governor Kelly signed SB 66 approving 2020/2021 budgets, only adjustment was supplemental we submitted for law enforcement to move to KPF retirement. Our EDIF apportionment for 2021 will remain same as 2020, $5,177,302; hold static to 2021. Governor added $2 million of general fund, which we don't normally get, to help state parks with flood repairs. Money assigned already to open areas for campers this spring; using in fast fashion and being put to good use. Impacts of COVID-19 to budget, one obvious one is suspended issuance of nonresident general turkey permits this spring, impact of about $2 million and that will hurt. What we don't know is impact to EDIF apportionment, which is divvied up between

administration, parks and tourism; because of changes in gaming may affect lottery revenues as well as casinos. Park Fee Fund finished down 9 percent, mainly due to $1 million hit last June, didn't make that up, so down for the year; down 1.6 percent from same time last year. With so many people at home, outdoor activities are allowed with safe distancing and public using parks, public lands and reservoirs at a great pace, use is up with spring weather, will translate some into license sales and park permits. Through changes to state employees, parks and public lands wildlife areas will remain open, permitting remaining the same as previous years. Cabin revenue down 16 percent in FY 19 due to flooding; down a little this week but in conversations this week parks seeing a lot of use prior to heavy summertime use, may help revenue. Wildlife Fee Fund down 4.7 percent from this time last year, doesn't worry us a lot but it if continues and we don't make that up that will be a concern. Commissioner Rider – Are we going to reopen turkey season for nonresident hunters if governor doesn't extend travel restrictions? Secretary Loveless – All that is based on restrictions, anticipate opening in May if opened up; we can talk about that if everything gets relaxed. Chris, do you know anything in that order that precludes us from reconsidering if everything eases up? Chris Tymeson, legal counsel – Ran through May 31 and allows order to be rescinded or if emergency executive declaration is rescinded, so it is a possibility. Commissioner Rider – May 3 or 31? Tymeson – May 31. Secretary Loveless – Aaron, do you have recommendations? Extend to end of season or wise to consider opening it? Commissioner Rider – No clear recommendation, if safe to do and if administration, governor's office and health and environment think this is safe, would like to open it up. Received comments from residents about concern of nonresidents coming in, don't know if that is real concern or not, especially with transportation industry. If we could I would be in favor of doing that. Chairman Lauber – Keep open in back of our minds, but don't think likely to see our way clear to do that. Outcry from constituents was strong, hard for governor to adjust that. We could do it but would have to ask governor to rescind or amend her order, which is not likely. Could ask if we felt it made sense. Assistant Secretary Miller – I have had a lot of calls similar to what Aaron described, I have started a list of nonresidents who have called, and I will call them back if we open that back up. Secretary Loveless – One thing that would factor in, good conversation with staff, ebb and flow of permit sales in past years comes in early when shotgun part of season opens. Some would be interested but if number is small that should weigh into our decision. Chairman Lauber – It makes sense. Disappointed we did it, understand pressure and why it was done but leave that to staff to make decision and recommendation, if commissioners feel otherwise we can email you. Most of my emails are on duck seasons now.

2. 2020 Legislature – Chris Tymeson, chief legal counsel, presented this update to the Commission – In second year of two-year cycle. Legislature cut short this year, initially scheduled to come back on April 27, but not coming back until May 6. As they went out of town they passed some priority bills. We didn't have any bills that made it through the process this year. SB 49 on cabins and campsites, made it three-fourths of the way through process. SB 50 on fee caps didn't go anywhere. SB 307 a new bill this year to make changes to personal flotation device language, changed at federal level and we need to change to accommodate manufacturers, had hearing and was on calendar, didn't move before they left town. Not time to adequately work things other than budgetary priorities. Had bill on purchasing property in Kingman County, in House, went onto the floor, stricken from calendar, reintroduced in Senate, scheduled for hearing but that was cancelled. On House side three other bills came in late in session. One on poachers to pay landowners a fine, but should have been listed as restitution, half of money collected from

poached animals. HB 2669 would have gutted threatened and endangered species list and made it track exactly with federal list. HB 2678, moving law enforcement to KPF retirement, didn't get traction. Chairman Lauber – Last one, trying to merge retirement of certain employees into bigger general state system? Tymeson – The opposite, taking our law enforcement certified folks from larger KPERS to KP&F. Chairman Lauber – In employees' best interest? Tymeson – Yes, allows slightly earlier retirement and different benefits and think it will help us to recruit and retain officers. Chairman Lauber – Politics, no objection, low level and can't get it done. Not sure any politicians that don't like it. Tymeson – A few people opposed, and larger issues associated with it. Corrections wants to be part of KP&F and disgruntlement now, been up a couple times and it hasn't gone anywhere so no drive to push it forward. Chairman Lauber – Like to have everything we could to assist us in recruitment of conservation officers. Secretary Loveless – I have had frank conversations with a number of legislators and there are some that have a fundamental problem with adding people to that existing retirement. There are law enforcement folks across the state, police and fire fighters who are covered under that retirement system. We will continue to work on this, will do some groundwork this summer and will go back with changing attitude of key legislators but if we don't change attitude we won't go anywhere. Commissioner Sill – Kingman property, by that being delayed are we at risk of losing that property? Secretary Loveless – Our partner in that is Ducks Unlimited (DU) and they purchased it, they modified agreement a couple years ago based on conversations with a couple of farmers, which caused it to be broadly accepted by local farm groups, in good spot but that bill stopped. People holding the bag is DU, and they want to free that money up, not in danger of going away unless they need money and have to sell it to somebody else.

B. General Discussion

Chairman Lauber – Furbearer discussion while Matt and Jason are here. Background, when in high school could catch coyotes and hang them on the fence, a gauche way to display and statutorily a law was passed making it unlawful to have a coyote on public display. The law made sense and was a good thing. In 1970s most of dog hunters quit and we didn't have that many coyotes and it became a non-event. Told to put dead coyotes in the back and cover them with a tarp. This winter many of us received a communication from a person who was ticketed, the first time in a long time, for having a coyote on public display. I went and looked at the location where the offense apparently took place, it would be difficult for the public to see it in my opinion. He paid a $200 fine. I would like to have Matt's and Jason's input. Maybe missive from offender was inaccurate but I got the impression it was a coyote hanging from a tree with a couple of deer; deer were lawful, and coyote wasn't. Is that your understanding? Jason Ott, LE Colonel – Yes, there was a coyote hanging with deer. Have photograph and a view back to where report came from; it was called in and dispatched to warden, so he wrote citation based on the coyote. Caused a stir in Yates Center, they enacted an ordinance to keep this from occurring. It is clear from photograph that it could be seen clearly, deer not violation, it was the coyote. Chairman Lauber – I am assuming it was the deer that was the original source of complaint? Ott – Don't know what actual complaint was other than there were animals hanging in the tree, complaint from nursing home, 100 yards from where animals were hanging, so clearly displayed. Chairman Lauber – Can't see from nursing home so had to be out walking to see the house, not visible from nursing home. Point is, wasn't that is wasn't violation of law, but doesn't make agency look good to issue citation for that. Ott – Not as general rule is that something citation is

written for, but this was not a violation he found, this was reported to him. Chairman Lauber – Violation was deer, not the coyote. Ott – No, it was coyote. Chairman Lauber – The report was on deer, don't think anyone would have thought anything about the coyote. Clearly a violation but makes us look petty. Matt Peek, furbearer biologist – Statute is written, and it makes display illegal, different than being visible. If take a coyote and throw him in the back of the pickup with feet sticking up I don't believe that is a violation of this statute even though visible. Definition of display is to put something somewhere with the intent for people to view it. Haven't heard both sides of this argument. Original law was written, had to do with coyotes hanging on fenceposts, like they do flathead fish today. Chairman Lauber – Not sure anything we can do about it. Heart didn't swell with pride when I received the letter, wondered what public display is. Invite Jason to look at that visibility. This is a statute. Commissioner Hayzlett – Got same letter and phone call. Man was out-of-state hunter, who has come here for last several years and spent a considerable amount of money. My question was, being on the other end of this once, and being accused of hunting on somebody else's property because my bullet hit neighbors land after firing at an antelope. I asked, when I hunt on Arkansas River for ducks and shot falls on the other side of the river, if I was in violation and they said yes. A law enforcement officer told me, they had an option to write ticket if visible violation or can give warning ticket or verbal warning ticket. I was given a warning. Common sense and law enforcement runs hand in hand and make a great deal of difference in whether people want to come back to an area to hunt. I told the gentleman I would speak on his behalf, he said he was offended, came back to same spot for a number of years and he may not want to come back. Commissioner Sporer – Is that law needed anymore? Can staff look at that and maybe change it? Colonel says sometimes they don't enforce that, they did that day and didn't make the department look very good. Is that a possibility or any interest in that? Chairman Lauber – Responsible thing to do but it is a statute not a regulation. Chris or Secretary would have to go to legislature to ask if they can eliminate that. Overzealous law enforcement does promote voluntary compliance, but this didn't sit well. Commissioner Sill – Because there is question, common sense not used one time is that necessarily a reason to get rid of it? Use better common sense next time, if no regulation or statute on public display when somone abuses it in opposite direction and obvious display, then options are limited on what can be done. Because this is a one-time issue, gentleman would apologize, ask him back and talk to law enforcement to use common sense, not sure one time is reason to change regulation. Commissioner Gfeller – Haven't heard from officer who wrote the ticket, need to hear from him. Chairman Lauber – Ott, what did Bob Funke say? Ott – Spoke to him, he felt he was beholding to person who filed the complaint, with that in mind he felt citation was deemed necessary. Disagree about location not having a clear view of coyote hanging; I have photo from behind coyote to the location where it was viewed from, no cedar trees a clear shot. Chairman Lauber – Maybe I am looking at the wrong house, is it southwest of nursing home, house that Chapman built? Ott – Don't know. I will send you the picture. Secretary Loveless – Good conversation and good feedback, I received same letter and responded back to the hunter, following the letter of the law and using our best judgement. We have a lot of internal conversations every time one of these issues comes up, speak to staff about it and learn from it. I receive a lot of letters from people who say they have a clear-cut case and after talking about an issue realize not so clear cut. Jason made good response today. Have another conversation and review this and talk at next commission meeting. Respond back with more details, and as a result of that we think a bad law we can discuss it at that time. Chairman Lauber – Not saying conservation officer didn't follow the letter of the law, just didn't put us in a good light for that sort of citation to be issued. Like to

see the picture. Commissioner Sporer – Go back to my point, not against the law to display any other dead game animals, but it is for coyotes. Unfortunate out-of-state hunter that spends all the money and got a citation, didn't understand he could display his deer but not the coyote, didn't understand the law. Most people don't know that, I didn't. Fact that only one game animal is that way that is causing the stir. What is next? Unlawful to hang deer? Chairman Lauber – Get back to us. Jason, sorry to put you on the spot. Awkward to explain to people who contacted me from there.

1. KAR 115-6-1 Fur dealer license; application, authority, possession of furs, records, and revocation – Matt Peek, biologist, presented this update to the Commission (Exhibit E). This regulation provides oversight of furdealers in Kansas. It currently requires fur dealers to maintain record books provided by the department, and books must be filled out as fur is received, shipped, or otherwise disposed of. It also states that the books shall be subject to inspection and copying upon demand by any conservation officer. We have one new fur dealer who has requested to collect and maintain fur dealer records electronically. We would like to modify this regulation to allow furdealers to use electronic systems that collect the same data required in our current paper books, and that allows for this data to be promptly printed or viewed as needed for inspection, thereby providing for the same level of oversight by conservation officers. This would just change technicality of being reported in paper book.

2. Falconry Regulations – Jake George, Wildlife Division director, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit F). Back in August 2012, we replaced falconry regulations 115-14-1 to -10, they were revoked and we adopted 115-14-11 to -15 to meet federal regulations; where states would be permitting falconers, rather than USFWS. State regulations could be more restrictive but not less than federal regulations; for the most part our regulations mirror federal regulations. Currently reviewing those at request of members of the Kansas Hawking Club. No recommendations at this time; two primary proposed changes they would like us to look at is eliminating capture permit for resident falconers, there is still federal database that we have access to for capture and release permits for wild falcons. So redundant to have additional state paper form, would still be required for nonresidents. Also, review to remove requirement for facility inspections when renewing as a resident falconer, if haven't moved the facility. Still have initial inspection for a new facility, not have every three years but still have law enforcement be able to inspect at any time during the year. Review those with respect to federal regulations to remain in compliance. Recommendations at a later date.

C. Workshop Session

1. KAR 115-5-1 Furbearers and coyotes; legal equipment, taking methods and general provisions (use of thermal imaging and night vision equipment) – Matt Peek, biologist, presented this update to the Commission (Exhibit G, PowerPoint – Exhibit H). Discussed night hunting in some detail in last several meetings and commission asked the department to develop a regulation for consideration. The department hasn't recommended this change but if this is going to be voted into regulation these are the options we would like to be in the regulation. Proposal would include held-hand lights, night vision and thermal imaging equipment. We also propose they only be allowed for coyotes and not furbearers at this time. Also propose season dates be enacted for use of this equipment from January 1 to March 31. An important compromise for law

enforcement; this is after their busiest time of year in the fall during antlered deer seasons when most hunters are out, it gives them a break. We also talked about a later opener, something like February 15, after furbearer season has closed, but a compromise for the ability to sell coyote pelt which is sellable from early to November, not marketable much after end of January, so January 1 season opener still give people a month as a recreational opportunity to harvest a sellable pelt and then continues on through February and March, through cow calving season. A lot of discussion about coyote control. Ends at end of March, prior to time when most coyotes have pups. Even though there is a year-around open season on coyotes by statute. Given our choice we would cut this off before coyotes begin having young and treat them more like other furbearers are treated, where harvest seasons don't overlap with reproduction. Another part of proposal is not to allow from a vehicle. Coyotes are one of the few things you can drive around and shoot out of a moving vehicle, propose person with lights be outside of a vehicle. Also recommending they be limited to private lands and permit would be required initially to learn more about frequency of use, like prairie chicken permit, less than $5 but we would be able to track activity. Main limitations. At last commission meeting I indicated I would survey furharvesters as part of furbearer harvest survey; currently underway but do have 900 respondents so far. Asked how they felt about legalization of lights, night vision and thermal imaging equipment to hunt coyotes at night; 75 percent support legalization of this equipment. Very few are opposed. Also, asked how likely they would participate in this activity and 70 percent said they definitely or probably would and only 16 percent said they probably or definitely would not. This is what you would expect as I have indicated in the past how common this request was in comments section of furbearer harvest survey. Asked specifics on each of the different options and how they felt about each limitation; supportive of being limited to coyotes only as opposed to all furbearers. The one they were most opposed to was shotgun only; something we talked about to alleviate some of the safety concerns of shooting high powered rifles at night, 63 percent strongly opposed or would rather not have that restriction, only 13 percent supported that. The no vehicle use or not being able to hunt with lights from a vehicle was supported by half of this restriction and another 22 percent were neutral; less than 30 percent opposed or did not support that limitation. Season dates less favorable, no strong opposition to that time period, most of these people happy with something instead of nothing, want to do however they can. Private land only, most people supportive, asked specifically about how they would feel about not doing this on walk-in hunting areas (WIHA) and less than 30 percent were against that option. Cheap permit, over 50 percent indicated they would support requirement to keep track of how many doing it and conduct specific survey on that. Suspect quite a few people out there who are not aware we are considering this. Would like to workshop one more time at next meeting to give us time to release a press release and make sure it is adequately publicized to get more input from the public. Chairman Lauber – Chris, if workshop one more time still in effect by next winter? Tymeson – Workshop again and vote in August, not having March meeting is kicking timelines back a little but think I can get done by August. Chairman Lauber – That would allow people to begin using night vision or thermal imaging equipment January 1, 2021? Tymeson – Correct, ready by January 1. Chairman Lauber – Some controversy about this, my opinion that legislative interest in this has been reported. Season dates, even though didn't understand them at first, with respect to law enforcement should go ahead with shorter date to get their foot in the door. Would have allowed in furbearer season to allow bobcats and raccoons, can do that down the road. Can review after a year to possibly do that. Cheap permit good way to gauge how much of this is going on out there. Commissioner Hayzlett – If cattle and sheep

people in my area, they would not as a landowner be able to use that until season started in January? They couldn't use this on their own property to take care of the problem? Peek – Landowners can currently protect their own property from wildlife damage, he can currently do it out of season, the difference is they are doing under damage control they can't keep the animal. If losing sheep or calves he can do it. In meetings past we also discussed the ability to hire a nuisance animal damage control person to do that. This season would allow for recreational people to come in and do it during those season dates, for landowner or any licensed person can conduct that activity, doesn't have to just be a landowner or animal damage control person as it is now. Commissioner Hayzlett – Landowner now can do that if he leaves the critter lay, not to harvest to sell hide, but to protect their livestock? Peek – He has to have damage or damage threat. Commissioner Hayzlett – With thermal vision? Peek – Yes. Commissioner Hayzlett – That contradicts what was said at a gun show in Ulysses by a warden, he said under no circumstance can they do it. Tymeson – The statute, 32-1003, there is an exemption that goes back to spotlighting occurring, there was a case that went to Kansas Supreme Court, a citation given to a landowner for using artificial light while in possession of a firearm; we think of the statute as using spotlights, which is was originally designed for, but broadly written, says, casting rays of a spotlight, headlight or artificial light; when talking about artificial light, thermal imaging and night vision scopes technically are amplifying light. Need to look at those words so we are all in agreement on use of night vision equipment, it is electronically amplifying light. So, need to think about that and get back to you. Landowners can cast light or use spotlights to protect livestock. The statute doesn't require damage but protecting livestock when they are doing that. Chairman Lauber – Some sponginess in the statute, law enforcement has had pat answer, that is not lawful; I have had constituents say that the statute is incorrect. I think it is a gray area on whether a landowner can use them, with depredation or nuisance permit clear that they can; hopefully get clarity on what can be used by landowners. Commissioner Gfeller – Mentioned private land only, exclude or include WIHA? Peek – Still discussing that. Commissioner Gfeller – Would not include public land? Peek – At this time proposal would exclude wildlife and parks public land. Commissioner Gfeller - Rationale for that? Peek – Head of public lands doesn't see need from recreational perspective for management. Commissioner Gfeller – Is it a safety issue? Peek – I don't know that it is but don't want to speak for him. Commissioner Gfeller – On private lands by permission only? Peek – We don't specify permission any differently than as for hunting at any other time. Commissioner Gfeller – If landowner doesn't want to allow they don't have to. Peek – The same laws of trespass would apply as they do now for daytime hunting. Commissioner Gfeller – I know a lot of private land is used recreationally by the family and others including overnight camp outs, fishing and things like that. That is a concern that needs to be taken into account. Considered question of access, considered a survey of private landowners to see if interested in allowing night hunting on their land? Peek – No, haven't considered a survey. Hope to get those types of comments by spreading the word through a press release and media efforts. Commissioner Gfeller – That is important, I know a number of landowners not interested in allowing night traffic on their land, me included. Peek – Some say that and some the ones like Gary is talking about that have livestock and would like to see this. Commissioner Gfeller – I understand but I have raised thousands of calves and only have two confirmed kills. Not a big issue in my country, but know it is to others. We talked in the past about fairness of the hunt issue, is that taken into account? Peek – Talked about it, not gone any farther than that. We came up with limitations on hunters we want in place if you are going to vote on this. We are following through with what the

commission asked us to do and that is what this list of limitations is that we have provided. If going to occur, conceding fair chase aspect of this, enough to allow as recreational opportunity. Commissioner Gfeller – The purpose for the question about shotgun only in the furbearer survey. What was reason for question? If favorable response would we have limited it shotguns only? Is safety concern of high-powered weapon at night and not knowing the backdrop? Peek – Fair to say maybe a safety concern but it has not panned out or risk hasn't developed in other states. There has been a couple of people killed by this activity, but it is not any higher percentage than other types of hunting. You would think risk would be higher because of lack of where you can see, can't say not a concern, but no issues in other states that have allowed it for a long time. There are some things done at night that are against what we recommend in hunter education as far as seeing what is beyond what we are shooting but other states allow it and in some cases for decades. Relatively safe or would have done away with it in other states a long time ago. Commissioner Gfeller – Wonder if education would be an important part of this. We talked in the past about strain on law enforcement, where now if complaint of spotlight at night it is probably a poacher. Peek – That is our biggest concern and why the department hasn't recommended this activity a long time ago, trying to limit that with season dates, later season a compromise for law enforcement who is already stretched thin during upland bird openers and waterfowl seasons, etc. Commissioner Gfeller – If you look at furbearers' survey, lot more people will be doing this, which will increase night traffic. Have other states talked about, or talked about visiting with local law enforcement about issues or problems this might cause them? Peek – I haven't. Ott – Repeat question. Commissioner Gfeller – If result is to increase night traffic substantially in some counties, have we run this by local law enforcement to see if it will create strain on them? Ott – Not a bad idea, local officers help us with these issues and respond to them the same, so there will be some additional strain. No survey or official results. Secretary Loveless – Discussed numbers in the past, you said other states weren't very high. Peek – I said other states, not sure how common, I did survey other states and investigating since we last talked. Most states don't keep track of this specifically it is just part of coyote hunting and they don't survey this alone. There are a handful of states that require a permit, so I reached out to them and didn't get good information. For example, Colorado issues permits but not necessarily at statewide level, so done by area and they didn't have a good statewide estimate. The only number I could actually get was from Florida, had 142 permits to do this, but don't know how many coyote hunters total, so information doesn't do me a lot of good. Most of states are managing within larger coyote hunting activity and not quantifying specifically about how widespread. Commissioner Gfeller – Helpful to get landowner survey to see how much support of night hunting, if only a few hunters may be enough land available. I might be surprised that there may be more private landowners who will allow night hunting, important to understand if access if even there. Safety issue I need to get more comfortable with. Strain on law enforcement is important and fairness of the chase bothers me. Commissioner Sill – From pragmatic perspective, with night vision or thermal imaging equipment, can you differentiate between coyote and a border collie? Peek – In some cases if close enough. My parents have a neighbor who shot a dog in low light under the current situation, so that may happen in any low light hunting. From what I have read, people are selective at it. Have to look at other states where used and concerns don't pan out in the field, could but not common. Commissioner Gfeller – Helpful to know if other states have education to be sure night hunters are responsible. Peek – I can investigate. Ott – Most technology varies a lot depending on how old it is, what technology is, etc. in come cases can tell the difference, harder in some; depends on situation and technology.

Answer is yes, but not always. Commissioner Sill – Fair chase, in presentation from last meeting, on list of bulleted points, fair chase was one. In your description, whether or not it is fair chase to employ technology that allows significant advantage that outweighs wildlife's ability to naturally detect and avoid predators; good explanation of what fair chase is. Has team that discussed this considered this is not a violation of fair chase ethics? Peek – We talked about it but put aside. Our directive from the commission was to come up with recommendations if this is to be voted into regulations and what limitations we would put on it. That implies that fair chase concerns are something we can live with, didn't spend a whole lot of time on that. Reason I wrote the terminology because of the individual's description at the commission meeting prior to that, the hunter that indicated he could walk out there among cows and shoot them. Since then have seen on hunting shows, other people would argue this is fair chase, coyotes figure out you can call them at night as well as the day pretty quickly; can be hard to hunt at night. Chairman Lauber – Coyotes have night vision don't they? Peek – Sure. Chairman Lauber – If against it a never ending group of reasons not to get this done. We will have this one way or another, we will do it or legislature will; I know we shouldn't care what they threaten. Like to workshop more and try to let public know to get input from landowners and sportsmen to get thoughts and concerns from both sides to vote yes or no in August. Stuart Schrag, Public Lands Division director – Answer Commissioner Gfeller's questions regarding not having it on public lands. It is mine and my staff's preference to not allow on public lands at this time for a number of reasons. Most have been addressed, same concerns as law enforcement on private lands and increased call outs for certified staff and potential poaching issues have come up. One of main concerns is that we are multiuse areas year-round so public safety is main concern; we have a lot of campers in January 1 through March 31 time frame too. Like to see as private lands only. Secretary Loveless – Appreciate clarification. On private land there are landowners controlling that land, on public land we don't know who is out their using that, a real concern. It would dampen peoples' sense of safety. Fair chase, what was pointed out to me was coyotes are in special category and everything was allowed years ago, point of reference, legislature felt they were in a different category, that affected my judgement of this also. Commissioner Gfeller – Public Lands answer, I appreciate that. Same concern I have on private land, even though you control your own land your neighbor has ability to control different. Come up with some method of identifying lands, like we do with WIHA, that are accessible for night hunting with permission. If land close to my land that landowners would know so they can be aware of what is happening at night. Chairman Lauber – Do we do that now? Isn't the risk the same? Can control your land but can't control your neighbor's land. Don't want a land registry to have 300-400 people using this in Kansas, not a practical approach. Commissioner Gfeller – Have department discuss to set that concern aside. As it is now, during deer season, people hunting in day, looking for people, so cautious. At night, do you call every night when you want to camp on your land to see if someone hunting on neighbor's land. It may not be feasible. Not attempting to make it a requirement, just consideration. Secretary Loveless – Include in our conversation and get back to you on that. Commissioner Sporer – If only a couple hundred, I though night hunting permit would be $25 upcharge and listed on your license that could generate some revenue and take out people not really serious about it. That might help with some of the safety concerns. Chairman Lauber – Most of equipment is expensive enough if you are buying equipment you are committed to it. Don't have problem with revenue generation. Had 900 who answered survey and half said they would do it? Peek – About 60- to 70-percent said they would. Chairman Lauber – Do you think more than 500 people doing this in the state? Peek – Yes, there are 5,000 to 6,000 furharvesters

but coyote hunters not required to have permit. Chairman Lauber – I thought it would be a small number. Commissioner Gfeller – Hand-held lights are allowed in this and that is not a major investment. Another way to approach this, sandhill cranes, in order to get a license, you take a test, could that be considered here to include the safety issue? If day hunters from around here are going to be hunting at night with a hand-held light that is a scary thought. Chairman Lauber – Maybe we should take out hand-held lights. I don't think a lot of people will use them. Commissioner Gfeller – I think a lot of people would use them, that is how they poach deer. Chairman Lauber – To get this moving, take out hand-held lights and use night vision and thermal imaging only. Peek – If going to allow it I don't think we should price out the lower end hunter. Need to discuss as a department. Chairman Lauber – Let staff and department go over some of these recommendations and concerns, particularly Commissioner Gfeller and Sill's. See if way to consider those concerns. Like to keep timeframe because if we are going to get it by the first of the year it becomes moot. One way or another will vote yes or no. See where we are at next meeting when we workshop it again. Commissioner Gfeller – That makes sense. I still have concerns. I am still open, like to have one more workshop. Chairman Lauber – One more workshop should allow us to put word out and get public comments. Peek – Appreciate comments, do best to give comments consideration and account for questions I was unable to answer today. Secretary Loveless – This will give us opportunity for more internal conversation. Make sure external groups are included in this, those folks need to be heard and counted in this process. Have heard from furbearer hunters but not other groups. Appreciate comments. Commissioner Rider – Most of what we have talked about is legal currently without thermal vision or night vision. Can still night hunt coyotes now without using light, currently legal? Peek – Yes. Commissioner Rider – All of the things we are adding is night vision and thermal imaging and projecting light; the only concern is we are adding more potential hunters. Chairman Lauber – More hunters; under existing law, safer to use better equipment, less likely to shoot the neighbors' dog. Commissioner Sporer – Taking away the spotlight element would not be a good thing, part of the process to use the light. Chairman Lauber – Probably so.

2. <u>KAR 115-25-9a. Deer; open season, bag limit, and permits; additional considerations; Fort Riley</u> – Levi Jaster, big game coordinator, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit I). Focus on military subunits and will focus on where they differ from regular proposed season. Smoky Hill Air National Guard requested same season as statewide. Fort Riley requested additional archery days for individuals authorized by Fort Riley, typically individuals deployed or going to be deployed and would not have an opportunity to hunt otherwise, September 1-13 and January 11-31; Also, would like additional days for designated persons, youth and disabled, for October 10-12, replaces pre-rut season they don't want. Firearms season dates of November 27-29 and December 15-23. It adjusts the dates but don't get any extra days, just 12 same as the rest of the state. Fort Leavenworth wants open firearm season for deer November 14-15, November 21-22, November 26-29, December 5-6, and December 12-13; again, only adjusts dates and makes them weekends, they only get 12 days. They want extended firearm season for antlerless-only white-tailed deer January 1-24; and extended archery season for antlerless-only whitetail deer January 25-31. These will be voted on in June. Chairman Lauber – This is the most varying request we have had for a long time isn't it? Jaster – Fairly on par, Fort Leavenworth usually requests rifle season to be weekends and Thanksgiving holiday; for Smoky Hill this is least amount of change ever. Chairman Lauber – It is their people in their area, doesn't compete with other our regular season does it? Jaster – No, the only one of those three

with open to public hunting is Fort Riley, and there is a process to access the Fort to hunt; there is a check in registration. In this case, still limited to same number of days of rifle hunting and does provide some opportunity for some general sportsmen to hunt.

Chairman Lauber – End of afternoon session. Any non-agenda item comments, did we get any comments?
Nadia Reimer, chief of public affairs – No public comments at this time in the chat room.
Chairman Lauber – This seems to be working okay. There may be additional opportunities for public to remotely access meetings in the future to get more public involvement. Would like to see that. Tymeson – Do we need to log off and log back in? Dickson – I was going to leave the meeting open and anyone who wants to would be muted. But I would say, go ahead and log off and back in this evening.

VII. RECESS AT 3:30 p.m.

VIII. RECONVENE AT 6:30 p.m.

IX. RE-INTRODUCTION OF COMMISSIONERS AND GUESTS

X. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Justin Bayes, Manhattan – Walleye fisherman, not much information on walleye initiative lately. There was a question from previous meeting about why creel surveys not used as much, and we don't have as much of a voice as they should; I don't disagree. Chairman Lauber stated tried for years to get more participation. Many groups are willing to discuss agency issues. My thought is to make our club available to participate, the Kansas Walleye Association has many members who would be willing to volunteer. Would also donate tournament results and creel surveys from the years. Also, could do possible fund raising through the club. Concerned with walleye fishing in the state, many people traveling out of the state to fish. Where are we at status of initiative? Could we add an item at the August meeting in Beloit and have ability to have Q&A? Looking for studies; heard about telemetry study at Glen Elder but no current information. Send us a link so we are better prepared. Doug Nygren – Wrapping up update to send to walleye anglers, available next week. Walleye initiative was two-pronged approach, fishing through use of regulations and improving production through fish hatcheries. Had to suspend creel surveys because of COVID, not any survey data this year because of that. Unable to collect walleye eggs this year either, at beginning of spawn employees put on administrative leave so will have limited walleye production this year. We are working to get walleye eggs from other states so will be raising some walleye fingerlings and stocked some fry already. We had one or two days of egg collection then shut down came, so will be a down year for production. The good news is when it comes to populations, missing a year class isn't the worst thing in the world. Hopefully geared up to hit it hard next year. Walleye initiative is moving ahead well, especially capabilities to produce walleye. We have made a number of improvements to walleye propagation, in numbers and size, we can stock. We have moved fingerling stocking to reach at least 43 millimeters in length, because recent research showed that fish just under two inches are fully scaled and survive from capture from hatchery ponds and stocking, the smallest size we stock other than fry. In addition, reviving our abilities to raise walleye on an artificial diet. Meade and

Milford hatcheries have both been involved with the culture of fingerlings on a pelleted diet and once we train the walleye to take an artificial diet we can raise them to any size we need. We are shooting to being able to produce around 100,000 nine-inch fish; in the next two years if we get all of the improvements made to the facility. Right now, we can raise about 30,000 nine-inch fish a year. Valuable when we had a hard time with good survival on fry and fingerling. We have a new building we want to build at Meade Hatchery to produce 500,000 43 mm fingerlings and about 30,000 nine-inch there. Retrofitting the inside of Milford Hatchery and acquired some new tanks, which will allow us to produce between 50,000 to 70,000 more nine-inch fish. In addition to improving walleye production equipment and facilities we have a lot of our hatchery ponds up and running again. We have all of the ponds at Meade Hatchery fully functional for the first time in the history of that hatchery. Also, we have been without the Woodson Rearing pond for the last few years due to a flood that damaged the dam at Woodson State Fishing Lake; that was producing a large portion of our channel catfish and we had to move that production to the other hatcheries so that took up some valuable space we could have used for raising walleye fingerlings. That facility is back open and operational so ponds they were temporarily using for channel catfish now will be used for largemouth bass and walleye. Future looks bright in terms of propagation program. Continuing to evaluate what is going on with length limits, public acceptance and response of fish populations to these difference length limit options. One of the options we put in place was to create some trophy fisheries on lakes with 21-inch length limit and also gave us opportunity to reach a larger size that makes it easier for us to obtain eggs with better brood stock. Two-page sheet coming out next week or so, will be sure Walleye Association gets a copy. We look forward to working with you on everything and anything you are interested in. Bayes – Is it possible to get spot on August 2020 agenda to have more people involved and cover subjects more deeply? I would like to see some of your data biologists are using to establish length limits. Like to know how you monitor what size and what year class are in lake at specific times. Some of us have a good handle on that, some don't, but a lot of folks interested and looking at this year not being able to stock because of COVID, also with flood loss from last year, things looking rough right now. Like to get involved in any way, whether annual creel survey that I do from my boat, I think several people would do that. A lot of ways to help, if we get involved, not just the Association but individuals willing to help. A lot more people concerned then maybe speak up. Following Facebook groups recently, one called Kansas Walleye Anglers, obviously they care about fisheries, are very opinionated but I don't think a lot of responses I have seen are backed up by fact. Not saying what you are saying isn't happening, but the general public doesn't understand. Nygren – All of our biologists create at least two newsletters each year for their part of the state and you will find a wonderful amount of information in those; they are archived on fisheries page on our website. Bayes – I think I have read them all, most of us have. We are more interested in studies and what actual biological guidance used to develop the length limits. I don't think anybody is pointing fingers just looking at ways to work together to achieve a better fishery. That is why I would like to see this added to August agenda. Secretary Loveless – Thanks Justin for thoughts and passion. Doug, appreciate comprehensive summary. What Doug didn't get to is the research done, a lot at Glen Elder, presented at previous commission meeting by Scott Waters. My background is fisheries and what I have been impressed with in my time at the agency is the depth of understanding and thought that has gone into their decision making. What I suggest is to set up a special meeting that focuses on walleye issues and initiative. Just, we can coordinate with your folks, at annual meeting or something like that. We can do as part of commission meeting, but better suited for

special meeting. If you let Doug talk he will talk for another half hour on all of the opportunities to get involved as volunteers. Bayes – Appreciate that, interested in that, would be even better than including as a topic at August meeting. How would we set date for that? Secretary Loveless – We will be glad to work directly with you and we will contact you tomorrow and work out needs and numbers of people. They will impress you and I am looking forward to listening into that meeting. Your questions, passion and insight are valuable to us. Bayes – Thanks for your time. Assistant Secretary Miller – We haven't seen any results from walleye telemetry study at Glen Elder because there is still another year left on that study. Scott is still working on that and has been tracking fish all spring and there should be good information out of that. You will see results when completed and it will be on our webpage.

Chairman Lauber – Some of you received an email and pictures from Colonel Ott. The property I was looking at was not the right property, it appears the coyote was visible to the nursing home. Not sure would have issued the ticket, or need to continue that law, but I was wrong as to visibility.

VI. DEPARTMENT REPORT

D. Public Hearing

Notice and Submission Forms, Attorney General letters dated January 15 and February 20 and Legislative Research Department letter dated March 6 and report from March 6 (Exhibit J).

1. KAR 115-25-20, Sandhill crane; management unit, hunting season, shooting hours, bag and possession limits, and permit validation – Richard Schultheis, migratory game bird research biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit K, PowerPoint – Exhibit L). I will summarize this because we spent a significant amount of time talking about this in the workshop session at the last meeting. The current season is the Wednesday after first Saturday in November and continues for 58 days including opening day. The current season structure does not align well with sandhill crane migration; primary consideration is avoiding conflicts with whooping cranes present in the state at that time. One thing that is beneficial is whooping crane migration occurs along a very predictable corridor that runs through the central part of Kansas. The proposed changes are to split the current sandhill crane hunting unit into western and central zones and adjust season dates for that western zone where whooping crane use is limited, to better align with sandhill crane migration. The boundary between the western and central units primarily runs along Highway 183, it does jog to the west southwest of Webster over to 283 and goes north from there. The season dates in the proposal are the third Saturday in October for 58 days and the season dates in central unit would remain the same, the Wednesday after the first Saturday in November and continue for 58 days. Chairman Lauber – Opportunity for sportsman and no particular downside.

Commissioner Troy Sporer moved to approve KAR 115-25-20 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Gary Hayzlett second.

The roll call vote to approve was as follows (Exhibit M):
Commissioner Cross Yes

Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-25-20 passed 7-0.

2. 2020-21 Waterfowl Seasons – Tom Bidrowski, migratory game bird program manager, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit N, PowerPoint – Exhibit O). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) annually develops frameworks from which states are able to establish migratory game bird hunting seasons. These frameworks establish maximum bag and possession limits, season lengths, and earliest and latest closing dates. States must operate within these frameworks when establishing state-specific migratory game bird seasons; can be more restrictive but not more liberal. Notable changes from previous years, duck season reduction of bag limit from two to one, closing date for general duck season is January 31, previously the last Sunday of January, and two additional hunting days for veterans and active military. Six public meetings were held the first part of August across the state, cities were chosen by combination of geographic location and potential number of hunters that could be reached; well attended and feedback for current season structures were positive. In fall 2019 KDWPT conducted a large-scale waterfowl hunter survey; 13,500 Kansas residents born after 2003 who purchased a Kansas waterfowl stamp in last six seasons were surveyed. Response rates were similar to 2015 waterfowl hunter survey and yielded statistical adequate sample garnered from residents on statewide basis. Survey summaries were sent to commissioners and posted on our webpage. Variety of factors that play a role in determining season preferences, vary from hunter to hunter depending on where they hunt, how they hunt, what they hunt as well as other factors. The opportunity to hunt greatest number of ducks consistently rates high among preferences. This overlays seasons with peak migration as well as timing seasons with high harvest periods. The majority indicated they were satisfied with current season timing and season structure was just right. For the High Plains unit, the early zone and late zone there were more who selected the season was too early rather than too late. The southeast zone selected seasons were too late rather than too early. There is very little difference in satisfaction with combined responses than those who just hunted in regular zone. For High Plains, Late Zone and Southeast Zone, December hunting days were selected as the most important; November days were most important for the Early Zone. Satisfaction with current goose seasons were high, three-fourths said season just right. The 107-day hunting frameworks, the maximum allowed, allows for plentiful goose hunting opportunities and to overlap the season covers most of the goose migration in Kansas. We received inquiries from snow goose hunters to advance the opening day of Spring Light Goose Conservation Order; this would require closing the regular light goose, Canada goose and white-fronted goose seasons earlier in their frameworks. The survey asked hunters if they favored this, only a small portion favored this change. The federal framework daily bag allows daily bag limit for Canada geese was increased from three to eight in 2013; Kansas has selected a six Canada goose daily bag limit. Similar to past surveys, respondents preferred limit of six Canada geese. Late in the regulation cycle last year Congress passed the John D. Dingle, Jr. Conservation, Management and Recreational Act; a component of this Act

allows two additional hunting days for veterans and active military, similar to youth waterfowl hunting days. Survey results were in support of allowing two additional hunting days for military; the preferred timing of those additional days is to hold in conjunction with youth waterfowl hunting, one week prior to the general duck season opener in each duck zone. Staff recommendations are an attempt to best align season dates that allow the greatest opportunity for participants, participation and harvest for all hunters. September teal, staff recommends adopting nine-day in the High Plains unit and 16-day in the Low Plains zones. To adopt federal frameworks for daily bag, possession and shooting hours. High Plains: September 19-27, Low Plains: September 12-27. For youth, veteran and active military, adopt two days, to adopt federal frameworks for daily bag, possession and shooting hours. Recommends simultaneous days and held one week prior to the opening of the general duck season in each respective duck zone. For general duck seasons staff recommends adopting 96-days in High Plains and 74-days in Low Plains zones and to adopt federal frameworks for daily bag, possession and shooting hours; and select Option A for the merganser unit. Season dates, High Plains: October 10 to January 3 and January 22 to January 31; Early zone: October 10 to December 6 and December 19 to January 3; Late zone: October 31 to January 3 and January 23 to January 31; and Southeast zone: November 7 to January 3 and January 16 to January 31. For goose season, staff recommends 105-day season for dark geese, includes any dark geese except white-fronted and light geese and to select Option B, which is 88-days with season bag limit of two for white-fronted. To adopt federal frameworks for daily bag, possession and shooting hours for white-fronted and light geese and daily bag of six for dark geese. Season dates, white-fronted: October 31 to January 3 and January 23 to February 14; dark geese: October 31 to November 1 and November 4 to February 14; light geese: October 31 to November 1 and November 4 to February 14; and Light Goose Conservation Order: February 15 to April 30. For the extended falconry season, staff recommends adopting a 15-day season in the Low Plains unit; adopt federal frameworks for daily bag, possession and hawking hours. Season dates February 24 to March 10. Chairman Lauber – On second or third slide, people born after 2003? Bidrowski – Basically 16 and older, born before 2003. Commissioner Gfeller – A lot of feedback on southeast duck zone, remember keeping seasons the same, is that what this does? Bidrowski – Large shift in calendar dates, last year first Saturday, this year second Saturday….loss of 2 days in Jan, gain 2 days in Nov….. Commissioner Gfeller – Quite a bit of feedback on Southeast zone and it seems we are keeping seasons the same, is that what this proposal does? Bidrowski – This year a lot of shift in calendar dates; season last year started on second Saturday, this year on first Saturday, however it does provide similar number of days in January like last year; this year 19 days, was 21; a loss of two days in January but two days are gained in November, second Saturday opener is now first Saturday in Southeast zone so slight changes. Commissioner Gfeller – Background for those changes? Bidrowski – Calendar shift and shifting from first Saturday to second Saturday, basically looking at past migration dates, hunter activity and harvest. November days starting around November 7 are very important migration in the Southeast zone and high hunter activity and harvest as well. Trading off some opportunity for early seasons versus slightly less possibility in January days. More likely to be frozen first week of January than first week of November. Commissioner Sporer – All the calls I received related to last year just 5-day split in January, this year a 10-day split. Why not the same as last year and explain calendar shift. Bidrowski – Traditionally the last day of the frameworks is the last Sunday of January which last year was January 26, the last Sunday this year is January 31, that adds five additional days. There is a longer split but they have more days the last part of January than they did last year. Losing

two January days from this year compared to last year, getting similar number of January days. Commissioner Rider – Surprised to see recommended dates, expected 5-day split, even when we had the same calendar in 2015 we went with 5-day split and basically would have the same season. People asking me what I thought it was going to be and I told them the department has been consistent since 2015 and recommended the 5-day split at or near the beginning of January and going through the last Sunday, which this year would be January 31, which I was excited about. I thought it was going to be easy for me to get in line with what department has consistently done. When I have argued in the past, especially when the calendar is on the other end where we were starting November 8 or 9. Having those early days and losing back end of January. I see it is similar to last year, thought it would go along that line and excited to have extra days in January. Personal preference is to start as late as possible and run all the way through but understand not the consensus of everybody. Thought 5-day split was good compromise and go to January 31 for late season enthusiasts. I was shocked and surprised and had to get in touch with people to tell them it was different then what I was anticipating. The Southeast zone was created for the late season and late migration, a great decision and has been very beneficial for southeast area. You look at surveys and see why we have so many zones but a good idea to have those zones and to have discussion. One of other reasons besides creating this zone, I didn't feel like expanding the split this year to 12 days with a weekend, I think that goes against the reasons why southeast zone was created. In the past I have argued, even with 5-day split whole state is shut down through all the zones for those five days and this year it would be 12 days, with one weekend. I do like and it is important to provide opportunity for those people who would like to travel through the various zones and hunt from early to mid-October all the way through, at least have that opportunity if they want it. People want to hunt when ducks are here. Understand more freezes and ice in January, but opportunity is still there if people are willing to go to bigger water and dry land opportunities. Don't have in earlier season in November. Like commission to consider going back to what we have had in past, 5-day split in January, similar to 2015 season where we ran from November 14 to January 3, have 5-day split, even though not a big fan, and from January 9 to January 31. That would be consistent and what I hear on a personal level. Chairman Lauber – A lot of emails, all over the place, like survey comments. A lot of emails say we are starting too late in Southeast zone, particularly those in north part of that zone; some want more days in January; a lot of people that have read the recommendations approve of these. If I were to look at emails, tend to think recommendation from staff most effectively is in line with the preference of most of the people. I think November 14 is a late start and I like opportunity for early migrants, getting extra five days by the way the calendar falls in January so I hate to have split reduced and all taken away from the front end; I like staff recommendations which seems to be consistent with emails I have received. Commissioner Sporer – In looking at dates, on January 3 no more duck hunting for a period of time, in any zone. I like Commissioner Rider's idea of moving that up. The High Plains zone should be October 17 to January 10 then have split; and Southeast zone should be November 14 to January 10. Commissioner Rider has mentioned multiple times, about having opportunity for people to go other places to hunt. I see January 3 day as a problem, where there is no hunting in any zone. Commissioner Sill – On survey results, do you have a "n" number, what was the total number of samples from the Southeast zone? Bidrowski – I will look it up. Commissioner Sill – Emails and phone calls I see a tendency, but when I look at survey results I see tendency in the opposite direction. Curious if this is a vocal minority group I have heard from? I appreciate them contacting me. If there is a larger number who completed survey and 30 percent say too late and

split even between preference between January and November; if representative of a large number of people that offsets emails and phone calls I have gotten. If survey results were 50 people that doesn't carry as much weight. Bidrowski – We had around 1,700 responses, 825 said they rarely hunted, occasionally hunted or frequently hunted the zone; 371 noted they frequently hunted the Southeast zone, 22 percent. Commissioner Sill – Thanks, that is helpful. Chairman Lauber – Have staff recommendations, Lauren made a good point. I wish we could have another five days to give the hunters, but we don't. Ask for motion to adopt staff recommendations. Commissioner Gfeller – Based on question from Commission Sill and answer; recent response I have gotten, five of seven emails to keep season as it was. On basis of survey and staff recommendation.

Commissioner Warren Gfeller moved to approve waterfowl seasons as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Lauren Sill second.

Commissioner Sporer – A couple of issues continually come up, the fact that the studies all show that migration continues to get later and later. One thing within survey is everybody wants to hunt ducks when they are here. If the ducks are coming later we have to start shifting seasons to accommodate them. Right on with Low Plains late, but High Plains and Southeast need to be adjusted because ducks coming later. Chairman Lauber – We hear ducks are coming later and yet it seems to be a familiar theme there is a lot of activity and migration early as well. Bidrowski – Different populations and different species; when talking about January hunting you are almost always talking about mallards, which makes up about 50 percent of our annual harvest each year; as high as 60 percent and some years as low as 40 percent. We have been moving seasons backwards in the Southeast zone, now two weeks later than we did ten years ago; same with other waterfowl seasons. Tradition around first part of January so we have accounted for those later migrations in some of these populations. Later season dates is more hunter preference than biological. What we see for peak migration in the Southeast zone is right around Thanksgiving with high numbers showing up in early November, tailoring off and then some other peaks. Considerable amount of ducks that move based on the calendar and coming in later. Chairman Lauber – Over the last decade the Southeast zone has probably had its opener moved back almost two weeks, hasn't it? Bidrowski – It has varied, the first five years we had five different seasons, our average opening day has been around November 9, this year two days earlier. It is really a balancing act with hunter preferences; our most vocal hunters are those wanting later seasons, but they are the minority of all of the hunting community we hear from. When looking at differences of five to seven days, it is hunter's preference and who the hunter is that you are asking. Commissioner Rider – Agree with Tom, Thanksgiving is peak migration, a good time to get out, I do think if you get too far earlier than that, especially into first week or week and a half, you missing out on days, which is one of reasons why I really thought we were going to keep the five-day split in January and have similar start day of November 14, like we did in 2015. In 2016, have November 12; 2017, November 11; and flowed down the calendar. That is why I thought when the calendar flipped we would go back to November 14 and once again work our way down, even though not my preference. I thought this was going to be a good compromise in having those later times in January without a big split and loss of a weekend in January as well. That extended period in January you miss out on everything being closed, I understand but times are similar to last year and that was earliest with consistency in the calendar. Bidrowski – See this with all calendar shift days on opening day, whether October 7 or

October 14 in Early zone or October 31 for Late zone. Ideally the way to shorten that up would be to do like we do for webless season, where we pick a date saying, November 10 and the Saturday closest to that. That would pick up a lot of these first or second Saturday arguments. You could trim that argument by three or four days, in big picture talking five to seven days of a 74-day season. Commissioner Rider – I would like to amend regulation for Southeast zone to go from November 14 to January 3 with 5-day and reopen January 9 to January 31. Tymeson – These are done by consensus we don't necessarily need a vote but since this has become a contentious issue we will treat like regulations and would need a motion and a second. Already a motion and a second to accept agency recommendation. Commissioner Rider made that motion, so need a second.

Commissioner Aaron Rider moved to amend waterfowl seasons in southeast zone from November 14 to January 3, with 5-day break and reopen January 8 to January 31, Commissioner Troy Sporer second.

Tymeson – You can have more discussion or call for a vote. Bidrowski – Is amendment for just the Southeast zone or High Plains zone requested by Commissioner Sporer as well? Commissioner Sporer – In an effort to partner I would just settle for the Southeast zone. Chairman Lauber – Respectfully to my two commissioners I will vote no because I like staff recommendations. I think November 14 is late for the Southeast zone. Commissioner Sill – Are we voting on the amendment or amended regulation? Chairman Lauber – Voting on amendment and if it doesn't pass we will go back and vote on the original motion.

The roll call vote to amend was as follows (Exhibit P):

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**No**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**No**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**No**

The motion to amend waterfowl seasons passed 4-3.

Chairman Lauber – Now we vote on the motion that was originally made or do we start over? Tymeson – You are going to vote on the recommendations as amended for the Southeast zone. Chairman Lauber – The recommendation is to have Southeast zone have a late start date and less of a split in January. Is that it? Commissioner Rider – Yes, that is correct. Commissioner Sporer – I am confused, I thought we just voted on the amendment to move the seasons for the Southeast zone. Chairman Lauber – We did. Commissioner Gfeller – Now we have to vote on the seasons for all zones as amended. Tymeson – That is correct. Commissioner Sporer – Just voting on High Plains and Low Plains late? Chairman Lauber – No, we had a motion to approve staff recommendations, had a motion and a second and amendment to change late zone Southeast to a different start date, that amendment passed, so the original motion, which is basically all of staff recommendations, but the amendment, is now to passed or voted down.

Commissioner Aaron Rider moved to accept as amended, Commissioner Gary Hayzlett second.

Chairman Lauber – Is that two motions on the floor that are the same? Tymeson – Yes, there was the original motion to accept staff recommendations, there was an amendment proposed that passed that amended the original staff recommendations, now we are back on the original staff recommendations with the amendment; the overall package, including goose seasons, etc. Chairman Lauber – We have two motions on the table, but I think I know what people mean to do and motions are identical; that we accept staff recommendations, except the Southeast zone has been modified. Is that your understanding Aaron? Commissioner Rider – Yes.

The roll call vote to pass as amended was as follows (Exhibit P):

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as amended passed 7-0.

3. Duck Hunting Zone Boundaries – Tom Bidrowski, Migratory Gamebird Program manager, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit Q, PowerPoint – Exhibit R). Every five years the US Fish and Wildlife Service opens the frameworks for duck zone guidelines, any changes for the 2021/2022 season. Zoning is the establishment of independent seasons in two or more areas within a state for the purpose of providing equitable distribution of harvest opportunities. Since 1972, Kansas waterfowl seasons has had zones or splits in the season with the Late zone added in 1996 and the Southeast zone in 2011. Physiographical diverse states, like Kansas, have added difficulty in selecting season dates that will accommodate hunted duck species and hunting style. Although zoning can add to regulation complexity, is also allow flexibility in maximizing opportunity of matching season dates with available habitat types, migration patterns, and season preferences of duck hunters for specific areas. Waterfowl hunters are just as diverse as Kansas waterfowl hunting opportunities. Zones and splits are tools that help serve a broad constituent base. The benefits of zoning increases under restrictive season length, as were in place from 1988 through 1992 where there was only 39 days to the season. When zoning we have to abide by USFWS frameworks; zones much be contiguous and can't be disjunct areas, zones cannot be selected during general duck seasons and September teal are not part of this consideration; the High Plains zone is not eligible for rezoning and not part of this discussion; and Kansas does not have any grandfathered zoned boundaries. Boundaries are set for every five years but season days and bag limits can be adjusted annually. Zones need to fit into one of the four options; currently Kansas operates under Option 3; three zones and two season segments. Results of meetings and waterfowl hunters survey suggest that the majority of duck hunters are satisfied with current zone boundaries. Similar to waterfowl season dates there are some who prefer adjustments to zones however many of these are polarized opinions on what exactly these adjustments should be. These adjustments are more a preference than a

geographical issue. Staff is recommending no changes to Kansas current zone boundaries. Commissioner Sporer – Any chance next year to get feds to reconsider how zones have to be contiguous and be able to circle Jamestown and not have to have such an ugly map? As you saw in the survey, zoning is confusing for Early zone. Any chance to get that rule changed? Bidrowski – Feds consider every five years; that was a request Kansas made during this process but was denied by USFWS Service Regulation Committee. We will offer again in 2025 for 2026 but set with what zones are for the past five years. We tried pretty hard and had some other state's support but USFWS deemed it unnecessary. Commissioner Sporer – See any way to get away from this, make less confusing? Bidrowski – Zones add complexity but adds opportunity. Any time you draw a line boundary you always want what your neighbor has on the other side. Currently the best option and the thing that helps with that is stability in regulation process, if changing zone boundaries every five years it gets more confusing. We made this change five years ago to allow Cedar Bluff to be in the Late zone rather than Early. We try to use highway boundaries and major roads as markers as much as possible. They are confusing and at a first glance may not make sense but if you look at reasoning behind it like migration date and hunter preference date it does. Commissioner Sporer – Not arguing Jamestown and the Bottoms and some of those specific areas shouldn't be Early zones, we are talking about area between Jamestown and the Bottoms that gets really confusing. Bidrowski – It was tough when we did make that in 2011, but it was evident that Cedar Bluff did not belong in the Early zone and we tried to make the least invasive way to go from Jamestown to the Bottoms and that was going through the Smoky Hills. Chairman Lauber – I think the map is confusing but would rather leave it the way it is; probably less headache if we leave it alone. Commissioner Sporer – Not asking to do anything with it or change it, understand a federal regulation and that is why it is what it is. If ever an opportunity for feds to see we have a problem here. Chairman Lauber – Encourage Tom and his staff to pursue non-contiguous to do it. Bidrowski – There was some interesting conversations at the Committee meeting, the mountain states gave a good argument about having valleys in the same zone rather than trying to connect them through some mountain pass and I can share those discussions notes with you. So, there are state efforts for it and Nebraska and Kansas pushed hard to have some of these obstacles removed. Commissioner Sill – Live near lines around McPherson Valley Wetlands, it is confusing. There is one place where there could be simplification in this area around McPherson; as you drop down 14th Avenue out of McPherson to Arapahoe Road, if you drop down one more mile to Apache Road it is county line road between McPherson/Reno counties and Reno/Rice counties and it eventually hits 61. As it stands now you drop down to Arapahoe, over to 61 and follow 61 down south to include the city of Hutchinson and South Hutch and back up 96, not gaining hunting territory. So, come south on 14th Ave to Apache Road and follow the county line to 96, I said 61 a minute ago. That eliminates three lines of verbiage in description of that zone. Chairman Lauber – We can't do anything about the zones now can we? Bidrowski – We can make an adjustment at this time but can't change federal frameworks. Chairman Lauber – Do they have to approve it? Bidrowski – Yes, the approve process when we submit season selection letters and zone descriptions, they will review it to make sure it makes sense and fits their guidelines. Review what is in frameworks, not what our descriptions are. Chairman Lauber – From duck meetings was there any desire to have boundaries changed? Bidrowski – The two big areas was whether Quivira should be in the Late or Early zone, a lot of complex issues there, from water rights to bird use to private land versus public lands and where you draw those boundaries around there. The second comments were surrounding McPherson based off changes made in 2011 to include all of

McPherson Wildlife Area, some private land holdings there upset about those changes. Chairman Lauber – Are we wanting to consider changing the zones to have less complication in lines or doing it to move a hunting area to a different zone? If just to fix lines I would say leave it alone. Commissioner Sill – In reading the surveys and personal opinion is the confusion of where all those boundaries are can limit some hunters who are borderline hunters, go or not go; especially if they have to go alone and not with duck hunters who hunt frequently or don't have a set place where they go. While numbers may be fairly small I think confusion does discourage some hunters. In simplification could remove a barrier for some hunters. Bidrowski – Looking at your suggested recommendation, talking about moving boundary one mile south to Apache Road, rather than Arapahoe Road, correct? Commissioner Sill – Yes. Bidrowski – Arapahoe Road was chosen because it is paved, more of a physical border that hunters can rely on, Apache Road is blacktop or gravel. We are trying to connect the center part of McPherson Valley Wetlands, either Little Sinkhole or Chain of Lakes to catch them. Commissioner Sill – The need to include Hutch and South Hutch and dropping down further south didn't make much sense to me, I didn't understand that. Bidrowski – Trying to get more river access where you could draw a line over from Apache Road or county line marker and back, but we used Hwy 61 that catches portions of Hutch just because it is a large 4-lane barrier that hunters would know they are crossing where a county line is more of an imaginary line than a physical boundary. Commissioner Sill – No agenda to change it but stand behind idea of simplifying it to remove a barrier for some hunters. Like to see that if ways to do that in the future. Bidrowski – A good suggestion, we try to remove barriers whether regulatory or not, we try to consider that. Chairman Lauber – See points, but changing on the fly is difficult. Do we have to wait five years from this year to consider? Bidrowski – Yes, we would kick off the process again in 2025 either by changing federal frameworks again like contiguous zone requirements, getting public feedback to be available for 2026/2027 hunting season. Chairman Lauber – Caught off guard with this, synopsis from meetings was that people were generally happy with the zones. Only when I read the comments did I hear anything about being difficult to follow; maybe those people put comments on a survey but didn't attend waterfowl meetings. Bidrowski – The people who do go to meetings are active waterfowl hunters so are more likely to participate; one of the reasons we do these large mail surveys is to catch casual hunters where regulations might be more of an issue. The ones who actively hunt are more aware of zone boundaries. Chairman Lauber – Casual hunter is never bashful about an anonymous comment. I am going to ask to approve staff recommendations again.

Commissioner Troy Sporer moved to approve duck hunting zones as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Lauren Sill second.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on duck hunting zones passed 7-0.

4. KAR 115-25-7, Antelope; open season, bag limit and permits – Matt Peek, biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit T). Unit boundaries defined in 115-4-6 with Units 2, 17 and 18 open to hunting. Starting with archery season, the dates are September 19-27 and October 10-31, 2020; permits valid in all three units; unlimited and available to residents and nonresidents. The firearm season dates are October 2-5, 2020; permits limited to residents; proposing 110 for Unit 2, 40 for Unit 17 and 8 for Unit 18. Muzzleloader season dates are September 28 to October 5, 2020; permits limited to residents; proposing 30 for Unit 2, 10 for Unit 17 and 4 for Unit 18. Unit 2 and 17 limited permits are the same as last year. In Unit 18 we have reduced permits from 16 limited draw down to 12; we cut firearm and archery [muzzleloader] permits each by two.

Commissioner Warren Gfeller moved to approve KAR 115-25-7 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Emerick Cross second.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-25-7 passed 7-0.

5. KAR 115-25-8, Elk; open season, bag limit and permits – Matt Peek, biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit V). Unit boundaries for elk are defined in 115-4-6b. Units 2 and 3 are open to hunting, the only part not open is a little area in southwest corner that encompasses Cimarron National Grassland. Proposed archery season dates are September 14 to December 31, 2020 in Units 2 and 3 outside of Fort Riley and season dates on Fort Riley will be September 1-30, 2020, which is subunit 2a. Proposed firearm season off of Fort Riley are August 1-31, the early season we established due to some depredation concerns; also December 2-13, 2020 and that overlaps with firearm deer season and January 1 to March 15, 2021 firearm season. On Fort Riley the firearm season dates are October 1 through December 31, 2020, with October being the first segment, November the second and December the third. Proposed muzzleloader season both on and off Fort Riley are September 1-30, 2020. Limited quota either-sex elk permits are valid during any open season and we are proposing 12 of those be authorized. For Fort Riley, the antlerless-only elk permits are the same type and we are proposing six of those are valid during each segment, the same as last year. Elk permits are available only to Kansas residents and limited quota permit applications are separated into military and non-military applicants prior to the actual draw. An unlimited number of hunt-on-your-own-land antlerless-only and either-sex permits are authorized in Units 2 and 3 and an unlimited number of general resident and landowner/tenant antlerless-only and either-sex are authorized in Unit 3

Commissioner Emerick Cross moved to approve KAR 115-25-8 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Aaron Rider second.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-25-8 passed 7-0.

6. KAR 115-4-2, Big game and wild turkey; general provisions – Levi Jaster, big game biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit X). This includes tagging of animals, looking at proof of sex; the current regulation requires that on a big game animal taken on an antlerless-only permit the head has to remain attached to the carcass as proof of sex. Because of the risk of chronic wasting disease (CWD) and fear of spreading that, we want to change that to remove requiring the head and change that to having visible sex organs remain attached to the carcass or a quartered portion of the carcass. This is to allow hunters to voluntarily remove the most infected portion of the carcass in the field as a best practice. Commissioner Sporer – Not going to have to leave identifying sex parts? Jaster – Don't have to leave head but do have to leave visible sex organs. Chairman Lauber – Leave one or the other? Jaster – Yes.

Commissioner Gary Hayzlett moved to approve KAR 115-4-2 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Lauren Sill second.

Commission Rider – Does this deal with tagging a turkey? Jaster – No, remains the same for turkey, has to have beard attached to the breast. Commissioner Rider – With new app, how does somebody tag their turkey if permit is on the app? Assistant Secretary Miller – We don't have electronic tagging in place yet but will in the near future; you would have electronic tag connected to your permit on your mobile device. We have talked about using a photograph like electronic registration you would validate the tag on mobile device, and you would receive a confirmation number that would allow you to transport that animal. Chairman Lauber – Can you get a tag on your phone right now? Assistant Secretary Miller – Tagging is not in place on phone yet. Nygren – Hoped to have out for spring turkey season but with COVID issues it has been delayed. It will be available in a couple of weeks. Commissioner Rider – If somebody has purchased it and it is in their wallet, they still need to print out a paper copy? Nygren – The way it is supposed to be is when you purchase permit you will be asked if you want to use paper or electronic, not both because we want to eliminate potential for fraud by having two sets of tags. It will be set up where you make choice and use that choice. Chairman Lauber – Today, could I have a permit on my phone and no way to tag a harvested turkey? Nygren – Yes, if you buy a turkey permit you will have permit on the phone the tags won't show up on there for fulfillment.

Chairman Lauber – Hope I can explain that to a game warden. Nygren – Hasn't rolled out yet. Chairman Lauber – If you opted for paper you will have them. Chairman Lauber – What if you opted for electronic? Nygren – You can't get on phone yet. Chairman Lauber – I thought you could but permit electronically and not get tag, thought half was ready and half was not. Commissioner Rider – My understanding as well, printed on my computer. Had someone purchased on app on phone but didn't understand what they needed to do to tag the turkey. They need to go online to website and print it out? Nygren – Yes, they will need to print the tags.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-4-2 passed 7-0.

7. KAR 115-4-4, Big game; legal equipment and taking methods – Levi Jaster, big game biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit Z). Change is to strike language that prohibits the use of lock draw on a vertical bow. It would not require a special permit. You can use these if you apply and get a special permit through law enforcement under 115-18-7 for handicap or older hunter that needs assistance of the device. Cleans up regulation and reduces handful of folks from doing extra work to get those permits. Commissioner Hayzlett – It is only available for handicap or youth? Jaster – Currently yes and I think that includes medical allowance too. Not available to general public at this time Chairman Lauber – Passing this regulation would allow general public to use one without a permit. Commissioner Rider – Similar in line with a crossbow, as you see it? Jaster – That is correct. Commissioner Rider – Crossbow currently is available for general public use? Jaster – Yes it is. Commissioner Sill – Has anyone gotten any public comment in support of this? I have had a lot of emails and texts opposing this. Anyone else get support? Commissioner Hayzlett – Have received opposition to it, they say we have already allowed crossbows, so we don't need it. If specifically, for handicap person to get it I understand, but don't understand putting another article like this on the market. Chairman Lauber – I have not received comments one way or the other. Comments at previous meeting, some archers say they don't know why you would want one because it doesn't make it any more accurate. Of the opinion it doesn't make a lot of difference one way or the other. We had some discussion about whether or not it made fair chase different, I am not sure it makes a lot of difference. Not a lot of feedback either way. Commissioner Rider – Received two not in favor, they were traditional bowhunters, they think it would be bad for bowhunting, believe not in favor of crossbows as well. Trying to figure out the difference between crossbows and adding draw lock to compound bow, not that much different? Chairman Lauber – Bowhunters tend to be against a lot of new stuff and I don't think this makes a lot of difference. I don't think this is fundamentally different than a crossbow but not sure it is going to be sought after by that many people. Commissioner Cross – This would eliminate another obstacle for people who did need this draw lock, correct? Jaster – Yes. Assistant Secretary Miller – As a point of clarification, this

came about with questions we have received over the years of why we allow a crossbow and won't allow draw lock on a compound bow because basically a crossbow has a draw lock on it. A special permit was provided for use of a draw lock before crossbows were part of our equipment, so it allowed someone with certain limitations to shoot a bow when they couldn't hold it at full draw. Questions we received recently have been why we don't allow draw lock when you can shoot a crossbow. I don't think demand for these special permits is very high. Commissioner Gfeller – That is what I recall from the workshop, didn't seem to make sense to have crossbow availability and not allow draw locks. Archery purists can still be archery purists they don't have to use it. People who have a particular need they can draw with draw lock by standing on bow and drawing and locking. I received very little public feedback, other than at commission meetings, one way or the other.

Commissioner Warren Gfeller moved to approve KAR 115-4-4 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Aaron Rider second.

Commissioner Sill – I think this is one opportunity to listen. Folks say, why participate you don't listen. I understand why this cleans some things up but understand there is a fair amount of public in opposition to it and I think this is an opportunity to show people we are listening, just as Commissioner Rider earlier and the duck seasons and that group. Chairman Lauber – See your point, but we listen to bowhunters a lot, they are not an ignored group. Agree with Warren, if you want to be a purist don't use it. Commissioner Gfeller – It seems we had quite a bit of public support at previous meetings, explaining out it was used and support for the use of it. Also, how it helps people that have deficiencies and we got some written support previously. I was under the understanding that we had a fair amount of support for this. Chairman Lauber – Support for it was why it gone on agenda to begin with. Negative comments by bowhunters surfaced later.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**No**
Commissioner Sporer	**Absent**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-4-4 passed 5-1.

8. KAR 115-4-6, Deer; management units – Levi Jaster, big game biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit BB, Exhibit CC – map). Unit 19 is the Kansas City urban unit; it goes along the I-70 corridor and was put in place to help with population management and to help reduce roadkill potential in that area. The big change is to move the boundary south to include the lower half of Unit 10 within Unit 19, to have that small triangle that only allows only one antlerless whitetail deer tag and is surrounded by areas that you could use up to five. Additionally, to use some more major roads on the north side to clean up the confusing boundary. On the south, the same and to solve the same problem of have area surrounded by five deer permits. These boundaries were set on the biologists' recommendations.

Chairman Lauber – From map, above the black line is still Unit 10? Jaster – Correct. We don't want to make changes to Unit 10 entirely as far as antlerless permits go because north of that black line we are still recording lower deer populations and get comments from hunters in that area. Keep that reduced to one antlerless there but open up area that does have higher population.

Commissioner Emerick Cross moved to approve KAR 115-4-6 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Warren Gfeller second.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-4-6 passed 7-0.

9. KAR 115-25-9, Deer open season, bag limit and permits – Levi Jaster, big game biologist, presented this regulation to the Commission (Exhibit EE). This is where we set statewide seasons and allow for number of antlerless permits that can be used in what units. Sticking with tradition overall but providing a little longer than normal antlerless season; we had issue with short number of days in last couple of years. Also, adding Elk City and Berentz Dick Wildlife Area, also known as the buffalo ranch, to list of state properties that allow more than one whitetail antlerless permit to be used due to complaints from neighbors and flooding pushing deer off of that area; to help that and reduce damage and will keep a close eye on deer populations. Archery season dates are September 14 to December 31, 2020, statewide. Urban antlerless-only white-tailed deer archery will be January 25-31, 2021. Firearm season will start traditional Wednesday after Thanksgiving, December 2-13, 2020. Pre-rut antlerless season will be October 10-12, 2020, which is Columbus Day weekend. Muzzleloader will be September 14-27, 2020. Youth and disabled season, September 5-13, 2020. Extended whitetail antlerless-only seasons in January for Units 6, 8, 9, 10 or 17 open from January 1-10, 2021; Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 14 or 16, January 1-17, 2021; and Units 10A, 12, 13, 15 and 19 will be January 1-24, 2021. Unit 18 will have no January season and have no antlerless permits allocated. Commissioner Rider – Do you have information on where we are on nonresident applications? Jaster – I don't handle that. Secretary Loveless – Tracking that, Doug or Mike? Assistant Secretary Miller – Following that, ahead of last year. Nygren – Two days ago we were 500 applications ahead of last year, big push is last few days and that is when we will know where we are. Chairman Lauber – At one time we had discussed, if nonresident was unsuccessful in draw could buy an antlerless permit and still come to Kansas. Consider that for next year. Feel COVID-19 will reduce number of applicants coming to Kansas. Review that before next year. Secretary Loveless – Glad to do that and report back. In terms of feedback, constituent voiced he thought that would be a well-used option; subsequent to that I have talked to outfitters who are critical of that, they said in their opinion those permits were misused fraudulently, skeptical that there was a significant number of nonresidents that would travel to Kansas to take a non-antlered deer. They

felt it would be a cover for them to try and take an antlered deer. We have received input on both sides so will be glad to review and report back. Chairman Lauber – Told proponent we would review. Only in situations of being unsuccessful in a draw. Surprised at outfitters reaction, usually they can't have enough nonresidents staying with them. Maybe not a good idea. Secretary Loveless – Will get back to you on that. Jaster – They can purchase an antlerless whitetail permit in January after the season for taking antlered deer is over. Will look at those numbers to see how many people do that.

Commissioner Gary Hayzlett moved to approve KAR 115-25-9 as presented to the Commission. Commissioner Aaron Rider second.

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

Commissioner Cross	**Yes**
Commissioner Gfeller	**Yes**
Commissioner Hayzlett	**Yes**
Commissioner Rider	**Yes**
Commissioner Sill	**Yes**
Commissioner Sporer	**Yes**
Commissioner Lauber	**Yes**

The motion as presented on KAR 115-25-9 passed 7-0.

XII. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Lauber – Nadia, any public comments? Reimer – I haven't been handling the phone calls, just the chat room and there are no comments there. Chairman Lauber – This meeting went off well even though few public comments.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Future Meeting Locations and Dates

June 25, 2020 – New Strawn (Burlington), New Strawn Community Center
August 20, 2020 – Meet in Beloit, tour Ring Neck Ranch in morning as invited

After discussion set:
September 24, 2020, Topeka
November 19, 2020, in northwest, day before Governor's Hunt, decided on Oakley

Assistant Secretary Miller – Had a phone call with Keith Houghton, Ring Neck Ranch, and he wanted me to make sure everybody knew they were still going to be able to meet at Ring Neck Ranch before the August meeting. He said he could make rooms available for the night before and offer tours of his facility the morning before the meeting. He wanted to know what else you might be interested in learning about or hearing. Chairman Lauber – When is that meeting? Sheila Kemmis – August 20 in Beloit. Chairman Lauber – We will try to have responses to him maybe by the time we meet in June. Commissioner Sporer – One option would be Jamestown

tour after all of the construction has been done and upland game bird operations in the Tipton/Beloit area. Assistant Secretary Miller – That is part of what Keith would offer. He could arrange tours of those hatcheries.

Commissioner Sporer – Opening up out-of-state turkey sales again, what would have to happen to open sales? Secretary Loveless – Basis was concern of health and welfare of Kansans with nonresidents potentially bringing in that virus. Would have to be a relaxation of those concerns and while this wasn't a scientific process there were a lot of comments. I don't know if we will. We will have better data available when we come out of emergency declaration. Things are lagging in western Kansas, some counties don't have any cases yet; eastern Kansas may feel like relaxing, may just be coming on in the west. Governor would want to base a change back on science and risk posed to Kansans. That is the same kind of logic that went into rescinding issuance of those permits. Chairman Lauber – There are a lot of regional health departments brought in and their job is worry about this stuff and this was definitely worth worrying about. I think they put enough pressure on the governor and she gave in. Secretary and Assistant Secretary had a good response they were sending to hunters inquiring and we were surprised. The level of pressure to understand safety whether or not rational, impossible to say no after a while. Secretary Loveless – Had conversation with outfitter up by Delphos and he talked about the impact on his operation by not having these nonresident turkey hunters in; we are sensitive to that. We would love to share opportunities before end of season if we can. Can have ongoing conversation and give you feedback on how that progresses into May; we will keep conversation alive with the Governor and see if relaxation is responsible. Medical professionals reaching out to us with their concerns, get feedback from them as well as outfitters. If a consensus out there, if danger has passed and we can let folks back in to chase our birds in Kansas, we will. Chairman Lauber – If we get too far into May, the demand, weather conditions and vegetation .are less desirable. If something comes up, do it. Secretary Loveless – Appreciate latitude, first item on my list on things to discuss and respond back to you on; an internal discussion as well with the Governor and her staff, we will keep you apprised. Governor stating, she hopes relaxation can be done around early May; she will follow the science but if she relaxes that it is a logical question for us to ask if we could start issuing those permits again.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 8:49 pm.