

Filed 9-8-76

M I N U T E S

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON FORESTRY, FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

August 4 and 5, 1976

Members Present

Representative R. E. Arbuthnot, Chairman
Senator Richard Williams, Vice-Chairman
Representative James Cubit
Representative James Holderman
Representative Herbert Rogg

Staff Present

Robert Haley, Kansas Legislative Research Department
John Rowe, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Don Hayward, Revisor of Statutes Office

Conferees and Guests Present

See Attachment I

August 4, 1976
(8:30 a.m.)

Tour of Milford Reservoir and Game Management Area

The Committee departed Junction City at 8:30 a.m., August 4, 1976, for Milford Reservoir and the Game Management Area. Attachment II identifies the Forestry, Fish and Game staff who accompanied or met the Committee at various locations. Over 16,700 acres of game management and refuge land around the lake are licensed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers to the Commission. The focus of the tour was on the various activities associated with the management of this area.

The Committee observed several techniques of the Fisheries Division used in sampling reservoir fish populations, including the use of various nets and an electrical stunning device. Through the sampling process, fish are evaluated as to age, size, health, location and other characteristics. When sampling projects require more than one man, two biologists may be used if less expensive help is not available. The agency cited the need for two persons to perform certain tasks as justification for temporary summer help for the biologists.

The Committee also inspected one of the Courtesy Water Patrol boats. Three boats are used by the Patrol to randomly patrol the more heavily used waters of the state.

The Committee viewed a slide presentation at the Fish and Game Office in Wakefield of fisheries management activities. Particular mention was made of mud flat seeding for waterfowl and fisheries habitat.

The first stop of the afternoon tour was a view of land leased by the Commission to area farmers. Note was made of the restricted use of fencing and wildlife habitat strips which are alternated with cultivated crops. The Committee was also shown two field areas, the first recently cleared by burning and the second in need of clearing. Comparisons were

made between them as to the type of habitat they provided. It was noted that if land is left unmanaged, it will develop a habitat not necessarily suited for game species. In the areas visited, controlled burning clears grasslands of unwanted undergrowth and debris making them a more suitable quail habitat.

Another example of both management practice and the need for management was seen in the various plantings of mud flats. These areas were seeded to provide waterfowl habitat and then when flooded, fisheries habitat. Unmanaged, these areas would provide little habitat for either of these game populations.

The Committee was also shown several small areas where a variety of shrubs, trees and bushes had been planted in fields for wildlife shelters. These shelter areas, along with hedgerows, trees, and other growth were along many of the roads under Commission responsibility. Several lake roads have been closed by the Commission where more than one road led to the same area. The Committee was also shown brushpiles constructed throughout management areas for the protection of wildlife. The tour ended in Junction City at 4:30 p.m.

Evening Session

(7:30 p.m.)

The meeting was called to order by Chairman R.E. Arbuthnot. The Chairman introduced the Committee members, staff, Forestry, Fish and Game Commission representatives and Representative Harold Beninga.

Chairman Arbuthnot recognized Dr. James Smart from Washington County, whose remarks are included as Attachment III. In reference to Dr. Smart's question concerning governmental reorganization, the Chairman noted that legislation for reorganization was killed in the last session but that there is considerable interest in the issue and the question could be raised again.

Mr. Ted Cunningham, the executive director of the Kansas Wildlife Federation, also presented a written statement which is included as Attachment IV. Dr. Harold Klaasen, an instructor and biologist at Kansas State University spoke next. Dr. Klaasen said he had instructed many of the biologists now on the staff of the Commission and that he is concerned about maintaining the professional image of the Commission. Dr. Klaasen's suggestions for improving and maintaining professionalism within the Commission are as follows:

1. That each new biologist in the Commission should hold a master's degree;
2. that game protectors be required to hold a bachelor's degree;
3. that the Commission support and encourage attendance by its professional employees at national and regional conventions;
4. that contract research with universities be continued; and
5. that funding patterns be expanded beyond license sales revenue.

He stressed the need for the Commission to be self-supporting and free of political control.

Mr. Gary Penn of the Geary County Fish and Game Association spoke next in support of SASNAK. His association supports the elimination of youth exemptions and a financially self-supporting Commission.

Mr. Tom Bruce of the Geary County Fish and Game Association stressed that landowners should be allowed to hunt on their own land during deer season. Currently landowners must compete with all other hunters in Kansas for a deer permit. He also said that the notice of seasons and license sales is not adequate to inform the public.

Representative Beninga remarked that license exemptions for those over 65 years of age had been discussed in the last legislative session and in his opinion, such persons should be required to have a license. Representative Beninga also asked about the agency's policy concerning the cutting of hay on public land. Mr. Lee Queal responded that the cutting of hay is done on a competitive basis and that the cutting frequency must depend on an overall management program.

Mr. Carl Gray of the Geary County Fish and Game Association spoke for the removal of license exemptions. He expressed support of the SASNAK program and the extension beyond five years for SASNAK results to be fully recognized. He noted that economic conditions now prevailing in state agricultural activities encouraged farmers to plant from fence row to fence row, thus eliminating a great amount of wildlife habitat. This practice made it essential for the agency to continue its programs of developing habitat on private lands. He suggested that additional revenue can be found by refunding sporting fines to the Commission. He would also like to see the Commission removed from political activity such as caused the purchase of St. Jacob's Well.

Mr. Milton Rawlings of the Geary County Fish and Game Association asked whether it would be possible to "refund" to the Fish and Game Commission a percentage of the gasoline tax collected in the state. Mr. Robert Haley of the Kansas Legislative Research Department noted that the Department of Transportation generally receives all tax collected on gasoline.

Mr. Gary Macklin of the Geary County Fish and Game Association spoke against any efforts to reorganize the current Fish and Game Commission. He also stressed that meetings of the Legislature were not adequately publicized. Representative Cubit replied that many people secure calendars of the legislative session and that a hand-out calendar is prepared each day of the session in Topeka. He noted that the public has some responsibility in seeking out information in regard to schedules.

Mr. Ed Hardesty of Junction City presented the following alternate methods for gaining revenue:

1. Elimination of exemptions;
2. a fee to nonsportsmen as a nonconsumptive user of public sportsland; and
3. that interest earned on Forestry, Fish and Game funds be returned to the Commission rather than being deposited in the State General Fund.

Mr. Ron Schulz of the Tri-County Rod and Gun Club of Kansas City, Kansas said that in Colorado a nonconsumptive use license sold for \$2.00 and in 1976 only 200 of these licenses were sold.

Mr. James Corbutt of Wakefield, Kansas spoke of his concern for SASNAK, saying that he still cannot see the results of the efforts and money expended. He is unhappy with the program and feels that much of the money has been wasted. Mr. Corbutt remembered a time in the 1950's following a severe storm when Kansas sportsmen donated a great deal of labor in restoring the habitat, feed, and shelter for birds. He suggested that a program of volunteer labor in conjunction with the Commission leadership would provide a more beneficial program.

Mr. Tony Ekhart of the Kansas Professional Bass Anglers Association noted that this association had money to donate for the development of bass fishing in Kansas but that the association was fearful such funds would not be earmarked for the specific activity. Chairman Arbuthnot noted that funds could be so directed if they followed the appropriate legislative process.

Mr. Ronald Schultz of the Tri-County Rod and Gun Club said that it was difficult for people to have adequate input into the Commission because it holds meetings on weekday mornings, precluding attendance by many sportsmen.

Mr. Wentworth of Salina expressed his concern that sportsmen cannot keep up with legislation. He requested that the legislature and Committee members make a greater effort in notifying sportsmen's organizations as to programs being proposed and legislation enacted.

Mr. Jack Jackson, President of the Kansas State Rifle Association of Hays, Kansas expressed the need for keeping professional people on the Commission's staff. He suggested giving them greater authority and responsibility. He also observed that one of the many problems faced by SASNAK is that people expected too much too soon and that farmers could not develop habitat without the help of a cost sharing program.

Mr. Bill Carter of Washington, Kansas stressed that the sportsmen must sell the program of habitat development to the farmer and volunteer to do much of the labor. He also suggested that Kansas follow the example of European countries in allowing local game management authorities to set limits on fish and game take.

Mr. Walter Schullely of Washington, Kansas noted that land used for habitat is land taken out of production and that hunters must be more courteous and thoughtful about their habits and trash, etc., when using farmers' land. The farmer is under economic pressure and needs help from the sportsman in volunteer labor and cooperation for the development of habitat on his land.

Representative Cubit noted that 87 percent of the hunting is done on private land, indicating that many sportsmen are not necessarily benefiting from any public program. He also said that there is tremendous use of public hunting land by nonsportsmen, indicating a possible need for a nonconsumptive use fee.

Representative Herbert Rogg indicated the need for good public relations and communications on the part of the Commission. He expressed appreciation for the tour conducted this afternoon for the Committee's benefit to observe what the SASNAK program was doing and where the money was going. He stressed that sportsmen need to support revenue measures when they are presented to ensure their passage. Representative Holderman noted the importance of having communication with the state sportsmen over proposals for increased fees in order to ensure favorable response in the legislature.

In review of the WHIP program, Mr. Queal explained that due to the farmer's need to maximize production, private habitat development did not catch on. Formerly, the Commission offered five percent of the cost of materials for new habitat development. Farmers now want total costs covered rather than just materials. The agency simply cannot afford to meet all the costs of lost profit and habitat development. There is a need for the agency to become concerned with total wildlife development. Wildlife belongs to all the people in the state, not just to the sportsmen. He thus noted that funds should perhaps come from the general revenue as well as from the sportsmen.

Representatives of the Geary County Fish and Game Association again expressed their interest in support of volunteer development of private habitat. Mr. Cunningham of the Kansas Wildlife Federation noted that his organization currently has working arrangements with conservation districts on the planning of projects whenever critical habitats are threatened.

Chairman Arbuthnot thanked everyone for participating and adjourned the meeting until 8:30 the following morning.

August 5, 1976

(8:30 a.m.)

The Committee meeting was called to order by Chairman Arbuthnot. The first order of business was to set the dates for the next Committee meeting as September 1 and 2, 1976 in Pratt, Kansas. The Committee decided that the September meeting should be coordinated with the Forestry, Fish and Game Commission meeting on September 1, and that there would be no public hearing that evening. The September 2 meeting would be reserved for Committee tours of the area.

Representative Cubit introduced letters from constituents complaining that the Forestry, Fish and Game Commission did not have adequate bass at the Farlington hatcheries to supply ponds in the area. The second letter charged that too many people had been hired too fast and that agency expenses were out of line with revenue.

Following approval of the minutes, the Chairman recognized Mr. Lee Queal, chief of the Game Management Division of the Forestry, Fish and Game Commission. His review of the game management operation is on file in the Legislative Research Department. Discussion followed. Representative Holderman asked what the Commission had done to distribute information on game management programs. Mr. Queal replied that a few surveys were distributed to the general public but that he was unaware of specific proposals to gain public input.

Representative Holderman also asked if the Commission was reluctant to release information on goals and goal attainment. Mr. Queal replied that goals outlined in SASNAK are difficult to measure. Therefore, little could be released about such goal attainment. Representative Holderman stressed the need for having more information released that would tell the effectiveness of the SASNAK program as well as the work biologists and other employees do.

He also asked if the agency was heading in the right direction with so few people actually appearing to benefit from its programs. Mr. Queal replied that the number of hunters on state lands is about 200,000 and that there is continuing effort

to promote hunting on both private and public lands. Representative Holderman questioned what would happen if efforts directed toward public land hunting were shifted to the development of hunting on private lands. Mr. Queal responded that currently there is no accurate figure for the total amount of habitat available on private lands or the hunting they could support. He pointed out that landowners want to be payed for habitat materials and that two-thirds of the Division's funds now go to salaries, leaving little to offset the development expenses of private land. He mentioned also that the Commission is generally satisfied with the hunting pressure public lands now have. As expected on opening day, nearly all lands receive maximum hunting pressure but except for the most popular areas, demand slacks off later in the season. Mr. Queal's opinion was that private land hunting must be enhanced but not at the expense of public hunting areas. He noted that private landowners must be more aware of the need for habitat development as more and more land goes into agricultural production.

In response to a question concerning fee hunting areas, Mr. Queal expressed the Commission's concern that only the well-to-do would be encouraged to hunt on such land and cited Texas as an example of a state that utilizes fee hunting. Another fear is that landowners would tend to improve habitat at agency expense in an effort to make more money.

Chairman Arbuthnot asked if the quality and quantity of hunting on private property could be improved with more personnel. The Committee was told that both personnel and money are needed to develop private land habitat and that manpower alone would not do the job. Farmers expect payments to cover the costs of both habitat development and management. If such payments were to include repayment for loss of agricultural production, the cost could be extremely high.

Mr. Darrell Montei, Regional Game Supervisor, expressed the opinion that a national soil reserve cost sharing program could help as much or more than local programs. Mr. Queal remarked that public lands could be managed with lower intensity and more emphasis put on the development of private habitats. However, such a program would not be compatible with current SASNAK objectives.

Chairman Arbuthnot noted that the five-year plan for SASNAK is a relatively short period and that to be effective goals must be continually reviewed.

Representative Rogg suggested that any effort on the Commission's part to generate funds from nonsports or nonconsumptive users of Commission lands would point to the need for agency reorganizing and a Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Queal commented that he does not see the need for reorganization to generate revenue from these sources but felt that State General Fund money could be used with the current organization. He suggested that 20-25 percent of the license sales revenue could be matched by State General Fund moneys to pay for the expenses caused by nonconsumptive users of Commission land. This, he said, would be more responsive to the general public's needs and activities.

Representative Holderman expressed feelings that any use of State General Fund money would bring increased intervention in Commission's activities from the legislature. Mr. Queal mentioned that while nonhunter use of Commission land is significant, no efforts have been made to support that use. Mr. Montei suggested that State General Fund moneys could be used to support activities such as trash pickup, maintenance, and road repair. Enhancement of nonconsumptive uses such as birdwatching and the protection of endangered species, etc., could also be provided with more funds available.

Responding to a question concerning the number of licenses sold, Mr. Queal said 200,000 to 210,000 licenses were sold in Kansas last year. Representative Cubit noted that this represented only about 10 percent of the state population, not enough to justify State General Fund use.

A question was then raised concerning the migration of game from private to public lands or from public to private lands. Mr. Queal responded that such migration was not significant except when summer feeding is poor and when winters are severe and game forage farther. Representative Cubit noted that certain areas having great amounts of habitat on private lands have the habitat in the wrong places. There is need for cooperation between the farmer and the local sportsman, possibly for the donation of labor by the sportsman, in the proper development of private habitats. Such a cooperative effort would significantly improve the relationship between the farmer and the hunter. Mr. Queal responded that the Commission could possibly supply personnel to advise and manage such efforts.

Representative Cubit mentioned another problem relating to leasing land to sports groups. Some people who could not afford to hunt on lease hunting areas would be

required to go further into the country and thus become altogether discouraged with hunting.

Committee discussion at this point turned to consideration of lease policies for land around the state's reservoirs. Mr. Queal noted that if the federal licenses allowed cash leases, funds generated would possibly make the management areas self-supporting. He noted, however, that self-supporting operations should not be the goal of the Commission.

In the Fall River-Toronto area, problems between the lessees and the Commission primarily stem from the change in management policies of the Corps of Engineers to those established by the Commission. The Corps lessees operate on a cash basis and the Commission uses a sharecropping arrangement. It must be noted that the Commission's charge is not to support farming, but to develop wildlife habitat. Problems are aggravated by communication difficulties with the federal agencies involved.

Milford Reservoir area is on an interim license under which the Commission offers more liberal lease arrangements. To offset the farmers' cost of fertilizers, the farmer is given a larger than usual share of the crop. Currently a Commission study is underway to review the share proportions of its sharecropping lease.

Mr. Darrell Montei reviewed the agency's grazing programs stating that they are managed like other activities. Under certain circumstances, grazing is beneficial to the habitat. In others, it can be neutral or harmful. Any grazing approval must come through the Corps of Engineers upon recommendation of the Commission. He noted that under the Corps of Engineers, 75 percent of the funds from the cash leases go to the counties. Under the Commission no cash is available to return to local jurisdictions.

Chairman Arbuthnot recognized that while there are problems connected with leasing situations, they are not within the scope of the Committee's review.

Mr. Verlyn Ebert observed how essential it was that the Commission have summer help to reduce the seasonal loads on the biologists. Oftentimes management and fisheries personnel must help each other in chores resulting in severe manpower limitations.

Chairman Arbuthnot expressed that Committee recommendations should soon be formalized and that he was looking forward to the joint meeting with the Commission. He noted the need for coordinated efforts on behalf of both the Committee and the Commission.

Mr. Queal, responding to Representative Holderman's question on the status of Commission recommendations, said that he was not in a position to speak for the Commission and that he was not aware of what recommendations the Commission is developing. Representative Holderman understood the Commission would be preparing for the upcoming joint meeting with the Committee. He expressed disappointment that no Commission member had attended any of the Committee's meetings. He had three specific questions for the Commission, as follows:

1. Where does the Commission want to go with its programs?
2. Does the Commission know how much money is necessary for the programs it has in mind? and
3. What are the specific arrangements for fee adjustments?

Representative Cubit noted that the Committee will not be a rubber stamp for the Commission's recommendations but that coordination of both groups is essential.

Representative Holderman noted that if the Commission was unable to affect necessary changes in its operations, more legislative pressure will be exerted to examine agency operations. Long-term management was cited as one of the Commission's major challenges and essential for plotting future developments. Such planning was noted to be necessary on a regional level as well.

John Moir of the Budget Division noted that management by objectives with planning for increments of five, ten, or fifteen years would possibly permit letters

of credit against future apportionments from the federal government. A current critical problem is matching individual projects to available federal funds. It is feared that such funds could be lost unless a coordinated funding effort is undertaken to ensure needed projects at the proper time and magnitude of available funding. Chairman Arbuthnot requested that staff prepare a short memorandum regarding this subject. The Chairman also noted the worthwhile nature of the Committee's meetings, hearings, and his regret there had been no Commission members present. Representative Holderman suggested that the Committee and staff be present when the Governor reviews the Fish and Game budget. In discussion it was noted how important a long range plan was in coordinating programs to meet the needs of Kansas sportsmen.

Chairman Arbuthnot again thanked the Committee for its dedication and adjourned the meeting.

Prepared by John Rowe

Approved by Committee on:

9-2-76

(Date)

J. Arbuthnot

PERSONS ATTENDING PUBLIC MEETING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Ed Augustino	1513 Hale Drive Junction City, Kansas 66441	
Tom J. Baker	1868 South Coy Kansas City, Kansas 66103	Kansas Rod and Gun Club
Ray Beisel	120 West 19th Concordia, Kansas 66901	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Rep. Harold Beninga	609 Eisenhower Drive Junction City, Kansas 66441	State Representative, 69th District
Rex Boatman	3504 Stagecoach Manhattan, Kansas 66502	Kansas Wildlife Federation
Henry D. Bonowitz	310 Osage Manhattan, Kansas 66502	Kansas Wildlife Federation
Thomas R. Bruce	120 East 15th Junction City, Kansas 66441	Geary County Fish and Game
William Carter	Washington, Kansas 66968	
Jim Corbutt	Fir Street Wakefield, Kansas 67487	
Ted Cunningham	R.R. 1 Wamego, Kansas 66547	Kansas Wildlife Federation
Leo Dowlin	R.R. 1 St. George, Kansas 66535	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Verlyn Ebert	721 East 12th Concordia, Kansas 66901	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Tony Ekart	111 Dix Drive Manhattan, Kansas 66502	Kansas Pro Bass Anglers
Mike Gauntt	913 Countryside Court Junction City, Kansas 66441	Geary County Fish and Game

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Tom Glick	Box 293 Wakefield, Kansas 67487	
Carl R. Gray	534 West Elm Junction City, Kansas 66441	Geary County Fish and Game
Cal Groen	Box 312 Wakefield, Kansas 67487	
Ralph A. Hartzell	253 North Ohio Salina, Kansas 67401	President, Saline County Rod and Gun Club
George L. Hoffman, Jr.	2315 South Early Kansas City, Kansas 66103	Kansas Rod and Gun
Charles B. Howe	Box 328 Wakefield, Kansas 67487	
Lee Howe	Box 328 Wakefield, Kansas 67487	
L.M. "Jack" Jackson	R.R. 1, Box 1906 Hays, Kansas 67601	President, Kansas State Rifle Association
Marty Karmann	Junction City, Kansas 66441	Blue Valley Bass
Dr. John R. Kelley	Manhattan, Kansas 66502	Kansas State University
James Kidd	Junction City, Kansas 66441	Milford Lake Association
Harold E. Klaasen	3009 Conver Drive Manhattan, Kansas 66502	Kansas State University
Rich Lang	1117 Skyline Junction City, Kansas 66441	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Harry L. Macklin	R.R. 1 Milford, Kansas 66514	Geary County Fish and Game - S.I.
Kerry McCue	Box 204	
J.A. McNally	1716 Republican Concordia, Kansas 66901	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Bob Meduna	Manhattan, Kansas 66504	Kansas State University
John B. Minger	7214 Berger Kansas City, Kansas 66111	
Darrell Montei	Concordia, Kansas 66901	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Randy Olson	Box 141 Wakefield, Kansas 67487	
Tom Owens	704 Crestview Junction City, Kansas 66441	
Gary M. Penn	530 West Elm Junction City, Kansas 66441	Geary County Fish and Game
Dan Fletcher	Manhattan, Kansas 66504	Kansas State University
Lee Queal	Pratt, Kansas 67124	Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission
Milton T. Rawlings	1072 Cedar Junction City, Kansas 66441	Geary County Fish and Game
Tony Schroeder	Council Grove, Kansas 66846	
Walter Schurelle	Washington, Kansas 66968	
Martin Sharp	Box 666 Junction City, Kansas 66441	
Ronald Shultz	1332 North 32nd Kansas City, Kansas 66102	Tri-County Rod and Gun
James H. Smart DVM	Washington, Kansas 66968	Washington County Sportsmen's Club
E.R. Swallow, Jr.	424 South 76th Terrace Kansas City, Kansas 66111	Tri-County Rod and Gun

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Charles Swank	Council Grove, Kansas 66846	
Gerald L. Vincent	938 South Garfield Junction City, Kansas 66441	
Lowell L. Vonada	Lincoln, Kansas 67455	
Richard Worth	611 Max Salina, Kansas 67401	Saline County Rod and Gun - Kansas State Rifle Association
Alfred A. Yonada	Sylvan Grove, Kansas 67481	

FORESTRY, FISH AND GAME
STAFF ASSISTING TOUR

1. Ray Beisel, Water Patrolman
2. Verlyn Ebero, Regional Fisheries Supervisor
3. Calvin Groen, Regional Biologist
4. Rush Lang, Game Protector
5. Jack McNally, Regional Law Enforcement Supervisor
6. Darrell Montei, Regional Game Supervisor
7. Randy Olson, Biology Aide
8. Lee Queal, Chief, Game Division

Copy of testimony given by James H. Smart, D.V.M., of Washington, Kansas, to the Special Legislative Committee of Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission on August 4, 1976, at Junction City, Kansas.

I would first like to express my appreciation to the special committee on Forestry, Fish, and Game for this opportunity to testify as a Kansas sportsman. It seems a good sign when any legislative group is interested in hearing how the people feel concerning their department of government.

Since time is short, it seems pertinent that we not dwell on past complaints, but look to the future of Kansas Fish and Game and the needs to be met. I feel that the two outstanding accomplishments of the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission have been the great success of the Hunter Safety Program and the quality of the Kansas Fish and Game magazine.

It seems to me as a Kansas sportsman that the greatest need and crisis facing us today in Kansas is the need to establish more wildlife habitat on private lands. The bull dozers have melted much of the habitat from the face of the land. To have any amount of quality hunting in the future, we must put great emphasis and effort in the WHIP program on private land.

I would like to emphasize here that I feel the farmer and the heavy equipment people are in no way to blame. They have to make a living and manage their business, too. If I were a farmer paying taxes on \$700 to \$1,000 per acre land, I'd put it into profitable production also. Later in my testimony, I will indicate why I feel the sportsman is the one who should be responsible.

The reason I emphasize the WHIP effort on private lands is because we are doing quite a great deal now on public lands. I believe, in fact, that the extensive public lands may have become somewhat of a monster project for the commission to manage and keep up. At the present time, sixty percent of the game division expenditures go toward public land management. According to the Legislative Research Department, eighty-seven percent of the hunting takes place on private land. If this is true, approximately sixty percent of Game Division money goes to the benefit of thirteen percent of the hunters. This is the reason for my concern for WHIP emphasis on private lands.

I believe the reason the WHIP program didn't catch on in 1971 is due to the fact that it was presented and sold to the wrong people. In 1971, the agency surveyed the Kansas farmers to determine if they would cooperate in a WHIP program. Twenty-five percent replied they might consider it. By spring of 1975, only one percent were listed as cooperators. WHY????? The reason is most likely because the farmer doesn't care that much about WHIP. Wildlife habitat means several things to the farmer. Among them are: loss of cultivatable land; direct expense and cost in plants, seed and planting; and loss of time spent developing the program. It seems to me that selling the farmer the WHIP program is much like selling a dedicated walleye fisherman a pair of water skis. He simply isn't very excited about it.

The WHIP program is going to exert its greatest benefit on the Kansas sportsman, and he is the one that must buy the program and in turn sell it to the farmer on a personal basis. Every

hunter has cultivated friendships and relationships with those landowners on whose land he has hunted for years. He can help implement the WHIP program in his hunting area, and solicit the farmers help. There are very few Kansas farms that don't have a few waste acres that could be developed into good wildlife habitat. There are very few farmers that wouldn't let their friends develop those acres for wildlife habitat and feed if the case were presented properly.

In 1975, the legislature authorized a seventy-five percent cost sharing program for seed and planting stock in connection with the WHIP program. They have cut this program back to practically nothing due to the lack of farmer enthusiasm. I feel this is a drastic mistake. We need to fund WHIP and make seeds, seedlings, and trees available to the Kansas sportsman at a minimal cost if we are going to re-establish any amount of habitat. We have the guidance and technology available to do the job properly in the six Regional Fish and Game offices and the personnel have done a bang-up job whenever they were given the chance. Please help us implement WHIP on private land.

The only really sore spot I have with the Commission, I will mention briefly. I feel like the Pittsburg Quail Farm is an expensive folly. The projected budget for 1977 is \$57,000. Last year the quail produced at the farm cost Kansas sportsmen \$4.31 per bird raised. The cost per bird harvested by sportsmen amounted to \$33.80. Quail can be bought from game bird raisers for \$3.00 or less in many cases. The biologists tell us that the total impact of pen raised quail released by the Commission doesn't amount to a hill of beans. It seems to me the \$57,000 and the

personnel could be used to a much greater advantage in other ways.

As sportsmen in Kansas, we beg the Legislative Committee to let us raise hunting and fishing fees in Kansas to raise funds for our programs. I believe any individual over fourteen years of age can certainly afford a minimum of \$10 annually for a hunting or fishing license. Just because a person reaches the age of 65 years doesn't entitle them to belong to a bowling league free, or to the country club free, or to drive their automobile on free gasoline. There is no way we can develop and maintain a strong ongoing program for wildlife without money. Please do not make a political football out of funding the Fish and Game Commission forcing us to a pinch penny, welfare program. Please don't deny us the right to finance a good program with our own funds. If progress were to be held back due to the inability or unwillingness of a small majority to pay their fair share, we would still be without electric lights, running water, and flush toilets.

Please help us rebuild Kansas into a great hunting and fishing state by letting us finance a strong program through the Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission.

James H. Smart, D.V.M.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

For the record I am Ted Cunningham, Executive Director of the Kansas Wildlife Federation, with offices located at RR 1, Wamego, Kansas. The Federation has a membership of over 6000 and has been active in conservation and environmental issues for over 27 years in this state.

The executive board of the Federation was privileged to hear about Sasnak, its programs, goals and concepts, some time before it was announced to the general public and even before a name was given to the project. The executive board, the board of directors and the general membership approved the ideas of the program and we then began working toward public acceptance of Sasnak. The Federation spent hundreds of hours on radio, television and using the Kansas Sportsman, our official publication, selling and supporting Sasnak. We ran a complete series on regional offices and the persons working out of those offices. We believed three years ago, and still do today, that Sasnak was, and is, a realistic program and the program goals can be attained.

Today we can see many tangible benefits directly related to the Sasnak program. Fish habitat in many reservoirs and state fishing lakes, wildlife habitat improvement that benefits game and non-game species alike, new and greatly needed research programs, and enhancement of the technical staffs. We are proud of our fisheries and wildlife biologists, we believe they are highly competent and professional people, an asset to Kansas and to our fish and wildlife resources!

The Federation does not see insurmountable problems facing the agency. We do not feel all is lost or that all programs should be curtailed. We all find ourselves in a position of re-evaluation and assessment and we must look to the future, not dwell on past mistakes!

The Kansas Fish and Game administration, the Legislature and the Federation must all face criticism for the position we find ourselves in today: The Fish and Game administration for not building in higher inflationary spirals, the Legislature for not fully funding Sasnak in its inception, and the Federation for not speaking out,

Statement presented to the interim committee, August 4, 1976, by Ted Cunningham, Executive Director, Kansas Wildlife Federation, Inc.

loud and clear, when we realized the program faced financial difficulties. We found the Fish and Game administration reluctant to admit that fiscal miscalculations were made and that increased funding measures were necessary, until faced with program and personnel losses and an edict by Governor Bennett and the budget division to face up to the financial situation that we find is now very real.

In early November, of 1975, K.W.F. presented a number of ideas for new methods of revenue to the Fish and Game Commission. We felt then, and still do, that every citizen who utilizes fish and wildlife resources should be held responsible for funding and enhancement of those resources! Evidently the commissioners and administration gave little thought to our ideas until recently. Hopefully, the Legislature, the Fish and Game Commission and the Federation can all work toward acceptance of some of our ideas.

Mr. Chairman, we respectfully suggest and recommend the following items for your consideration:

1. That license fees increase over a period of years on a set scheduled basis. Scheduled increases would condition license buyers in advance and would provide necessary funds needed to meet rising costs of doing business. License fee increases should be kept small, but should be scheduled for fiscal 1978, 1980 and 1982. We would expect to see a ten dollar (\$10.00) license by January 1983. Along with increases we would expect prudent fiscal management so as to not face future personnel and program losses. We would also expect open and public discussions of fiscal matters, the license buyer is the sole support of the agency and should be kept informed at all costs!

2. That the minimum age for license purchase, both hunting and fishing permits, be 14 years. We feel that the present exempted 14 to 16 year age class utilizes the resources as much as the 16 to 18 year age class. We feel the Hunter Safety Program trains young hunters well at ages 14 and 15 and that trained hunters are more active in the sport. We also feel that the 14 year age class of anglers should be required to accept fiscal responsibility.

3. At age 65 offer a lifetime license for hunting or fishing, or a combination license, or require an annual license until age 70. We do not feel that active hunting and fishing ends at age 65, in fact the reverse may be true. We have observed great numbers of that age

group involved in both hunting and fishing and usually with better equipment, tackle, boats, campers, and related items than in much younger age groups. We believe Kansas sportsmen are the finest in the United States and are willing to help finance fish and game activities, upon reaching age 65, for future generations of young sportsmen.

4. Offer a lifetime license, at age 45, at a discount price for hunting or fishing or make a combination permit available. Each year would find a new 45 year age class available for license purchases. This type license would be a prestige sales item, would probably be a profit item due to attrition, as well as pre-empting a lifetime license at age 65.
5. Require every citizen who utilizes fish and wildlife resources to purchase a license. The American Indian population is now exempted from license purchase and we feel this not fair to the rest of the Kansas license buyer public. The Indian population probably utilizes the resource as much as, or more than, any segment of the sportsmen society.
6. Return a percentage of the state gasoline tax to the fish and game fee fund. (example: $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1%) Vast, and at this time unknown, amounts are spent by boaters on gasoline and since the Fish and Game Commission administers and enforces boating regulations this method would insure additional funding for boating activities, including a greatly expanded safety educational program.
7. Require an additional permit to hunt waterfowl on the three state owned and operated waterfowl areas. The areas are extensively managed for waterfowl and for waterfowl hunters and the extra income generated by a special permit could be used for upkeep of the areas.
8. Require a hunting license for any person who hunts coyotes with only the exception of landowners or tenants who hunt their own land.
9. Increase the out of state license fees in an equal amount to the increases of resident licenses.
10. At all costs maintain the integrity of dedicated wildlife lands now under license to the Fish and Game Commission. Licensed lands are the bright hope for improved habitat, for wildlife, in Kansas at the present time. Such licensed lands are not dedicated to farming operations and farming practices should remain secondary to wildlife needs. If a legislative mandate for more intensive farming operations

comes about, it will be a great loss to license buyers and to the wildlife programs now in effect on the licensed lands.

11. Strengthen and enhance all public relations activities of the agency. We believe it is of prime importance that news and issues be discussed openly by the press and on radio and television. The license buyer deserves to know about programs, actions, budgets, personnel, meetings and hearings and operations of the agency. An aggressive and intense public relations effort is necessary, not only to continually inform, but to gain and hold the confidence of Kansas license buyers. We believe that, quote, "first stories" from the agency should be the rule not the exception. We feel that Sasnak has been sadly neglected, in the area of public relations, during the past 10 months. Good P.R. would point up the intangibles as well as the tangibles accruing in the program. License buyers must be informed if they are to remain license buyers! We cannot emphasize enough the need for a fully staffed I & E division. We recommend a fully staffed division, one that can write, release news and keep the Kansas license buyer informed, above all!

12. That the Fish and Game Commission become aggressive and take a dominate role in issues facing Kansas sportsmen. We do not feel policy statements concerning anti-hunting issues, gun control or registration, habitat losses, trapping and wildlife populations and management have been forthcoming without a great deal of prodding from organizations such as the Kansas Wildlife Federation. We believe the agency should be willing and able, and allowed, to speak out on important issues without fear of political blacklashes. We believe the same is, and should be, true in regards to legislation that would adversely affect the agency or the resources, or by the same token, legislation that would enhance the resources or the agency. The Kansas Fish and Game Commission is charged with propagation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources and should be highly responsive to all issues. The agency should always have Kansas sportsmen and the fish and wildlife resources as the prime objectives in all deliberations. We feel the Kansas Fish and Game Commission exists for only two reasons: the fish and wildlife resources of the State of Kansas and for the Kansas license buyers who fund the agency!

Finally, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we in no way intend our statements to be taken as dissatisfaction with Sasnak. We intend no undue criticism of the agency or the administration.

Being human we have all made mistakes and will continue to do so if we remain active in fish and wildlife issues. We must all be more open to suggestions and willing to openly discuss issues and problems relating to our state!

We are well pleased with a great many parts of the Sasnak program, to this date. We believe we have an excellent technical staff, an able administration and a population of license buyers willing to pay for quality hunting and fishing. It is our contention that all needs can be met and the Legislature, the agency and the sportsmen society must get on with the tasks at hand. First, continuation of research and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources; second, funding of the program and third, Legislative approval of needed funding methods.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, on behalf of the membership of the Kansas Wildlife Federation, we thank you for the opportunity to speak toward the issues facing fish and game resources in Kansas.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Cunningham
Executive Director
Kansas Wildlife Federation, Inc.

Although I am not happy with the present way the Commission is appointed or the way it operates, it is much better than the one proposed by the Governor. The one proposed by the Governor would still have a Commission but they would only be advisory and the head could be changed by the whom of the Governor or by a change of administration which would leave no continuity.

Harry L. Macklin
R.R. 1
Milford, Kansas 66514
U.S. Army Ret.